

Sheriff Hutton Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		51	70 (664)	75	101	658	663	
Stage 1 - Sift	Planning application has decision in principle to approve.							
all sites 0.15Ha and above	0.15 Ha or greater ++ Less than 0.15 Ha --	(++) 0.71ha	(++) 0.45ha	Developed	(--) 0.06ha	(++)1.04ha	(++) 0.22ha	
Check for conformity with Local Plan Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy SP1	Conforms to Local Plan Strategy Spatial Strategy (SP1) ++ Does not meet Local Plan Strategy (Spatial Strategy) SP1 --	(++)	(++)	Developed	(++)	(++)	(++)	
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 --	(++)	(++)	Developed	(--) Significantly adversely affect setting of Sheriff Hutton Castle SM	(++)	(++)	
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 --	(++)	(++)	Developed	(++)	(++)	(++)	
Stage 2 - Site Assessment								
Q1A How accessible is the site to key services and facilities	Bus stop	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(++)	(+)	Developed		(+) but is just over 5 minutes in the isochrone	(+) but is just over 5 minutes in the isochrone
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +						
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -						
		15 minutes walking and over --						
	Local Shop	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(+)	(+)	Developed		(+)	(+)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +						
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -						
		15 minutes walking and over --						
	Nearest Primary School	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(-)	(+)	Developed		(++)	(++)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +						
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -						
		15 minutes walking and over --						
Nearest Development Limit	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(++)	(++)	Developed		(++)	(++)	
	Up to 10 minutes walking time +							
	Up to 15 minutes walking time -							
	15 minutes walking and over --							

Sheriff Hutton Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		51	70 (664)	75	101	658	663
Overall accessibility rating	Site has excellent accessibility ++	(+)	(+)	Developed	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Site has good accessibility +						
	Site has variable accessibility –						
	Site has poor accessibility --						
Q2A What flood zone does the site fall within?	Flood Zone 1++	(++)	(++)	Developed	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Flood Zone 2 +						
	Flood zone 3a –						
Q2B What vulnerability class does the site fall	Flood Zone ++	(++)	(++)	Developed	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Flood Zone 2						
	Flood Zone 3a						
	Less vulnerable ++						
	More vulnerable +						
Q2D Has a Flood Risk Assessment been	yes ++	SFRA - FRA not required due to site size, but see below:	SFRA FRA not required due to site size, but see below:	Developed	SFRA. FRA not required	(-) SFRA- FRA required	FRA not required
	No --						
A Overall Flood Risk Assessment	Site has low overall flood risk ++	(++)	(++)	developed	(++)	(++) Subject to FRA	(++)
	Site faces significant flood risk issues which can be mitigated +						
	Site faces significant flood risk issues which could potentially be mitigated –						
	Site faces significant flood risk issues and may be inappropriate for development --						
Q3 What are the conclusions of the Highways Authorities (North Yorkshire County Council) and Highways England (HE) (where appropriate) initial highway assessment?	Site has no highway issues identified ++	(+) County Highways have advised: East Lane is narrow in nature, and existing residential parking is an issue (although not a planning matter). Turning head for Service Vehicles would also need considering. The resubmitted submission has identifies a satisfactory layout for the Highway Authority	(+) Access onto Finkle Street. Works will be required to improve existing major road, and extend footway/street lighting. Not likely to create excessive travel demand, but does not address appropriate accessibility criteria.	developed	No comments provided.	As a later submission the site access has not been assessed by the Highways Authority. An indicative master plan has been produced.	(+)As a later submission the site access has not been assessed by the Highways Authority. An indicative master plan has been produced. A widening of the access has been granted planning permission: 16/01835/FUL to widen the access to serve the land to the rear. This is not on the basis of futher residential development.
	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 has been assessed against the Natural England (NE) Impact Risk Zones. No automatic requirement to consult NE. However, NE has been consulted. The SINC qualifies under semi natural neutral grassland scoring. The Glebe does not qualify by itself and St Helen's church yard is an active churchyard, development to the north would not impact on the management of the churchyard and therefore the biodiversity of the SINC.	(+) 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.	developed	(+) 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 has been assessed against the Natural England (NE) Impact Risk Zones. No automatic requirement to consult NE.	(+) 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. No automatic requirement to consult NE.
	Neutral impact – no effect or effect can be fully mitigated +						
	Adverse impact but mitigation possible –						
	Serious impact with limited means of mitigation --						
Q5 Would the development provide opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure, including linking in with existing green infrastructure/ corridors	Excellent opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors ++	(+) Existing PRoW runs through the site, opportunities to retain boundary screening (particularly to south). The indicative layouts which were submitted as part of the application ensured the retention of the PRoW.	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	developed	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	(+) the site shows the retention of an existing pond, and retention of existing trees and planting of new trees	(-) This is the padock to the west of Dorlin House, the site is small, and only pre-existing hedgerows
	Some opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors +						

