

Thornton le Dale Full Site Assessment

Assessment		82	97	109	465	592	593	
Stage 1 - Sift								
all sites 0.15Ha and above	0.15 Ha or greater ++	(++) 2.42 ha	(++) 26.03ha	(++) 2.91 ha	(++) 2.72 ha	(++)7.33ha	(++) 3.87ha	
	Less than 0.15 Ha --							
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 --							
Sites which cause significant harm to national/international nature conservation sites (species or habitat) or would involve substantial harm or loss to designated heritage assets will not be considered further	Will Not cause harm ++	(++) No harm identified to the North York Moors SPA	(++) No harm identified to the North York Moors SPA	(++) No harm identified to the North York Moors SPA	(++) No harm identified to the North York Moors SPA	(++) No harm identified to the North York Moors SPA	(++) No harm identified to the North York Moors SPA	
	Will cause harm --							
Sites which fall wholly within Flood Zone 3b not considered further for built development. Where sites are partially in Flood for built development. Zone 3b, that part of the site will be not be considered further	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 ++	Not proximal to our development limits, but proximal to National Park Development Limits		(++)	(++)		
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +						
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -						
		15 minutes walking time and over --						

Thornton le Dale Full Site Assessment

Assessment		82	97	109	465	592	593	
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 1,2 and 3. As the site is undeveloped the SFRA states that any FZ3 areas should be FZ3b status.	(++)	
	Flood Zone 2 +							
	Flood zone 3a -							
Q2B What vulnerability class does the site fall	Flood Zone 1++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	More Vulnerable	(++)	
	Flood Zone 2							Flood Zone 3a
	Less vulnerable ++							Less vulnerable+
	More vulnerable +							More vulnerable -
	Highly vulnerable -							Highly vulnerable --
Q2D Has a Flood Risk Assessment been	yes ++	(--)- SFRA. FRA required due to site size.	(--)- SFRA. FRA required due to site size.	(--)- SFRA. FRA required due to site size.	(--)- SFRA. FRA required due to site size.	(--)- SFRA. FRA required due to site size.	(--)- SFRA. FRA required due to site size.	
	No --							
A Overall Flood Risk Assessment	Site has low overall flood risk ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(--)- for element in FZ3b	(++)	
	Site faces significant flood risk issues which can be mitigated +							
	Site faces significant flood risk issues which could potentially be mitigated -							
	Site faces significant flood risk issues and may be inappropriate for development --							
Q3.What are the conclusions of the Highways Authorities (NYCC) and Highways England (HE) (where appropriate) initial highway assessment?	Site has no highway issues identified ++	Highway comments not asked for due to fundamental issues with the site.	No Highway Authority representations sought as site is significantly distanced from the existing settlement.	Access acceptable onto the A170. However, the speed limits would need to be considered.	Access acceptable onto the A170. However, the speed limits would need to be considered.	Highway comments not asked for due to fundamental issues with the site.	No Highway Authority representations sought as site is significantly distanced from the existing settlement.	
	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 --							

