

Assessment		125	141	144	175	176	182
Stage 1 - Sift						part planning consent granted.	
all sites 0.15Ha and above	0.15 Ha or greater ++	(--)-0.08ha	(++)1.91ha	(++) 0.51ha	(++) 1.12ha	(++)1.29ha	(++)0.28ha
	Less than 0.15 Ha --						
Check for conformity with Local Plan Strategy, Settlement Hierarchy, SP1	Conforms to Local Plan Strategy Spatial Strategy (SP1) ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Does not meet Local Plan Strategy (Spatial Strategy) SP1 --						
Sites which cause significant harm to national/international nature conservation sites (species or habitat) or would involve substantial harm or loss to designated heritage assets will not be considered further.	Will Not cause harm ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Will cause harm --						
Sites which fall wholly within Flood Zone 3b not considered further for built development. Where sites are partially in Flood Zone 3b, that part of the site will be not be considered further for built development.	Is not within Flood Zone 3b ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Is within Flood Zone 3b --						
Stage 2 - Site Assessment							
Q1A How accessible is the site to key services and facilities	Bus stop	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(+)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +					
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -					
		15 minutes walking time and over --					
	Local Shop	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(+)	(++)	(+)	(+)	(+)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +					
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -					
		15 minutes walking time and over --					
	Nearest Primary School	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(+)	(++)	(+)	(+)	(+)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +					
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -					
		15 minutes walking time and over --					
Nearest Development Limit	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	
	Up to 10 minutes walking time +						
	Up to 15 minutes walking time -						
	15 minutes walking time and over --						

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		125	141	144	175	176	182
Overall accessibility rating	Site has excellent accessibility ++		(+)	(++)	(+)	(+)	(+)
	Site has good accessibility +						
	Site has variable accessibility –						
	Site has poor accessibility --						
Q2A What flood zone does the site fall within?	Flood Zone 1++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Flood Zone 2 +						
	Flood zone 3a –						
Q2B What vulnerability class does the site fall	Flood Zone 1++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Flood Zone 2						
	Flood Zone 3a						
	Less vulnerable ++						
	More vulnerable +						
	Highly vulnerable -						
Q2D Has a Flood Risk Assessment been undertaken?	yes ++	SFRA	(-) SFRA -FRA will be required	SFRA	(-)SFRA -FRA will be required	(-) SFRA -FRA will be required	SFRA
	No --						
A Overall Flood Risk Assessment	Site has low overall flood risk ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Site faces significant flood risk issues which can be mitigated +						
	Site faces significant flood risk issues which could potentially be mitigated –						
	Site faces significant flood risk issues and may be inappropriate for development --						
Q3 What are the conclusions of the Highways Authority (NYCC) and Highways England (where appropriate) initial highway assessment?	Site has no highway issues identified ++	(++) Highways England have confirmed that: access is principally gained from a signalised junction. This site would be served by that established junction.	(+) Highways England have confirmed that direct access onto the A64 is not possible, due to existing direct access onto the A64. No access details have been provided. Site could be accessed from Sands Lane, and then the visibility of the junction will need consideration. The County Highways Officer advises: Acceptable onto Sands Lane or A64 (Subject to HA approval). Significant improvements to Sands Lane would be required. Accessibility criteria can be met.	(+) Highways England have confirmed that the site is on the Thorpe Bassett Road, which is acceptable in principle. No access details have been provided.	(+) Highways England have confirmed that direct access onto the A64 is not possible, due to existing direct access onto the A64. Access details have been provided recently, and so have not been assessed by the relevant authorities. The site would be accessed from Sands Lane. With a widening of the junction from Sands Lane onto the A64. Highway Authority observations were 10-15 dwellings could be acceptable. The County Highways Officer advises: Acceptable onto Sands Lane or A64 (Subject to HA approval). Significant improvements to Sands Lane would be required. Accessibility criteria can be met.	(++) Highways England are satisfied that access to the A64 is principally gained from a signalised junction.	(++) Highways England are satisfied that access to the A64 is principally gained from a signalised junction. The County Highways Officer advises: Access onto Moorgate Lane significant improvements will be required as access point is over small stream. Footpath and accessibility infrastructure must also be introduced into this area.
	Site has some highways issues identified which can be mitigated subject to further investigation +						
	Site has multiple highways issues which can be mitigated subject to further investigation -						
	Site has multiple highway issues which may be difficult to mitigate unless further investigation demonstrates otherwise --						
Biodiversity and Geo-diversity							
Q4 Would the development affect a regional or local site of biodiversity (including SINCs, LNRs or RIGS) or affect UK, NYMNP or Ryedale Biodiversity Plan protected species	Enhancement of feature/species possible – mitigation not required ++	(+) The site is not designated, or identified as a site of biodiversity. However, were there to be protected species, these would be considered under their statutory framework.	(+) The site is not designated, or identified as a site of biodiversity. However, were there to be protected species, these would be considered under their statutory framework.	(+) The site is not designated, or identified as a site of biodiversity. However, were there to be protected species, these would be considered under their statutory framework.	(+) The site is not designated, or identified as a site of biodiversity. However, were there to be protected species, these would be considered under their statutory framework.	(+) The site is not designated, or identified as a site of biodiversity. However, were there to be protected species, these would be considered under their statutory framework.	(-) There is a protected pond very close to this site, an ecological survey will be required to assess the biological assets
	Neutral impact – no effect or effect can be fully mitigated +						
	Adverse impact but mitigation possible –						

Assessment		125	141	144	175	176	182
protected species	Serious impact with limited means of mitigation --						

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		125	141	144	175	176	182
Q5 Would the development provide opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure, including linking in with existing green infrastructure/corridors?	<p>Excellent opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors ++</p> <p>Some opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors +</p> <p>No opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors, however the site has the potential to accommodate these –</p> <p>No opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure corridors, however the site does not have the potential to accommodate these --</p>	(-) No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible. The established trees would be very important to retain, these trees form a continuous line of trees which follow the course of Rillington Beck. The site forms part of a local green infrastructure network.	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible. This strip is heavily treed, with conifer plantation, which in themselves have a limited biodiversity value.	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible. Grazed field.	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible. Grazed field.	Planning consent is now granted for part of the site. The site is a grazed paddock, with other paddocks, a distinctive feature of this part of Rillington.	No information has been submitted. The site is established farm buildings. There is no reason to suggest that green infrastructure could not be accommodated. The site has a pond to the rear of the site.
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>	(-) Comments from the Council's Tree Officer: The site contains is surrounded by a number of trees which are considered to be highly prominent. The site also contains established hedgerows. Ensure that the position of any new dwelling is positioned in accordance with BS 5837:2005 and retain existing hedged boundaries and boundary trees (mentions designating the trees and hedgerows).	(-) There is a conifer plantation. Its visual amenity quality comes from the block form, which looks like it forms part of the wider 'Estate Landscape' of the Scampston Estate. Development would mean the loss of the plantation. Which would change the visual character of this area.	(+) No Trees. The site has manicured native hedgerows, which would need to be retained.	(+) The site contains two lines of mature, attractive trees which are outside the field boundary on the northern and southern boundaries. They make a distinctive contribution to the character of this part of Rillington, which is closest to the Scampston Estate.	(-) Ensure that the position of any new dwelling(s) is positioned in accordance with BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to construction – Recommendations. Selected trees within the site should be retained to provide maturity to the development and to screen the development against open countryside to the east. Retain selected trees within the site and along the eastern boundary. Retain existing boundary hedges. Although part of the site has been developed (namely the paddock off Low Moorgate Lane), the heavily treed area remains undeveloped.	(+) There are no trees in this site, and the boundaries are limited, and the site is almost fully developed with farm buildings currently.
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>	(+)	(-)	(+)	(+)	(+)	impact on pond

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		125	141	144	175	176	182
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 ++	<p>(--) Rillington is within the Vale of Pickering National Character Area, which is principally defined by its low-lying topography. However, it is on the edge of this area, and to the south, the land begins to rise and form the Wolds escarpment. The Local Landscape Character type is Wooded Open Vale, reflecting the flat, low lying terrain which is punctuated by woodland blocks. This is a small, but prominent site which is surrounded by trees. These trees make an important contribution to the street scene. The site is elevated, and on the gentle rising land, as it is on the southernmost extent of the village, and is outside Development Limits. There is an existing timber building, which the site submitter proposes to replace with a new dwelling. It is unlikely to cause wider landscape impacts by virtue of its size, but an adverse localised impact would be present.</p>	<p>(-) Rillington is within the Vale of Pickering National Character Area, which is principally defined by its low-lying topography. However, it is on the edge of this area, and to the south, the land begins to rise and form the Wolds escarpment. The Local Landscape Character type is Wooded Open Vale, reflecting the flat, low lying terrain which is punctuated by woodland blocks. The site feels distanced from the village, forms part of a wedge of land which straddles between Sand Lane and the A64. It has an open-estate-land character, in part due to the proximity of Scampston Hall Estate. The site links in-between sites 175 and 515. The site includes a woodland block which is a distinctive element of character in this area.</p>	<p>(-) Rillington is within the Vale of Pickering National Character Area, which is principally defined by its low-lying topography. However, it is on the edge of this area, and to the south, the land begins to rise and form the Wolds escarpment. The Local Landscape Character type is Wooded Open Vale, reflecting the flat, low lying terrain which is punctuated by woodland blocks. This site is to the south of the settlement, and is afforded open views of the land rising into the Wolds. Site has development to the north, but then there is no further development (sports pitch is to the east of the site, and the site is also a triangular shaped site, making it a site that is more visually intrusive.</p>	<p>(+) Rillington is within the Vale of Pickering National Character Area, which is principally defined by its low-lying topography. However, it is on the edge of this area, and to the south, the land begins to rise and form the Wolds escarpment. The Local Landscape Character type is Wooded Open Vale, reflecting the flat, low lying terrain which is punctuated by woodland blocks. The site feels distanced from the village, forming part of a wedge of land which straddles between Sand Lane and the A64. It has an open-estate-land character, in part due to the proximity of Scampston Hall Estate. This site is the closer to the village, but will still feel distanced from the village.</p>	<p>(-) Rillington is within the Vale of Pickering National Character Area, which is principally defined by its low-lying topography. However, it is on the edge of this area, and to the south, the land begins to rise and form the Wolds escarpment. The Local Landscape Character type is Wooded Open Vale, reflecting the flat, low lying terrain which is punctuated by woodland blocks. The site area is the same extent as sites 286 and 638. Site incorporates a number of grazed paddocks, with linear, hedged boundaries. This area has a very distinct rural character, and there are some gaps in the frontage, which do contribute to the character of the local area. There are attractive brick walls on the southern boundary. To the rear of the properties to the east there is a well treed area, with mature vegetation. It is considered that this site is visually sensitive, and contributes to the rural dispersed character of this part of Rillington.</p>	<p>(++) Rillington is within the Vale of Pickering National Character Area, which is principally defined by its low-lying topography. However, it is on the edge of this area, and to the south, the land begins to rise and form the Wolds escarpment. The Local Landscape Character type is Wooded Open Vale, reflecting the flat, low lying terrain which is punctuated by woodland blocks. This site consists of modern and older farm outbuildings on the northern edge of the village, and is aligned to sites 223 and 255, in making up the farm complex. The modern farm buildings in themselves are not visually attractive, but they contribute to the rural character of this part of Rillington. They are not capable of conversion. The older elements look like stabling blocks, and are curtilage listed. The development character is single depth, the open flat topography means that a sensitive conversion of the traditional buildings, with some modern building, with appropriate landscaping could be feasible.</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 +						
	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 protected landscapes the North York Moors NP and 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 ++	<p>(++) Not proximal to the AONB or NP</p>	<p>(++) Distanced and low lying topography. Not proximal to AONB.</p>	<p>(++) Distanced and low lying topography. Not proximal to the AONB</p>	<p>(++) Distanced and low lying topography. Not proximal to the AONB.</p>	<p>(++) Distanced and low lying topography. Not proximal to the AONB.</p>	<p>(++) Distanced and low lying topography. Not proximal to the AONB.</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 +						
	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 --						

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		125	141	144	175	176	182
Q10 Is the site capable of utilising existing landscape features to minimise its impact or provide adequate landscape mitigation measures?	<p>Site is capable of retaining and enhancing existing landscape features ++</p> <p>Site is capable of retaining some existing landscape features and limited or no landscape mitigation is required +</p> <p>Site will not retain most existing landscape features, however landscape mitigation is possible –</p> <p>Site will not retain any existing landscape features and limited or no landscape mitigation is possible/proposed –</p>	<p>(--) The site is surrounded by trees, particularly the west, and south, and a new dwelling likely to necessitate positioning to ensure no harm to the trees, which would be to the detriment of this site.</p>	<p>(--) Site is heavily treed area, which is distinctive for this part of the eastern side of Rillington, and linkages with the Scampston Estate. It is a distinctive element of landscape character for this area.</p>	<p>(-) The site is adjacent to the edge of the settlement. Its is open, and so boundary treatments would be particularly important.</p>	<p>(-) The site is adjacent to a paddock, straddling between the A64 and Sands Lane, and is open in character. It is considered that development in this location would be highly visible, as the land is flat, and relatively open, despite the presence of trees on the boundary, which there is an expectation they would be retained.</p>	<p>(+)The approved scheme gives the street frontage the appearance of one dwelling, but 10 dwellings are proposed, which sweep round the site and to the back of no.56.</p>	<p>(+) Farm buildings, site open and flat without such buildings screening would be required. Paddock adjacent this is screened by a row of trees.</p>
Q11 Will the site lead to the coalescence of settlements which will impact on their character and setting?	<p>Development within the built form of the settlement ++</p> <p>Development is on the edge of a settlement which is not affected by coalescence with another settlement +</p> <p>Development is on the edge of the settlement and will lead to coalescence with another settlement however mitigation possible –</p> <p>Development is on the edge of the settlement and will lead to significant coalescence with another settlement and limited/no mitigation possible --</p>	<p>(+) Southern side of the village, Thorpe Bassett some distance away.</p>	<p>(-)There is no proximal settlement, but properties in Scampston are viewable from Sands Lane. It is considered that the site could contribute to coalescence through the loss of the trees, which would increase intervisibility.</p>	<p>(+) Southern side of the village, Thorpe Bassett some distance away.</p>	<p>(+) There is no proximal settlement, but properties in Scampston are viewable from Sands Lane. It is considered that in itself this site is unlikely to exacerbate coalescence, but with other sites in proximity, the physical separation between Rillington and Scampston would be significantly eroded. But alone, given it is the site closest to the village (with development to north and south, it may be possible to integrate the site.</p>	<p>(+) To the Northern side of the village.</p>	<p>(+) To the Northern side of the village.</p>

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		125	141	144	175	176	182
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 ++	(--)	(-)	(-)	(+) (Green)	(-)	(+) (Green)
	Neutral impact – the proposal will not have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement +						
	Negative impact – the proposal will have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement, however mitigation is possible –						
	Significant impact – the proposal will have a significant adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement and limited or no mitigation is possible --						
Culture and Heritage							
Q12 Will the site affect a designated heritage asset, either directly or indirectly through its setting?	Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++	(+)	(-)	(+)	(-)	(+)	(-)
	Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +						
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –						
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --						
	(+) No designated heritage assets proximal. The site is within the buffer zone of the Scampston Estate Registered Park and Garden, but is not proximal or of a scale to harm the setting of the park. The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of a number 1117 An Iron Age Barrow Cemetery, but is not in a discernible distance to the SM.	(-) Being a treed site straddling currently open fields on Sands Lane, the site is particularly close to the boundary with Scampston Estate Registered Park and Garden (RPG). As such development of this site has the potential to affect the setting of the RPG. The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of number 1117, an Iron Age Barrow Cemetery, but is not in a discernible distance to the SM.	(+) No designated heritage assets proximal. The site is within the buffer zone of the Scampston Estate Registered Park and Garden, but is not proximal or of a scale to harm the setting of the park. The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of number 1117, an Iron Age Barrow Cemetery, but is not in a discernible distance to the SM.	(-) The site is particularly close to the boundary with Scampston Estate Historic Park and Garden (HPG). Consider that development of this site has the potential to affect the setting of the HPG, the site is on Sands Lane leads into the RPG. The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of a number 1117 An Iron Age Barrow Cemetery, but is not in a discernible distance to the SM. Historic England have identified the proximity of the site to the Scampston HPG. It is Grade II*. An assessment needs to be undertaken to assess the contribution which this site makes to the HPG, and what the development of this area would have upon the significance. At Grade II* it within the category of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, where substantial harm to their significance should be wholly exceptional.	(+) No designated heritage assets proximal. The site is within the buffer zone of the Scampston Estate Registered Park and Garden, but is not proximal or of a scale to harm the setting of the park. The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of a number 1117 An Iron Age Barrow Cemetery, but is not in a discernible distance to the SM.	(-) The proposal for this site is for conversion and redevelopment of outbuildings. This is adjacent to the Grade II Listed Manor Farmhouse. As these are the traditional outbuildings would be curtilage listed. Any development would need to carefully consider the historic nature of the outbuildings and the setting of the farm house, but it is a natural progression in many villages that farmsteads have become incorporated into the village through later development. This is a characteristic of Rillington. The site is within the buffer zone of the Scampston Estate Registered Park and Garden, but is not proximal or of a scale to harm the setting of the park. The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of number 1117 an Iron Age Barrow Cemetery, but is not in a discernible distance to the SM.	

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		125	141	144	175	176	182
<p>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?</p>	<p>Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++</p>	<p>(--) It is considered that development of this site, given its elevated, constrained area, in conjunction with the absence of immediate properties and the presence of trees, means that development of this site, even for an individual dwelling, would be a intrusive development within the streetscene. Which is This is an Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. The village (like many villages along the Foothlope of the Wolds have existed for multiple centuries and there is a immense archaeological record showing settlement chronology dating back millennia. All sites would need to undertake geophysical surveying in the first instance to establish the archaeological features within this area.</p>	<p>(--) This parcel of land forms part of a wedge of land which is out with the built form of the village. It is a planted coniferous wood, which is part of the distinctive character of this part of the Vale of Pickering. It is considered that this site is not well related to the built form of the settlement and in its current state contributes to the character and setting of the village. This is an Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. NYCC Heritage Unit advises: Site lies across road from SM of Iron Age barrow cemetery, East Field. Area of extremely high potential for presence of prehistoric and later burials and associated settlement/activity as the wider area along the southern edge of the Vale of Pickering is known for a corridor of almost continuous settlement and activity from early prehistory through to the medieval period between the 25-45m contour zone. Would advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching to clarify the nature and significance of any archaeological remains.</p>	<p>(--) This site is to the south of the settlement, and is afforded open views of the land rising into the Wolds. Site has development to the north, but then there is no further development (sports pitch is to the east of the site, and the site is also a triangular shaped site, making it a site that is more visually intrusive. This is an Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. NYCC Heritage Unit advise: Archaeological evaluation by geophysical survey and trial trenching, of a site to the north, located north of Southlea in response to a development proposal for 29 dwellings, identified archaeological remains of prehistoric land later date. Would advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching to clarify the nature and significance of any archaeological remains.</p>	<p>(-) The site feels distanced from the village, forming part of a wedge of land which straddles between Sand Lane and the A64. It has an open-estate-land character, in part due to the proximity of Scampston Hall Estate. This site is the closer to the village, but will still feel distanced from the village. This is an Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. NYCC Heritage Unit have advised: Site lies across road from SM of Iron Age barrow cemetery, East Field. Area of extremely high potential for presence of prehistoric and later burials and associated settlement/activity as the wider area along the southern edge of the Vale of Pickering is known for a corridor of almost continuous settlement and activity from early prehistory through to the medieval period between the 25-45m contour zone. Would advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching to clarify the nature and significance of any archaeological remains.</p>	<p>(-)The site area is the same extent as sites 286 and 638. Site incorporates a number of grazed paddocks, with linear, hedged boundaries. This area has a very distinct rural character, and there are some gaps in the frontage, which do contribute to the character of the local area. There are attractive brick walls on the southern boundary. To the rear of the properties to the east there is a well treed area, with mature vegetation. It is considered that this site is visually sensitive, and contributes to the rural dispersed character of this part of Rillington. This is an Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. NYCC Heritage Unit advise: uncertain of precise site boundary and whether it extends beyond the area already subject to geophysical survey. If additional area to be developed, then would advise geophysical survey should be carried out in area not previously surveyed, to be followed by trial trenching as appropriate. If area same as that already surveyed, then a condition to secure mitigation archaeological recording would be advised.</p>	<p>(-) This is an Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. The village (like many villages along the Foothlope of the Wolds have existed for multiple centuries and there is a immense archaeological record showing settlement chronology dating back millennia. All sites would need to undertake geophysical surveying in the first instance to establish the archaeological features within this area. NYCC Heritage Unit advise: Site is in an area of potential, but already disturbed by development.</p>
	<p>Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +</p>						
	<p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –</p>						
	<p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --</p>						

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		125	141	144	175	176	182
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 provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	The submitter of the site has stated that they are intending to use building design features.	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information 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 ++	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.
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 ++	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.
E Overall rating for 'Low Carbon Development and Renewable Energy'	Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer willing ++	Site submitter has confirmed they would be using low carbon technologies	No information submitted.	No information submitted.	No information submitted.	No information submitted.	No information submitted.
	Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer unwilling -						
	Site not capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology --						
Sustainable Building and Waste Reduction							
Q17 Can the site accommodate higher sustainable building standards than currently required?	Site can accommodate 2 levels higher than mandatory limit ++	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that higher sustainable building standards could not be accommodated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that higher sustainable building standards could not be accommodated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that higher sustainable building standards could not be accommodated.	No standard is suggested, the submitter of the site is intending to use building design features.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that higher sustainable building standards could not be accommodated.	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible. The submitter of the site is promoting reuse of buildings as sustainable.
	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?	Site can accommodate 2 levels higher than mandatory limit ++	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for waste reduction could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for waste reduction could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for waste reduction could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for waste reduction could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for waste reduction could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for waste reduction could not be incorporated.
	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 details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for recycling facilities could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for recycling facilities could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for recycling facilities could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for recycling facilities could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for recycling facilities could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for recycling facilities could not be incorporated.
	No --						

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		125	141	144	175	176	182
F Overall Rating for 'Sustainable Building and Waste Minimisation'	Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development and developer willing ++	No information submitted	No information submitted	No information submitted	No information submitted	No information submitted	No information submitted
	Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development but developer unwilling -						
	Site not capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development --						
Efficient Use of Land							
Q.20 Is the site or any part of the site considered previously developed land?	Site is over 50% to 100% Brownfield ++	(++) 0.08ha of Brownfield (curtilage to unit)	1.91ha of greenfield land. But no Brownfield sites are available and capable of meeting housing need.	0.51ha of greenfield. But no Brownfield sites are available and capable of meeting housing need.	1.12ha of greenfield. But no Brownfield sites are available and capable of meeting housing need.	1.29ha of greenfield. But no Brownfield sites are available and capable of meeting housing need.	0.28ha of greenfield. But no Brownfield sites are available and capable of meeting housing need. Although there are buildings on the site they are agricultural buildings.
	Site is up to 50% Brownfield +						
Q.21 Can the site achieve an appropriate density to achieve the most efficient use of the land?	Excellent density achieved taking into account location and context ++	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 1 dwelling.	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. 40 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. 11 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. 23 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. 27 dwellings.	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 6 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 --						
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 ++	No evidence that the land is contaminated.	No evidence that the land is contaminated.	No evidence that the land is contaminated.	No evidence that the land is contaminated.	Part of site in 1975 has road haulage	No evidence that the land is contaminated.
	Development is located on land which may be contaminated and will be remediated +						
	Development is located on land which may be contaminated and no proposals for remediation have been put forward -						
	Development is located on land which is likely to be highly contaminated no proposals for remediation have been put forward --						
G Overall Rating for 'Efficient Use of Land'	Site represents very efficient use of land with mitigation to fully overcome concerns where necessary ++	(++)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)
	Site represents efficient use of land but further mitigation required to fully overcome concerns where necessary +						
	Site does not represent efficient use of land. Further investigation of mitigation measures to overcome concerns required -						
	Site does not represent efficient use of land and mitigation is not possible --						
Natural Resources							
Q. 23 Would the development of this site involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1,2 and 3a)?	No loss of best and most versatile agricultural land ++	(+) 0.08ha of grade 2 land. This is Best and Most Versatile Land. Although the site is currently not in agriculture, and is less than 5ha in size.	(-) 1.91ha grade 3 land. 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 loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The site is	(-) 1.91ha grade 2 land. This is Best and Most Versatile Land. Although the site is currently not in intensive agriculture, being grazed, and is less than 5ha in size.	(-) 1.12ha grade 3 land. 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 loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The land is	(-) 1.29 grade 2 land. This is Best and Most Versatile Land. Although the site is currently not in intensive agriculture, being grazed, and is less than 5ha in size.	(-) 0.28ha Grade 2 land. This is Best and Most Versatile Land. Although the site is currently occupied by farm buildings, and is less than 5ha in size.
	Up to 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost -						

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		125	141	144	175	176	182
	More than 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost --		currently a conifer tree plantation.		currently grazed.		
Q. 24 Would the development lead to the sterilisation of mineral resources?	<p>Site not within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search, or Mineral Consultation Zone ++?</p> <p>Site within the buffer of a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone --?</p> <p>Site within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone --</p>		(--) within sand gravel mineral safeguarding area. But adjacent to the built form of the settlement.	(--) within sand gravel mineral safeguarding area. But adjacent to the built form of the settlement.	(--) within sand gravel mineral safeguarding area. But adjacent to the built form of the settlement.	(--) within sand gravel mineral safeguarding area. But adjacent to the built form of the settlement.	(--) within sand gravel mineral safeguarding area. But adjacent to the built form of the settlement.
Q. 25 Would the development have an adverse impact on a Groundwater Source Protection Zone?	<p>Development is not located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone ++</p> <p>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 +</p> <p>Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but no risk assessment has been undertaken -</p> <p>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 --</p>	Environment Agency not requested to comment.	Environment Agency not requested to comment.	Environment Agency not requested to comment.	(++) Unproductive Aquifer, not in groundwater Source Protection Zone	(++) Unproductive Aquifer, not in groundwater Source Protection Zone	Environment Agency not requested to comment.
Q. 27 Is any part of the development on suspected unstable land?	<p>Land has no instability concerns ++</p> <p>Land potentially unstable but investigation has shown that mitigation is possible +</p> <p>Land potentially unstable but no investigation has been carried out -</p> <p>Land suffers from significant instability problems and either no mitigation has been proposed or instability problems are not possible to mitigate --</p>	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.	There is no evidence that the land is unstable.	There is no evidence that the land is unstable.
Q. 28 Will the site impact on major hazard sites or pipelines?	<p>HSE Standing Advice states "do not advise against development" ++</p> <p>HSE Standing Advice states "advise against development"</p>	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
H Overall Rating for 'Natural Resources'	<p>Site would not adversely affect any natural resources ++</p> <p>Site would not have any significant adverse effect on natural resources +</p> <p>Site would have an adverse effect on natural resources but mitigation is possible -</p> <p>Site would have a significant adverse effect on natural resources and limited/no mitigation is possible --</p>	(++)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)
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?	<p>The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +</p> <p>The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -</p>	(+) By virtue of its location, and size of site, and adjacent uses, it is unlikely that noise, light dust or smell would cause a nuisance to both existing and prospective users.	(+) By virtue of its location, and size of site, and adjacent uses, it is unlikely that noise, light dust or smell would cause a nuisance to both existing and prospective users.	(+) By virtue of its location, and size of site, and adjacent uses, it is unlikely that noise, light dust or smell would cause a nuisance to both existing and prospective users.	(+) By virtue of its location, and size of site, and adjacent uses, it is unlikely that noise, light dust or smell would cause a nuisance to both existing and prospective users.	(+) By virtue of its location, and size of site, and adjacent uses, it is unlikely that noise, light dust or smell would cause a nuisance to both existing and prospective users.	(+) By virtue of its location, and size of site, and adjacent uses, it is unlikely that noise, light dust or smell would cause a nuisance to both existing and prospective users.