Sheriff Hutton Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		51	70 (664)	75	101	658	663
	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 --						

Sheriff Hutton Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		51	70 (664)	75	101	658	663
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 proposed scheme looks to utilise and improve the appearance. The landscaping scheme would need to be considered in further detail.	potential impact	developed	potential impact	(+) The proposed scheme looks to utilise and improve the appearance, with retaining features such as the pond and existing trees. The landscaping scheme would need to be considered in further detail.	(+)
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>	(+)	(+)	developed	(+)	(+)	(+)
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>	(+) The site is within the Vale of York National Character Area, which is defined as being of limited topographical variation. However, Sheriff Hutton, being to the north, is on the fringe of the Howardian Hills, and is on modestly elevated land, and the settlement extends down slope. As a result, the land to East and north are sensitive to open views, as land drops away from west to east and south to north. It is an edge of settlement site. Variations in topography mean that the settlement of Sheriff Hutton is viewable at distance from the north east.	(--) It is a field distanced from the village-proper. There is a collection of properties on the road to the south of the site, at the junction with West Lilling Road. The land begins to gently rise from this point, and as such the site would be visually prominent.	developed	(--) In wider landscape terms the site is modest, and topographical variations would reduce its visibility within the wider context of the settlement. However, there is the presence of Sheriff Hutton Castle, and this land is part of the wider land which contributes to the setting of the Castle. The properties have their backs to the castle. It is an important zone of transition between the village and castle. Historic linear form. Development would not perpetuate it.	(+) Sheriff Hutton sits on the gently undulating land within the Vale of York LCA. It is capable of being viewed from the elevated land of the southern Howardian Hills, particularly from the east. The settlement is dominated by the ruins of the Castle. The land rises to the north, and then falls away. This site is on the most elevated parts of the settlement. Despite this relative elevation, the site is not viewable in the wider setting of the settlement. The field patterns are characterised by parliamentary enclosure. The site is adjacent to the existing settlement, which includes different build types including modern estate, and a series of detached properties. The site is viewable from the lower valley area, and so any landscaping treatment would need careful consideration.	(+) Sheriff Hutton sits on the gently undulating land within the Vale of York LCA. It is capable of being viewed from the elevated land of the southern Howardian Hills, particularly from the east. The settlement is dominated by the ruins of the Castle. The land rises to the north, and then falls away. This site is on the most elevated parts of the settlement. Despite this relative elevation, the site is not viewable in the wider setting of the settlement. The field patterns are characterised by parliamentary enclosure. The site is adjacent to the existing settlement, which includes different build types including modern estate, and a series of detached properties. The site is viewable from the lower valley area, and so any landscaping treatment would need careful consideration.
Q8. What impact would the site have on nationally designated landscapes- the North York Moors National Park and/or the Howardian Hills AONB?	<p>Site has a very low landscape sensitivity to being developed or existing landscape features are retained or enhanced. Site will not detract from landscape character ++</p> <p>Site has a low landscape sensitivity to being developed and some existing landscape features can be retained. Site is unlikely to detract from landscape character +</p>	(+) The site, and eastern part of Sheriff Hutton (plus castle and church) are viewable from the Sheriff Hutton/ Bulmer Road, and the site is screened by the 'layers' of treed areas, which allow partial screening. Eastern and northern boundary treatments would be important.	(++) within the context of the AONB, as Sheriff Hutton itself screens the site.	developed	(++) within the context of the AONB, due to the nature and scale of the site. But other site-specific concerns.	(+) The site, and north western part of the settlement, plus glimpsed views of the Castle, are viewable from Whenby Road, and on lower lying land. The site is currently screened by the 'layers' of treed areas, which allow partial screening. Longer distance views are not capable of being achieved, due to the presence of trees within	(+) The site, and north western part of the settlement, plus glimpsed views of the Castle, are viewable from Whenby Road, and on lower lying land. The site is currently screened by the 'layers' of treed areas, which allow partial screening. Longer distance views are not capable of being achieved, due to the presence of trees within