Thornton le Dale Full Site Assessment

Assessment		82	97	109	465	592	593
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	<p>Enhancement of feature/species possible – 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 means of mitigation --</p>	<p>(+) The site is within the buffer zone of the North York Moors SPA designation so designated for ground nesting moorland birds, in particular the Golden Plover. A survey was undertaken to assess the impact of development on such birds, and other protected species. The findings of the survey demonstrate that there would be no harm to the integrity of the site. The site, or surrounding land is not subject to any biodiversity designations. Any protected species, and their habitats would be afforded their statutory protection. Single Yellowhammer territory found.</p>	<p>(+) The site is within the buffer zone of the North York Moors SPA designation so designated for ground nesting moorland birds, in particular the Golden Plover. A survey was undertaken to assess the impact of development on such birds, and other protected species. The findings of the survey demonstrate that there would be no harm to the integrity of the site. The site, or surrounding land is not subject to any biodiversity designations. Any protected species, and their habitats would be afforded their statutory protection. Single pair of Skylarks holding territory, additional territory to immediate west of site. Two Yellowhammer territories found. Single pair of Kestrels on a nest.</p>	<p>(+) The site is within the buffer zone of the North York Moors SPA designation so designated for ground nesting moorland birds, in particular the Golden Plover. A survey was undertaken to assess the impact of development on such birds, and other protected species. The findings of the survey demonstrate that there would be no harm to the integrity of the site. The site, or surrounding land is not subject to any biodiversity designations. Any protected species, and their habitats would be afforded their statutory protection. Single territory of Whitethroat.</p>	<p>(+) The site is within the buffer zone of the North York Moors SPA designation so designated for ground nesting moorland birds, in particular the Golden Plover. A survey was undertaken to assess the impact of development on such birds, and other protected species. The findings of the survey demonstrate that there would be no harm to the integrity of the site. The site, or surrounding land is not subject to any biodiversity designations. Any protected species, and their habitats would be afforded their statutory protection.</p>	<p>(+) The site is within the buffer zone of the North York Moors SPA designation so designated for ground nesting moorland birds, in particular the Golden Plover. A survey was undertaken to assess the impact of development on such birds, and other protected species. The findings of the survey demonstrate that there would be no harm to the integrity of the site. The site, or surrounding land is not subject to any biodiversity designations. Any protected species, and their habitats would be afforded their statutory protection. Single pair of Skylarks holding territory, and Skylark territory in south east of site. A single Song Thrush territory was located on site. Single pair of Linnets found on site.</p>	<p>(+) The site is within the buffer zone of the North York Moors SPA designation so designated for ground nesting moorland birds, in particular the Golden Plover. A survey was undertaken to assess the impact of development on such birds, and other protected species. The findings of the survey demonstrate that there would be no harm to the integrity of the site. The site, or surrounding land is not subject to any biodiversity designations. Any protected species, and their habitats would be afforded their statutory protection.</p>
Q5 Would the development provide opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure, including linking in with existing green infrastructure/corridors	<p>Excellent opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors ++</p> <p>Some opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors +</p> <p>No opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors, however the site has the potential to accommodate these –</p> <p>No opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure corridors, however the site does not have the potential to accommodate these --</p>	<p>(++)The site has, to its northern boundary the former disused railway lane, which could in the future be a form of green infrastructure. The proposer of the site has indicated that the retention of this could be included.</p>	<p>(-) </p>	<p>(+) The submitter of the site has planted a now mature hedge on the eastern boundary of the site, which they are keen to retain. No further proposals to enhance green infrastructure links but there is no reason to assume that it cannot be incorporated.</p>	<p>(-) </p>	<p>(-) </p>	<p>(-) </p>

Thornton le Dale Full Site Assessment

Assessment		82	97	109	465	592	593
Q6 Would the development impact on protected and unprotected trees, hedgerows and ancient woodland?	Positive impact. Enhancement of feature possible and mitigation not required ++	(++) The site has an absence of trees, but the hedgerows are mature and established. No scheme has been submitted but in conjunction with the railway line, improvements to green infrastructure could be improved.		(-)The hedgerows are an important feature of the landscape and form in this area. Limit the northern extent of the site to coincide with the northern boundaries of the existing development to the west of the site. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain existing semi-mature belt of trees and hedge along eastern boundary as a priority (subject to a health and safety assessment) and ensure that layouts respect the recommendations in BS 5837:2012 – Trees in relation to demolition, design, and construction- Recommendations. Ensure that the layout respects the requirements of existing trees along the northern boundaries of existing properties to the south of the site in accordance with recommendations in BS 5837:2012 – Trees in relation to demolition, design, and construction- Recommendations.. Ensure that the development is generally well treed utilising a mixture of native and non-native species appropriate to the available space to provide a greened environment in harmony with existing local residential areas, and in the interests of views from the east and south 	(-) The hedgerows are an important feature of the landscape and form in this area. The Linear Scarp Farmland identifies the linear form of the fields. This site is not contiguous with the settlement, and its development would detract from the existing form of Thornton le Dale. Retention of the hedgerows is of principal importance.		
	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 --						