Assessment		125	141	144	175	176	182
	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 --						

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		125	141	144	175	176	182
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.	<p>The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +</p> <p>The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -</p> <p>The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --</p>	(+) it is considered that these amenity impacts could be addressed though considering the scale, massing and orientation of the properties in respect of existing dwellings, and proposed dwellings. The surrounding build form is of domestic proportions.	(+) it is considered that these amenity impacts could be addressed though considering the scale, massing and orientation of the properties in respect of existing dwellings, and proposed dwellings. The surrounding build form is of domestic proportions.	(+) it is considered that these amenity impacts could be addressed though considering the scale, massing and orientation of the properties in respect of existing dwellings, and proposed dwellings. The surrounding build form is of domestic proportions.	(+) it is considered that these amenity impacts could be addressed though considering the scale, massing and orientation of the properties in respect of existing dwellings, and proposed dwellings. The surrounding build form is of domestic proportions.	(+) it is considered that these amenity impacts could be addressed though considering the scale, massing and orientation of the properties in respect of existing dwellings, and proposed dwellings. The surrounding build form is of domestic proportions.	(+) it is considered that these amenity impacts could be addressed though considering the scale, massing and orientation of the properties in respect of existing dwellings, and proposed dwellings.
I Overall Rating for 'Amenity'	<p>The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +</p> <p>The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -</p> <p>The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of this site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --</p>	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)
Flood Risk							
Q. 31 Is the site potentially affected by groundwater flooding?	<p>No ++</p> <p>Yes further investigation required --</p>	(--) Yes - the SFRA notes that Rillington lies on the edge of a zone of potential ground water and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A)	(--) Yes - the SFRA notes that Rillington lies on the edge of a zone of potential ground water and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A)	(--) Yes - the SFRA notes that Rillington lies on the edge of a zone of potential ground water and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A)	(--) Yes - the SFRA notes that Rillington lies on the edge of a zone of potential ground water and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A)	(--) Yes - the SFRA notes that Rillington lies on the edge of a zone of potential ground water and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A)	(--) Yes - the SFRA notes that Rillington lies on the edge of a zone of potential ground water and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A)
Q. 32 Is the site potentially affected by surface water flooding and is this site considered to be within a critical drainage area?	<p>No ++</p> <p>Yes further investigation required --</p>	(--) The site is within an area potentially affected by surface water flooding, but it is not within a Critical Drainage Area. Environment Agency would expect no increase in surface water runoff from the site	(--) The site is within an area potentially affected by surface water flooding, but it is not within a Critical Drainage Area. Environment Agency would expect no increase in surface water runoff from the site	(--) The site is within an area potentially affected by surface water flooding, but it is not within a Critical Drainage Area. Environment Agency would expect no increase in surface water runoff from the site	(--) The site is within an area potentially affected by surface water flooding, but it is not within a Critical Drainage Area. Environment Agency would expect no increase in surface water runoff from the site	(--) The site is within an area potentially affected by surface water flooding, but it is not within a Critical Drainage Area. Environment Agency would expect no increase in surface water runoff from the site	(--) The site is within an area potentially affected by surface water flooding, but it is not within a Critical Drainage Area. Environment Agency would expect no increase in surface water runoff from the site
Q. 33 Is the site potentially affected by sewer flooding?	<p>No ++</p> <p>Yes further investigation required --</p>	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		125	141	144	175	176	182
Q. 34 Have Sustainable Drainage Systems (SDS) been proposed as part of the development?	<p>Site capable of accommodating SDS and have been proposed as part of the development ++</p> <p>Site capable of accommodating SDS though no information on whether SDS proposed as part of the development +</p> <p>Site capable of accommodating SDS however SDS not being proposed on site -</p> <p>Site not suitable for accommodating SDS -</p>	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme, and any Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme, and any Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme, and any Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme, and any Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme, and any Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme, and any Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.
Q. 35 What other measures* have been considered which ensure the development is resilient to climate change? * which may vary	<p>Multiple additional measures proposed which build in resilience to climate change ++</p> <p>Single additional measure proposed to build in resilience to climate change +</p> <p>No information provided on measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change -</p> <p>No measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change --</p>	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme and other resilience measures to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme and other resilience measures to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme and other resilience measures to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme and other resilience measures to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme and other resilience measures to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme and other resilience measures to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.
J Overall Rating for 'Flood Risk'	<p>No flood risk associated with the site ++</p> <p>Limited flood risk associated with the site which can be fully mitigated +</p> <p>Site affected by a number of flood risk issues, however mitigation possible-</p> <p>Site affected by significant flood risk issues and limited mitigation possible --</p>	(+) No information submitted.	(+) No information submitted.	(+) No information submitted.	(+) No information submitted.	(+) No information submitted.	(+) No information submitted.
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>	Development of the site would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of Rillington.	Development of the site would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of Rillington.	Development of the site would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of Rillington.	Development of the site would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of Rillington.	Development of the site would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of Rillington.	Development of the site would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of Rillington.
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 submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that secured by design principles could not be taken into account. Some specifics may not be appropriate within the village context of Rillington- but this is a site specific consideration.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that secured by design principles could not be taken into account. Some specifics may not be appropriate within the village context of Rillington- but this is a site specific consideration.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that secured by design principles could not be taken into account. Some specifics may not be appropriate within the village context of Rillington- but this is a site specific consideration.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that secured by design principles could not be taken into account. Some specifics may not be appropriate within the village context of Rillington- but this is a site specific consideration.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that secured by design principles could not be taken into account. Some specifics may not be appropriate within the village context of Rillington- but this is a site specific consideration.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that secured by design principles could not be taken into account. Some specifics may not be appropriate within the village context of Rillington- but this is a site specific consideration.
Q. 38 Does the design of the development encourage people to walk	Cycle ways and footpaths effectively integrated into the development encouraging walking and cycling ++	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that measures to	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that measures to	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that measures to	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that measures to	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that measures to	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that measures to

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		125	141	144	175	176	182
and cycle rather than travel by car?	Some cycle ways and/or footpaths shown encouraging walking and cycling +	increase walking and cycling could not be taken into account.	increase walking and cycling could not be taken into account.	increase walking and cycling could not be taken into account.	increase walking and cycling could not be taken into account.	increase walking and cycling could not be taken into account.	increase walking and cycling could not be taken into account.
	No cycle ways and footpaths indicated as part of this development --						

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		125	141	144	175	176	182
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>	A Travel Plan is not required for this site.	No Travel Plan has been submitted although there is no reason to suggest that a Travel Plan could not be produced.	A Travel Plan is not required for this site.	No Travel Plan has been submitted although there is no reason to suggest that a Travel Plan could not be produced.	No Travel Plan has been submitted although there is no reason to suggest that a Travel Plan could not be produced.	A Travel Plan is not required for this site.
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 site is particularly small, and so it unlikely to make any meaningful contribution of attracting a balanced living/working population or reducing inequality of opportunity.	No details have been submitted as to the type of housing proposed. Although there is no reason to suggest that development of the site would not support the ability to attract a more balanced population, and reducing inequality.	A "wholly affordable" scheme is being proposed, although the nature of this is not identified. Although there is no reason to suggest that development of the site would not support the ability to attract a more balanced population, and reducing inequality.	No details have been submitted as to the type of housing proposed. Although there is no reason to suggest that development of the site would not support the ability to attract a more balanced population, and reducing inequality.	No details have been submitted as to the type of housing proposed. Although there is no reason to suggest that development of the site would not support the ability to attract a more balanced population, and reducing inequality.	No details have been submitted as to the type of housing proposed. Although there is no reason to suggest that development of the site would not support the ability to attract a more balanced population, and reducing inequality.
K Overall Rating for 'People'	<p>Development actively planned to encourage the development of sustainable communities ++</p> <p>Development has taken into account the need to develop sustainable communities +</p> <p>Development has little regard to the need to develop sustainable communities -</p> <p>Development has no regard for the need to develop sustainable communities --</p>	(-)	(-)	(+)	(-)	(+)	(-)
Meeting needs							
Q.41 Does the type and mix of development proposed meet the needs identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), Employment Land Review Update 2010 (ELR), Ryedale Retail Capacity Studies (RRCS) and Malton Town Centre Strategy?	<p>Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++</p> <p>Proposal identifies what the needs are and how some needs will be met by the development +</p> <p>Proposal either does not identify what the needs are or how any needs will be met by the development -</p> <p>No assessment is undertaken of what the needs are and whether any needs will be met --</p>	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)	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 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)	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 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)	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 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)	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 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)	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 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		125	141	144	175	176	182
Q. 42 What level and type of affordable housing is proposed?	<p>Development offers appropriate level and type of affordable housing which meets the needs as set out in the SHMA ++</p> <p>Development offers some affordable housing which meets some of the need as set out in the SHMA +</p> <p>Development does not offer the appropriate level and type of affordable housing or does not meet the need for affordable housing as set out in the SHMA -</p> <p>The development makes no provision for affordable housing --</p>	(--)	There are no details provided concerning the amount of affordable housing. On a theoretical yield of 40 units the scheme would be expected to comply with SP3 regarding the on-site provision of affordable housing.	(+)Site is proposed as a "wholly affordable" scheme.	There are no details provided concerning the amount of affordable housing. On a theoretical yield of 23 units the scheme would be expected to comply with SP3 regarding the on-site provision of affordable housing.	There are no details provided concerning the amount of affordable housing. On a theoretical yield of 27 units the scheme would be expected to comply with SP3 regarding the on-site provision of affordable housing.	(-)There are no details provided concerning the amount of affordable housing. On a theoretical yield of 6 units the scheme would be expected to comply with SP3 regarding a commuted sum for affordable housing.
Q. 43 What provision has been made for Ryedale's elderly population?	<p>Development addresses and meets the needs of Ryedale's elderly population ++</p> <p>Development takes into account and meets some of the needs of Ryedale's elderly population +</p> <p>Development does not address the needs of Ryedale's elderly population -</p> <p>The development makes no provision for the needs of Ryedale's elderly population --</p>	No details have been provided, although as a service village there is no presumption for extra-care facilities. There is no expectation that bungalows will be required, but the Plan supports the delivery of lifetime homes. This will be considered as a site-specific matter.	No details have been provided, although as a service village there is no presumption for extra-care facilities. There is no expectation that bungalows will be required, but the Plan supports the delivery of lifetime homes. This will be considered as a site-specific matter.	No details have been provided, although as a service village there is no presumption for extra-care facilities. There is no expectation that bungalows will be required, but the Plan supports the delivery of lifetime homes. This will be considered as a site-specific matter.	No details have been provided, although as a service village there is no presumption for extra-care facilities. There is no expectation that bungalows will be required, but the Plan supports the delivery of lifetime homes. This will be considered as a site-specific matter.	No details have been provided, although as a service village there is no presumption for extra-care facilities. There is no expectation that bungalows will be required, but the Plan supports the delivery of lifetime homes. This will be considered as a site-specific matter.	No details have been provided, although as a service village there is no presumption for extra-care facilities. There is no expectation that bungalows will be required, but the Plan supports the delivery of lifetime homes. This will be considered as a site-specific matter.
L Overall Rating for 'Meeting Needs'	<p>Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++</p> <p>Proposal identifies what the needs are and how some needs will be met by the development +</p> <p>Proposal either does not identify what the needs are or how any needs are or how any needs will be met by the development -</p> <p>No assessment is undertaken of what the needs are and whether any needs --</p>	No details provided.	No details provided.	No details provided.	No details provided.	No details provided.	No details provided.
Community Facilities, utilities and Infrastructure							
Q45 On sites greater than 1ha: Has a Transport Assessment been undertaken	<p>Yes ++</p> <p>No- transport assessment required --</p>	No Transport Assessment required	(--) No Transport Assessment has been submitted at present.	No Transport Assessment required	(++) An Access Feasibility study has been undertaken to propose how access from Sands Lane could be provided onto the A64, with some junction alteration	(--) No Transport Assessment has been submitted at present.	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?	<p>No mitigation required or no impact on the highway following mitigation ++</p> <p>Mitigation required but no unacceptable impact following mitigation +</p> <p>Mitigation required and development would have a significant impact though not unacceptable impact after mitigation -</p> <p>Mitigation required and development would still have an unacceptable impact following mitigation --</p>	(-)Site would use signalised junction onto the A64. Access would need to be improved, and conflicts anticipated with playing pitch access adjacent.	(-) Access not achievable directly onto A64, would be via sands lane. Junction with A64 and Sands Lane is non-signalised. Need further assessment.	(-) Access would be via Thorpe Bassett Road concerns around visibility	(-) An Access Feasibility study has been undertaken to propose how access from Sands Lane could be provided onto the A64, with some junction alteration.	(++) Subject to existing planning consent, which has set out the acceptable access arrangement. Utilises existing signalised junction.	(+) Subject to access, site would utilise signalised junction

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		125	141	144	175	176	182
Q. 47 Can the site accommodate adequate parking and servicing facilities?	<p>Site meets highway guidelines for parking and servicing ++</p> <p>Site does not currently meet parking and/or servicing requirements. However these issues can potentially be overcome or mitigated –</p> <p>Site does not meet highway requirements for parking and/or servicing and the issues identified are difficult/not practically possible to overcome --</p>	No details have been submitted. Site submission is for a single dwelling.	No details have been submitted. No reason to suggest that adequate servicing and parking standards cannot be achieved.	No details have been submitted. No reason to suggest that adequate servicing and parking standards cannot be achieved.	No details have been submitted. No reason to suggest that adequate servicing and parking standards cannot be achieved.	(++) Subject to existing planning consent, which has set out the acceptable access arrangement. Utilises existing signalised junction.	No details have been submitted. No reason to suggest that adequate servicing and parking standards cannot be achieved.
Q. 48 Will the proposal provide, enable or improve access to public rights of way (PROW)?	<p>Proposal will create new PROW or integrate existing PROW into the development ++</p> <p>Proposal will not affect a PROW +</p> <p>Proposal would involve the diversion or loss of a PROW --</p>	(+) The site is adjacent to a PROW, no information has been submitted concerning any impact on the PROW, but depending on the proposed access to the property this could transect the PROW. It would not affect the PROW if the access is from the north of the site.	(+) No PROW proximal. No information is provided concerning creation of new PROWs.	(+) No PROW proximal. No information is provided concerning creation of new PROWs.	(+) No PROW proximal. No information is provided concerning creation of new PROWs.	(--) The site is adjacent to a PROW which runs from Scarborough Road/A64 and also Low Moorgate and continues along the back of various properties with paddocks on the eastern boundary to a track that runs to the Railway Lane. No details have been submitted as to how this PROW would be impacted upon.	(+) No PROW proximal. No information is provided concerning creation of new PROWs.
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>	The site is of a size where new public realm is unrealistic to be delivered.	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.	The site is of a size where new public realm is unrealistic to be delivered.	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.	The site is of a size where new public realm is unrealistic to be delivered.

Assessment		125	141	144	175	176	182
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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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>
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>	<p>(++)</p>	<p>(++)</p>	<p>(++)</p>	<p>(++)</p>	<p>(++)</p>	<p>(-)</p>

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		125	141	144	175	176	182
Q. 52 Would the development on its own, have an impact on an existing community facility and has mitigation of this impact been proposed as part of the development?	<p>Site has no adverse impact on community facilities or where there is an adverse impact this is fully mitigated through the provision of new, expanded or alternative facilities ++</p> <p>Site does not have a significant adverse impact on community facilities or where there is a significant adverse impact this is mitigated through the provision of new, expanded or alternative facilities +</p> <p>Site has an adverse impact on community facilities and limited mitigation is indicated -</p> <p>Site has a significant adverse impact on community facilities and no mitigation is indicated --</p>	(++) Development of the site would not have a direct impact on the an existing community facility.	(++) Development of the site would not have a direct impact on the an existing community facility.	(++) Development of the site would not have a direct impact on the an existing community facility.	(++) Development of the site would not have a direct impact on the an existing community facility.	(++) Development of the site would not have a direct impact on the an existing community facility.	(++) Development of the site would not have a direct impact on the an existing community facility.
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>	(-)	(-)	(+)	(-) access onto the A64 needs further consideration	(++)	(+)
Strong Economy							
Q.53 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>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Q. 55 (Employment/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>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
N Overall rating for 'Strong Economy'	<p>Proposal will have a significant positive impact on the economy ++</p> <p>Proposal will have a positive impact on the economy +</p> <p>Proposal will have a negative impact on the economy -</p> <p>Proposal will have a significant negative impact on the economy --</p>	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

Assessment		125	141	144	175	176	182
Stage 3 - Deliverability / Developability							
Q56. How does the site perform against the SHLAA Update (housing), ELR Update (employment) and RRCS (retail) in terms of its ability to come forward and its suitability for development?	Housing: Category 1 (Deliverable)++		(++) Category 1 Site in the 2009 SHLAA.	Not considered in the 2009 SHLAA	(++) Category 1 Site in the 2009 SHLAA.	Not considered in the 2009 SHLAA	Not considered in the 2009 SHLAA
	Housing: Category 2 (Developable) +						
	Housing: Category 3 (Not Currently Developable) --						
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	(+) All three owners are in agreement . Subject to archaeological investigation	(+)Subject to archaeological investigation	(+)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 provide appropriate levels of developer contributions?	Normal range of contributions can be achieved ++		(+) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	Unknown - no response received to date	(+) 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.	Unknown - no response received to date	(++) 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 ++	Site submitter wishes the site to be considered	(+)	(+) but no response has been recieved to date.	(+)	(++) in conjunction with 638	(+)
	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		223	231	232	233	255	286
Stage 1 - Sift							
all sites 0.15Ha and above	0.15 Ha or greater ++	(++)0.21ha	(++)60.96ha	(++)12.28ha	(++)0.70ha	(--)-0.09ha	(++)1.29ha
	Less than 0.15 Ha --						
Check for conformity with Local Plan Strategy, Settlement Hierarchy, SP1	Conforms to Local Plan Strategy Spatial Strategy (SP1) ++	(++)	(-- based on the scale of development required this site is not close to the settlement	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Does not meet Local Plan Strategy (Spatial Strategy) SP1 --						
Sites which cause significant harm to national/international nature conservation sites (species or habitat) or would involve substantial harm or loss to designated heritage assets will not be considered further.	Will Not cause harm ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Will cause harm --						
Sites which fall wholly within Flood Zone 3b not considered further for built development. Where sites are partially in Flood Zone 3b, that part of the site will be not be considered further for built development.	Is not within Flood Zone 3b ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Is within Flood Zone 3b --						
Stage 2 - Site Assessment							
Q1A How accessible is the site to key services and facilities	Bus stop	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(+)	(+) at its nearest point	(++)	(++)	(++)
		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 ++	(+)	(+) at its nearest point	(+)	(++)	(++)
		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 ++	(+)	(+) at its nearest point	(+)	(++)	(+)
		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 ++	(++)	(++) at its nearest point	(++)	(++)	(++)	
	Up to 10 minutes walking time +						
	Up to 15 minutes walking time -						
	15 minutes walking time and over --						

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		223	231	232	233	255	286
Overall accessibility rating	Site has excellent accessibility ++	(+)	(+)	(+)	(++)		(++)
	Site has good accessibility +						
	Site has variable accessibility –						
	Site has poor accessibility --						
Q2A What flood zone does the site fall within?	Flood Zone 1++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Flood Zone 2 +						
	Flood zone 3a –						
Q2B What vulnerability class does the site fall	Flood Zone 1++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Flood Zone 2						
	Flood Zone 3a						
	Less vulnerable ++						
	More vulnerable +						
	Highly vulnerable -						
Q2D Has a Flood Risk Assessment been undertaken?	yes ++	SFRA	(--SFRA -FRA will be required	(--SFRA -FRA will be required	SFRA	SFRA	(-- SFRA -FRA will be required
	No --						
A Overall Flood Risk Assessment	Site has low overall flood risk ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Site faces significant flood risk issues which can be mitigated +						
	Site faces significant flood risk issues which could potentially be mitigated –						
	Site faces significant flood risk issues and may be inappropriate for development --						
Q3 What are the conclusions of the Highways Authority (NYCC) and Highways England (where appropriate) initial highway assessment?	Site has no highway issues identified ++	(++) Highways England are satisfied that access to the A64 is principally gained from a signalised junction.	(--) Highways England have concerns that they would have major concerns about the bringing forward of this site, due to its impact on the A64	(--) Highways England have concerns that they would have major concerns about the bringing forward of this site, due to its impact on the A64. The County Highways Officer advises: The site does not include sufficient frontage to enable and access of acceptable standards to be formed on the public highway. The existing access would require significant improvement and need widening to meet adoptable standards. Improvements are restricted due to existing infrastructure.	(-) Highways England have confirmed that only the existing or a replacement access may be possible. The site is close to the junction, which could impact on potential occupants and road users. The County Highways Officer has advised: Acceptable onto A64/ Westgate subject to HA approval. Accessibility criteria can be met.	(++) Highways England are satisfied that access to the A64 is principally gained from a signalised junction. The County Highways Officer advises: Access onto Moorgate Lane significant improvements will be required as access point is over small stream. Footpath and accessibility infrastructure must also be introduced into this area.	(++) Highways England are satisfied that access to the A64 is principally gained from a signalised junction.
	Site has some highways issues identified which can be mitigated subject to further investigation +						
	Site has multiple highways issues which can be mitigated subject to further investigation -						
	Site has multiple highway issues which may be difficult to mitigate unless further investigation demonstrates otherwise --						
Biodiversity and Geo-diversity							
Q4 Would the development affect a regional or local site of biodiversity (including SINC, LNRs or RIGS) or affect UK, NYMNP or Ryedale Biodiversity Plan protected species	Enhancement of feature/species possible – mitigation not required ++	(+) The site is not designated, or identified as a site of biodiversity. However, were there to protected species, these would be considered under their statutory framework.	(+) The site is not designated, or identified as a site of biodiversity. However, were there to protected species, these would be considered under their statutory framework.	(+) The site is not designated, or identified as a site of biodiversity. However, were there to protected species, these would be considered under their statutory framework.	(+) The site is not designated, or identified as a site of biodiversity. However, were there to protected species, these would be considered under their statutory framework.	(+) The site is not designated, or identified as a site of biodiversity. However, were there to protected species, these would be considered under their statutory framework.	(+) The site is not designated, or identified as a site of biodiversity. However, were there to protected species, these would be considered under their statutory framework.
	Neutral impact – no effect or effect can be fully mitigated +						
	Adverse impact but mitigation possible –						