Sheriff Hutton Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		51	70 (664)	75	101	658	663
	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 –					due to the presence of trees within the Vale of Area. Views from Terrington Bank are not achievable (which is within the AONB).	due to the presence of trees within the Vale of Area. Views from Terrington Bank are not achievable (which is within the AONB).
	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 --						

Sheriff Hutton Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		51	70 (664)	75	101	658	663
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>	(+) the site is capable of retaining some existing landscape features, but further mitigation is likely- but achievable.	(--) The site is hedged, but it is flat and open, and so any development could be visually distinct and prominent.	developed	(--) No impact within the context of impact on the AONB, concerns on the local landscape impact and setting of designated heritage asset	(+) the site is capable of retaining some existing landscape features, but further mitigation is necessary. The site sits on an elevated part of the settlement, where views from the north are capable of being achieved at distance. But it is considered that through scaling, massing and boundary treatment measures would be achievable.	(+) the site is capable of retaining some existing landscape features, but further mitigation is necessary. The site sits on an elevated part of the settlement, where views from the north are capable of being achieved at distance. But it is considered that through scaling, massing and boundary treatment measures would be achievable.
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>	(+) Sheriff Hutton is not a settlement affected by coalescence with another settlement.	(+) Sheriff Hutton is not a settlement affected by coalescence with another settlement.	developed	(+) Sheriff Hutton is not a settlement affected by coalescence with another settlement.	(+) Sheriff Hutton is not a settlement affected by coalescence with another settlement.	(+) Sheriff Hutton is not a settlement affected by coalescence with another settlement.
C Overall Rating for 'Special Qualities, Landscape and Setting'	<p>Positive impact – the proposal will retain and enhance the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement ++</p> <p>Neutral impact – the proposal will not have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement +</p> <p>Negative impact – the proposal will have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement, however mitigation is possible –</p> <p>Significant impact – the proposal will have a significant adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement and limited or no mitigation is possible --</p>	(+) through appropriate landscaping	(--)		(--)	(+) Through appropriate scale, massing of buildings and landscaping.	(+) Through appropriate scale, massing of buildings and landscaping.
Culture and Heritage							
Q12 Will the site affect a designated heritage asset, either directly or indirectly through its setting?	<p>Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++</p> <p>Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +</p> <p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –</p>	(+) the site is proximal to the Grade I listed Church of St. Helen, which is immediately to the south of the site, and the Sheriff Hutton Conservation Area. There is mature screening currently, but this does not extend along the full site, and its stark appearance detracts from the wider views which would be capable of the Church. Church is in an elevated	(+) The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of numbers 30114 and 32704 , but is not in a discernible distance to the SMs.	developed	(--) Concerns about the setting of Sheriff Hutton Castle (Scheduled Monument 32704), as the properties have their backs to the castle. It is an important zone of transition between the village and castle. Historic linear form. Development would not perpetuate it. It would therefore not preserve nor enhance the character of the	(+) The Site is physically and visually distanced from any designated heritage asset. It is on the western side of the settlement, which has witnessed modern, estate-style development.	(+) The Site is physically and visually distanced from any designated heritage asset. It is on the western side of the settlement, which has witnessed modern, estate-style development.

Sheriff Hutton Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		51	70 (664)	75	101	658	663
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --	position relative to the site. The Church yard is also Scheduled Monument 30114. Screening and landscaping and consideration of development form will be necessary to ensure impact on the church is mitigated satisfactorily. The ability to appreciate the Church in the context of the established views from the village into the church, and the Churchyard would be retained. An assessment would be required to assess the contribution to towards both the significance of the Conservation Area, and the Listed Church, and whether this generally open area contributes to the significance of the church, as required by Historic England. The Developers have been in discussions with English Heritage to produce a scheme which complemented the Church of St. Helen, this discussion has led to a revision of the layout, resulting in a reduced number of units (12).			Sheriff Hutton Conservation Area, which it is adjacent to.		