Thornton le Dale Full Site Assessment

Assessment		82	97	109	465	592	593
C Special Qualities, Landscape and Setting							
Q7 What is the capacity of the landscape to accommodate the site according to the Landscape Character Assessments which cover the Ryedale Area and Special Qualities Study (including views and open spaces)?	<p>Site has a very low landscape sensitivity to being developed or existing landscape features are retained or enhanced. Site will not detract from landscape character ++</p> <p>Site has a low landscape sensitivity to being developed and some existing landscape features can be retained. Site is unlikely to detract from landscape character +</p> <p>Site has medium landscape sensitivity to being developed and may affect landscape features, however mitigation is possible. Site may detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved –</p> <p>Site has high landscape sensitivity to being developed and will affect landscape features with limited/no means of mitigation. Site will detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved --</p>	<p>(++) This is in the Vale Of Pickering National Character area. The topography is flattened, with fields bounded by mature hedgerows. It is considered that this site would not have an adverse impact on the character of Thornton le Dale, given the physical association with the more recent extended part of the village, nor Vale of Pickering in a wider sense due to the flatter topography. It is considered that the landscape within this area is capable of accommodating some development.</p>	<p>(--) This field straddles two National Character Areas, The Vale of Pickering, and the North York Moors and Cleveland Hills. The land is rising from the Vale, and so the topography is steepening in gradient. The land is to the south of the A170, where the land begins to rise considerably. It is considered that development of this land would in effect be very visually intrusive by virtue of its scale and positioning on the rising land of the Vale.</p>	<p>(-) This site, which is a linear field, perpendicular to the road, is in the North York Moors and Cleveland Hills National Landscape Character Area, and Linear Scarp Farmland in the local landscape Character type. The land is rising from the Vale, and so the topography is steepening in gradient. The land is to the north of the A170, where the land begins to rise considerably, into the Fringe of the Moors Area of High Landscape Value. The linear field patterns are considered in the landscape character assessment to be an important visual characteristics which should be retained. The site does not extend as far up the hill slope as other site submissions, but it extends well beyond the existing northern extent of the built up area of Thornton le Dale. A key difference to other submissions is that it is adjacent to the existing built extent of Thornton le Dale, and so it is more physically related to the settlement. This is considered to provide a key means of integrating some development on the site, but landscape mitigation will be required.</p>	<p>(--) This site, which is a linear field, perpendicular to the road, is in the North York Moors and Cleveland Hills National Landscape Character Area, and Linear Scarp Farmland in the local landscape Character type. The land is rising from the Vale, and so the topography is steepening in gradient. The land is to the north of the A170, where the land begins to rise considerably, in a sweeping unbroken manner, into the Fringe of the Moors Area of High Landscape Value. The linear field patterns are considered in the landscape character assessment to be an important visual characteristics which should be retained. The site does not extend as far up the hill slope as other site submissions, but it extends well beyond the existing northern extent of the built up area of Thornton le Dale. It is considered that the landscape form and hedgerow patterns in linear form mean the landscape is particularly sensitive to accommodating development.</p>	<p>(++) This land is in the Vale of Pickering National Character Area, and the topography is relatively flat, with hedgerows and a more enclosed feel. The field patterns have changed to a less linear form. The landscape here is less sensitive to accommodating development, although the site is physically distanced from the settlement.</p>	<p>(--) This site, which is a linear field, perpendicular to the road, is in the North York Moors and Cleveland Hills National Landscape Character Area, and Linear Scarp Farmland in the local landscape Character type. The land is rising from the Vale, and so the topography is steepening in gradient. The land is to the north of the A170, where the land begins to rise considerably, into the Fringe of the Moors Area of High Landscape Value. It is considered that development of this land would in effect be very visually intrusive by virtue of its scale and positioning on the rising land of the Vale. The topography in combination within the nature of the linear, 'strip field' form of field pattern, means that the development of this site, and the adjacent proposal would be visually intrusive, in particular given the absence of development in this area. The linear field patterns are considered in the landscape character assessment to be an important visual characteristics which should be retained.</p>
What impact would the site have on the nationally designated landscapes of the North York Moors National Park and/or Howardian Hills AONB?	<p>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>(+) The site is adjacent to the National Park Boundary, but at a point which is adjacent to the more recently extended part of Thornton le Dale, and on lower, flatter land, as such it is considered that some form of residential development would not harm the special qualities of the National Park. By virtue of distance and topography there would be no impact on the Howardian Hills AONB.</p>	<p>(--) This site is proximal to the boundary with the National Park, it is considered that by virtue of its nature, in terms of its isolation, scale, and situation on the topographical variations, it is considered that development would be akin to a new settlement, on a visually prominent elevation and it is considered that development in this location would have an adverse impact on the setting and qualities of the National Park.</p>	<p>(-) This site is adjacent to both the edge of Thornton le Dale, and the National Park. The site extends northwards beyond the built extent of Thornton le Dale, and the entirety of the site would be excessive. It is considered that the site has medium landscape sensitivity, and mitigation will be necessary to ensure that the setting of both the village and the National Park is not compromised.</p>	<p>(--) This site is proximal to the boundary with the National Park, whilst not as prominent as some of the other sites submitted, it is considered that by virtue of its nature, in terms of its scale, and situation on the topographical variations, it is considered development here, which is not physically related to the settlement, on a visually prominent elevation and it is considered that development in this location would have an adverse impact on the setting and qualities of the National Park.</p>	<p>(-) This site on lower level land, and although proximal to the National Park it is considered that development of the site would not have an adverse impact on the setting of the National Park per se, and terms of the interrelationship between the site and the National Park, but it is not contiguous the settlement, and as such would be detrimental to the character of Thornton le Dale, and so on a site-specific level it could be harmful to the setting of the village, and this would be harmful to the special qualities of the National Park.</p>	<p>(--) This site is proximal to the boundary with the National Park, it is considered that by virtue of its nature, in terms of its isolation, scale, and situation on the topographical variations, it is considered that development would be akin to a new settlement, on a visually prominent elevation and it is considered that development in this location would have an adverse impact on the setting and qualities of the National Park</p>