Assessment		223	231	232	233	255	286
protected species	Serious impact with limited means of mitigation --						

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		223	231	232	233	255	286
Q5 Would the development provide opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure, including linking in with existing green infrastructure/corridors?	<p>Excellent opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors ++</p> <p>Some opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors +</p> <p>No opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors, however the site has the potential to accommodate these –</p> <p>No opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure corridors, however the site does not have the potential to accommodate these --</p>	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible. The site is currently a small triangular plot of land which contains a small copse, and a paddock.	No information has been submitted concerning the provision of green infrastructure, although there is no reason to suggest that this could not be achieved. The site, however, is a collection of cropped fields, covering a large area to the west of the village.	No information has been submitted concerning the provision of green infrastructure, although there is no reason to suggest that this could not be achieved. The site, however, is two fields currently grazed, covering a large area to the north of the village.	No information has been submitted concerning the provision of green infrastructure, although there is no reason to suggest that this could not be achieved. This site consists of farm buildings and a paddock to the rear of the site.	No information has been submitted concerning the provision of green infrastructure, although there is no reason to suggest that this could not be achieved. This site is a small paddock.	Planning consent is now granted for part of the site. The site is a grazed paddock, with other paddocks, a distinctive feature of this part of Rillington.
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>	(-) The small copse is attractive feature in the street scene. The paddock is bounded by low level hedging.	(-) This a large site which incorporates a number of cropped fields, which are demarcated by hedgerows. Sporadic trees are within some of these hedgerows. Nature of site would be so large that there would be an immitigable impact.	(-) The site is made up of a three fields, and a farm complex. The site is bounded by mature established hedgerows, and contains a small number of mature trees, which contribute to the setting of the village. On the western boundary, along Low Moorgate lane, is a collection of eight trees (Beech) which are subject to a TPO, and these make a significant contribution to this part of the village.	(-) This site involves farm buildings, and established hedgerows, with mixed boundary treatments to the north of the site. The site also has a single Ash tree. Retain existing western hedge boundary and the Ash Tree, and instigate management techniques to ensure their enhancement with additional planting and new trees. Ensure that layout design allows space for a small number of large tree species. Ensure a good quality of landscaping throughout the development.	(+) A small paddock, in between development, a overgrown hedgerow has allowed a line of small trees to become established. Their retention would be preferred.	(-) Ensure that the position of any new dwelling(s) is positioned in accordance with BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to construction – Recommendations. Selected trees within the site should be retained to provide maturity to the development and to screen the development against open countryside to the east. Retain selected trees within the site and along the eastern boundary. Retain existing boundary hedges. Although part of the site has been developed (namely the paddock off Low Moorgate Lane), the heavily treed area remains undeveloped.
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>	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(+)	(+)

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		223	231	232	233	255	286
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>(--) Rillington is within the Vale of Pickering National Character Area, which is principally defined by its low-lying topography. However, it is on the edge of this area, and to the south, the land begins to rise and form the Wolds escarpment. The Local Landscape Character type is Wooded Open Vale, reflecting the flat, low lying terrain which is punctuated by woodland blocks. This site forms the curtilage of the farm (with a paddock) and part of an access point into the adjacent field and sewerage treatment plant. It is considered that the site in the wider landscape terms is unlikely to have an adverse impact, but that within the character of the immediate locality the paddock and copse contribute to the rural character of this part of Low Moorgate Lane.</p>	<p>(--) Rillington is within the Vale of Pickering National Character Area, which is principally defined by its low-lying topography. However, it is on the edge of this area, and to the south, the land begins to rise and form the Wolds escarpment. The Local Landscape Character type is Wooded Open Vale, reflecting the flat, low lying terrain which is punctuated by woodland blocks. Site 231 is extraordinarily large area, covering nearly 61 hectares. It represents a site greatly in excess of what development is expected to be built in this village. The site is distanced from the settlement of Rillington, and is actually adjacent to Rillington Fields, a small hamlet. It is disproportionate in its scale, and were it to come forward in whole or in part it would create a diffuse sprawling form of development and would be visually discordant feature in the land surrounding Rillington, given the low lying topography and absence of trees.</p>	<p>(--) Rillington is within the Vale of Pickering National Character Area, which is principally defined by its low-lying topography. However, it is on the edge of this area, and to the south, the land begins to rise and form the Wolds escarpment. The Local Landscape Character type is Wooded Open Vale, reflecting the flat, low lying terrain which is punctuated by woodland blocks. The land is located to the extreme north of the village, where development has been predominantly linear and single depth. The site low lying, but is open in character with low hedges and few trees. The land is distanced from the main settlement, extending out into the Vale, and it has the potential to significantly adversely affect settlement character as currently displayed. Part of the site, adjacent to the village would have significantly less impact.</p>	<p>(++) Rillington is within the Vale of Pickering National Character Area, which is principally defined by its low-lying topography. However, it is on the edge of this area, and to the south, the land begins to rise and form the Wolds escarpment. The Local Landscape Character type is Wooded Open Vale, reflecting the flat, low lying terrain which is punctuated by woodland blocks. This site is within the general built form of the village, but includes a paddock area to the north of the existing farm complex with out buildings the land is flat, and well screened. It is considered that in wider landscape terms this site could accommodate development without detriment to the settlement.</p>	<p>(-) Rillington is within the Vale of Pickering National Character Area, which is principally defined by its low-lying topography. However, it is on the edge of this area, and to the south, the land begins to rise and form the Wolds escarpment. The Local Landscape Character type is Wooded Open Vale, reflecting the flat, low lying terrain which is punctuated by woodland blocks. This site consists of a small paddock, which has agricultural farm buildings to the north, a residential bungalow to the south and open fields to the rear. Although a more rural area than other parts of Rillington it is considered that given its scale an proximity to modern development and the size of the sites means it is unlikely to harm the setting of the village. Although it will contribute to the gradual erosion of the rural character in this part of Rillington.</p>	<p>(-) Rillington is within the Vale of Pickering National Character Area, which is principally defined by its low-lying topography. However, it is on the edge of this area, and to the south, the land begins to rise and form the Wolds escarpment. The Local Landscape Character type is Wooded Open Vale, reflecting the flat, low lying terrain which is punctuated by woodland blocks. The site area is the same extent as sites 176 and 638. Site incorporates a number of grazed paddocks, with linear, hedged boundaries. This area has a very distinct rural character, and there are some gaps in the frontage, which do contribute to the character of the local area. There are attractive brick walls on the southern boundary. To the rear of the properties to the east there is a well treed area, with mature vegetation. It is considered that this site is visually sensitive, and contributes to the rural dispersed character of this part of Rillington.</p>
Q8 What impact would the site have on nationally protected landscapes the North York Moors NP and 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>(++) Distanced and low lying topography. Not proximal to the AONB.</p>	<p>(++) Distanced and low lying topography. Not proximal to the AONB.</p>	<p>(++) Distanced and low lying topography. Not proximal to the AONB.</p>	<p>(++) Distanced and low lying topography. Not proximal to the AONB.</p>	<p>(++) Distanced and low lying topography. Not proximal to the AONB.</p>	<p>(++) Distanced and low lying topography. Not proximal to the AONB.</p>

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		223	231	232	233	255	286
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 site is bounded by mature Hawthorne and post and rail fencing, with at its most northerly extent a group of trees. The contribution of these trees will need to be considered. The land is kept more like a paddock, with the garden area of the farm house to the south and east.	(--) Due to the scale of the site, and its distance from the settlement-proper of Rillington there is no landscape features inherent in the landscape which would ameliorate the impact, and no mitigation measures given the land is open in form and character.	(-) This site is low lying and existing screening is limited to low, hedging. Given the scale of the site it is unlikely that mitigation will be achievable on the site if the site remains in its current extent.	(+) The site is modest, and if existing screening is retained (and the existing Listed Building is sensitively incorporated into the scheme).	(-) Modest infill plot, the established screening should be retained.	(-) Part of site has planning application submitted on the site. Which covers all of the frontage of the side, to two thirds of the depth of the site. Hedging would provide some screening. Screening from the frontage (south-western) elevation is unlikely to be achieved. But that is not a natural feature of the streetscene here.
	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 ++	(+) To the Northern side of the village.	(--) site is vast, and would join Rillington to the small hamlet known as Rillington Fields, and it is considered that development of this scale would through scale and coalescence irrevocably harm the character of Rillington, and lead to the loss of Rillington Fields as an identifiable hamlet.	(+) To the Northern side of the village.	(++)	(+) to the western extent of the village.	(+)North eastern part of the village
	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 --						

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		223	231	232	233	255	286
C Overall Rating for 'Special Qualities, Landscape and Setting'	Positive impact – the proposal will retain and enhance the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement ++	(-)	(--)	(--)	(++)	(-)	(-)
	Neutral impact – the proposal will not have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement +						
	Negative impact – the proposal will have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement, however mitigation is possible –						
	Significant impact – the proposal will have a significant adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement and limited or no mitigation is possible --						
Culture and Heritage							
Q12 Will the site affect a designated heritage asset, either directly or indirectly through its setting?	Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++	(-) This site is described as a paddock, but it could form part of the curtilage of the Listed farm house. Any development would have an intimate association with the Listed Farm House and affect the setting of the curtilage of the Listed Farm House. How this relationship is treated will be an important consideration. It is a natural progression in many villages that farmsteads have become incorporated into the village through later development. This is a characteristic of Rillington. The site is within the buffer zone of the Scampston Estate Registered Park and Garden, but is not proximal or of a scale to harm the setting of the park. The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of a number 1117 An Iron Age Barrow Cemetery, but is not in a discernible distance to the SM.	(+) No harm directly to a designated heritage asset. No such heritage assets proximal. The site is within the buffer zone of the Scampston Estate Registered Park and Garden, but is not proximal or of a scale to harm the setting of the park. The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of number 1117, an Iron Age Barrow Cemetery, but is not in a discernible distance to the SM.	(--) Direct harm to grade II Listed Rectory Farmhouse. Whole property and curtilage are within site area. Also Potential harm to setting of nearby Listed Buildings. The site is within the buffer zone of the Scampston Estate II* Registered Park and Garden, but is not proximal to harm the setting of the park in terms of the southern part of the site. The northern part is both physically closer, and there are no intervening features to provide a screen or break, as such the wider site has the potential to harm the setting of the Registered Park and Garden. The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of number 1117, an Iron Age Barrow Cemetery, but is not in a discernible distance to the SM.	(-) The site forms a paddock to the Grade II Listed Church Farm late 17 early 18th century. The setting will need to be preserved, and this will require careful consideration. The site includes a number of outbuildings, and those of traditional construction, will be curtilage listed. As such, whilst the paddock would be a new development, the remainder of the site would require particularly careful consideration in terms of developing the site in a manner which was sensitive to the physical fabric, context and setting of the Listed Church Farm, and the outbuildings. The site is within the buffer zone of the Scampston Estate Registered Park and Garden, but is not proximal or of a scale to harm the setting of the park. The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of number 1117, an Iron Age Barrow Cemetery, but is not in a discernible distance to the SM.	(+) This is a small paddock, which has agricultural farm buildings to the north, a residential bungalow to the south and open fields to the rear. Although a more rural area than other parts of Rillington it is considered that given its scale and proximity to modern development, it is unlikely to harm the character of the area. There are some Listed Buildings in the vicinity, but sensitive development is unlikely to adversely affect their setting. The site is within the buffer zone of the Scampston Estate Registered Park and Garden, but is not proximal or of a scale to harm the setting of the park. The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of a number 1117 An Iron Age Barrow Cemetery, but is not in a discernible distance to the SM.	(+) No designated heritage assets proximal. The site is within the buffer zone of the Scampston Estate Registered Park and Garden, but is not proximal or of a scale to harm the setting of the park. The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of number 1117, an Iron Age Barrow Cemetery, but is not in a discernible distance to the SM.
	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		223	231	232	233	255	286
<p>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?</p>	<p>Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++</p>	<p>(--) It is considered that the site in the wider landscape terms is unlikely to have an adverse impact, but that within the character of the immediate locality the paddock and copse contribute to the rural character of this part of Low Moorgate Lane. This is an Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. NYCC Heritage Unit advise: Site lies in an area of extremely high potential for presence of prehistoric and later burials and associated settlement/activity as the wider area along the southern edge of the Vale of Pickering is known for a corridor of almost continuous settlement and activity from early prehistory through to the medieval period between the 25-45m contour zone. Would advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching to clarify the nature and significance of any archaeological remains.</p>	<p>(--) The nature and scale of this site equates to the size of the existing settlement, sprawling out to the west of the village (not in itself contiguous to the village), and its development would adversely affect the setting and character of Rillington by causing coalescence with the small hamlet of Rillington Fields. Such a scale of development would disproportionately harm the character of the village. Were it to be developed alone, it would, in effect, create an entirely new village. This is an Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. The village (like many villages along the Foothlope of the Wolds have existed for multiple centuries and there is a immense archaeological record showing settlement chronology dating back millennia. All sites would need to undertake geophysical surveying in the first instance, and trial trenching to establish the archaeological features within this area. See NYCC Heritage Unit response in 233.</p>	<p>(--) although the site extends out in the direction of prevailing development in Rillington, it is a site of considerable size and depth, and as such has the ability to harm the wider setting of Rillington and the character of this much more rural, less dense, form of development, which has occurred along Low Moorgate Lane. This is an Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. NYCC Heritage Unit advise: Site lies in an area of extremely high potential for presence of prehistoric and later burials and associated settlement/activity as the wider area along the southern edge of the Vale of Pickering is known for a corridor of almost continuous settlement and activity from early prehistory through to the medieval period between the 25-45m contour zone. Would advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching to clarify the nature and significance of any archaeological remains.</p>	<p>(+) This site is includes some previously developed land, but also is important to the setting of the Listed Farm, and outbuildings. This is an Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. NYCC Heritage Unit advise: Extensive geophysical survey by the Landscape Research Centre to the west of this site has revealed an extensive area of settlement and burial activity from prehistory though to the Anglian period to either side of a ditched track way heading towards this site 233. The part of the site already covered by buildings may have already disturbed archaeological remains, but the northern part of the site should be subject to geophysical survey if ground conditions are suitable, to be followed by trial trenching.</p>	<p>(-) This site consists of a small paddock, which has agricultural farm buildings to the north, a residential bungalow to the south and open fields to the rear. Although a more rural area than other parts of Rillington it is considered that given its scale and proximity to modern development and the size of the sites means it is unlikely to harm the setting of the village. Although it will contribute to the gradual erosion of the rural character in this part of Rillington. This is an Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. The village (like many villages along the Foothlope of the Wolds have existed for multiple centuries and there is a immense archaeological record showing settlement chronology dating back millennia. All sites would need to undertake geophysical surveying in the first instance to establish the archaeological features within this area.</p>	<p>(-) Site incorporates a number of grazed paddocks, with linear, hedged boundaries. This area has a very distinct rural character, and there are some gaps in the frontage, which do contribute to the character of the local area. There are attractive brick walls on the southern boundary. To the rear of the properties to the east there is a well treed area, with mature vegetation. It is considered that this site is visually sensitive, and contributes to the rural dispersed character of this part of Rillington. This is an Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. The village (like many villages along the Foothlope of the Wolds have existed for multiple centuries and there is a immense archaeological record showing settlement chronology dating back millennia. All sites would need to undertake geophysical surveying in the first instance to establish the archaeological features within this area. NYCC Heritage Unit advise: uncertain of precise site boundary and whether it extends beyond the area already subject to geophysical survey. If additional area to be developed, then would advise geophysical survey should be carried out in area not previously surveyed, to be followed by trial trenching as appropriate. If area same as that already surveyed, then a condition to secure mitigation archaeological recording would be advised.</p>
	<p>Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +</p>						
	<p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –</p>						
	<p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --</p>						

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		223	231	232	233	255	286
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	(-)	(-)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 provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information 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 ++	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.
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 ++	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.
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 submitted.	No information submitted.	No information submitted.	No information submitted.	No information submitted.	No information submitted.
	Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer unwilling -						
	Site not capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology --						
Sustainable Building and Waste Reduction							
Q17 Can the site accommodate higher sustainable building standards than currently required?	Site can accommodate 2 levels higher than mandatory limit ++	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that higher sustainable building standards could not be accommodated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that higher sustainable building standards could not be accommodated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that higher sustainable building standards could not be accommodated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that higher sustainable building standards could not be accommodated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that higher sustainable building standards could not be accommodated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that higher sustainable building standards could not be accommodated.
	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?	Site can accommodate 2 levels higher than mandatory limit ++	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for waste reduction could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for waste reduction could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for waste reduction could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for waste reduction could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for waste reduction could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for waste reduction could not be incorporated.
	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 details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for recycling facilities could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for recycling facilities could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for recycling facilities could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for recycling facilities could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for recycling facilities could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for recycling facilities could not be incorporated.
	No --						

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		223	231	232	233	255	286
F Overall Rating for 'Sustainable Building and Waste Minimisation'	Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development and developer willing ++	No information submitted	No information submitted	No information submitted	No information submitted	No information submitted	No information submitted
	Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development but developer unwilling -						
	Site not capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development --						
Efficient Use of Land							
Q.20 Is the site or any part of the site considered previously developed land?	Site is over 50% to 100% Brownfield ++	0.21ha of greenfield. But no Brownfield sites are available and capable of meeting housing need.	(--) 60.96ha of greenfield.	(--)12.82ha of greenfield. But no Brownfield sites are available and capable of meeting housing need.	0.7ha of greenfield. But no Brownfield sites are available and capable of meeting housing need.	0.09ha of greenfield. But no Brownfield sites are available and capable of meeting housing need.	1.29ha greenfield. But no Brownfield sites are available and capable of meeting housing need.
	Site is up to 50% Brownfield +						
Q.21 Can the site achieve an appropriate density to achieve the most efficient use of the land?	Excellent density achieved taking into account location and context ++	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 4 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. 1280 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. 269 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. 15 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. 1 dwelling.	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. 26 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 --						
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 ++	No evidence that the land is contaminated.	Sewage works on site	No evidence that the land is contaminated.	No evidence that the land is contaminated.	No evidence that the land is contaminated.	Part of site in 1975 has road haulage
	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 ++	(-) 0.21ha Grade 2 land. This is Best and Most Versatile Land. Although the site is currently not in agriculture, forming a paddock, and copse, and is less than 5ha in size.	(--) 60.96ha of grade 2 land. This is Best and Most Versatile Land. The site is in agricultural use, through cropping.	(--) 12.82ha grade 2 land. This is Best and Most Versatile Land. The site is in agricultural use, through grazing.	(-) 0.70ha grade 3 land. 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 loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The site includes	(-) 0.09ha grade 2 land. This is Best and Most Versatile Land. Although the site is currently not in intensive agriculture, and is less than 5ha in size.	(-) 1.29ha grade 2 land. This is Best and Most Versatile Land. Although the site is currently not in intensive agriculture, being used as a paddock and is less than 5ha in size.
	Up to 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost -						

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		223	231	232	233	255	286
	More than 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost --				a paddock and farm buildings.		
Q. 24 Would the development lead to the sterilisation of mineral resources?	<p>Site not within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search, or Mineral Consultation Zone ++?</p> <p>Site within the buffer of a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone --?</p> <p>Site within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone --</p>	(--)	(--)	(--)	(--)		(--)
Q. 25 Would the development have an adverse impact on a Groundwater Source Protection Zone?	<p>Development is not located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone ++</p> <p>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 +</p> <p>Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but no risk assessment has been undertaken -</p> <p>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 --</p>	Environment Agency not requested to comment.	Environment Agency not requested to make comment	Environment Agency not requested to make comment	Environment Agency not requested to make comment	Environment Agency not requested to comment.	(++) Unproductive Aquifer, not in groundwater Source Protection Zone
Q. 27 Is any part of the development on suspected unstable land?	<p>Land has no instability concerns ++</p> <p>Land potentially unstable but investigation has shown that mitigation is possible +</p> <p>Land potentially unstable but no investigation has been carried out --</p> <p>Land suffers from significant instability problems and either no mitigation has been proposed or instability problems are not possible to mitigate --</p>	There is no evidence that the land is unstable.	(++) There is no evidence that the land is unstable.	There is no evidence that the land is unstable.	There is no evidence that the land is unstable.	There is no evidence that the land is unstable.	There is no evidence that the land is unstable.
Q. 28 Will the site impact on major hazard sites or pipelines?	<p>HSE Standing Advice states "do not advise against development" ++</p> <p>HSE Standing Advice states "advise against development"</p>	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
H Overall Rating for 'Natural Resources'	<p>Site would not adversely affect any natural resources ++</p> <p>Site would not have any significant adverse effect on natural resources +</p> <p>Site would have an adverse effect on natural resources but mitigation is possible --</p> <p>Site would have a significant adverse effect on natural resources and limited/no mitigation is possible --</p>	(+)	(--)	(--)	(+)	(+)	(+)
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?	<p>The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +</p> <p>The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible --</p>	(+) By virtue of its location, and size of site, and adjacent uses, it is unlikely that noise, light dust or smell would cause a nuisance to both existing and prospective users.	(--)	(--)	(+) By virtue of its location, and size of site, and adjacent uses, it is unlikely that noise, light dust or smell would cause a nuisance to both existing and prospective users.	(+) By virtue of its location, and size of site, and adjacent uses, it is unlikely that noise, light dust or smell would cause a nuisance to both existing and prospective users.	(+) By virtue of its location, and size of site, and adjacent uses, it is unlikely that noise, light dust or smell would cause a nuisance to both existing and prospective users.