Sheriff Hutton Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		51	70 (664)	75	101	658	663
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 ++	(+)NYCC Heritage Unit advise: High archaeological potential for medieval and possibly earlier remains in earliest part of village, overlying early green and adjoining churchyard boundary & close to C12th motte & bailey SM. Suggest DBA, followed by geophysical survey & trial trenching. See Dennison 1998 for discussion of village morphology & development. It is considered that sensitive development of this site would not harm the character of Sheriff Hutton.	(-) Development of this site will impact on the setting of Sheriff Hutton settlement form and character, by virtue of its distance from the village, and it will perpetuate sporadic, piecemeal development along Finkle Street, the southern entrance to the village. NYCC heritage unit advise: Outside medieval village, area of former medieval field system (formerly ridge & furrow)	developed	(-) Development of this site will impact on the setting of Sheriff Hutton settlement character, by altering the relationship between the village and the Castle.		
	Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +						
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –						
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --						
D Overall Rating for 'Culture and Heritage'	Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++	(-) Subject to archaeological assessment	(-)	developed	(-)		
	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.	developed	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 ++	A solar array is operational close to the village. No information has been submitted regarding connection.	A solar array is operational close to the village. No information has been submitted regarding connection.	developed		A solar array is operational close to the village. No information has been submitted regarding connection.	A solar array is operational close to the village. No information has been submitted regarding connection.
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 in this locality.	No such schemes in this locality.	developed	No such schemes in this locality.	No such schemes in this locality.	No such schemes in this locality.
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 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.	developed	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 of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer unwilling -						
	Site not capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology --						

Sheriff Hutton Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		51	70 (664)	75	101	658	663
Sustainable Building and Waste Reduction							
Q17 Can the site accommodate higher sustainable building standards than currently required?	<p>Site can accommodate 2 levels higher than mandatory limit ++</p> <p>Site can accommodate 1 level higher than mandatory limit -</p> <p>Development cannot accommodate higher standards than mandatory level --</p>	No information 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.	developed	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.
Q18 Does the development contain proposals for waste reduction in both its construction and when in operation?	<p>Proposals for waste reduction incorporated into both the construction and operation of the development++</p> <p>Proposals have investigated waste reduction, however only limited measures are achievable -</p> <p>No proposals suggested for waste reduction --</p>	No information 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.	developed	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.
Q. 19 Does the development contain individual/communal recycling facilities/	<p>Yes +</p> <p>No --</p>	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.	developed	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.
F Overall Rating for 'Sustainable Building and Waste Minimisation'	<p>Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development and developer willing ++</p> <p>Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development but developer unwilling-</p> <p>Site not capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development --</p>	No information 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.	developed	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.
Efficient Use of Land							
Q.20 Is the site or any part of the site considered previously developed land?	<p>Site is over 50% to 100% Brownfield ++</p> <p>Site is up to 50% Brownfield +</p>	(+) part of the site. But there are limited Brownfield sites to meet housing need.	(+) Greenfield. But there are limited Brownfield sites to meet housing need.	developed	(+) Greenfield. But there are limited Brownfield sites to meet housing need.	Greenfield site, with an existing dwelling on the site.	Greenfield site, paddock to east of existing house.
Q.21 Can the site achieve an appropriate density to achieve the most efficient use of the land?	<p>Excellent density achieved taking into account location and context ++</p> <p>Appropriate density achieved taking into account location and context +</p> <p>Lower density proposed as site faces some constraints in its development -</p> <p>Lower density necessary as site faces significant constraints in its development --</p>	(+) 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. As a result of discussions with Historic England the planning application is for 12 units.	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c.9 dwellings.	developed	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 1 dwelling.	The density is a function of the scheme- the site submitter has proposed various development scenarios from 4 units to 30+, depending on the extent of the site, which could come forward in 3 phases. This would have implications concerning affordable housing contributions, and for efficient use of the site.	An indicative scheme provided, which shows four units with garages. This is deemed to be a reasonable density for the size of the site, with a 0.7 site development factor.
Q.22 Would the development of the site lead to the remediation of contaminated land?	<p>Development is located on land which is likely to be highly contaminated and will be remediated ++</p> <p>Development is located on land which may be contaminated and will be remediated +</p> <p>Development is located on land which may be contaminated and no proposals for remediation have been put forward -</p> <p>Development is located on land which is likely to be highly contaminated no proposals for remediation have been put forward --</p>	No evidence of land contamination	No evidence of land contamination	developed	No evidence of land contamination	No evidence of land contamination	No evidence of land contamination