Thornton le Dale Full Site Assessment

Assessment		82	97	109	465	592	593
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 topography is low-lying and generally flat, it is considered that providing the boundary treatments are appropriate the landscape can accommodate development, in particular of a domestic scale.	(--) The site is open, with sweeping topography on rising land. Within strongly defined, linear field form. It is considered that the landscape is not able to accommodate development without it having an adverse impact on this area of the Vale of Pickering.	(-) The site extends northwards beyond the built extent of Thornton le Dale, and the entirety of the site would be excessive. It is considered that the site has medium landscape sensitivity, given the topography it will be necessary to look at the scale of the site, and landscaping through trees and hedging and any siting and design of development	(--) The site is open, with sweeping topography on rising land. Within strongly defined, linear field form. It is considered that the landscape is not able to accommodate development without it having an adverse impact on this area of the Vale of Pickering, but also the Fringe of the Moors Area of High Landscape Value.	(-) The site is proximal, but not adjacent to the village, and the topography is flatter. It is considered that the open nature of the field boundaries would mean that the site would be intrusive within the landscape.	(--) The site is open, with sweeping topography on rising land. Within strongly defined, linear field form. It is considered that the landscape is not able to accommodate development without it having an adverse impact on this area of the Vale of Pickering, but also the Fringe of the Moors Area of High Landscape Value.
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>	(++)	(--) the site is not on the edge of the settlement, but it has the potential to give the impression of coalescence between Thornton le Dale and Wilton, the adjacent settlement to the east of the A170.	(+) this site is adjacent to the settlement, but there is a distinct separation between Thornton le Dale and Wilton and this would not be eroded by this site.	(+) the site is physically proximal to the settlement, but there is a distinct separation between Thornton le Dale and Wilton.	(-) the site is a moderate distance from the village.	(--) the site is not on the edge of the settlement, but it has the potential to give the impression of coalescence between Thornton le Dale and Wilton, the adjacent settlement to the east of the A170.
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>	(++)	(--)	(+)	(--)	(-)	(--)
Culture and Heritage							
Q12 Will the site affect a designated heritage asset, either directly or indirectly through its setting?	<p>Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++</p> <p>Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +</p> <p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –</p> <p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --</p>	(+) Within the Listed Building Buffer of Hall Farmhouse (as listed) in Hall Garth Farm. But separated from the farm by twentieth century development. The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of a number of SMs, but is not in a discernible distance to the SMs.	(+) The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of a number of SMs, but is not in a discernible distance to the SMs.	(+)The site is within the buffer zone of a series of Listed cottages on High Street, it is not considered that development of this site would adversely affect the setting- there is further development which surrounds the Listed properties. The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of a number of SMs, but is not in a discernible distance to the SMs.	(+) The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of a number of SMs, but is not in a discernible distance to the SMs.	(+) The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of a number of SMs, but is not in a discernible distance to the SMs.	(+) The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of a number of SMs, but is not in a discernible distance to the SMs.