Assessment		223	231	232	233	255	286
	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 --						

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		223	231	232	233	255	286
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.	<p>The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +</p> <p>The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -</p> <p>The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --</p>	(+) it is considered that these amenity impacts could be addressed though considering the scale, massing and orientation of the properties in respect of existing dwellings, and proposed dwellings.	(+) it is considered that these amenity impacts could be addressed though considering the scale, massing and orientation of the properties in respect of existing dwellings, and proposed dwellings.	(+) it is considered that these amenity impacts could be addressed though considering the scale, massing and orientation of the properties in respect of existing dwellings, and proposed dwellings.	(+) it is considered that these amenity impacts could be addressed though considering the scale, massing and orientation of the properties in respect of existing dwellings, and proposed dwellings.	(+) it is considered that these amenity impacts could be addressed though considering the scale, massing and orientation of the properties in respect of existing dwellings, and proposed dwellings.	(+) it is considered that these amenity impacts could be addressed though considering the scale, massing and orientation of the properties in respect of existing dwellings, and proposed dwellings.
I Overall Rating for 'Amenity'	<p>The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +</p> <p>The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -</p> <p>The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of this site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --</p>	(+)	(--)	(--)	(+)	(+)	(+)
Flood Risk							
Q. 31 Is the site potentially affected by groundwater flooding?	<p>No ++</p> <p>Yes further investigation required --</p>	(-- Yes - the SFRA notes that Rillington lies on the edge of a zone of potential ground water and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A)	(-- Yes - the SFRA notes that Rillington lies on the edge of a zone of potential ground water and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A)	(-- Yes - the SFRA notes that Rillington lies on the edge of a zone of potential ground water and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A)	(-- Yes - the SFRA notes that Rillington lies on the edge of a zone of potential ground water and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A)	(-- Yes - the SFRA notes that Rillington lies on the edge of a zone of potential ground water and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A)	(-- Yes - the SFRA notes that Rillington lies on the edge of a zone of potential ground water and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A)
Q. 32 Is the site potentially affected by surface water flooding and is this site considered to be within a critical drainage area?	<p>No ++</p> <p>Yes further investigation required --</p>	(-- The site is within an area potentially affected by surface water flooding, but it is not within a Critical Drainage Area. Environment Agency would expect no increase in surface water runoff from the site	(-- The site is within an area potentially affected by surface water flooding, but it is not within a Critical Drainage Area. Environment Agency would expect no increase in surface water runoff from the site	(-- The site is within an area potentially affected by surface water flooding, but it is not within a Critical Drainage Area. Environment Agency would expect no increase in surface water runoff from the site	(-- The site is within an area potentially affected by surface water flooding, but it is not within a Critical Drainage Area. Environment Agency would expect no increase in surface water runoff from the site	(-- The site is within an area potentially affected by surface water flooding, but it is not within a Critical Drainage Area. Environment Agency would expect no increase in surface water runoff from the site	(-- The site is within an area potentially affected by surface water flooding, but it is not within a Critical Drainage Area. Environment Agency would expect no increase in surface water runoff from the site
Q. 33 Is the site potentially affected by sewer flooding?	<p>No ++</p> <p>Yes further investigation required --</p>	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		223	231	232	233	255	286
Q. 34 Have Sustainable Drainage Systems (SDS) been proposed as part of the development?	<p>Site capable of accommodating SDS and have been proposed as part of the development ++</p> <p>Site capable of accommodating SDS though no information on whether SDS proposed as part of the development +</p> <p>Site capable of accommodating SDS however SDS not being proposed on site -</p> <p>Site not suitable for accommodating SDS -</p>	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme, and any Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme, and any Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme, and any Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme, and any Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme, and any Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme, and any Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.
Q. 35 What other measures* have been considered which ensure the development is resilient to climate change? * which may vary	<p>Multiple additional measures proposed which build in resilience to climate change ++</p> <p>Single additional measure proposed to build in resilience to climate change +</p> <p>No information provided on measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change -</p> <p>No measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change --</p>	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme and other resilience measures to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme and other resilience measures to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme and other resilience measures to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme and other resilience measures to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme and other resilience measures to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme and other resilience measures to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.
J Overall Rating for 'Flood Risk'	<p>No flood risk associated with the site ++</p> <p>Limited flood risk associated with the site which can be fully mitigated +</p> <p>Site affected by a number of flood risk issues, however mitigation possible-</p> <p>Site affected by significant flood risk issues and limited mitigation possible --</p>	(+) No information submitted.	(+) No information submitted.	(+) No information submitted.	(+) No information submitted.	(+) No information submitted.	(+) No information submitted.
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>	Development of the site would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of Rillington.	Development of the site would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of Rillington.	Development of the site would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of Rillington.	Development of the site would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of Rillington.	Development of the site would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of Rillington.	Development of the site would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of Rillington.
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 submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that secured by design principles could not be taken into account. Some specifics may not be appropriate within the village context of Rillington- but this is a site specific consideration.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that secured by design principles could not be taken into account. Some specifics may not be appropriate within the village context of Rillington- but this is a site specific consideration.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that secured by design principles could not be taken into account. Some specifics may not be appropriate within the village context of Rillington- but this is a site specific consideration.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that secured by design principles could not be taken into account. Some specifics may not be appropriate within the village context of Rillington- but this is a site specific consideration.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that secured by design principles could not be taken into account. Some specifics may not be appropriate within the village context of Rillington- but this is a site specific consideration.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that secured by design principles could not be taken into account. Some specifics may not be appropriate within the village context of Rillington- but this is a site specific consideration.
Q. 38 Does the design of the development encourage people to walk	Cycle ways and footpaths effectively integrated into the development encouraging walking and cycling ++	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that measures to	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that measures to	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that measures to	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that measures to	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that measures to	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that measures to

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		223	231	232	233	255	286
and cycle rather than travel by car?	Some cycle ways and/or footpaths shown encouraging walking and cycling + No cycle ways and footpaths indicated as part of this development --	increase walking and cycling could not be taken into account.	increase walking and cycling could not be taken into account.	increase walking and cycling could not be taken into account.	increase walking and cycling could not be taken into account.	increase walking and cycling could not be taken into account.	increase walking and cycling could not be taken into account.

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		223	231	232	233	255	286
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>	A Travel Plan is not required for this site.	No Travel Plan has been submitted although there is no reason to suggest that a Travel Plan could not be produced.	No Travel Plan has been submitted although there is no reason to suggest that a Travel Plan could not be produced.	A Travel Plan is not required for this site.	A Travel Plan is not required for this site.	No Travel Plan has been submitted although there is no reason to suggest that a Travel Plan could not be produced.
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>	No details have been submitted as to the type of housing proposed. Although there is no reason to suggest that development of the site would not support the ability to attract a more balanced population, and reducing inequality.	No details have been submitted as to the type of housing proposed the proposal makes some general references to the provision of affordable housing. Although there is no reason to suggest that development of the site would not support the ability to attract a more balanced population, and reducing inequality. The site proposes mixed uses, also would include employment and other facilities and services.	No details have been submitted as to the type of housing proposed. Although there is no reason to suggest that development of the site (or part of it) would not support the ability to attract a more balanced population, and reducing inequality.	No details have been submitted as to the type of housing proposed. Although there is no reason to suggest that development of the site would not support the ability to attract a more balanced population, and reducing inequality.	The site is particularly small, and so it unlikely to make any meaningful contribution of attracting a balanced living/working population or reducing inequality of opportunity.	No details have been submitted as to the type of housing proposed. Although there is no reason to suggest that development of the site would not support the ability to attract a more balanced population, and reducing inequality.
K Overall Rating for 'People'	<p>Development actively planned to encourage the development of sustainable communities ++</p> <p>Development has taken into account the need to develop sustainable communities +</p> <p>Development has little regard to the need to develop sustainable communities -</p> <p>Development has no regard for the need to develop sustainable communities --</p>	(-)	(+) Despite its size and situation which would make a new settlement	(-)	(-)	(-)	(+)
Meeting needs							
Q.41 Does the type and mix of development proposed meet the needs identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), Employment Land Review Update 2010 (ELR), Ryedale Retail Capacity Studies (RRCS) and Malton Town Centre Strategy?	<p>Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++</p> <p>Proposal identifies what the needs are and how some needs will be met by the development +</p> <p>Proposal either does not identify what the needs are or how any needs will be met by the development -</p> <p>No assessment is undertaken of what the needs are and whether any needs will be met --</p>	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. Although this is a very substantial site, covering a mix of uses. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)	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 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)	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 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)	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 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)	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 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		223	231	232	233	255	286
Q. 42 What level and type of affordable housing is proposed?	<p>Development offers appropriate level and type of affordable housing which meets the needs as set out in the SHMA ++</p> <p>Development offers some affordable housing which meets some of the need as set out in the SHMA +</p> <p>Development does not offer the appropriate level and type of affordable housing or does not meet the need for affordable housing as set out in the SHMA -</p> <p>The development makes no provision for affordable housing --</p>	(--) The site is not capable of delivery of any on site or commuted sum for affordable housing delivery	There are no details provided concerning the amount of affordable housing. On a theoretical yield of c.1280 units the scheme would be expected to comply with SP3 regarding the on-site provision of affordable housing. However, this quantum of development is well in excess of that envisaged for Rillington as a Service Village	There are no details provided concerning the amount of affordable housing. On a theoretical yield of 269 units the scheme would be expected to comply with SP3 regarding the on-site provision of affordable housing. The contribution will be limited. However, this quantum of development is well in excess of that envisaged for Rillington as a Service Village	There are no details provided concerning the amount of affordable housing. On a theoretical yield of 15 units the scheme would be expected to comply with SP3 regarding the on-site provision of affordable housing.	(--) The site is not capable of delivery of any on site or commuted sum for affordable housing delivery	There are no details provided concerning the amount of affordable housing. On a theoretical yield of 26 units the scheme would be expected to comply with SP3 regarding the on-site provision of affordable housing.
Q. 43 What provision has been made for Ryedale's elderly population?	<p>Development addresses and meets the needs of Ryedale's elderly population ++</p> <p>Development takes into account and meets some of the needs of Ryedale's elderly population +</p> <p>Development does not address the needs of Ryedale's elderly population -</p> <p>The development makes no provision for the needs of Ryedale's elderly population --</p>	No details have been provided, although as a service village there is no presumption for extra-care facilities. There is no expectation that bungalows will be required, but the Plan supports the delivery of lifetime homes. This will be considered as a site-specific matter.	No details have been provided, although as a service village there is no presumption for extra-care facilities. Site is capable of exceeding the threshold for a requirement for bungalows. The Plan supports the delivery of lifetime homes. This will be considered as a site-specific matter.	No details have been provided, although as a service village there is no presumption for extra-care facilities. Site is capable of exceeding the threshold for a requirement for bungalows. The Plan supports the delivery of lifetime homes. This will be considered as a site-specific matter.	No details have been provided, although as a service village there is no presumption for extra-care facilities. There is no expectation that bungalows will be required, but the Plan supports the delivery of lifetime homes. This will be considered as a site-specific matter.	No details have been provided, although as a service village there is no presumption for extra-care facilities. There is no expectation that bungalows will be required, but the Plan supports the delivery of lifetime homes. This will be considered as a site-specific matter.	No details have been provided, although as a service village there is no presumption for extra-care facilities. There is no expectation that bungalows will be required, but the Plan supports the delivery of lifetime homes. This will be considered as a site-specific matter.
L Overall Rating for 'Meeting Needs'	<p>Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++</p> <p>Proposal identifies what the needs are and how some needs will be met by the development +</p> <p>Proposal either does not identify what the needs are or how any needs are or how any needs will be met by the development -</p> <p>No assessment is undertaken of what the needs are and whether any needs --</p>	No details provided.	(+)	No details provided.	No details provided.	No details provided.	No details provided.
Community Facilities, utilities and Infrastructure							
Q45 On sites greater than 1ha: Has a Transport Assessment been undertaken	<p>Yes ++</p> <p>No- transport assessment required --</p>	No Transport Assessment required	(--) No Transport Assessment has been submitted at present.	(--) No Transport Assessment has been submitted at present.	No Transport Assessment required	No Transport Assessment required	(--) No Transport Assessment has been submitted at present.
Q. 46 Is highway mitigation required as part of the development and what is the impact of the development on the highway network following mitigation?	<p>No mitigation required or no impact on the highway following mitigation ++</p> <p>Mitigation required but no unacceptable impact following mitigation +</p> <p>Mitigation required and development would have a significant impact though not unacceptable impact after mitigation -</p> <p>Mitigation required and development would still have an unacceptable impact following mitigation --</p>	(+) Subject to access, site would utilise signalised junction	(--) This is a substantial site. The submission refers to the development of a Rillington Bypass, which was made in 2001, before the time of the submission. Highway Agency objection.	(--) Highways England concerned with scale of site. No access details provided.	(-) Site would access A64 directly. There is an existing access, but it is not of sufficient width for simultaneous ingress and egress. Farm buildings could be adversely affected.	(+) Subject to access, site would utilise signalised junction	(++) Subject to existing planning consent, which has set out the acceptable access arrangement. Utilises existing signalised junction.

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		223	231	232	233	255	286
Q. 47 Can the site accommodate adequate parking and servicing facilities?	<p>Site meets highway guidelines for parking and servicing ++</p> <p>Site does not currently meet parking and/or servicing requirements. However these issues can potentially be overcome or mitigated –</p> <p>Site does not meet highway requirements for parking and/or servicing and the issues identified are difficult/not practically possible to overcome --</p>	No details have been submitted. No reason to suggest that adequate servicing and parking standards cannot be achieved.	No details have been submitted. No reason to suggest that adequate servicing and parking standards cannot be achieved.	No details have been submitted. No reason to suggest that adequate servicing and parking standards cannot be achieved.	No details have been submitted. No reason to suggest that adequate servicing and parking standards cannot be achieved. Width of access could prove a challenge of service vehicles.	No details have been submitted. No reason to suggest that adequate servicing and parking standards cannot be achieved.	(++) Subject to existing planning consent, which has set out the acceptable access arrangement. Utilises existing signalised junction.
Q. 48 Will the proposal provide, enable or improve access to public rights of way (PROW)?	<p>Proposal will create new PROW or integrate existing PROW into the development ++</p> <p>Proposal will not affect a PROW +</p> <p>Proposal would involve the diversion or loss of a PROW --</p>	(--) The site is adjacent to a PROW which links into another PROW runs from Scarborough Road/A64 and also Low Moorgate and continues along the back of various properties with paddocks on the eastern boundary to a track that runs to the Railway Lane. No details have been submitted as to how this PROW would be impacted upon.	(--) A PROW extends through the site, from the A64, along the edge of the settlement, past the Waste Water Treatment Plant, and across the site in a westerly direction. No details have been submitted as to how this PROW would be impacted upon. It is likely the PROW be in the very least diverted.	(--) The site contains three PROWs which link into one another in this site. There is a PROW which runs from Scarborough Road/A64 and also Low Moorgate and continues along the back of various properties with paddocks on the eastern boundary to a track that runs to the Railway Lane. From Low Moorgate there is two PROWs which link up to this PROW. No details have been submitted as to how these PROWs would be impacted upon, but it likely that some of them would need diversion.	(--) A PROW extends along the western boundary of the site, from the A64, along the edge of the settlement, past the Waste Water Treatment Plant, and across the site in a westerly direction. No details have been submitted as to how this PROW would be impacted upon.	(+) No PROW proximal. No information is provided concerning creation of new PROWs.	(--) The site is adjacent to a PROW which runs from Scarborough Road/A64 and also Low Moorgate and continues along the back of various properties with paddocks on the eastern boundary to a track that runs to the Railway Lane. No details have been submitted as to how this PROW would be impacted upon.
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>	The site is of a size where new public realm is unrealistic to be delivered.	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.	The site is of a size where new public realm is unrealistic to be delivered.	The site is of a size where new public realm is unrealistic to be delivered.	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		223	231	232	233	255	286	
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.	(--) Given the size of the site this is far larger than the spatial strategy allows for: Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: likely that additional capacity required. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water, (based on spatial approach) Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer.	Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: no additional capacity required. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. The site contains a pumped sewer, the sewer pipelines would need either diversion, or development reflect infrastructure. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water. Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer.	Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: 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.	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.	Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. No capacity issue concerning water supply. Upgrading of sewerage capacity is required, limited capacity. 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.	
	Site has limited to medium adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be satisfactorily mitigated +	Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.	Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development. Access onto the A64 has been identified as a constraint. In particular concerns identified by Highways England, due to the size of the site.	Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.	Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.	Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.	Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.	Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.
	Site has medium to high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation –							
	Site has high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation --							
Q. 51 What is the impact on Waste Water Treatment Works?	Further than 400m from the boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works ++	(-)	(--)	(-)	(++)	(-)	(++)	
	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 --							

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		223	231	232	233	255	286
Q. 52 Would the development on its own, have an impact on an existing community facility and has mitigation of this impact been proposed as part of the development?	<p>Site has no adverse impact on community facilities or where there is an adverse impact this is fully mitigated through the provision of new, expanded or alternative facilities ++</p> <p>Site does not have a significant adverse impact on community facilities or where there is a significant adverse impact this is mitigated through the provision of new, expanded or alternative facilities +</p> <p>Site has an adverse impact on community facilities and limited mitigation is indicated -</p> <p>Site has a significant adverse impact on community facilities and no mitigation is indicated --</p>	(++) Development of the site would not have a direct impact on the an existing community facility.	(--) Development of the site would not have a direct impact on the an existing community facility, but the size of the site would have a significant impact on Rillington's services.	(--) Development of the site would not have a direct impact on the an existing community facility, but the size of the site would have a significant impact on Rillington's services.	(++) Development of the site would not have a direct impact on the an existing community facility.	(++) Development of the site would not have a direct impact on the an existing community facility.	(++) Development of the site would not have a direct impact on the an existing community facility.
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>	(+)	(--)	(--)	(-)	(+)	(++)
Strong Economy							
Q.53 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>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Q. 55 (Employment/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>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
N Overall rating for 'Strong Economy'	<p>Proposal will have a significant positive impact on the economy ++</p> <p>Proposal will have a positive impact on the economy +</p> <p>Proposal will have a negative impact on the economy -</p> <p>Proposal will have a significant negative impact on the economy --</p>	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

Assessment		223	231	232	233	255	286
Stage 3 - Deliverability / Developability							
Q56. How does the site perform against the SHLAA Update (housing), ELR Update (employment) and RRCS (retail) in terms of its ability to come forward and its suitability for development?	Housing: Category 1 (Deliverable)++	Not considered in the 2009 SHLAA	(+) Category 2 Site in the 2009 SHLAA.	(+) Category 2 Site in the 2009 SHLAA.	(++) Category 1 Site in the 2009 SHLAA.		Not considered in the 2009 SHLAA
	Housing: Category 2 (Developable) +						
	Housing: Category 3 (Not Currently Developable) --						
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	(--) Previous agents no longer act for landowner. Uncertainty over landowners intentions (archaeological considerations)	(--) Previous agents no longer act for landowner. Uncertainty over landowners intentions (archaeological considerations)	(--) Previous agents no longer act for landowner. Uncertainty over landowners intentions (archaeological considerations)	(+) 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 provide appropriate levels of developer contributions?	Normal range of contributions can be achieved ++	(+) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	No response received	No response received	No response received	(+) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	See response to 638
	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 response received	No response received	No response received	(++) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	See response to 638
	No --						
O Overall Deliverability / Developability Rating	Site is able to come forward without impairment and is able to provide a normal range of contributions ++	(+)	(--)	(--)	(--)	(+)	(++) in conjunction with 638
	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		290	291	292	370	412	441
Stage 1 - Sift							
all sites 0.15Ha and above	0.15 Ha or greater ++	(++)1.4ha	(++)0.17ha	(++)0.26ha	(++)4.71ha	(++)0.49ha	(--)0.04ha
	Less than 0.15 Ha --						
Check for conformity with Local Plan Strategy, Settlement Hierarchy, SP1	Conforms to Local Plan Strategy Spatial Strategy (SP1) ++	(--) employment	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Does not meet Local Plan Strategy (Spatial Strategy) SP1 --						
Sites which cause significant harm to national/international nature conservation sites (species or habitat) or would involve substantial harm or loss to designated heritage assets will not be considered further.	Will Not cause harm ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(--) site of SM barrow. Historic England have raised specific objection.	(++)	(++)
	Will cause harm --						
Sites which fall wholly within Flood Zone 3b not considered further for built development. Where sites are partially in Flood Zone 3b, that part of the site will be not be considered further for built development.	Is not within Flood Zone 3b ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Is within Flood Zone 3b --						
Stage 2 - Site Assessment							
Q1A How accessible is the site to key services and facilities	Bus stop	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++		(++)	(++)		(++)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +					
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -					
		15 minutes walking time and over --					
	Local Shop	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++		(++)	(++)		(++)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +					
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -					
		15 minutes walking time and over --					
	Nearest Primary School	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++		(+)	(+)		(+)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +					
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -					
		15 minutes walking time and over --					
	Nearest Development Limit	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++		(++)	(++)		(++)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +					
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -					
		15 minutes walking time and over --					

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		290	291	292	370	412	441
Overall accessibility rating	Site has excellent accessibility ++		(++)	(++)		(++)	
	Site has good accessibility +						
	Site has variable accessibility –						
	Site has poor accessibility --						
Q2A What flood zone does the site fall within?	Flood Zone 1++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Flood Zone 2 +						
	Flood zone 3a –						
Q2B What vulnerability class does the site fall	Flood Zone 1++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Flood Zone 2						
	Flood Zone 3a						
	Less vulnerable ++						
	More vulnerable +						
	Highly vulnerable -						
Q2D Has a Flood Risk Assessment been undertaken?	yes ++	(--) SFRA -FRA will be required	SFRA	SFRA	(--) SFRA -FRA will be required	SFRA	SFRA
	No --						
A Overall Flood Risk Assessment	Site has low overall flood risk ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Site faces significant flood risk issues which can be mitigated +						
	Site faces significant flood risk issues which could potentially be mitigated –						
	Site faces significant flood risk issues and may be inappropriate for development --						
Q3 What are the conclusions of the Highways Authority (NYCC) and Highways England (where appropriate) initial highway assessment?	Site has no highway issues identified ++	(++) Highways England are satisfied that access to the A64 is principally gained from a signalised junction.	(++) Highways England are satisfied that access to the A64 is principally gained from a signalised junction. Currently the site (as an individual site) has limited access. County Highways have advised: The site does not include sufficient frontage to enable an access of an acceptable standard to be formed on the public highway. The existing access would require significant improvement and need widening to meet adoptable standards. Improvements are restricted due to existing infrastructure.	(++) Highways England are satisfied that access to the A64 is principally gained from a signalised junction. Currently the site (as an individual site) has limited access. County Highways have advised: The site does not include sufficient frontage to enable an access of an acceptable standard to be formed on the public highway. The existing access would require significant improvement and need widening to meet adoptable standards. Improvements are restricted due to existing infrastructure.	(--) Highways England would object to new access points onto the A64. No specific access details have been provided. The County Highways Officer has had advised: The site does not include sufficient frontage to enable an access of acceptable standards to be formed on the public highways. The existing access would require significant improvement and need widening to meet adoptable standards. Improvements are restricted due to existing infrastructure.	(--) This site could be served by the established junction. However, no access is demonstrated on the Plan. But from the submission material it is proposed that access will be through the curtilage of 31 Low Moorgate with demolition and relocation of the garage of 31 Low Moorgate. The County Highways Officer advises: the site does not include sufficient frontage to enable an access of acceptable standards to be formed on the public highway. The existing access would require significant improvement and need widening to meet adoptable standards. Improvements are restricted due to existing infrastructure.	(+)Highways England have confirmed that the site is on the Thorpe Bassett Road, and would use the established junction onto the A64. No access details have been provided. The County Highways Officer advises: acceptable onto Collinsons Lane. Accessibility criteria can be met.
	Site has some highways issues identified which can be mitigated subject to further investigation +						
	Site has multiple highways issues which can be mitigated subject to further investigation -						
	Site has multiple highway issues which may be difficult to mitigate unless further investigation demonstrates otherwise --						
Biodiversity and Geo-diversity							
Q4 Would the development affect a regional or local site of biodiversity (including SINC, LNRs or RIGS) or affect UK, NYMNP or Ryedale Biodiversity Plan protected species	Enhancement of feature/species possible – mitigation not required ++	(+) The site is not designated, or identified as a site of biodiversity. However, were there to protected species, these would be considered under their statutory framework.	(+) The site is not designated, or identified as a site of biodiversity. However, were there to protected species, these would be considered under their statutory framework.	(+) The site is not designated, or identified as a site of biodiversity. However, were there to protected species, these would be considered under their statutory framework.	(+) The site is not designated, or identified as a site of biodiversity. However, were there to protected species, these would be considered under their statutory framework.	(+) The site is not designated, or identified as a site of biodiversity. However, were there to protected species, these would be considered under their statutory framework.	(+) The site is not designated, or identified as a site of biodiversity. However, were there to protected species, these would be considered under their statutory framework.
	Neutral impact – no effect or effect can be fully mitigated +						
	Adverse impact but mitigation possible –						

Assessment		290	291	292	370	412	441
protected species	Serious impact with limited means of mitigation --						

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		290	291	292	370	412	441
Q5 Would the development provide opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure, including linking in with existing green infrastructure/corridors?	<p>Excellent opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors ++</p> <p>Some opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors +</p> <p>No opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors, however the site has the potential to accommodate these –</p> <p>No opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure corridors, however the site does not have the potential to accommodate these --</p>	No information has been submitted concerning the provision of green infrastructure, although there is no reason to suggest that this could not be achieved. The site is to the rear of the established Ellis Patents site, and it is being proposed as an expansion to their existing operations.	Planning consent is now granted for part of the site. The site is a grazed paddock, with other paddocks, a distinctive feature of this part of Rillington.	Planning consent is now granted for part of the site. The site is a grazed paddock, with other paddocks, a distinctive feature of this part of Rillington.	No information has been submitted concerning the provision of green infrastructure, although there is no reason to suggest that this could not be achieved. This site is a cropped field.	No information has been submitted concerning the provision of green infrastructure, although there is no reason to suggest that this could not be achieved. The site is to the rear of properties on Low Moorgate, and is currently a paddock area, with mature boundaries (including many trees) and a group of trees within the site.	No information has been submitted concerning the provision of green infrastructure, although there is no reason to suggest that this could not be achieved. This site is currently a small part of a larger cropped field.
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>	(+) the site is difficult to see by virtue of the surrounding land. The land is bounded by hedgerows and is cropped.	(+) There is a protected tree (Horse Chestnut) on the northern boundary of the site. Its retention, and protection in accordance with the BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to construction – Recommendations.	(+) Ensure that the position of any new dwelling(s) is positioned in accordance with BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to construction – Recommendations. Retain existing boundary hedges. Although part of the site has been developed (namely the paddock off Low Moorgate Lane) which is adjacent to this site, the heavily treed area remains undeveloped. The site to the south has a protected tree (Horse Chestnut).	(+) The general prevailing landscape is one of predominantly rectangular fields bounded in the most part by hawthorn hedges but generally sparsely treed, and a scattering of mainly coniferous woodland blocks. Any scheme should: Retain existing hedged boundaries and instigate management techniques to ensure their enhancement with additional planting and new trees. Retain existing four sycamores within eastern boundary of the site. Ensure a good quality of landscaping throughout the development.	(+) The site is enclosed by mixed hedges on all sides. The south western section of the site contains six mature trees of mixed species. These trees are barely visible from public locations outside of the site. The site also contains other lower scrubby material that is only visible from the Sledgate access to the site. Retain existing western hedge boundary and instigate management techniques to ensure their enhancement with additional planting and new trees. Ensure that layout design allows space for a small number of large tree species. Ensure a good quality of landscaping throughout the development.	(-) This is a small parcel of land from a much larger arable fields, it would alter the open sweeping nature of the field, but would not cause the loss of any hedgerows. There are no trees.
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>	(+)	(-)	(-)	(+)	(-)	(-)