Sheriff Hutton Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		51	70 (664)	75	101	658	663
G Overall Rating for 'Efficient Use of Land'	Site represents very efficient use of land with mitigation to fully overcome concerns where necessary ++	(+) (green)	(+) (green)	developed (grey)	(+) (green)	(+) variable- depending on the scheme proposed. (green)	(+) (green)
	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 ++	(-)0.71ha The site is a mixture of grades 3 and 4. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in loss of Best and Most Versatile Land. Land is less than 5ha. (pink)	(-) 0.45ha Grade 3. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in loss of Best and Most Versatile Land. Land is less than 5ha. (pink)	developed (grey)	(++) Grade 4 (paddock) (green)	(-) 1.04ha Grade 3. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in loss of Best and Most Versatile Land. Land is less than 5ha. (pink)	(-) 1.04ha Grade 3. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in loss of Best and Most Versatile Land. Land is less than 5ha. (pink)
	Up to 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost -						
	More than 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost --						
Q. 24 Would the development lead to the sterilisation of mineral resources?	Site not within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search, or Mineral Consultation Zone ++?	(++) (green)	(++) (green)	developed (grey)	(++) (green)	(++) (green)	(++) (green)
	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 ++	(++) Secondary (undifferentiated) Aquifer, not in groundwater Source Protection Zone (green)	(++) (green)	developed (grey)	(++) (green)	(++) (green)	(++) (green)
	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 ++	No evidence that the land is unstable (green)	No evidence that the land is unstable (green)	developed (grey)	No evidence that the land is unstable (grey)	No evidence that the land is unstable (green)	No evidence that the land is unstable (green)
	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" ++	(++) (green)	(++) (green)	developed (grey)	(++) (green)	(++) (green)	(++) (green)
	HSE Standing Advice states "advise against development"						
H Overall Rating for 'Natural Resources'	Site would not adversely affect any natural resources ++	(+) (green)	(+) (green)	developed (grey)	(+) (green)	(+) (green)	(+) (green)
	Site would not have any significant adverse effect on natural resources +						
	Site would have an adverse effect on natural resources but mitigation is possible -						

Sheriff Hutton Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		51	70 (664)	75	101	658	663
	Site would have a significant adverse effect on natural resources and limited/no mitigation is possible --						

Sheriff Hutton Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		51	70 (664)	75	101	658	663
Amenity							
Q. 29 Is the development in an area where noise, light, dust or smell is likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to generate noise, light or dust which will affect existing users?	The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +	(+) The site is not in an area where noise, light, dust or smell would be an issue for new residents. Increased traffic would be experienced by existing residents. It is considered that through the consideration of a planning application, issues around amenity would be fully addressed. Under the operation of the existing planning use, the site could be used much more intensively.	(+)Without ascertaining the precise use (now proposed for residential) this is uncertain. For general employment and residential uses there are unlikely to be any concerns.	developed	(+) The site is not in an area where noise, light, dust or smell would be an issue for new residents.	(+) The site is not in an area where noise, light, dust or smell would be an issue for new residents. Increased traffic would be experienced by existing residents. It is considered that through the consideration of a planning application, issues around amenity would be fully addressed.	(+) The proposal would be adjacent to a paddock which is to be retained. Stabling is to the west of the site, with intervening land (and Dorlin House) providing a buffer. As such there is unlikely to be issues concern smell from the stables.
	The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -						
	The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --						
Q. 30 Is the development in an area where other factors are likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to generate forms of nuisance which may affect the amenity of existing users? These may include issues such as privacy, lack of sunlight overbearing effects.	The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +	(+) The site is not in an area where noise, light, dust or smell would be an issue for new residents. Increased traffic would be experienced by existing residents. It is considered that through the consideration of a planning application, issues around amenity would be fully addressed. Under the operation of the existing planning use, the site could be used much more intensively.	(+) development could be proximal to existing residences, but the design could mitigate any potential unacceptably adverse impact at the consideration of a planning application.	developed	(-) The site is to back of existing properties, and is short in depth, with no consideration of orientation, any development could have an impact on residential amenity.	(+) The site is not in an area where noise, light, dust or smell would be an issue for new residents. Increased traffic would be experienced by existing residents. It is considered that through the consideration of a planning application, issues around amenity would be fully addressed. Under the operation of the existing planning use, the site could be used much more intensively.	(+)Increased traffic would be experienced by existing residents. It is considered that through the consideration of a planning application, issues around amenity would be fully addressed. Under the operation of the existing planning use, the site could be used much more intensively.
	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 --						
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 site is not in an area where noise, light, dust or smell would be an issue for new residents. Increased traffic would be experienced by existing residents. It is considered that through the consideration of a planning application, issues around amenity would be fully addressed. Under the operation of the existing planning use, the site could be used much more intensively.	(+) development could be proximal to existing residences, but the design could mitigate any potential unacceptably adverse impact at the consideration of a planning application.	developed	(-) The site is to back of existing properties, and is short in depth, with no consideration of orientation, any development could have an impact on residential amenity.	(+) The site is not in an area where noise, light, dust or smell would be an issue for new residents. Increased traffic would be experienced by existing residents. It is considered that through the consideration of a planning application, issues around amenity would be fully addressed. Under the operation of the existing planning use, the site could be used much more intensively.	(+)Increased traffic would be experienced by existing residents. It is considered that through the consideration of a planning application, issues around amenity would be fully addressed. Under the operation of the existing planning use, the site could be used much more intensively.
	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 ++	(++)	(++)	developed	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Yes further investigation required --						
Q. 32 Is the site potentially affected by surface water	No ++	(++) The SFRA notes reported drainage issues for the settlement.	(++) The SFRA notes reported drainage issues for the settlement.	developed	(++)The SFRA notes reported drainage issues for the settlement.	(--) The SFRA notes reported drainage issues for the settlement.	(++)The SFRA notes reported drainage issues for the settlement.