Thornton le Dale Full Site Assessment

Assessment		82	97	109	465	592	593
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>Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++</p> <p>Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +</p> <p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –</p> <p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --</p>	(+) It is not considered that development of this site (or in part) would harm the wider character of Thornton le Dale. NYCC Heritage Unit advise: Records indicate that there are a number of finds from this area and close to the beck where evidence of settlement and activity from the Bronze Age through to the Roman period have been found. Advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching to clarify the nature and significance of any archaeological remains.	(--) it is considered that development of this isolated field which is substantial in scale, would detract from the individual and distinctive identities of Thornton le Dale and Wilton.	(+) NYCC Heritage Unit advise: This is an area with potential for remains and finds of the prehistoric and Roman periods. Aerial photographic evidence indicates prehistoric and/or Roman period track ways and a dyke, as well as finds of prehistoric flints and querns, which suggest prehistoric and later settlement and activity in this area. Advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching to clarify the nature and significance of any archaeological remains. It is not considered that part development of this site would harm the wider character of Thornton le Dale	(+)NYCC Heritage Unit advises: This is an area with potential for remains and finds of the prehistoric and Roman periods. Aerial photographic evidence indicates prehistoric and/or Roman period track ways and a dyke, as well as finds of prehistoric flints and querns, which suggest prehistoric and later settlement and activity in this area. Advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching to clarify the nature and significance of any archaeological remains. It is not considered that development of this site (or in part) would harm the wider character of Thornton le Dale	(+) It is not considered that development of this site (or in part) would harm the wider character of Thornton le Dale	(--) it is considered that development of this isolated field which is substantial in scale, would detract from the individual and distinctive identities of Thornton le Dale and Wilton.
D Overall Rating for 'Culture and Heritage'	<p>Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++</p> <p>Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +</p> <p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –</p> <p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --</p>	(+) Subject to archaeological investigation	(--)	(+) Subject to archaeological investigation	(+) Subject to archaeological investigation	(+)	(--)
Low Carbon Development and Renewable Energy							
Q14 Is the site adopting the Energy Hierarchy of the Local Plan Strategy?	<p>Site capable and developer willing++</p> <p>Site capable but developer unwilling -</p> <p>Site not capable --</p>	No proposals have been submitted. The site, subject to feasibility and viability considerations, would be capable of complying with some elements of the Energy Hierarchy.	No proposals have been submitted. The site, subject to feasibility and viability considerations, would be capable of complying with some elements of the Energy Hierarchy.	No proposals have been submitted. The site, subject to feasibility and viability considerations, would be capable of complying with some elements of the Energy Hierarchy.	No proposals have been submitted. The site, subject to feasibility and viability considerations, would be capable of complying with some elements of the Energy Hierarchy.	No proposals have been submitted. The site, subject to feasibility and viability considerations, would be capable of complying with some elements of the Energy Hierarchy.	No proposals have been submitted. The site, subject to feasibility and viability considerations, would be capable of complying with some elements of the Energy Hierarchy.
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 schemes available.	No schemes available.	No schemes available.	No schemes available.	No schemes available.	No schemes 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 schemes available.	No schemes available.	No schemes available.	No schemes available.	No schemes available.	No schemes available.
E Overall rating for 'Low Carbon Development and Renewable Energy'	<p>Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer willing ++</p> <p>Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer unwilling -</p>	No information submitted.	No information submitted.	No information submitted.	No information submitted.	No information submitted.	No information submitted.

Thornton le Dale Full Site Assessment

Assessment		82	97	109	465	592	593
	Site not capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology --						

Thornton le Dale Full Site Assessment

Assessment		82	97	109	465	592	593
Sustainable Building and Waste Reduction							
Q17 Can the site accommodate higher sustainable building standards than currently required?	<p>Site can accommodate 2 levels higher than mandatory limit ++</p> <p>Site can accommodate 1 level higher than mandatory limit -</p> <p>Development cannot accommodate higher standards than mandatory level --</p>	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.
Q18 Does the development contain proposals for waste reduction in both its construction and when in operation?	<p>Proposals for waste reduction incorporated into both the construction and operation of the development++</p> <p>Proposals have investigated waste reduction, however only limited measures are achievable -</p> <p>No proposals suggested for waste reduction --</p>	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.
Q. 19 Does the development contain individual/communal recycling facilities/ infrastructure?	<p>Yes +</p> <p>No -</p>	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, 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 submitted.	No information submitted.	No information submitted.	No information submitted.	No information submitted.	No information submitted.
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>	2.42ha of Greenfield	26.03ha of Greenfield	2.91ha of Greenfield	2.72ha of Greenfield	7.33ha of Greenfield	3.87ha of Greenfield
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.51 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.546 dwellings. A scheme of this size would need a substantial amount of social infrastructure, this would be reducing the developable area	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.61 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.57 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.153 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.81 dwellings.
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>	There is no contaminated land.	There is no contaminated land.	There is no contaminated land.	There is no contaminated land.	There is no contaminated land.	There is no contaminated land.