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		290	291	292	370	412	441
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>(-) Rillington is within the Vale of Pickering National Character Area, which is principally defined by its low-lying topography. However, it is on the edge of this area, and to the south, the land begins to rise and form the Wolds escarpment. The Local Landscape Character type is Wooded Open Vale, reflecting the flat, low lying terrain which is punctuated by woodland blocks. This site to the southern-most extent of the village, to the north is modern estate-type residential development and to the west is the established business of Ellis Patents. Which includes a factory. The land slowly rises to the south, but views of the site are hard to gain, Thorpe Basset offers no vantage point from which to view the site. The site is adjacent to the established business use.</p>	<p>(+) Rillington is within the Vale of Pickering National Character Area, which is principally defined by its low-lying topography. However, it is on the edge of this area, and to the south, the land begins to rise and form the Wolds escarpment. The Local Landscape Character type is Wooded Open Vale, reflecting the flat, low lying terrain which is punctuated by woodland blocks. This site links to 292 and is current modern outbuildings. They are not in themselves worthy of retention. The paddocks do contribute to the rural character of this part of Rillington, and indeed these grazed paddocks are a distinctive feature. Given the nature of sounding development it would represent development 'at depth' but that has previously been established.</p>	<p>(-) Rillington is within the Vale of Pickering National Character Area, which is principally defined by its low-lying topography. However, it is on the edge of this area, and to the south, the land begins to rise and form the Wolds escarpment. The Local Landscape Character type is Wooded Open Vale, reflecting the flat, low lying terrain which is punctuated by woodland blocks. This is a site bounded by fencing and hedging to the rear of a farm complex with a series of out buildings. The site has quite a rural character, and the outbuildings give it a rural, utilitarian character. Given the size of the site and its proximity to the settlement, it is unlikely to harm the character of the wider landscape, but in conjunction with other sites, would represent a distinct change in the character of the development in this part of Rillington.</p>	<p>(+) Rillington is within the Vale of Pickering National Character Area, which is principally defined by its low-lying topography. However, it is on the edge of this area, and to the south, the land begins to rise and form the Wolds escarpment. The Local Landscape Character type is Wooded Open Vale, reflecting the flat, low lying terrain which is punctuated by woodland blocks. This site is an open, relatively flat area of land which very gently rises to the south. Development has occurred to the north of the site in the form of a single strip of residential development. To the west is residential development of a modern, estate type development. It is considered that on a visual basis the site is unlikely to detract from either the setting of Rillington or the landscape character in this area. However, given the concerns regarding the vulnerability of the designated heritage asset this site cannot be brought forward.</p>	<p>(-) Rillington is within the Vale of Pickering National Character Area, which is principally defined by its low-lying topography. However, it is on the edge of this area, and to the south, the land begins to rise and form the Wolds escarpment. The Local Landscape Character type is Wooded Open Vale, reflecting the flat, low lying terrain which is punctuated by woodland blocks. This is an area of land to the rear of properties on Sledgate and Low Moorgate Lane. It would represent development at depth, which has not yet occurred on this side of Low Moorgate, although there is Sledgate to the south. Views of the site were limited by the existing dwellings and the presence of a substantial treed boundary. As such the visual impact of such a site is limited.</p>	<p>(-) Rillington is within the Vale of Pickering National Character Area, which is principally defined by its low-lying topography. However, it is on the edge of this area, and to the south, the land begins to rise and form the Wolds escarpment. As a result of this, the site is within the Fringe of the Wolds Area of High Landscape Value. The Local Landscape Character type is Wooded Open Vale, reflecting the flat, low lying terrain which is punctuated by woodland blocks. The site is on the southern side of the village, where the land begins to rise. The site is very small, in effect a single plot, but it is considered that this is an open and rural area, with important vistas showing the relationship of the settlement to the Wolds, and this would be a visually intrusive intrusion, which would allow the opportunity to perpetuate linear development along the road, which has not occurred.</p>
Q8 What impact would the site have on nationally protected landscapes the North York Moors NP and 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>(++) Distanced and low lying topography. Not proximal to the AONB.</p>	<p>(++) Distanced and low lying topography. Not proximal to the AONB or the National Park.</p>	<p>(++) Distanced and low lying topography. Not proximal to the AONB or the National Park.</p>	<p>(++) Distanced and low lying topography. Not proximal to the AONB or the National Park.</p>	<p>(++) Distanced and low lying topography. Not proximal to the AONB or the National Park.</p>	<p>(++) Distanced and low lying topography. Not proximal to the AONB or the National Park.</p>

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		290	291	292	370	412	441
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 ++	(-) With the topography it is considered unlikely that there would be any wider distanced views of the site, and hedging would be used. It will be more of a challenge to the north of the site, and its boundary with residential properties	(-) There is existing hedging, and this should be retained.	(-) Paddock, with existing hedging, adjacent to sites 291 and 286/176/638 flat, relatively open.	(-) Site is open and flat. Bounded by modern estate type development, and linear development to the north. If site were developable, new landscaping would be required, but it considered that the site is capable of allowing this to be accommodated in the wider landscape.	(-) Site is not accessible from public view points. There are a number of trees which screen the site as well.	(--) This is part of a large, open field, landscaping would not minimise its impact. The site extends out beyond the existing curtilage of the properties on Malton Road.
	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 ++	(+) Southern side of the village, Thorpe Bassett some distance away.	(+) North eastern part of the village	(+) North eastern part of the village	(+) south western part of the village, distanced from both Thorpe Bassett and Scampston.	(+) western part of the village	(+) south western part of the village
	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 --						

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		290	291	292	370	412	441
C Overall Rating for 'Special Qualities, Landscape and Setting'	Positive impact – the proposal will retain and enhance the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement ++	(-)	(+)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(--)
	Neutral impact – the proposal will not have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement +						
	Negative impact – the proposal will have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement, however mitigation is possible –						
	Significant impact – the proposal will have a significant adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement and limited or no mitigation is possible --						
Culture and Heritage							
Q12 Will the site affect a designated heritage asset, either directly or indirectly through its setting?	Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++	(-) The site is adjacent to the Scheduled Monument number 1117, an Iron Age Barrow Cemetery. Given the proximity, further exploration may be required, although the site is subterranean, so in terms of setting, there is no significant impact. The site is within the buffer zone of the Scampston Estate Registered Park and Garden, but is not proximal or of a scale to harm the setting of the park.	(+) No designated heritage assets proximal. The site is within the buffer zone of the Scampston Estate Registered Park and Garden, but is not proximal or of a scale to harm the setting of the park. The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of number 1117, an Iron Age Barrow Cemetery, but is not in a discernible distance to the SM.	(+) No designated heritage assets proximal. The site is within the buffer zone of the Scampston Estate Registered Park and Garden, but is not proximal or of a scale to harm the setting of the park. The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of number 1117, an Iron Age Barrow Cemetery, but is not in a discernible distance to the SM.	(--) The site is within the Scheduled Monument 1117 an Iron Age Barrow Cemetery. Historic England have raised an objection in principle. As such the site has not met the stage 1 test of the SSM.	(-) To north of the site is the Grade II Listed 'The Vicarage'. Development of this site would extend back beyond the curtilage of this property which could harm the context of the setting of this building. The site is within the buffer zone of the Scampston Estate Registered Park and Garden, but is not proximal or of a scale to harm the setting of the park. The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of number 1117, an Iron Age Barrow Cemetery, but is not in a discernible distance to the SM.	(+)No designated heritage assets proximal. The site is within the buffer zone of the Scampston Estate Registered Park and Garden, but is not proximal or of a scale to harm the setting of the park. The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of a number 1117 An Iron Age Barrow Cemetery, but is not in a discernible distance to the SM.
	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 --						

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		290	291	292	370	412	441	
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 site to the southern-most extent of the village, to the north is modern estate-type residential development and to the west is the established business of Ellis Patents. Which includes a factory. The land slowly rises to the south, but views of the site are hard to gain, Thorpe Basset offers no vantage point from which to view the site. The site is adjacent to the established business use. This is an Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. The village (like many villages along the Foothslopes of the Wolds have existed for multiple centuries and there is a immense archaeological record showing settlement chronology dating back millennia. All sites would need to undertake geophysical surveying in the first instance to establish the archaeological features within this area.	(-) This site links to 292 and is current modern outbuildings. They are not in themselves worthy of retention. The paddocks do contribute to the rural character of this part of Rillington, and indeed these grazed paddocks are a distinctive feature. Given the nature of sounding development it would represent development 'at depth' but that has previously been established. This is an Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. The village (like many villages along the Foothslopes of the Wolds have existed for multiple centuries and there is a immense archaeological record showing settlement chronology dating back millennia. All sites would need to undertake geophysical surveying in the first instance to establish the archaeological features within this area. NYCC Heritage Unit advise: Unsure at to precise site boundary, but NYCC commented on a 2008 planning application for 3 dwellings, ref 08/00160/OUT in this area, and advised an archaeological watching brief, to be secured by condition.	(-) Given the size of the site and its proximity to the settlement, it is unlikely to harm the character of the wider landscape, but in conjunction with other sites, would represent a distinct change in the character of the development in this part of Rillington. This is an Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. NYCC Heritage Unit advise: Similar to site 638, appears to lie adjacent (to the north) of the area already subject to geophysical survey. If additional area to be developed, then would advise geophysical survey should be carried out in area not previously surveyed, to be followed by trial trenching as appropriate.	(--) This is an Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. The village (like many villages along the Foothslopes of the Wolds have existed for multiple centuries and there is a immense archaeological record showing settlement chronology dating back millennia. All sites would need to undertake geophysical surveying in the first instance to establish the archaeological features within this area.	(-) This is an area of land to the rear of properties on Sledgate and Low Moorgate Lane. It would represent development at depth, which has not yet occurred on this side of Low Moorgate, although there is Sledgate to the south. Views of the site were limited by the existing dwellings and the presence of a substantial treed boundary. As such the visual impact of such a site is limited. This is an Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. NYCC heritage Unit advise: Site lies across road from SM of Iron Age barrow cemetery, East Field. (370) Area of extremely high potential for presence of prehistoric and later burials and associated settlement/activity as the wider area along the southern edge of the Vale of Pickering is known for a corridor of almost continuous settlement and activity from early prehistory through to the medieval period between the 25-45m contour zone. Would advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching to clarify the nature and significance of any archaeological remains.	(-)The site is very small, in effect a single plot, but it is considered that this is an open and rural area, with important vistas showing the relationship of the settlement to the Wolds, and this would be a visually intrusive intrusion, which would allow the opportunity to perpetuate linear development along the road, which has not occurred. This is an Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. The village (like many villages along the Foothslopes of the Wolds have existed for multiple centuries and there is a immense archaeological record showing settlement chronology dating back millennia. All sites would need to undertake geophysical surveying in the first instance to establish the archaeological features within this area.	
	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 --							

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		290	291	292	370	412	441
D Overall Rating for 'Culture and Heritage'	Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++	(-)	(-) Subject to archaeological survey	(-) Subject to archaeological survey	(--)	(-) Subject to archaeological survey	(-) Subject to archaeological survey
	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 provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information 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 ++	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.
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 ++	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.
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 submitted.	No information submitted.	No information submitted.	No information submitted.	No information submitted.	No information submitted.
	Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer unwilling -						
	Site not capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology --						
Sustainable Building and Waste Reduction							
Q17 Can the site accommodate higher sustainable building standards than currently required?	Site can accommodate 2 levels higher than mandatory limit ++	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that higher sustainable building standards could not be accommodated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that higher sustainable building standards could not be accommodated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that higher sustainable building standards could not be accommodated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that higher sustainable building standards could not be accommodated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that higher sustainable building standards could not be accommodated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that higher sustainable building standards could not be accommodated.
	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?	Site can accommodate 2 levels higher than mandatory limit ++	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for waste reduction could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for waste reduction could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for waste reduction could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for waste reduction could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for waste reduction could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for waste reduction could not be incorporated.
	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 details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for recycling facilities could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for recycling facilities could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for recycling facilities could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for recycling facilities could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for recycling facilities could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for recycling facilities could not be incorporated.
	No --						

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		290	291	292	370	412	441
F Overall Rating for 'Sustainable Building and Waste Minimisation'	Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development and developer willing ++	No information submitted	No information submitted	No information submitted	No information submitted	No information submitted	No information submitted
	Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development but developer unwilling -						
	Site not capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development --						
Efficient Use of Land							
Q.20 Is the site or any part of the site considered previously developed land?	Site is over 50% to 100% Brownfield ++	1.4ha of greenfield. But no Brownfield sites are available and capable of meeting housing need.	0.17ha of greenfield. But no Brownfield sites are available and capable of meeting housing need.	0.26ha of greenfield. But no Brownfield sites are available and capable of meeting housing need.	4.71ha of greenfield. But no Brownfield sites are available and capable of meeting housing need.	0.49ha of greenfield. But no Brownfield sites are available and capable of meeting housing need.	0.04ha of greenfield. But no Brownfield sites are available and capable of meeting housing need.
	Site is up to 50% Brownfield +						
Q.21 Can the site achieve an appropriate density to achieve the most efficient use of the land?	Excellent density achieved taking into account location and context ++	This site has been proposed as an employment site, for expansion of the existing business.	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.	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. 99 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. 10 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. 1 dwelling.
	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 --						
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 ++	Factory is adjacent.	Part of site in 1975 has road haulage	Part of site in 1975 has road haulage	No evidence that the land is contaminated.	No evidence that the land is contaminated.	No evidence that the land is contaminated.
	Development is located on land which may be contaminated and will be remediated +						
	Development is located on land which may be contaminated and no proposals for remediation have been put forward -						
	Development is located on land which is likely to be highly contaminated no proposals for remediation have been put forward --						
G Overall Rating for 'Efficient Use of Land'	Site represents very efficient use of land with mitigation to fully overcome concerns where necessary ++	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)
	Site represents efficient use of land but further mitigation required to fully overcome concerns where necessary +						
	Site does not represent efficient use of land. Further investigation of mitigation measures to overcome concerns required -						
	Site does not represent efficient use of land and mitigation is not possible --						
Natural Resources							
Q. 23 Would the development of this site involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1,2 and 3a)?	No loss of best and most versatile agricultural land ++	(-) 1.4ha 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 loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The land is	(-) 0.17ha grade 2 land. This is Best and Most Versatile Land. Although the site is currently not in agricultural use, being used with storage containers and is less than 5ha in size.	(-) 0.26ha grade 2 land. This is Best and Most Versatile Land. Although the site is currently not in intensive agricultural use, being used as a grazed paddock and is less than 5ha in size.	(-) 4.71ha grade 3 land. 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 loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.	(-) 0.49ha grade 2 land. This is Best and Most Versatile Land. Although the site is currently not in agricultural use, being used as paddock and is less than 5ha in size.	(-) 0.04ha grade 2 land. This is Best and Most Versatile Land. The site is in agricultural use, and is cropped.
	Up to 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost -						

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		290	291	292	370	412	441
	More than 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost --	currently cropped.					
Q. 24 Would the development lead to the sterilisation of mineral resources?	<p>Site not within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search, or Mineral Consultation Zone ++?</p> <p>Site within the buffer of a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone --?</p> <p>Site within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone --</p>		(-) within sand gravel mineral safeguarding area. But adjacent to the built form of the settlement.	(-) within sand gravel mineral safeguarding area. But adjacent to the built form of the settlement.		(-) within sand gravel mineral safeguarding area. But adjacent to the built form of the settlement.	(++)The site is not 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?	<p>Development is not located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone ++</p> <p>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 +</p> <p>Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but no risk assessment has been undertaken -</p> <p>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 --</p>	Environment Agency not requested to comment.	Environment Agency not requested to make comment	Environment Agency not requested to make comment	Environment Agency not requested to comment.	Environment Agency not requested to make comment	Environment Agency not requested to comment.
Q. 27 Is any part of the development on suspected unstable land?	<p>Land has no instability concerns ++</p> <p>Land potentially unstable but investigation has shown that mitigation is possible +</p> <p>Land potentially unstable but no investigation has been carried out -</p> <p>Land suffers from significant instability problems and either no mitigation has been proposed or instability problems are not possible to mitigate --</p>	There is no evidence that the land is unstable.	There is no evidence that the land is unstable.	There is no evidence that the land is unstable.	There is no evidence that the land is unstable.	There is no evidence that the land is unstable.	There is no evidence that the land is unstable.
Q. 28 Will the site impact on major hazard sites or pipelines?	<p>HSE Standing Advice states "do not advise against development" ++</p> <p>HSE Standing Advice states "advise against development"</p>	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
H Overall Rating for 'Natural Resources'	<p>Site would not adversely affect any natural resources ++</p> <p>Site would not have any significant adverse effect on natural resources +</p> <p>Site would have an adverse effect on natural resources but mitigation is possible -</p> <p>Site would have a significant adverse effect on natural resources and limited/no mitigation is possible --</p>	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)
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?	<p>The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +</p> <p>The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -</p>	(-) The extension of the site will need to consider the residential amenity of the adjacent residential properties. They have relatively short back gardens (relative to the properties currently to the north of Ellis Patents).	(+) By virtue of its location, and size of site, and adjacent uses, it is unlikely that noise, light dust or smell would cause a nuisance to both existing and prospective users.	(+) By virtue of its location, and size of site, and adjacent uses, it is unlikely that noise, light dust or smell would cause a nuisance to both existing and prospective users.	(-) the scale of this site will create a level of development which would significantly increase traffic movements, which would be detrimental to the amenities of existing residences.	(+) By virtue of its location, and size of site, and adjacent uses, it is unlikely that noise, light dust or smell would cause a nuisance to both existing and prospective users.	(+) By virtue of its location, and size of site, and adjacent uses, it is unlikely that noise, light dust or smell would cause a nuisance to both existing and prospective users.

Assessment		290	291	292	370	412	441
	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 --						

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		290	291	292	370	412	441
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.	<p>The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +</p> <p>The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -</p> <p>The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --</p>	(-) The height of any buildings on site would need to be considered, as the properties to the south have short back gardens.	(+) it is considered that these amenity impacts could be addressed though considering the scale, massing and orientation of the properties in respect of existing dwellings, and proposed dwellings.	(+) it is considered that these amenity impacts could be addressed though considering the scale, massing and orientation of the properties in respect of existing dwellings, and proposed dwellings.	(+) it is considered that these amenity impacts could be addressed though considering the scale, massing and orientation of the properties in respect of existing dwellings, and proposed dwellings.	(+) it is considered that these amenity impacts could be addressed though considering the scale, massing and orientation of the properties in respect of existing dwellings, and proposed dwellings.	(+) it is considered that these amenity impacts could be addressed though considering the scale, massing and orientation of the properties in respect of existing dwellings, and proposed dwellings.
I Overall Rating for 'Amenity'	<p>The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +</p> <p>The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -</p> <p>The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of this site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --</p>	(-)	(+)	(+)	(-)	(+)	(+)
Flood Risk							
Q. 31 Is the site potentially affected by groundwater flooding?	<p>No ++</p> <p>Yes further investigation required --</p>	(--) Yes - the SFRA notes that Rillington lies on the edge of a zone of potential ground water and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A)	(--) Yes - the SFRA notes that Rillington lies on the edge of a zone of potential ground water and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A)	(--) Yes - the SFRA notes that Rillington lies on the edge of a zone of potential ground water and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A)	(--) Yes - the SFRA notes that Rillington lies on the edge of a zone of potential ground water and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A)	(--) Yes - the SFRA notes that Rillington lies on the edge of a zone of potential ground water and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A)	(--) Yes - the SFRA notes that Rillington lies on the edge of a zone of potential ground water and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A)
Q. 32 Is the site potentially affected by surface water flooding and is this site considered to be within a critical drainage area?	<p>No ++</p> <p>Yes further investigation required --</p>	(--) The site is within an area potentially affected by surface water flooding, but it is not within a Critical Drainage Area. Environment Agency would expect no increase in surface water runoff from the site	(--) The site is within an area potentially affected by surface water flooding, but it is not within a Critical Drainage Area. Environment Agency would expect no increase in surface water runoff from the site	(--) The site is within an area potentially affected by surface water flooding, but it is not within a Critical Drainage Area. Environment Agency would expect no increase in surface water runoff from the site	(--) The site is within an area potentially affected by surface water flooding, but it is not within a Critical Drainage Area. Environment Agency would expect no increase in surface water runoff from the site	(--) The site is within an area potentially affected by surface water flooding, but it is not within a Critical Drainage Area. Environment Agency would expect no increase in surface water runoff from the site	(--) The site is within an area potentially affected by surface water flooding, but it is not within a Critical Drainage Area. Environment Agency would expect no increase in surface water runoff from the site
Q. 33 Is the site potentially affected by sewer flooding?	<p>No ++</p> <p>Yes further investigation required --</p>	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		290	291	292	370	412	441
Q. 34 Have Sustainable Drainage Systems (SDS) been proposed as part of the development?	<p>Site capable of accommodating SDS and have been proposed as part of the development ++</p> <p>Site capable of accommodating SDS though no information on whether SDS proposed as part of the development +</p> <p>Site capable of accommodating SDS however SDS not being proposed on site -</p> <p>Site not suitable for accommodating SDS -</p>	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme, and any Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme, and any Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme, and any Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme, and any Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme, and any Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme, and any Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.
Q. 35 What other measures* have been considered which ensure the development is resilient to climate change? * which may vary	<p>Multiple additional measures proposed which build in resilience to climate change ++</p> <p>Single additional measure proposed to build in resilience to climate change +</p> <p>No information provided on measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change -</p> <p>No measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change --</p>	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme and other resilience measures to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme and other resilience measures to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme and other resilience measures to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme and other resilience measures to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme and other resilience measures to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme and other resilience measures to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.
J Overall Rating for 'Flood Risk'	<p>No flood risk associated with the site ++</p> <p>Limited flood risk associated with the site which can be fully mitigated +</p> <p>Site affected by a number of flood risk issues, however mitigation possible-</p> <p>Site affected by significant flood risk issues and limited mitigation possible --</p>	(+) No information submitted.	(+) No information submitted.	(+) No information submitted.	(+) No information submitted.	(+) No information submitted.	(+) No information submitted.
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>	Development of the site would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of Rillington.	Development of the site would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of Rillington.	Development of the site would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of Rillington.	Development of the site would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of Rillington.	Development of the site would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of Rillington.	Development of the site would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of Rillington.
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 submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that secured by design principles could not be taken into account. Some specifics may not be appropriate within the village context of Rillington- but this is a site specific consideration.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that secured by design principles could not be taken into account. Some specifics may not be appropriate within the village context of Rillington- but this is a site specific consideration.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that secured by design principles could not be taken into account. Some specifics may not be appropriate within the village context of Rillington- but this is a site specific consideration.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that secured by design principles could not be taken into account. Some specifics may not be appropriate within the village context of Rillington- but this is a site specific consideration.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that secured by design principles could not be taken into account. Some specifics may not be appropriate within the village context of Rillington- but this is a site specific consideration.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that secured by design principles could not be taken into account. Some specifics may not be appropriate within the village context of Rillington- but this is a site specific consideration.
Q. 38 Does the design of the development encourage people to walk	Cycle ways and footpaths effectively integrated into the development encouraging walking and cycling ++	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that measures to	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that measures to	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that measures to	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that measures to	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that measures to	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that measures to

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		290	291	292	370	412	441
and cycle rather than travel by car?	Some cycle ways and/or footpaths shown encouraging walking and cycling +	increase walking and cycling could not be taken into account.	increase walking and cycling could not be taken into account.	increase walking and cycling could not be taken into account.	increase walking and cycling could not be taken into account.	increase walking and cycling could not be taken into account.	increase walking and cycling could not be taken into account.
	No cycle ways and footpaths indicated as part of this development --						