Sheriff Hutton Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		51	70 (664)	75	101	658	663
flooding and is this site considered to be within a critical drainage area?	Yes further investigation required --	FRA not required due to site size, but. Environment Agency expect no increase in surface runoff from the site. There is no historic record of flooding being made to the county council associated with the site. EA surface water plans demonstrate a risk of flooding within the site area indicated which would require addressing.	FRA not required, but Environment Agency expect no increase in surface runoff from the site.		FRA not required. Environment Agency expect no increase in surface runoff from the site.	FRA required due to site size, but. Environment Agency expect no increase in surface runoff from the site.	FRA not required. Environment Agency expect no increase in surface runoff from the site.

Sheriff Hutton Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		51	70 (664)	75	101	658	663
Q. 33 Is the site potentially affected by sewer flooding?	No ++ Yes further investigation required --	(++)	(++)	developed	(++)	(++)	(++)
Q. 34 Have Sustainable Drainage Systems (SDS) been proposed as part of the development?	Site capable of accommodating SDS and have been proposed as part of the development ++ Site capable of accommodating SDS though no information on whether SDS proposed as part of the development + Site capable of accommodating SDS however SDS not being proposed on site - Site not suitable for accommodating SDS --	The SFRA notes reported drainage issues for the settlement. No details have been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that SDS are not achievable.	The SFRA notes reported drainage issues for the settlement. No details have been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that SDS are not achievable.	developed	The SFRA notes reported drainage issues for the settlement. No details have been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that SDS are not achievable.	The SFRA notes reported drainage issues for the settlement. No details have been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that SDS are not achievable. There is a pond, which is to be retained.	The SFRA notes reported drainage issues for the settlement. No details have been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that SDS are not achievable.
Q. 35 What other measures have been considered which ensure the development is resilient to climate change?	Multiple additional measures proposed which build in resilience to climate change ++ Single additional measure proposed to build in resilience to climate change + No information provided on measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change - No measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change --	No details have been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No details have been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	developed	No details have been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No details have been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No details have been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.
J Overall Rating for 'Flood Risk'	No flood risk associated with the site ++ Limited flood risk associated with the site which can be fully mitigated + Site affected by a number of flood risk issues, however mitigation possible- Site affected by significant flood risk issues and limited mitigation possible --	(+)	(+)	developed	(+)	(+) Subject to FRA, and treatment of surface water	(+)
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 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 --	There are no uses on the site which contribute to the social character and distinctive of the settlement.	There are no uses on the site which contribute to the social character and distinctiveness of the settlement.	developed	(-) The development of this site would alter the experience of walking round the publically accessible vantage points of the land around Sheriff Hutton Castle. This cannot be mitigated.	There are no uses on the site which contribute to the social character and distinctive of the settlement.	There are no uses on the site which contribute to the social character and distinctive of the settlement.
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 – SBD principles not taken into account -	Information not provided, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	Information not provided, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	developed	Information not provided, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	Information not provided, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	Information not provided, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.
Q. 38 Does the design of the development encourage people to walk and cycle rather than travel by car?	Cycleways and footpaths effectively integrated into the development encouraging walking and cycling ++ Some cycleways and/or footpaths shown encouraging walking and cycling + No cycleways and footpaths indicated as part of this development --	Information not provided, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	Information not provided, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	developed	Information not provided, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible.	Information not provided, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible. The site in on the edge of the village.	Information not provided, although there is no reason to assume this would not be possible. The site in on the edge of the village.
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 ++ 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 --	Not required.	Not required	developed	Not required	The site is just over 1ha.	Not required

Sheriff Hutton Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		51	70 (664)	75	101	658	663
Q. 40 Will the proposed development attract a balanced living and/or working population, reducing inequality of opportunity?	<p>Development proposed is clearly designed to attract a balanced living and/or working community ++</p> <p>Development takes into account the need to attract a balanced and/or working community +</p> <p>Development takes no account of the need to attract a balanced living and/or working community -</p>	The scheme currently proposed has a mix of dwellings.	No details have been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	developed	This is a single dwelling site.	No details have been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	This is a relatively small scheme of 4 units. No affordable housing would be delivered either on site, or in terms of commuted sums.
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>	(+) based on the information submitted at this stage	(+) based on the information submitted at this stage	developed	(--)	(+) based on limited information at this stage.	(-) based on limited information at this stage. The site is relatively small, which makes limited contribution to wider Plan objectives
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 'Sheriff Hutton and Ryedale.' of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 56 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 9. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 18 dwellings.	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Sheriff Hutton and Ryedale.' of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 56 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 9. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 18 dwellings.	developed	The site is for a single dwelling.	No details have been provided concerning the type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Sheriff Hutton and Ryedale.' of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 56 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 9. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 18 dwellings.	No details have been provided concerning the type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Sheriff Hutton and Ryedale.' of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 56 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 9. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 18 dwellings.
Q.42 What level and type of affordable housing is proposed?	<p>Development offers appropriate level and type of affordable housing which meets the needs as set out in the SHMA ++</p> <p>Development offers some affordable housing which meets some of the need as set out in the SHMA +</p> <p>Development does not offer the appropriate level and type of affordable housing or does not meet the need for affordable housing as set out in the SHMA -</p> <p>The development makes no provision for affordable housing --</p>	(++) On an actual yield of 12 units, the provision of on-site affordable housing is proposed in line with SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy. The site now proposes 12 units, it is indicated as being 2 intermediate and 2 social rented	(-)No details have been submitted. On a theoretical yield of 9 units, a commuted sum for affordable housing would be expected in accordance with SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy. The contribution would be limited. No confirmation has been provided in acknowledging some form of commuted sum or on site provision.	developed	The site is for a single dwelling.	An indicative scheme has been submitted which indicates 36 units. In order to comply with policy SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy 35% of those (pro rata) would be affordable, within the context of meeting local needs. The site submission mentions different scenarios, which could have implications for affordable housing provision.	(--) Due to the size of the site, there would be neither an on-site nor commuted sum.
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. No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible. Although the size of the site would not necessitate the requirement for 5% bungalow provision. The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.	No details have been provided. No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible. Although the size of the site would not necessitate the requirement for 5% bungalow provision. The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.	developed	Single dwelling. The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.	No details have been provided. No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible. Although the size of the site would not necessitate the requirement for 5% bungalow provision. The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.	No details have been provided. No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible. Although the size of the site would not necessitate the requirement for 5% bungalow provision. The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.

Sheriff Hutton Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		51	70 (664)	75	101	658	663
L Overall Rating for 'Meeting Needs'	Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++	(++)	(-) No details have been submitted.	developed	No details have been submitted.	Subject to discussions concerning affordable housing provision.	(-) site not capable of delivery of affordable housing
	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 required --	Not required.	Not required		Not required	(-) site is just above 1ha - would require at the very least a transport statement	Not 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 and turning arrangements will require specific consideration. The Local Highway Authority have no objections to the proposal, subject to conditions.	(+) Access onto Finkle Street. Works will be required to improve existing major road, and extend footway/street lighting. Not likely to create excessive travel demand, but does not address appropriate accessibility criteria.	developed		(+) Access and turning arrangements will require specific consideration.	(+) Access and turning arrangements will require specific consideration.
	Mitigation required but no unacceptable impact following mitigation +						
	Mitigation required and development would have a significant impact though not unacceptable impact after mitigation -						
	Mitigation required and development would still have an unacceptable impact following mitigation --						
Q. 47 Can the site accommodate adequate parking and servicing facilities?	Site meets highway guidelines for parking and servicing ++	(++) provides a improved situation for turning of service vehicles	No details have been provided	developed		Further information is required to consider this aspect.	Information is provided to consider this through the indicative scheme.
	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 Ebor Way runs through the middle of the site, and skirts round the edge of the site on the north eastern boundary. It will be important to retain the ability of this walk to continue its established route, and it is likely that this can be achieved.	(+) The site is not proximal to any PRoW.	developed	(+) The site is not proximal to any PRoW.	(+) The site is not proximal to any PRoW.	(+) The site is not proximal to any PRoW.
	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 details have been submitted, the site is unlikely to have any public realm due to its size.	No details have been submitted.	developed	The scale of site means such provision would not be possible.	(+) The site proposes a LAP, and open space is association with the new development, although it could be accessed by non-residents.	Site is not capable of delivering public open space. Put would provide CIL contribution.
	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 --						