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		290	291	292	370	412	441
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 Travel Plan has been submitted although there is no reason to suggest that a Travel Plan could not be produced.	A Travel Plan is not required for this site.	A Travel Plan is not required for this site.	No Travel Plan has been submitted although there is no reason to suggest that a Travel Plan could not be produced.	A Travel Plan is not required for this site.	A Travel Plan is not required for this site.
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>	<p>The site submission is for employment use, to expand an established business. The Local Plan Strategy is supportive of supporting established business.</p> <p>There is no reason to suggest that development of the site would not support the ability to attract a more balanced population, and reducing inequality.</p>	No details have been submitted as to the type of housing proposed. Although there is no reason to suggest that development of the site would not support the ability to attract a more balanced population, and reducing inequality.	No details have been submitted as to the type of housing proposed. Although there is no reason to suggest that development of the site would not support the ability to attract a more balanced population, and reducing inequality.	No details have been submitted as to the type of housing proposed. Although there is no reason to suggest that development of the site would not support the ability to attract a more balanced population, and reducing inequality.	No details have been submitted as to the type of housing proposed. Although there is no reason to suggest that development of the site would not support the ability to attract a more balanced population, and reducing inequality.	The site is particularly small, and so it unlikely to make any meaningful contribution of attracting a balanced living/working population or reducing inequality of opportunity.
K Overall Rating for 'People'	<p>Development actively planned to encourage the development of sustainable communities ++</p> <p>Development has taken into account the need to develop sustainable communities +</p> <p>Development has little regard to the need to develop sustainable communities -</p> <p>Development has no regard for the need to develop sustainable communities --</p>	(+)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
Meeting needs							
Q.41 Does the type and mix of development proposed meet the needs identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), Employment Land Review Update 2010 (ELR), Ryedale Retail Capacity Studies (RRCS) and Malton Town Centre Strategy?	<p>Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++</p> <p>Proposal identifies what the needs are and how some needs will be met by the development +</p> <p>Proposal either does not identify what the needs are or how any needs will be met by the development -</p> <p>No assessment is undertaken of what the needs are and whether any needs will be met --</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Given the proposal is to support an existing enterprise, on the edge of the settlement, it is likely that this site is capable of addressing the requirements of the ELR and update in principle.</p>	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)	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 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)	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 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)	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 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)	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 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		290	291	292	370	412	441
Q. 42 What level and type of affordable housing is proposed?	<p>Development offers appropriate level and type of affordable housing which meets the needs as set out in the SHMA ++</p> <p>Development offers some affordable housing which meets some of the need as set out in the SHMA +</p> <p>Development does not offer the appropriate level and type of affordable housing or does not meet the need for affordable housing as set out in the SHMA -</p> <p>The development makes no provision for affordable housing --</p>	Employment use.	(--) The site is not capable of delivery of any on site or commuted sum for affordable housing delivery	(--) The site is not capable of delivery of any on site or commuted sum for affordable housing delivery	There are no details provided concerning the amount of affordable housing. Although there is no reason to suggest that an appropriate level of housing could not be negotiated.	(-) There are no details provided concerning the amount of affordable housing. On a theoretical yield of 10 units the scheme would be expected to comply with SP3 regarding the provision of a commuted sum for affordable housing.	(--) The site is not capable of delivery of any on site or commuted sum for affordable housing delivery
Q. 43 What provision has been made for Ryedale's elderly population?	<p>Development addresses and meets the needs of Ryedale's elderly population ++</p> <p>Development takes into account and meets some of the needs of Ryedale's elderly population +</p> <p>Development does not address the needs of Ryedale's elderly population -</p> <p>The development makes no provision for the needs of Ryedale's elderly population --</p>	Employment use.	No details have been provided, although as a service village there is no presumption for extra-care facilities. There is no expectation that bungalows will be required, but the Plan supports the delivery of lifetime homes. This will be considered as a site-specific matter.	No details have been provided, although as a service village there is no presumption for extra-care facilities. There is no expectation that bungalows will be required, but the Plan supports the delivery of lifetime homes. This will be considered as a site-specific matter.	No details have been provided, although as a service village there is no presumption for extra-care facilities. Site is capable of exceeding the threshold for a requirement for bungalows. The Plan supports the delivery of lifetime homes. This will be considered as a site-specific matter.	No details have been provided, although as a service village there is no presumption for extra-care facilities. There is no expectation that bungalows will be required, but the Plan supports the delivery of lifetime homes. This will be considered as a site-specific matter.	No details have been provided, although as a service village there is no presumption for extra-care facilities. There is no expectation that bungalows will be required, but the Plan supports the delivery of lifetime homes. This will be considered as a site-specific matter.
L Overall Rating for 'Meeting Needs'	<p>Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++</p> <p>Proposal identifies what the needs are and how some needs will be met by the development +</p> <p>Proposal either does not identify what the needs are or how any needs are or how any needs will be met by the development -</p> <p>No assessment is undertaken of what the needs are and whether any needs --</p>	Employment use.	No details provided.	No details provided.	No details provided.	No details provided.	No details provided.
Community Facilities, utilities and Infrastructure							
Q45 On sites greater than 1ha: Has a Transport Assessment been undertaken	<p>Yes ++</p> <p>No- transport assessment required --</p>	(--) The material submitted recognises the need for a transport assessment to be undertaken.	No Transport Assessment required	No Transport Assessment required	(--) No Transport Assessment has been submitted at present.	No Transport Assessment 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?	<p>No mitigation required or no impact on the highway following mitigation ++</p> <p>Mitigation required but no unacceptable impact following mitigation +</p> <p>Mitigation required and development would have a significant impact though not unacceptable impact after mitigation -</p> <p>Mitigation required and development would still have an unacceptable impact following mitigation --</p>	Employment use.	See response to 638. Site alone demonstrates no access.	See response to 638. Site alone demonstrates no access.	(--) concerns about site in proximity to A64 and need to use established access points.	(--) No appropriate access has been demonstrated to the site	(-) Access would be via Thorpe Bassett Road concerns around visibility. Single dwelling.

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		290	291	292	370	412	441
Q. 47 Can the site accommodate adequate parking and servicing facilities?	<p>Site meets highway guidelines for parking and servicing ++</p> <p>Site does not currently meet parking and/or servicing requirements. However these issues can potentially be overcome or mitigated –</p> <p>Site does not meet highway requirements for parking and/or servicing and the issues identified are difficult/not practically possible to overcome --</p>	Employment use.	See response to 638. Site alone demonstrates no access.	See response to 638. Site alone demonstrates no access.	Parking and servicing issues may be addressed, but would not overcome the access issues.	(--) No appropriate access has been demonstrated to the site	No details have been submitted. No reason to suggest that adequate servicing and parking standards cannot be achieved.
Q. 48 Will the proposal provide, enable or improve access to public rights of way (PROW)?	<p>Proposal will create new PROW or integrate existing PROW into the development ++</p> <p>Proposal will not affect a PROW +</p> <p>Proposal would involve the diversion or loss of a PROW --</p>	(+) No PROW proximal. No information is provided concerning creation of new PROWs.	(--) The site is adjacent to a PROW which runs from Scarborough Road/A64 and also Low Moorgate and continues along the back of various properties with paddocks on the eastern boundary to a track that runs to the Railway Lane. No details have been submitted as to how this PROW would be impacted upon.	(--) The site is adjacent to a PROW which runs from Scarborough Road/A64 and also Low Moorgate and continues along the back of various properties with paddocks on the eastern boundary to a track that runs to the Railway Lane. No details have been submitted as to how this PROW would be impacted upon.	(--) The site has a PROW which runs from Scarborough Road/A64 behind a series of properties, across the site to a farm track. No details have been submitted as to how this PROW would be impacted upon. It is likely the PROW be in the very least diverted.	(+) No PROW proximal. No information is provided concerning creation of new PROWs.	(+) No PROW proximal. No information is provided concerning creation of new PROWs.
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>	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.	The site is of a size where new public realm is unrealistic to be delivered.	The site is of a size where new public realm is unrealistic to be delivered.	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.	The site is of a size where new public realm is unrealistic to be delivered.	The site is of a size where new public realm is unrealistic to be delivered.

Assessment		290	291	292	370	412	441	
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. No capacity issue concerning water supply. Upgrading of sewerage capacity is required, limited capacity. 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.	Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. No capacity issue concerning water supply. Upgrading of sewerage capacity is required, limited capacity. 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.	Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. No capacity issue concerning water supply. Upgrading of sewerage capacity is required, limited capacity. 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.	Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. No capacity issue concerning water supply. Upgrading of sewerage capacity is required, limited capacity. 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.	Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. No capacity issue concerning water supply. Upgrading of sewerage capacity is required, limited capacity. 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.	Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. No capacity issue concerning water supply. Upgrading of sewerage capacity is required, limited capacity. 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.	
	Site has limited to medium adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be satisfactorily mitigated +	Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.	Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.	Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.	Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.	Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.	Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.	Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.
	Site has medium to high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation –							
	Site has high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation --							
Q. 51 What is the impact on Waste Water Treatment Works?	Further than 400m from the boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(-)	(++)	
	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		290	291	292	370	412	441
Q. 52 Would the development on its own, have an impact on an existing community facility and has mitigation of this impact been proposed as part of the development?	Site has no adverse impact on community facilities or where there is an adverse impact this is fully mitigated through the provision of new, expanded or alternative facilities ++	(++) Development of the site would not have a direct impact on the an existing community facility.	(++) Development of the site would not have a direct impact on the an existing community facility.	(++) Development of the site would not have a direct impact on the an existing community facility.	(++) Development of the site would not have a direct impact on the an existing community facility.	(++) Development of the site would not have a direct impact on the an existing community facility.	(++) Development of the site would not have a direct impact on the an existing community facility.
	Site does not have a significant adverse impact on community facilities or where there is a significant adverse impact this is mitigated through the provision of new, expanded or alternative facilities +						
	Site has an adverse impact on community facilities and limited mitigation is indicated -						
	Site has a significant adverse impact on community facilities and no mitigation is indicated --						
M Overall Rating for 'Community facilities, Utilities and Infrastructure'	Site has limited or no adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has a adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be fully mitigated ++	(+)	(-)	(-)	(--)	(--)	(+)
	Site has limited to medium adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be satisfactorily mitigated +						
	Site has medium to high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation –						
	Site has high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation –						
Strong Economy							
Q.53 Will the site promote the viability and vitality of the Principal Town or Local Service Centre?	Proposal will support and enhance the vitality and viability of the town centre, encouraging new investment ++	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Proposal will support the vitality and viability of the town centre in retaining key services and facilities +						
	Proposal could adversely harm the viability and vitality of the town centre leading to decline --						
Q. 54 (Employment uses) Will the mix of uses proposed by the development assist in diversifying the economy as set out in the ELR?	Mix of uses proposed will diversify the economy as set out in the ELR ++	(+)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Mix of uses proposed will not diversify the economy but will support existing employment sectors in Ryedale +						
Q. 55 (Employment/retail uses) Does the proposal involve the creation of net additional or net loss of jobs in Ryedale?	Up to 250 net jobs created ++	No details have been provided as to the nature of job creation.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Up to 50 net jobs created +						
	Up to 50 net jobs lost -						
	Up to 250 net jobs lost --						
N Overall rating for 'Strong Economy'	Proposal will have a significant positive impact on the economy ++	(+) expansion of ex business	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 --						

Assessment		290	291	292	370	412	441
Stage 3 - Deliverability / Developability							
Q56. How does the site perform against the SHLAA Update (housing), ELR Update (employment) and RRCS (retail) in terms of its ability to come forward and its suitability for development?	Housing: Category 1 (Deliverable)++		Not considered in the 2009 SHLAA	Not considered in the 2009 SHLAA	(-) Category 1 Site in the 2009 SHLAA. But site of a Scheduled Monument	(-) Category 1 Site in the 2009 SHLAA. But no identified access.	
	Housing: Category 2 (Developable) +						
	Housing: Category 3 (Not Currently Developable) --						
Q57. Are there any other legal or physical constraints which may affect the ability of the site to come forward?	No constraints identified ++	(+)Subject to archaeological investigation	(+)Subject to archaeological investigation	(+)Subject to archaeological investigation	(-) Objection from Historic England concerning the Scheduled Monument	(-) Subject to archaeological investigation access is sub-standard	(+)Subject to archaeological investigation
	Constraint(s) identified but resolution possible +						
	Constraint(s) identified but resolution is uncertain --						
Developer Contributions							
Q58. Will the development provide appropriate levels of developer contributions?	Normal range of contributions can be achieved ++		See response to 638	See response to 638	(+) 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.	Unknown
	Some contributions can be achieved +						
	Limited contributions can be achieved -						
	No contributions can be achieved --						
Q. 59 Can the development support the requirements of the CIL charging schedule?	Yes ++		See response to 638	See response to 638	(++) 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.	Unknown
	No --						
O Overall Deliverability / Developability Rating	Site is able to come forward without impairment and is able to provide a normal range of contributions ++	Continue to consider for employment purposes only, advised no allocations for employment in Service Villages	(++) in conjunction with 638	(++) in conjunction with 638	(-)	(-)	No response provided
	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		515	516	517	518	536	633	
Stage 1 - Sift						Subject of a separate permission for a single dwelling. Became separate from 638 in 2916.	Planning application 13/01425/FUL approved for 4 dwellings determined 9.3.2015, and a lawful commencement has been confirmed 2 May 2017.	
all sites 0.15Ha and above	0.15 Ha or greater ++	(++)2.87ha	(++)8.26ha	(++)56.93ha	(++)2.02ha	(++)0.16ha	(++)0.37ha	
	Less than 0.15 Ha --							
Check for conformity with Local Plan Strategy, Settlement Hierarchy, SP1	Conforms to Local Plan Strategy Spatial Strategy (SP1) ++	(++)	(++)	(++) Subject to a much more modest site adjacent to the settlement being considered	(--) based on scale of development this site would be separated from the settlement	(++)	(++)	
	Does not meet Local Plan Strategy (Spatial Strategy) SP1 --							
Sites which cause significant harm to national/international nature conservation sites (species or habitat) or would involve substantial harm or loss to designated heritage assets will not be considered further.	Will Not cause harm ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	
	Will cause harm --							
Sites which fall wholly within Flood Zone 3b not considered further for built development. Where sites are partially in Flood Zone 3b, that part of the site will be not be considered further for built development.	Is not within Flood Zone 3b ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	
	Is within Flood Zone 3b --							
Stage 2 - Site Assessment								
Q1A How accessible is the site to key services and facilities	Bus stop	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(++)	(++)	(++) at closest point		(++)	(++)
		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 ++	(+)	(++)	(++) at closest point		(++)	(++)
		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 ++	(-)	(++)	(++) at closest point		(+)	(+)
		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 ++	(++)	(++)	(++) at closest point		(++)	(++)	
	Up to 10 minutes walking time +							
	Up to 15 minutes walking time -							
	15 minutes walking time and over --							

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		515	516	517	518	536	633
Overall accessibility rating	Site has excellent accessibility ++	(+)	(++)	(++)		(++)	(++)
	Site has good accessibility +						
	Site has variable accessibility -						
	Site has poor accessibility --						
Q2A What flood zone does the site fall within?	Flood Zone 1++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Flood Zone 2 +						
	Flood zone 3a -						
Q2B What vulnerability class does the site fall	Flood Zone 1++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Flood Zone 2						
	Flood Zone 3a						
	Less vulnerable ++						
	More vulnerable +						
	Highly vulnerable -						
Q2D Has a Flood Risk Assessment been undertaken?	yes ++	(--) SFRA -FRA will be required	(--)SFRA -FRA will be required	(--) SFRA -FRA will be required	(--)SFRA -FRA will be required	SFRA	SFRA
	No --						
A Overall Flood Risk Assessment	Site has low overall flood risk ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Site faces significant flood risk issues which can be mitigated +						
	Site faces significant flood risk issues which could potentially be mitigated -						
	Site faces significant flood risk issues and may be inappropriate for development --						
Q3 What are the conclusions of the Highways Authority (NYCC) and Highways England (where appropriate) initial highway assessment?	Site has no highway issues identified ++	(+) Highways England have confirmed that direct access onto the A64 is not possible, due to existing direct access onto the A64. No access details have been provided. Site could be accessed from Sands Lane, and then the visibility of the junction will need consideration. The site would be within the 60mph zone. The County Highways Officer advises: Acceptable onto Sands Lane or A64 (Subject to HA approval). Significant improvements to Sands Lane would be required. Accessibility criteria can be met.	(-) Highways England stress than any new access is principally gained from a signalised junction. A number of properties do access the A64 directly, but no new accesses will be allowed. No access details have been submitted, but it is suggested that access would be onto Sands Lane, meaning the site could be served by the established un-signalised junction at Sands Lane, onto the A64. However, the operation of the junction would need consideration and an assessment undertaken to assess the impact of the sites development on its operation. The County Highways Officer has advised: acceptable onto Sands Lane, but significant improvements to Sands Lane would be required. Accessibility criteria can be met.	(--) Highways England have concerned that they would have major concerns about the bringing forward of this site, due to its impact on the A64	(++) Highways England are satisfied that access to the A64 is principally gained from a signalised junction.	(++) Highways England are satisfied that access to the A64 is principally gained from a signalised junction.	(-) A number of properties have direct access onto the A64. No access details have been provided. The site would have direct access from the A64, but is proximal to the junction with Sands Lane. The County Highways Officer advises: Acceptable onto the A64 (Subject to HA approval). Existing access would require improvements. the location of the existing pedestrian island would also need considering.
	Site has some highways issues identified which can be mitigated subject to further investigation +						
	Site has multiple highways issues which can be mitigated subject to further investigation -						
	Site has multiple highway issues which may be difficult to mitigate unless further investigation demonstrates otherwise --						
Biodiversity and Geo-diversity							
Q4 Would the development affect a regional or local site of biodiversity (including SINCs, LNRs or RIGS) or affect UK, NYMNP or Ryedale Biodiversity Plan protected species	Enhancement of feature/species possible - mitigation not required ++	(+) The site is not designated, or identified as a site of biodiversity. However, were there to protected species, these would be considered under their statutory framework.	(+) The site is not designated, or identified as a site of biodiversity. However, were there to protected species, these would be considered under their statutory framework.	(+) The site is not designated, or identified as a site of biodiversity. However, were there to protected species, these would be considered under their statutory framework.	(+) The site is not designated, or identified as a site of biodiversity. However, were there to protected species, these would be considered under their statutory framework.	(+) The site is not designated, or identified as a site of biodiversity. However, were there to protected species, these would be considered under their statutory framework.	(+) The site is not designated, or identified as a site of biodiversity. However, were there to protected species, these would be considered under their statutory framework.
	Neutral impact - no effect or effect can be fully mitigated +						
	Adverse impact but mitigation possible -						

Assessment		515	516	517	518	536	633
protected species	Serious impact with limited means of mitigation --						

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		515	516	517	518	536	633
Q5 Would the development provide opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure, including linking in with existing green infrastructure/corridors?	<p>Excellent opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors ++</p> <p>Some opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors +</p> <p>No opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors, however the site has the potential to accommodate these –</p> <p>No opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure corridors, however the site does not have the potential to accommodate these --</p>	No information has been submitted concerning the provision of green infrastructure, although there is no reason to suggest that this could not be achieved. This site is a grazed field, bounded by trees to the north, west and east and intermittently to the south.	No information has been submitted concerning the provision of green infrastructure, although there is no reason to suggest that this could not be achieved. This site is a collection of three grazed fields, with mature hedging. A public right of way straddles the site, and another follows the westernmost boundary.	No information has been submitted concerning the provision of green infrastructure, although there is no reason to suggest that this could not be achieved. The site, however, is a collection of cropped fields, covering a large area to the west of the village.	No information has been submitted concerning the provision of green infrastructure, although there is no reason to suggest that this could not be achieved. The site is some distance from the village, forming a strip of land between the Railway and the PRoW.	The site contains a number of mature trees and in combination with the paddocks, a distinctive feature of this part of Rillington.	No information has been submitted concerning the provision of green infrastructure, although there is no reason to suggest that this could not be achieved. The site is part of the curtilage of a dwelling, and has a number of trees in the site.
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>	(+) The site is bounded by trees on all sides, in particular the northern boundary has a deeper strip of trees.	(+) The site is formed by three grazing fields. The two internal boundaries are manicured native hedges which include two mature native trees. The eastern boundary is entirely formed by a block of mature coniferous woodland. The western boundary is fenced. The southern boundary is hedgerows that form the boundaries of residential properties and include a number of mature trees. The existing hedged boundaries of the site should be supplemented with native trees, existing gaps within the hedges being made good with appropriate native species, providing sufficient space to accommodate this without conflict to new residences. New trees along boundaries should be container grown specimens, minimum 12/14cm stem girth. The existing four sycamores within eastern boundary of the site should be retained. Ensure a good quality of landscaping throughout the development.	(+) This is a large site which incorporates a number of cropped fields, which are demarcated by hedgerows. Sporadic trees are within some of these hedgerows.	(+) This is a site which is bounded by the Railway and a drainage ditch. There is a small collection of trees, which provide screening from the railway for the farmstead.	(-) Ensure that the position of any new dwelling(s) is positioned in accordance with BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to construction – Recommendations. Selected trees within the site should be retained to provide maturity to the development and to screen the development against open countryside to the east. Retain selected trees within the site and along the eastern boundary. Retain existing boundary hedges. Although part of the site has been developed (namely the paddock off Low Moorgate Lane), the heavily treed area remains undeveloped.	(-) The northern boundary of the site is a mature hedge, with a number of trees within the site.
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>	(+)	(+)	(-)	(+)	(-)	(+)

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		515	516	517	518	536	633
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 ++	(--) Rillington is within the Vale of Pickering National Character Area, which is principally defined by its low-lying topography. However, it is on the edge of this area, and to the south, the land begins to rise and form the Wolds escarpment. The Local Landscape Character type is Wooded Open Vale, reflecting the flat, low lying terrain which is punctuated by woodland blocks. This site, and the surrounding land is typical of this description: The site is particularly distanced from the village, because it is the exterior-most site which forms part of a wedge of land which straddles between Sand Lane and the A64. It is also screened by a belt of coniferous tree planting. As such it has an open-estate-land character in feel, in part due to the proximity of Scampston Hall estate, and as such it has limited physical and visual connect to the village of Rillington. Were development to occur it would be particularly visually prominent.	(-) Rillington is within the Vale of Pickering National Character Area, which is principally defined by its low-lying topography. However, it is on the edge of this area, and to the south, the land begins to rise and form the Wolds escarpment. The Local Landscape Character type is Wooded Open Vale, reflecting the flat, low lying terrain which is punctuated by woodland blocks. This site typifies the landscape character. With three relatively substantial fields, on low lying land, bounded to the east by a shelter belt type woodland of conifers. The fields are adjacent to the various paddocks and residential curtilages of the properties on Low Moorgate Lane and Scarborough Road. The fields combined represent a substantial site, but due to the topography, and existing development the sites are screened. They would be physically not well related to the existing settlement, and access to the sites would determine how any part of the site could come forward.	(--) Rillington is within the Vale of Pickering National Character Area, which is principally defined by its low-lying topography. However, it is on the edge of this area, and to the south, the land begins to rise and form the Wolds escarpment. The Local Landscape Character type is Wooded Open Vale, reflecting the flat, low lying terrain which is punctuated by woodland blocks. Site 517 is an extraordinarily large area, covering nearly 57 hectares. The site is distanced from the settlement of Rillington by virtue of its size, but it is adjacent to the built up edge of Rillington. It is disproportionate in its scale, and were it to come forward in whole or in part it would create a diffuse sprawling form of development and would be visually discordant feature in the land surrounding Rillington, given the low lying topography and absence of trees.	(--) Rillington is within the Vale of Pickering National Character Area, which is principally defined by its low-lying topography. However, it is on the edge of this area, and to the south, the land begins to rise and form the Wolds escarpment. The Local Landscape Character type is Wooded Open Vale, reflecting the flat, low lying terrain which is punctuated by woodland blocks. Linked physically to the submissions of 517 and 231.	(-) Rillington is within the Vale of Pickering National Character Area, which is principally defined by its low-lying topography. However, it is on the edge of this area, and to the south, the land begins to rise and form the Wolds escarpment. The Local Landscape Character type is Wooded Open Vale, reflecting the flat, low lying terrain which is punctuated by woodland blocks. The site area is the has been separately submitted, but is incorporated in the same extent as sites 176, 286 and 638. To the rear of the properties to the east there is a well treed area, with mature vegetation. It is considered that this site is visually sensitive, and contributes to the rural dispersed character of this part of Rillington, and that the trees here contribute to the character of locality.	(+) Rillington is within the Vale of Pickering National Character Area, which is principally defined by its low-lying topography. However, it is on the edge of this area, and to the south, the land begins to rise and form the Wolds escarpment. The Local Landscape Character type is Wooded Open Vale, reflecting the flat, low lying terrain which is punctuated by woodland blocks. This is a small site which is within part of the curtilage of an existing property.
	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 protected landscapes the North York Moors NP and 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 ++	(++) Distanced and low lying topography. Not proximal to the AONB or the National Park.	(++) Distanced and low lying topography. Not proximal to the AONB or the National Park.	(++) Distanced and low lying topography. Not proximal to the AONB or the National Park.	(++) Distanced and low lying topography. Not proximal to the AONB or the National Park.	(++) Distanced and low lying topography. Not proximal to the AONB or the National Park.	(++) Distanced and low lying topography. Not proximal to the AONB or the National Park.
	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		515	516	517	518	536	633
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 ++	(--) It is considered that the site is open in character, with mature treed vegetation, on the eastern elevation. The site is also surrounded by hedging and sporadic groups of trees. The general prevailing landscape is one of predominantly rectangular fields bounded in the most part by hawthorn hedges but generally sparsely treed, and a scattering of mainly coniferous woodland blocks. This is a distinctive feature of the landscape type here. Development would erode that character which is so defined in this area.	(--) The site is relatively substantial in scale, and by virtue of that it is likely to have an unmitigatable impact on the character of the settlement, although the site itself is bounded by trees in the wider surroundings, which may limit this wider impact, but they are not part of the site. The general prevailing landscape is one of predominantly rectangular fields bounded in the most part by hawthorn hedges but generally sparsely treed, and a scattering of mainly coniferous woodland blocks. This is a distinctive feature of the landscape type here. Development would erode that character which is so defined in this area.	(--) Due to the scale of the site, and its distance from the settlement-proper of Rillington there is no landscape features inherent in the landscape which would ameliorate the impact, and no mitigation measures given the land is open in form and character.	(--) This site, being very much separate from the village would not be capable of utilising any landscaping features to mitigate its impact.	(-) This site is a plot to the rear of existing dwellings. The site is set back from the garden curtilages, and is bounded by a fence. The site is adjacent to cul-de-sac development to the south. As an individual site it is probable that the topographical landscaping features could be utilised, but the site contains a number of mature trees which contribute to the character of this part of Low Moorgate. Their retention would be necessary.	(-) This plot is a relatively small curtilage plot. Given the mature nature of the screening. It is considered that such development is unlikely to adversely affect settlement character, providing this is retained.
	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 ++	(--) There is no proximal settlement, but properties in Scampston are viewable from Sands Lane. It is considered that this site has the greatest potential to exacerbate the loss of physical separation between Rillington and Scampston. The Local Landscape Character type is Wooded Open Vale, reflecting the flat, low lying terrain which is punctuated by woodland blocks. This site, and the surrounding land is typical of this description: The site is particularly distanced from the village, because it is the exterior-most site which forms part of a wedge of land which straddles between Sand Lane and the A64. It is also screened by a belt of coniferous tree planting. As such it has an open-estate-land character in feel, in part due to the proximity of Scampston Hall estate, and as such it has limited physical and visual connect to the village of Rillington. This site abuts to Registered Park and Gardens, and as such would adversely affect the character and setting of the Registered Park and Garden. There is trees which provide a substantial screen to either side of the site, it would not be well related to the established village.	(-) This in the north eastern part of the village, the large site, developed to its full extent would bring the village much closer to the boundary with Scampston Estate.	(+) large site, but on the western side of the village.	(+) distanced from village, but no settlements are proximal	(+) small site on north eastern side of the village.	(+) small site
	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 --						

Assessment		515	516	517	518	536	633
C Overall Rating for 'Special Qualities, Landscape and Setting'	Positive impact – the proposal will retain and enhance the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement ++	(--)	(--)	(--)	(--)	(-)	(+)
	Neutral impact – the proposal will not have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement +						
	Negative impact – the proposal will have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement, however mitigation is possible –						
	Significant impact – the proposal will have a significant adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement and limited or no mitigation is possible --						
Culture and Heritage							
Q12 Will the site affect a designated heritage asset, either directly or indirectly through its setting?	Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++	(--) This site abuts to Scampston Hall Registered Park and Gardens, and as such would adversely affect the character and setting of the RPG. There are trees which provide a substantial screen, but it is not about the visual impact, it is the loss of the open character of this site. The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of number 1117, an Iron Age Barrow Cemetery, but is not in a discernible distance to the SM.	(-) This in the north eastern part of the village, the large site, developed to its full extent would bring the village much closer to the boundary with Scampston Estate. The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of number 1117, an Iron Age Barrow Cemetery, but is not in a discernible distance to the SM.	(-) Potential to directly harm the setting of a number of Listed Buildings along Low Moorgate and Breckney Lane by virtue of scale. The site is within the buffer zone of the Scampston Estate Registered Park and Garden, and despite its size, it is not proximal to harm the setting of the park as it is to the west of the village. The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of number 1117, an Iron Age Barrow Cemetery, but is not in a discernible distance to the SM.	(+) No designated heritage assets proximal. The site is within the buffer zone of the Scampston Estate Registered Park and Garden, but is not proximal or of a scale to harm the setting of the park. The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of number 1117, an Iron Age Barrow Cemetery, but is not in a discernible distance to the SM.	(+) No designated heritage assets proximal. The site is within the buffer zone of the Scampston Estate Registered Park and Garden, but is not proximal or of a scale to harm the setting of the park. The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of number 1117, an Iron Age Barrow Cemetery, but is not in a discernible distance to the SM.	(+) No designated heritage assets proximal. The site is within the buffer zone of the Scampston Estate Registered Park and Garden, but is not proximal or of a scale to harm the setting of the park. The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of a number 1117 An Iron Age Barrow Cemetery, but is not in a discernible distance to the SM.
	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		515	516	517	518	536	633
<p>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?</p>	<p>Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++</p>	<p>(--) This site, were it to be developed, would have the greatest impact on exacerbating the loss of physical separation between Rillington and Scampston. It would also alter the character of this area, which is described in the landscape character assessments as being This is an Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. NYCC Heritage Unit advises for adjacent site 141: Site lies across road from SM of Iron Age barrow cemetery, East Field. Area of extremely high potential for presence of prehistoric and later burials and associated settlement/activity as the wider area along the southern edge of the Vale of Pickering is known for a corridor of almost continuous settlement and activity from early prehistory through to the medieval period between the 25-45m contour zone. Would advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching to clarify the nature and significance of any archaeological remains.</p>	<p>(-) The fields combined represent a substantial site, but due to the topography, and existing development the sites are screened. They would be physically not well related to the existing settlement, and access to the sites would determine how any part of the site could come forward. This is an Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. NYCC Heritage Unit advise: Site lies in an area of extremely high potential for presence of prehistoric and later burials and associated settlement/activity as the wider area along the southern edge of the Vale of Pickering is known for a corridor of almost continuous settlement and activity from early prehistory through to the medieval period between the 25-45m contour zone. Would advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching to clarify the nature and significance of any archaeological remains.</p>	<p>(--) The nature and scale of this site equates to the size of the existing settlement, sprawling out from the west of the village. Such a scale of development would disproportionately harm the character of the village. This is an Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. NYCC Heritage Unit advise: Site lies in an area of extremely high potential for presence of prehistoric and later burials and associated settlement/activity as the wider area along the southern edge of the Vale of Pickering is known for a corridor of almost continuous settlement and activity from early prehistory through to the medieval period between the 25-45m contour zone. Would advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching to clarify the nature and significance of any archaeological remains.</p>	<p>(--) Separate and distanced from the settlement, it lies on the other side of the Railway Line. It is too physically displaced from the settlement to be considered appropriate for residential development, irrespective of the landscape character. It has no visual or physical ties Rillington. It would be an isolated site. This is an Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. NYCC Heritage Unit advise: appears to lie adjacent south of the area already subject to geophysical survey. If additional area to be developed, then would advise geophysical survey should be carried out, to be followed by trial trenching as appropriate.</p>	<p>(-) To the rear of the properties to the east there is a well treed area, with mature vegetation. It is considered that this site is visually sensitive, and contributes to the rural dispersed character of this part of Rillington, and that the trees here contribute to the character of locality. This is an Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. NYCC Heritage Unit advise: appears to lie adjacent south of the area already subject to geophysical survey. If additional area to be developed, then would advise geophysical survey should be carried out, to be followed by trial trenching as appropriate.</p>	<p>(+) A planning application is being considered currently. There hasn't been any development of depth in this area as yet, but consent was granted in 2011 for three dwellings on an adjacent site. by virtue of the location of the site, and its size, development in principle unlikely to harm settlement character, and the landscape, being low lying and flat can visually accommodate the development. This is an Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. The village (like many villages along the Foothlope of the Wolds have existed for multiple centuries and there is a immense archaeological record showing settlement chronology dating back millennia. All sites would need to undertake geophysical surveying in the first instance to establish the archaeological features within this area.</p>
	<p>Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +</p>						
	<p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –</p>						
	<p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --</p>						

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		515	516	517	518	536	633
D Overall Rating for 'Culture and Heritage'	Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++	(--)	(-) Subject to archaeological survey	(--) subject to archaeological survey	(--) Subject to archaeological survey	(-) Subject to archaeological survey	(-) Subject to archaeological survey
	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 provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information 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 ++	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.
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 ++	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.
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 submitted.	No information submitted.	No information submitted.	No information submitted.	No information submitted.	No information submitted.
	Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer unwilling -						
	Site not capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology --						
Sustainable Building and Waste Reduction							
Q17 Can the site accommodate higher sustainable building standards than currently required?	Site can accommodate 2 levels higher than mandatory limit ++	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that higher sustainable building standards could not be accommodated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that higher sustainable building standards could not be accommodated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that higher sustainable building standards could not be accommodated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that higher sustainable building standards could not be accommodated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that higher sustainable building standards could not be accommodated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that higher sustainable building standards could not be accommodated.
	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?	Site can accommodate 2 levels higher than mandatory limit ++	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for waste reduction could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for waste reduction could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for waste reduction could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for waste reduction could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for waste reduction could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for waste reduction could not be incorporated.
	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 details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for recycling facilities could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for recycling facilities could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for recycling facilities could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for recycling facilities could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for recycling facilities could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for recycling facilities could not be incorporated.
	No --						

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		515	516	517	518	536	633
F Overall Rating for 'Sustainable Building and Waste Minimisation'	Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development and developer willing ++	No information submitted	No information submitted	No information submitted	No information submitted	No information submitted	No information submitted
	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 ++	2.87ha of greenfield. But no Brownfield sites are available and capable of meeting housing need.	(--)8.26ha of greenfield. But no Brownfield sites are available and capable of meeting housing need.	(--) 56.93ha of greenfield land	2.02ha of greenfield land. But no Brownfield sites are available and capable of meeting housing need.	0.16ha of greenfield land. But no Brownfield sites are available and capable of meeting housing need.	0.37ha of greenfield land. But no Brownfield sites are available and capable of meeting housing need.
	Site is up to 50% Brownfield +						
Q.21 Can the site achieve an appropriate density to achieve the most efficient use of the land?	Excellent density achieved taking into account location and context ++	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 60 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. 173 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. 1195 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. 42 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. 3 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. 8 dwellings. The existing dwelling is retained in the scheme which has consent for 4 new 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 --						
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 ++	No evidence that the land is contaminated.	No evidence that the land is contaminated.	Sewage works on site	No evidence that the land is contaminated.	Part of site in 1975 has road haulage	No evidence that the land is contaminated.
	Development is located on land which may be contaminated and will be remediated +						
	Development is located on land which may be contaminated and no proposals for remediation have been put forward -						
	Development is located on land which is likely to be highly contaminated no proposals for remediation have been put forward --						
G Overall Rating for 'Efficient Use of Land'	Site represents very efficient use of land with mitigation to fully overcome concerns where necessary ++	(+)	(--)	(--)	(+)	(+)	(+)
	Site represents efficient use of land but further mitigation required to fully overcome concerns where necessary +						
	Site does not represent efficient use of land. Further investigation of mitigation measures to overcome concerns required -						
	Site does not represent efficient use of land and mitigation is not possible --						
Natural Resources							
Q. 23 Would the development of this site involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1,2 and 3a)?	No loss of best and most versatile agricultural land ++	(-)2.87ha grade 3 land. 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 loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The site is a	(--) 8.26ha grades 2 and 3 land. 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 loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.	(--) 56.93ha grades 2 and 3 land. 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 loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.	(-) 2.02ha grade 2 land. This is Best and Most Versatile Land. The site is in agricultural use, being used for grazing and cropping and is less than 5ha in size.	(-) 0.16ha grade 2 land. This is Best and Most Versatile Land. Although the site is currently not in agricultural use, and is less than 5ha in size.	(-) 0.37ha grades 2 and 3 land. 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 loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.
	Up to 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost -						

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		515	516	517	518	536	633
	More than 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost --	grazed field.	The land is in agricultural use as grazing land for sheep.	The land is in agricultural used and is cropped.			
Q. 24 Would the development lead to the sterilisation of mineral resources?	<p>Site not within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search, or Mineral Consultation Zone ++?</p> <p>Site within the buffer of a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone --?</p> <p>Site within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone --</p>	(-- within sand gravel mineral safeguarding area. But adjacent to the built form of the settlement.	(-- within sand gravel mineral safeguarding area. But adjacent to the built form of the settlement.	(-- within sand gravel mineral safeguarding area.	(++)The site is not within a Mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone	(-- within sand gravel mineral safeguarding area. But adjacent to the built form of the settlement.	(-- within sand gravel mineral safeguarding area. But adjacent to the built form of the settlement.
Q. 25 Would the development have an adverse impact on a Groundwater Source Protection Zone?	<p>Development is not located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone ++</p> <p>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 +</p> <p>Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but no risk assessment has been undertaken -</p> <p>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 --</p>	Environment Agency not requested to make comment	Environment Agency not requested to make comment	(-) Adjacent to a private water supply. Hydro geological Risk would be required.	Environment Agency not requested to comment.	Environment Agency not requested to make comment	Environment Agency not requested to comment.
Q. 27 Is any part of the development on suspected unstable land?	<p>Land has no instability concerns ++</p> <p>Land potentially unstable but investigation has shown that mitigation is possible +</p> <p>Land potentially unstable but no investigation has been carried out --</p> <p>Land suffers from significant instability problems and either no mitigation has been proposed or instability problems are not possible to mitigate --</p>	There is no evidence that the land is unstable.	There is no evidence that the land is unstable.	There is no evidence that the land is unstable.	There is no evidence that the land is unstable.	There is no evidence that the land is unstable.	There is no evidence that the land is unstable.
Q. 28 Will the site impact on major hazard sites or pipelines?	<p>HSE Standing Advice states "do not advise against development" ++</p> <p>HSE Standing Advice states "advise against development"</p>	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
H Overall Rating for 'Natural Resources'	<p>Site would not adversely affect any natural resources ++</p> <p>Site would not have any significant adverse effect on natural resources +</p> <p>Site would have an adverse effect on natural resources but mitigation is possible --</p> <p>Site would have a significant adverse effect on natural resources and limited/no mitigation is possible --</p>	(+)	(--)	(--)	(+)	(+)	(+)
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?	<p>The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +</p> <p>The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible --</p>	(+) By virtue of its location, and size of site, and adjacent uses, it is unlikely that noise, light dust or smell would cause a nuisance to both existing and prospective users.	(-- the scale of this site will create a level of development which lead to a significant increase in traffic movements, which would be detrimental to the amenities of existing residences.	(-- the scale of this site will create a level of development which would increase the population of the village to such an extent that there would be a significant increase in traffic movements, which would be detrimental to the amenities of existing residences across the entire settlement.	(+) By virtue of its location, and size of site, and adjacent uses, it is unlikely that noise, light dust or smell would cause a nuisance to both existing and prospective users.	(+) By virtue of its location, and size of site, and adjacent uses, it is unlikely that noise, light dust or smell would cause a nuisance to both existing and prospective users.	(+) By virtue of its location, and size of site, and adjacent uses, it is unlikely that noise, light dust or smell would cause a nuisance to both existing and prospective users.

Assessment		515	516	517	518	536	633
	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 --						

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		515	516	517	518	536	633
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.	<p>The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +</p> <p>The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -</p> <p>The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --</p>	(+) it is considered that these amenity impacts could be addressed though considering the scale, massing and orientation of the properties in respect of existing dwellings, and proposed dwellings.	(+) it is considered that these amenity impacts could be addressed though considering the scale, massing and orientation of the properties in respect of existing dwellings, and proposed dwellings.	(+) it is considered that these amenity impacts could be addressed though considering the scale, massing and orientation of the properties in respect of existing dwellings, and proposed dwellings.	(+) it is considered that these amenity impacts could be addressed though considering the scale, massing and orientation of the properties in respect of existing dwellings, and proposed dwellings.	(+) it is considered that these amenity impacts could be addressed though considering the scale, massing and orientation of the properties in respect of existing dwellings, and proposed dwellings.	(+) it is considered that these amenity impacts could be addressed though considering the scale, massing and orientation of the properties in respect of existing dwellings, and proposed dwellings.
I Overall Rating for 'Amenity'	<p>The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +</p> <p>The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -</p> <p>The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of this site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --</p>	(+)	(--)	(--)	(+)	(+)	(+)
Flood Risk							
Q. 31 Is the site potentially affected by groundwater flooding?	<p>No ++</p> <p>Yes further investigation required --</p>	(--) Yes - the SFRA notes that Rillington lies on the edge of a zone of potential ground water and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A)	(--) Yes - the SFRA notes that Rillington lies on the edge of a zone of potential ground water and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A)	(--) Yes - the SFRA notes that Rillington lies on the edge of a zone of potential ground water and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A)	(--) Yes - the SFRA notes that Rillington lies on the edge of a zone of potential ground water and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A)	(--) Yes - the SFRA notes that Rillington lies on the edge of a zone of potential ground water and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A)	(--) Yes - the SFRA notes that Rillington lies on the edge of a zone of potential ground water and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A)
Q. 32 Is the site potentially affected by surface water flooding and is this site considered to be within a critical drainage area?	<p>No ++</p> <p>Yes further investigation required --</p>	(--) The site is within an area potentially affected by surface water flooding, but it is not within a Critical Drainage Area. Environment Agency would expect no increase in surface water runoff from the site	(--) The site is within an area potentially affected by surface water flooding, but it is not within a Critical Drainage Area. Environment Agency would expect no increase in surface water runoff from the site	(--) The site is within an area potentially affected by surface water flooding, but it is not within a Critical Drainage Area. Environment Agency would expect no increase in surface water runoff from the site	(--) The site is within an area potentially affected by surface water flooding, but it is not within a Critical Drainage Area. Environment Agency would expect no increase in surface water runoff from the site	(--) The site is within an area potentially affected by surface water flooding, but it is not within a Critical Drainage Area. Environment Agency would expect no increase in surface water runoff from the site	(--) The site is within an area potentially affected by surface water flooding, but it is not within a Critical Drainage Area. Environment Agency would expect no increase in surface water runoff from the site
Q. 33 Is the site potentially affected by sewer flooding?	<p>No ++</p> <p>Yes further investigation required --</p>	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		515	516	517	518	536	633
Q. 34 Have Sustainable Drainage Systems (SDS) been proposed as part of the development?	Site capable of accommodating SDS and have been proposed as part of the development ++	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme, and any Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme, and any Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme, and any Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme, and any Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme, and any Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme, and any Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.
	Site capable of accommodating SDS though no information on whether SDS proposed as part of the development +						
	Site capable of accommodating SDS however SDS not being proposed on site -						
	Site not suitable for accommodating SDS -						
Q. 35 What other measures* have been considered which ensure the development is resilient to climate change? * which may vary	Multiple additional measures proposed which build in resilience to climate change ++	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme and other resilience measures to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme and other resilience measures to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme and other resilience measures to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme and other resilience measures to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme and other resilience measures to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme and other resilience measures to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.
	Single additional measure proposed to build in resilience to climate change +						
	No information provided on measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change -						
	No measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change --						
J Overall Rating for 'Flood Risk'	No flood risk associated with the site ++	(+) No information submitted.	(+) No information submitted.	(+) No information submitted.	(+) No information submitted.	(+) No information submitted.	(+) No information submitted.
	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 --						
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 ++	Development of the site would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of Rillington.	Development of the site would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of Rillington.	Development of the site would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of Rillington.	Development of the site would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of Rillington.	Development of the site would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of Rillington.	Development of the site would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of Rillington.
	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 submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that secured by design principles could not be taken into account. Some specifics may not be appropriate within the village context of Rillington- but this is a site specific consideration.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that secured by design principles could not be taken into account. Some specifics may not be appropriate within the village context of Rillington- but this is a site specific consideration.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that secured by design principles could not be taken into account. Some specifics may not be appropriate within the village context of Rillington- but this is a site specific consideration.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that secured by design principles could not be taken into account. Some specifics may not be appropriate within the village context of Rillington- but this is a site specific consideration.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that secured by design principles could not be taken into account. Some specifics may not be appropriate within the village context of Rillington- but this is a site specific consideration.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that secured by design principles could not be taken into account. Some specifics may not be appropriate within the village context of Rillington- but this is a site specific consideration.
	No – SBD principles not taken into account -						
Q. 38 Does the design of the development encourage people to walk	Cycle ways and footpaths effectively integrated into the development encouraging walking and cycling ++	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that measures to	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that measures to	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that measures to	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that measures to	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that measures to	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that measures to

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		515	516	517	518	536	633
and cycle rather than travel by car?	Some cycle ways and/or footpaths shown encouraging walking and cycling +	increase walking and cycling could not be taken into account.	increase walking and cycling could not be taken into account.	increase walking and cycling could not be taken into account.	increase walking and cycling could not be taken into account.	increase walking and cycling could not be taken into account.	increase walking and cycling could not be taken into account.
	No cycle ways and footpaths indicated as part of this development --						

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		515	516	517	518	536	633
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 Travel Plan has been submitted although there is no reason to suggest that a Travel Plan could not be produced.	No Travel Plan has been submitted although there is no reason to suggest that a Travel Plan could not be produced.	No Travel Plan has been submitted although there is no reason to suggest that a Travel Plan could not be produced.	No Travel Plan has been submitted although there is no reason to suggest that a Travel Plan could not be produced.	A Travel Plan is not required for this site.	A Travel Plan is not required for this site.
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>	No details have been submitted as to the type of housing proposed. Although there is no reason to suggest that development of the site would not support the ability to attract a more balanced population, and reducing inequality.	No details have been submitted as to the type of housing proposed. Although there is no reason to suggest that development of the site (or the part of it) would not support the ability to attract a more balanced population, and reducing inequality.	No details have been submitted as to the type of housing proposed. Although there is no reason to suggest that development of the site would not support the ability to attract a more balanced population, and reducing inequality. The site proposes mixed uses, also would include employment and other facilities and services.	No details have been submitted as to the type of housing proposed. Although there is no reason to suggest that development of the site would not support the ability to attract a more balanced population, and reducing inequality.	No details have been submitted as to the type of housing proposed. Although there is no reason to suggest that development of the site would not support the ability to attract a more balanced population, and reducing inequality.	No details have been submitted as to the type of housing proposed. Although there is no reason to suggest that development of the site would not support the ability to attract a more balanced population, and reducing inequality.
K Overall Rating for 'People'	<p>Development actively planned to encourage the development of sustainable communities ++</p> <p>Development has taken into account the need to develop sustainable communities +</p> <p>Development has little regard to the need to develop sustainable communities -</p> <p>Development has no regard for the need to develop sustainable communities --</p>	(-)	(-)	(+)But scale of site is excessive	(-)	(-)	(-)
Meeting needs							
Q.41 Does the type and mix of development proposed meet the needs identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), Employment Land Review Update 2010 (ELR), Ryedale Retail Capacity Studies (RRCS) and Malton Town Centre Strategy?	<p>Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++</p> <p>Proposal identifies what the needs are and how some needs will be met by the development +</p> <p>Proposal either does not identify what the needs are or how any needs will be met by the development -</p> <p>No assessment is undertaken of what the needs are and whether any needs will be met --</p>	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)	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 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. Although this is a very substantial site, covering a mix of uses. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)	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 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)	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 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)	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 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		515	516	517	518	536	633
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 ++	There are no details provided concerning the amount of affordable housing. On a theoretical yield of 60 units the scheme would be expected to comply with SP3 regarding the on-site provision of affordable housing.	There are no details provided concerning the amount of affordable housing. On a theoretical yield of 173 units the scheme would be expected to comply with SP3 regarding the on-site provision of affordable housing. However, this quantum of development is well in excess of that envisaged for Rillington as a Service Village	There are no details provided concerning the amount of affordable housing. On a theoretical yield of 1195 units the scheme would be expected to comply with SP3 regarding the on-site provision of affordable housing. However, this quantum of development is well in excess of that envisaged for Rillington as a Service Village	There are no details provided concerning the amount of affordable housing. On a theoretical yield of 42 units the scheme would be expected to comply with SP3 regarding the on-site provision of affordable housing.	(--) The site is not capable of delivery of any on site or commuted sum for affordable housing delivery	(-)There are no details provided concerning the amount of affordable housing. On a theoretical yield of 8 units the scheme would be expected to comply with SP3 regarding a commuted sum for 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 details have been provided, although as a service village there is no presumption for extra-care facilities. Site is capable of exceeding the threshold for a requirement for bungalows. The Plan supports the delivery of lifetime homes. This will be considered as a site-specific matter.	No details have been provided, although as a service village there is no presumption for extra-care facilities. Site is capable of exceeding the threshold for a requirement for bungalows. The Plan supports the delivery of lifetime homes. This will be considered as a site-specific matter.	No details have been provided, although as a service village there is no presumption for extra-care facilities. Site is capable of exceeding the threshold for a requirement for bungalows. The Plan supports the delivery of lifetime homes. This will be considered as a site-specific matter.	No details have been provided, although as a service village there is no presumption for extra-care facilities. Site is capable of exceeding the threshold for a requirement for bungalows. The Plan supports the delivery of lifetime homes. This will be considered as a site-specific matter.	No details have been provided, although as a service village there is no presumption for extra-care facilities. There is no expectation that bungalows will be required, but the Plan supports the delivery of lifetime homes. This will be considered as a site-specific matter.	No details have been provided, although as a service village there is no presumption for extra-care facilities. There is no expectation that bungalows will be required, but the Plan supports the delivery of lifetime homes. This will be considered as a site-specific matter.
	Development takes into account and meets some of the needs of Ryedale's elderly population +						
	Development does not address the needs of Ryedale's elderly population -						
	The development makes no provision for the needs of Ryedale's elderly population --						
L Overall Rating for 'Meeting Needs'	Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++	No details provided.	No details provided.	No details provided.	No details provided.	No details provided.	No details provided.
	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 submitted at present.	(--) No Transport Assessment has been submitted at present.	(--) No Transport Assessment has been submitted at present.	(--) No Transport Assessment has been submitted at present.	No Transport Assessment required	No Transport Assessment 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 ++	(-) Access not achievable directly onto A64, would be via sands lane. Junction with A64 and Sands Lane is non-signalised. Need further assessment.	(-) Access not achievable directly onto A64, would be via sands lane. Junction with A64 and Sands Lane is non-signalised. Need further assessment.	(--) This is a substantial site. The submission refers to the development of a Rillington Bypass, which was made in 2001, before the time of the submission. Highway Agency objection.	(-) Subject to access, site would utilise signalised junction. The site is of challenging configuration.	See response to 638. Site alone demonstrates no access.	(++) Planning application satisfied scheme proposes acceptable access.
	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 --						

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		515	516	517	518	536	633
Q. 47 Can the site accommodate adequate parking and servicing facilities?	<p>Site meets highway guidelines for parking and servicing ++</p> <p>Site does not currently meet parking and/or servicing requirements. However these issues can potentially be overcome or mitigated –</p> <p>Site does not meet highway requirements for parking and/or servicing and the issues identified are difficult/not practically possible to overcome --</p>	No details have been submitted. No reason to suggest that adequate servicing and parking standards cannot be achieved.	No details have been submitted. No reason to suggest that adequate servicing and parking standards cannot be achieved.	No details have been submitted. No reason to suggest that adequate servicing and parking standards cannot be achieved.	No details have been submitted. No reason to suggest that adequate servicing and parking standards cannot be achieved.	See response to 638. Site alone demonstrates no access.	(++)
Q. 48 Will the proposal provide, enable or improve access to public rights of way (PROW)?	<p>Proposal will create new PROW or integrate existing PROW into the development ++</p> <p>Proposal will not affect a PROW +</p> <p>Proposal would involve the diversion or loss of a PROW --</p>	(+) A PROW runs eastwards from the village and continues onto to Sands Lane, close to the site. No details have been submitted as to how these PROWs would be impacted upon.	(-) The site is adjacent to a PROW which runs from Scarborough Road/A64 and also Low Moorgate and continues along the back of various properties with paddocks on the eastern boundary to a track that runs to the Railway Lane. As such is to the western boundary of this site. A further PROW runs eastwards through the site and continues onto to Sands Lane. No details have been submitted as to how these PROWs would be impacted upon. It is likely the PROW be in the very least diverted.	(-) A PROW extends through the site, from the A64, along the edge of the settlement, past the Waste Water Treatment Plant, and across the site in a westerly direction. No details have been submitted as to how this PROW would be impacted upon. It is likely the PROW be in the very least diverted.	(+) No PROW proximal. No information is provided concerning creation of new PROWs.	(-) The site is adjacent to a PROW which runs from Scarborough Road/A64 and also Low Moorgate and continues along the back of various properties with paddocks on the eastern boundary to a track that runs to the Railway Lane. No details have been submitted as to how this PROW would be impacted upon.	(+) No PROW proximal. No information is provided concerning creation of new PROWs.
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>	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.	The site is of a size where new public realm is unrealistic to be delivered.	The site is of a size where new public realm is unrealistic to be delivered.