Sheriff Hutton Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		51	70 (664)	75	101	658	663
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: provision is at Easingwold. It is anticipated that contributions would 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.	Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: no additional capacity required. Secondary Education: provision is at Easingwold. It is anticipated that contributions would 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.	developed	Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: no additional capacity required. Secondary Education: provision is at Easingwold. It is anticipated that contributions would 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.	Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: no additional capacity required. Secondary Education: provision is at Easingwold. It is anticipated that contributions would 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.	Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: no additional capacity required. Secondary Education: provision is at Easingwold. It is anticipated that contributions would 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 250 m	(-) within 400m	Developed	(++)	(++)	(++)
	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 --						
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 ++	(++)	(++)	developed	(++)	(++)	(++)
	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 --						

Sheriff Hutton Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		51	70 (664)	75	101	658	663
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 ++	(+)	(+)	developed	(+)	(++)	(++)
	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	N/A	N/A
	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) 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	The site is not adjacent to the established industrial estate, and the Local Plan Strategy is clear that employment allocations will be at the Market Towns. Later submission is for residential development.	developed	NA	N/A	N/A
	Mix of uses proposed will not diversify the economy but will support existing employment sectors in Ryedale +						
Q. 55 (Employment/Retail) Does the proposal involve the creation of net additional or net loss of jobs in Ryedale?	Up to 250 net jobs created ++	NA	NA	developed	NA	N/A	N/A
	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 ++	NA	NA	developed	NA	N/A	N/A
	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 --						

Sheriff Hutton Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		51	70 (664)	75	101	658	663
Stage 3 - Deliverability / Developability							
Q56. How does the site perform against the SHLAA Update (housing), ELR Update (employment) and RRCS (retail) in terms of its ability to come forward and its suitability for development?	Housing: Category 1 (Deliverable)++	Employment: Category I ++	(++) Category 1 site in 2009 SHLAA	(++) Category 1 site in 2009 SHLAA	developed		Not within the 2009 SHLAA
	Housing: Category 2 (Developable) +	Employment: Category II +					
	Housing: Category 3 (Not Currently Developable) --	Employment: Category III -					
Q57. Are there any other legal or physical constraints which may affect the ability of the site to come forward?	No constraints identified ++	Subject to archaeological investigation	Site ID 70 was deemed undeliverable and the site submitter had moved away. New Landowner has renewed their interest in pursuing the site.	developed	Subject to archaeological investigation	Subject to archaeological investigation, FRA, Access considerations	Subject to archaeological investigation, FRA, Access considerations
	Constraint(s) identified but resolution possible +						
	Constraint(s) identified but resolution is uncertain --						
Developer Contributions							
Q58 Will the development be capable of meeting the usual range of site-specific s106 requirements?	Normal range of contributions can be achieved ++	(+) The agent for the developer has recognised that affordable housing contributions will be required.	(-) Site submitted has not recognised affordable housing contributions	developed	Unknown	The site submission has not referred to the recognition that affordable housing contributions will be payable	(-) due to site size
	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 ++	(++) The Developer's agent has confirmed their awareness of the CIL charging scheme, and that a plan-compliant level of affordable housing is deliverable.	CIL is a non-negotiable charge. The site submission has not referred to the charge.	developed	Unknown	CIL is a non-negotiable charge. The site submission has not referred to the charge	CIL is a non-negotiable charge. The site submission has not referred to the charge
	No --						
O Overall Deliverability / Developability Rating	Site is able to come forward without impairment and is able to provide a normal range of contributions ++	(++) subject to the signing of the s.106 agreement on affordable housing provision.	(--) Site ID 70 was deemed undeliverable - site submitter had moved away. New Landowner has renewed their interest in pursuing the site (664). No clear position regarding availability, and viability considerations and form and character issues with lack of connectivity to the settlement	Developed	No response provided	Subject to further discussions concerning affordable housing. Landowner has submitted a smaller site extent 663. Raises questions over deliverability	(+)
	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 --						