Assessment		515	516	517	518	536	633	
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. No capacity issue concerning water supply. Upgrading of sewerage capacity is required, limited capacity. Primary education: no additional capacity required. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water.	Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. No capacity issue concerning water supply. Upgrading of sewerage capacity is required, limited capacity. Primary education: no additional capacity required. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water.	(--) Given the size of the site this is far larger than the spatial strategy allows for: Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: likely that additional capacity required. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water, (based on spatial approach) Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer.	Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. No capacity issue concerning water supply. Upgrading of sewerage capacity is required, limited capacity. Primary education: no additional capacity required. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water.	Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. No capacity issue concerning water supply. Upgrading of sewerage capacity is required, limited capacity. Primary education: no additional capacity required. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water.	Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. No capacity issue concerning water supply. Upgrading of sewerage capacity is required, limited capacity. Primary education: no additional capacity required. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water.	
	Site has limited to medium adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be satisfactorily mitigated +	Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.	Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.	Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development. Access onto the A64 has been identified as a constraint. In particular concerns identified by Highways England, due to the size of the site.	Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.	Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.	Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.	Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.
	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 250m	(++)	(++)	(++)	
	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 --							

Rillington Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		515	516	517	518	536	633
Q. 52 Would the development on its own, have an impact on an existing community facility and has mitigation of this impact been proposed as part of the development?	<p>Site has no adverse impact on community facilities or where there is an adverse impact this is fully mitigated through the provision of new, expanded or alternative facilities ++</p> <p>Site does not have a significant adverse impact on community facilities or where there is a significant adverse impact this is mitigated through the provision of new, expanded or alternative facilities +</p> <p>Site has an adverse impact on community facilities and limited mitigation is indicated -</p> <p>Site has a significant adverse impact on community facilities and no mitigation is indicated --</p>	(++) Development of the site would not have a direct impact on the an existing community facility.	(++) Development of the site would not have a direct impact on the an existing community facility.	(--) Development of the site would not have a direct impact on the an existing community facility. But the size of the site would have a significant impact on Rillington's services.	(++) Development of the site would not have a direct impact on the an existing community facility.	(++) Development of the site would not have a direct impact on the an existing community facility.	(++) Development of the site would not have a direct impact on the an existing community facility.
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>	(-)	(--)	(--)	(-)	(-)	(+)
Strong Economy							
Q.53 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>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Q. 55 (Employment/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>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
N Overall rating for 'Strong Economy'	<p>Proposal will have a significant positive impact on the economy ++</p> <p>Proposal will have a positive impact on the economy +</p> <p>Proposal will have a negative impact on the economy -</p> <p>Proposal will have a significant negative impact on the economy --</p>	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

Assessment		515	516	517	518	536	633
Stage 3 - Deliverability / Developability							
Q56. How does the site perform against the SHLAA Update (housing), ELR Update (employment) and RRCS (retail) in terms of its ability to come forward and its suitability for development?	Housing: Category 1 (Deliverable)++	Not considered in the 2009 SHLAA	Not considered in the 2009 SHLAA	Not considered in the 2009 SHLAA		Not considered in the 2009 SHLAA	Not considered in the 2009 SHLAA
	Housing: Category 2 (Developable) +						
	Housing: Category 3 (Not Currently Developable) --						
Q57. Are there any other legal or physical constraints which may affect the ability of the site to come forward?	No constraints identified ++	(+)-Subject to archaeological investigation	(+)-Subject to archaeological investigation	(+)-Subject to archaeological investigation		(+)-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 provide appropriate levels of developer contributions?	Normal range of contributions can be achieved ++	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown		(+)- 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 ++	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown		(++)- 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 ++	No response provided	No response provided	No response provided		Planning permission was secured for a single dwelling in 2016.	(+)- Planning permission was secured in 2015, and a lawful commencement has been confirmed.
	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		638	
Stage 1 - Sift		Planning consent on front part of the site and rear part of the site for 28 dwellings	
all sites 0.15Ha and above	0.15 Ha or greater ++	(++)1.29ha	
	Less than 0.15 Ha --		
Check for conformity with Local Plan Strategy, Settlement Hierarchy, SP1	Conforms to Local Plan Strategy Spatial Strategy (SP1) ++	(++)	
	Does not meet Local Plan Strategy (Spatial Strategy) SP1 --		
Sites which cause significant harm to national/international nature conservation sites (species or habitat) or would involve substantial harm or loss to designated heritage assets will not be considered further.	Will Not cause harm ++	(++)	
	Will cause harm --		
Sites which fall wholly within Flood Zone 3b not considered further for built development. Where sites are partially in Flood Zone 3b, that part of the site will be not be considered further for built development.	Is not within Flood Zone 3b ++	(++)	
	Is within Flood Zone 3b --		
Stage 2 - Site Assessment			
Q1A How accessible is the site to key services and facilities	Bus stop	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(++)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +	
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -	
		15 minutes walking time and over --	
	Local Shop	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(++)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +	
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -	
		15 minutes walking time and over --	
	Nearest Primary School	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(++)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +	
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -	
		15 minutes walking time and over --	
	Nearest Development Limit	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(++)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +	
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -	
		15 minutes walking time and over --	

Assessment		638	
Overall accessibility rating	Site has excellent accessibility ++	(++)	
	Site has good accessibility +		
	Site has variable accessibility –		
	Site has poor accessibility --		
Q2A What flood zone does the site fall within?	Flood Zone 1++	(++)	
	Flood Zone 2 +		
	Flood zone 3a –		
Q2B What vulnerability class does the site fall	Flood Zone 1++	(++)	
	Flood Zone 2		Flood Zone 3a
	Less vulnerable ++		Less vulnerable+
	More vulnerable +		More vulnerable -
	Highly vulnerable -		Highly vulnerable --
Q2D Has a Flood Risk Assessment been undertaken?	yes ++	(--)-SFRA -FRA will be required. A FRA is in preparation, but is not with the Council	
	No --		
A Overall Flood Risk Assessment	Site has low overall flood risk ++	(++)	
	Site faces significant flood risk issues which can be mitigated +		
	Site faces significant flood risk issues which could potentially be mitigated –		
	Site faces significant flood risk issues and may be inappropriate for development --		
Q3 What are the conclusions of the Highways Authority (NYCC) and Highways England (where appropriate) initial highway assessment?	Site has no highway issues identified ++	(++). Planning consent has been granted for part of the site. Access is proposed through Low Moorgate as part of the existing planning permission which has been granted subject to s.106. Highways England are satisfied that access to the A64 is principally gained from a signalised junction. The County Highways have advised the site submitter that access is acceptable onto Low Moorgate for both the phase one, and phase two. Confirmation should be provided.	
	Site has some highways issues identified which can be mitigated subject to further investigation +		
	Site has multiple highways issues which can be mitigated subject to further investigation -		
	Site has multiple highway issues which may be difficult to mitigate unless further investigation demonstrates otherwise --		
Biodiversity and Geo-diversity			
Q4 Would the development affect a regional or local site of biodiversity (including SINC, LNRs or RIGS) or affect UK, NYMNP or Ryedale Biodiversity Plan protected species	Enhancement of feature/species possible – mitigation not required ++	(+). The site is not designated, or identified as a site of biodiversity. However, were there to protected species, these would be considered under their statutory framework. The site has been assessed against the Natural England (NE) Impact Risk Zones	
	Neutral impact – no effect or effect can be fully mitigated +		
	Adverse impact but mitigation possible –		

Assessment		638
protected species	Serious impact with limited means of mitigation --	England (NE) Impact Risk Zones. For residential schemes of 10 units or more automatic requirement to consult NE. However, NE has been consulted. Ecological assessments have been undertaken, and concluded no constraints, but the Council has not had sight of their findings.

Assessment		638
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 ++	(+ Planning consent is now granted for part of the site. The site is a grazed paddock, with other paddocks, a distinctive feature of this part of Rillington. Based on the indicative scheme, a number of pre-existing trees are to be retained.
	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 ++	(-) Ensure that the position of any new dwelling(s) is positioned in accordance with BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to construction – Recommendations. Selected trees within the site should be retained to provide maturity to the development and to screen the development against open countryside to the east. Retain selected trees within the site and along the eastern boundary. Retain existing boundary hedges. Although part of the site has been proposed for development (namely the paddock off Low Moorgate Lane). The heavily treed area (eastern corner of the site) would be losing some trees. A Tree Survey and report is to be submitted.
	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		638
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 ++	(-) Rillington is within the Vale of Pickering National Character Area, which is principally defined by its low-lying topography. However, it is on the edge of this area, and to the south, the land begins to rise and form the Wolds escarpment. The Local Landscape Character type is Wooded Open Vale, reflecting the flat, low lying terrain which is punctuated by woodland blocks. The site area is the same extent as sites 176 and 286. The site is adjacent to the edge of the village, and the surrounding area is typical of the "Wooded Open Vale" .
	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 protected landscapes the North York Moors NP and 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 ++	(++) Distanced and low lying topography. Not proximal to the AONB or the National Park.
	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		638
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 ++	(-) Part of site has planning application approved on the site. This covers all of the frontage of the side, to two thirds of the depth of the site. Hedging would provide some screening. Screening from the frontage (south-western) elevation is unlikely to be achieved. But that is not a natural feature of the streetscene here. It would be expected that a number of trees currently on the site would be retained. The Arboricultural Assessment is awaited.
	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 ++	(+)North eastern part of the village
	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 --	

Assessment		638
C Overall Rating for 'Special Qualities, Landscape and Setting'	Positive impact – the proposal will retain and enhance the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement ++	(-)
	Neutral impact – the proposal will not have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement +	
	Negative impact – the proposal will have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement, however mitigation is possible –	
	Significant impact – the proposal will have a significant adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement and limited or no mitigation is possible --	
Culture and Heritage		
Q12 Will the site affect a designated heritage asset, either directly or indirectly through its setting?	Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++	(+)
	Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +	
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –	
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --	
(+) No designated heritage assets proximal. The site is within the buffer zone of the Scampston Estate Registered Park and Garden, but is not proximal or of a scale to harm the setting of the park. The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of a number 1117 An Iron Age Barrow Cemetery, but is not in a discernible distance to the SM.		

Assessment	638	
<p>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?</p>	<p>Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++</p>	<p>(-) Site incorporates a number of grazed paddocks, with linear, hedged boundaries. This area has a very distinct rural character, and there are some gaps in the frontage, which do contribute to the character of the local area. There are attractive brick walls on the southern boundary. To the rear of the properties to the east there is a well treed area, with mature vegetation. It is considered that this site is visually sensitive, and contributes to the rural dispersed character of this part of Rillington. This is an Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. NYCC Heritage Unit advises, The central part of this site has already been subject to a geophysical survey in 2013 in response to NYCC comments on application 13/00652/MOUT, following which, a condition was advised by NYCC to secure archaeological mitigation. However, if the full extent of this site is to be developed, additional high-resolution geophysical survey should be carried out in area not previously surveyed, to be followed by trial trenching as appropriate. If development area extends beyond area of current geophysical survey, additional geophysical survey would also be advised prior to trial trenching. No further archaeological assessment has been undertaken.</p>
	<p>Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +</p>	
	<p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –</p>	
	<p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --</p>	

Assessment		638
D Overall Rating for 'Culture and Heritage'	Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++	(-) Subject to archaeological survey
	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 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 ++	No such schemes are available.
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 ++	No such schemes are available.
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 submitted.
	Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer unwilling -	
	Site not capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology --	
Sustainable Building and Waste Reduction		
Q17 Can the site accommodate higher sustainable building standards than currently required?	Site can accommodate 2 levels higher than mandatory limit ++	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that higher sustainable building standards could not be accommodated.
	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?	Site can accommodate 2 levels higher than mandatory limit ++	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for waste reduction could not be incorporated.
	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 details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for recycling facilities could not be incorporated.
	No --	

Assessment		638
F Overall Rating for 'Sustainable Building and Waste Minimisation'	Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development and developer willing ++	No information submitted
	Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development but developer unwilling -	
	Site not capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development --	
Efficient Use of Land		
Q.20 Is the site or any part of the site considered previously developed land?	Site is over 50% to 100% Brownfield ++	1.29ha of greenfield land. But no Brownfield sites are available and capable of meeting housing need.
	Site is up to 50% Brownfield +	
Q.21 Can the site achieve an appropriate density to achieve the most efficient use of the land?	Excellent density achieved taking into account location and context ++	(+). Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 27 dwellings. An indicative scheme has been submitted which shows development of 25 units. Planning permission was secured for 28 units in total
	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 --	
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 ++	Part of site in 1975 has road haulage, and so a contamination assessment would be required.
	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 ++	(-) 1.29 ha of grade 2 land. This is Best and Most Versatile Land. Although the site is currently not in intensive agriculture, being used as a paddock and is less than 5ha in size.
	Up to 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost -	

Assessment		638
	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 ++?	(--). Within sand gravel mineral safeguarding area. But adjacent to the built form of the settlement.
	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 ++	(++). Unproductive Aquifer, not in 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.
	Land potentially unstable but investigation has shown that mitigation is possible +	
	Land potentially unstable but no investigation has been carried out -	
	Land suffers from significant instability problems and either no mitigation has been proposed or instability problems are not possible to mitigate --	
Q. 28 Will the site impact on major hazard sites or pipelines?	HSE Standing Advice states "do not advise against development" ++	(++)
	HSE Standing Advice states "advise against development"	
H Overall Rating for 'Natural Resources'	Site would not adversely affect any natural resources ++	(+)
	Site would not have any significant adverse effect on natural resources +	
	Site would have an adverse effect on natural resources but mitigation is possible -	
	Site would have a significant adverse effect on natural resources and limited/no mitigation is possible --	
Amenity		
Q. 29 Is the development in an area where noise, light, dust or smell is likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to generate noise, light or dust which will affect existing users?	The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +	(+) By virtue of its location, and size of site, and adjacent uses, it is unlikely that noise, light dust or smell would cause a nuisance to both existing and prospective users.
	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 -	

Assessment		638
	The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --	

Assessment		638
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 +	(+) it is considered that these amenity impacts could be addressed though considering the scale, massing and orientation of the properties in respect of existing dwellings, and proposed dwellings.
	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 --	
Flood Risk		
Q. 31 Is the site potentially affected by groundwater flooding?	No ++	(--) Yes - the SFRA notes that Rillington lies on the edge of a zone of potential ground water and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A)
	Yes further investigation required --	
Q. 32 Is the site potentially affected by surface water flooding and is this site considered to be within a critical drainage area?	No ++	(--) The site is within an area potentially affected by surface water flooding, but it is not within a Critical Drainage Area. Environment Agency would expect no increase in surface water runoff from the site
	Yes further investigation required --	
Q. 33 Is the site potentially affected by sewer flooding?	No ++	(++)
	Yes further investigation required --	

Assessment		638
Q. 34 Have Sustainable Drainage Systems (SDS) been proposed as part of the development?	Site capable of accommodating SDS and have been proposed as part of the development ++	No specific details have been submitted concerning Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented, they are being proposed. The Environment Agency have advised that the site is close to Rillington Beck. They would seek to have combined water discharge. Where discharge to the water course is the only option then treatment and attenuation will be required. Consideration should be given to the use of SuDs. The LLFA identified a risk of surface water flooding which would require addressing. The risk is primarily associated with Low Moorgate adjacent to the site with a significant risk of surface water flooding, which should be addressed by any development plans to ensure this is not increased.
	Site capable of accommodating SDS though no information on whether SDS proposed as part of the development +	
	Site capable of accommodating SDS however SDS not being proposed on site -	
	Site not suitable for accommodating SDS -	
Q. 35 What other measures* have been considered which ensure the development is resilient to climate change? * which may vary	Multiple additional measures proposed which build in resilience to climate change ++	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme and other resilience measures to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.
	Single additional measure proposed to build in resilience to climate change +	
	No information provided on measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change -	
	No measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change --	
J Overall Rating for 'Flood Risk'	No flood risk associated with the site ++	(+) Information is awaited concerning flood risk assessment
	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 --	
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 ++	Development of the site would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of Rillington.
	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 submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that secured by design principles could not be taken into account. Some specifics may not be appropriate within the village context of Rillington- but this is a site specific consideration.
	No – SBD principles not taken into account -	
Q. 38 Does the design of the development encourage people to walk	Cycle ways and footpaths effectively integrated into the development encouraging walking and cycling ++	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that measures to

Assessment		638
and cycle rather than travel by car?	Some cycle ways and/or footpaths shown encouraging walking and cycling +	increase walking and cycling could not be taken into account.
	No cycle ways and footpaths indicated as part of this development --	

Assessment		638
Q. 39 For sites over 1ha or over 80 houses- Has a Travel Plan been produced which assesses alternative options and initiatives?	Travel Plan undertaken and clear implementable initiatives for promoting modal shift set out ++	No Travel Plan has been submitted although there is no reason to suggest that a Travel Plan could not be produced.
	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 ++	Details have been submitted as to the type of housing proposed, but not in terms of the affordable housing contribution. Although there is no reason to suggest that development of the site would not support the ability to attract a more balanced population, and reducing inequality.
	Development takes into account the need to attract a balanced and/or working community +	
	Development takes no account of the need to attract a balanced living and/or working community -	
K Overall Rating for 'People'	Development actively planned to encourage the development of sustainable communities ++	(+)
	Development has taken into account the need to develop sustainable communities +	
	Development has little regard to the need to develop sustainable communities -	
	Development has no regard for the need to develop sustainable communities --	
Meeting needs		
Q.41 Does the type and mix of development proposed meet the needs identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), Employment Land Review Update 2010 (ELR), Ryedale Retail Capacity Studies (RRCS) and Malton Town Centre Strategy?	Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)
	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 --	

Assessment		638
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 ++	(+)-There are no details provided concerning the precise amount of affordable housing. Although the Agent has outlined that on the first phase of the site which is subject to planning permission the Policy requirement was met, and there is a recognition that this will need to be continued.
	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 details have been provided, although as a service village there is no presumption for extra-care facilities. There is no expectation that bungalows will be required, but the Plan supports the delivery of lifetime homes. This will be considered as a site-specific matter.
	Development takes into account and meets some of the needs of Ryedale's elderly population +	
	Development does not address the needs of Ryedale's elderly population -	
	The development makes no provision for the needs of Ryedale's elderly population --	
L Overall Rating for 'Meeting Needs'	Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++	No details provided.
	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 submitted at present.
	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 ++	(++)- Subject to existing planning consent, which has set out the acceptable access arrangement. Utilises existing signalised junction.
	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 --	

Assessment		638
Q. 47 Can the site accommodate adequate parking and servicing facilities?	Site meets highway guidelines for parking and servicing ++	(++). Subject to existing planning consent, which has set out the acceptable access arrangement. Utilises existing signalised junction.
	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 ++	(--). The site is adjacent to a PROW which runs from Scarborough Road/A64 and also Low Moorgate and continues along the back of various properties with paddocks on the eastern boundary to a track that runs to the Railway Lane. No details have been submitted as to how this PROW would be impacted upon.
	Proposal will not affect a PROW +	
	Proposal would involve the diversion or loss of a PROW --	
Q. 49 Does the proposal involve new public realm or enhancements to the existing public realm as part of its development?	Proposal will create high quality new public realm or significantly enhance existing public realm as part of its development ++	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.
	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 --	

Assessment		638
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. No capacity issue concerning water supply. Upgrading of sewerage capacity is required, limited capacity. 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.
	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 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		638
Q. 52 Would the development on its own, have an impact on an existing community facility and has mitigation of this impact been proposed as part of the development?	Site has no adverse impact on community facilities or where there is an adverse impact this is fully mitigated through the provision of new, expanded or alternative facilities ++	(++). Development of the site would not have a direct impact on the an existing community facility.
	Site does not have a significant adverse impact on community facilities or where there is a significant adverse impact this is mitigated through the provision of new, expanded or alternative facilities +	
	Site has an adverse impact on community facilities and limited mitigation is indicated -	
	Site has a significant adverse impact on community facilities and no mitigation is indicated --	
M Overall Rating for 'Community facilities, Utilities and Infrastructure'	Site has limited or no adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has a adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be fully mitigated ++	(++)
	Site has limited to medium adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be satisfactorily mitigated +	
	Site has medium to high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation -	
	Site has high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation -	
Strong Economy		
Q.53 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
	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/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
	Up to 50 net jobs created +	
	Up to 50 net jobs lost -	
	Up to 250 net jobs lost --	
N Overall rating for 'Strong Economy'	Proposal will have a significant positive impact on the economy ++	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 --	

Assessment		638
Stage 3 - Deliverability / Developability		
Q56. How does the site perform against the SHLAA Update (housing), ELR Update (employment) and RRCS (retail) in terms of its ability to come forward and its suitability for development?	Housing: Category 1 (Deliverable)++	(+). Category 2 Site in the 2009 SHLAA.
	Housing: Category 2 (Developable) +	
	Housing: Category 3 (Not Currently Developable) --	
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. Site submitter (agent) has confirmed that there are two landowners, and she is acting on behalf of both owners
	Constraint(s) identified but resolution possible +	
	Constraint(s) identified but resolution is uncertain --	
Developer Contributions		
Q58. Will the development provide appropriate levels of developer contributions?	Normal range of contributions can be achieved ++	(++). Continue to have this site considered through the site selection process in the knowledge that the adopted policies of the new Local Plan will be applied and that these will affect the value of the site.
	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. The site submitter has noted that CIL will be applied, and that this will be factored in.
	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 obtained planning permission for the rear component of the site in 2016.
	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 --	