Thornton le Dale Full Site Assessment

Assessment		82	97	109	465	592	593	
G Overall Rating for 'Efficient Use of Land'	Site represents very efficient use of land with mitigation to fully overcome concerns where necessary ++	(+) 	(--)	(+) Subject to more detailed proposals 	(-) 	(--)	(-) 	
	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 ++	(-) 2.42ha of grade 2 and 3. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site contains land which is classified as grade 3 and therefore there is the possibility that development would result in the loss of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land. The land area of the site is less than 5ha.	(--)	26.03ha of grade 3. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site contains land which is classified as grade 3 and therefore there is the possibility that development would result in the loss of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land. However, the land area of the site is more than 5ha.	(-) 2.91ha of grade 3. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site contains land which is classified as grade 3 and therefore there is the possibility that development would result in the loss of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land. The land area of the site is less than 5ha.	(-) 2.72ha of grade 3. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site contains land which is classified as grade 3 and therefore there is the possibility that development would result in the loss of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land. The land area of the site is less than 5ha.	(--)	7.33ha of grade 2 and 3. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site contains land which is classified as grade 3 and therefore there is the possibility that development would result in the loss of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land. However, the land area of the site is more than 5ha.
	Up to 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost -							
	More than 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost --							
Q. 24 Would the development lead to the sterilisation of mineral resources?	Site not within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search, or Mineral Consultation Zone ++?	(++) 	(++) 	(++) 	(++) 	(++) 	(++) 	
	Site within the buffer of a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone -?							
	Site within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone --							

Thornton le Dale Full Site Assessment

Assessment		82	97	109	465	592	593
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 ++	No response sought from the Environment Agency	No response sought from the Environment Agency	(-) The southern part of the site is underlain by the Ampthill Clay & Kimmeridge Clay formations. North of this is the Hambleton Oolite which is member of the Corallian Group principal aquifer. Overlying the southernmost part of the site there are superficial drift deposits of Till which is generally a clay rich deposit with low permeability. To the north of the Till there is no drift over the solid geology. The northernmost part of the site lies with source protection zone 3 for the public water supply in Pickering. This zone is defined as the total catchment for water that may ultimately be abstracted from the boreholes. Development taking place on the southern part of the site should not present a risk to groundwater as any pollution would not infiltrate the geological formation to a significant degree. However, consideration would need to be given to the disposal of surface water from the site as it is unlikely that soakaways would be viable. The north of the site is highly vulnerable to groundwater pollution due to the transmissive nature of the solid geology and the absence of drift deposits. There are no potable abstractions of groundwater close to the site, although any development of the north of the site should consider the potential impacts on the Corallian aquifer and this is particularly applicable to the part of the site that falls within the source protection zone.	No response sought from the Environment Agency	No response sought from the Environment Agency	No response sought from the Environment Agency
	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. On sloping sites, specialist geotechnical advice should be sort detailing requirements for stabilisation and foundation design. The land slopes little, but does have the line of the former railway,	No evidence that the land is unstable. On sloping sites, specialist geotechnical advice should be sort detailing requirements for stabilisation and foundation design.	No evidence that the land is unstable. On sloping sites, specialist geotechnical advice should be sort detailing requirements for stabilisation and foundation design.	No evidence that the land is unstable. On sloping sites, specialist geotechnical advice should be sort detailing requirements for stabilisation and foundation design.	No evidence that the land is unstable.	No evidence that the land is unstable. On sloping sites, specialist geotechnical advice should be sort detailing requirements for stabilisation and foundation design.
	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 --						

Thornton le Dale Full Site Assessment

Assessment		82	97	109	465	592	593
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"	(--) HSE standing advice is advise against development	(++)	(++)	(++)	(--) HSE standing advice is 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 + The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible - The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --	(-) The site is proximal (but not adjacent) to the sewerage works, and if this site progresses, Environmental Health should be consulted and Yorkshire Water as within 400m.	(+)	(-) The site is also relatively close to the tip, and smell issues are already identified, which may limit development potential. Access arrangements would need further consideration to reduce impacts on amenity.	(-) The site may experience smell issues from the tip which is to the north west of the site.	(--) Presence of the Waste Water Treatment Works less than 400m within site. The site is adjacent to the sewerage plant, and as such there could be smell and vermin issues which could affect residential properties. There could also be concerns raised about the expansion of the site. Should the site progress further, Environmental Health would need to be consulted, as would Yorkshire Water.	(+) The sites is distanced from residential properties. There are no adverse uses in close proximity.
Q. 30 Is the development in an area where other factors are likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to generate forms of nuisance which may affect the amenity of existing users? These may include issues such as privacy, lack of sunlight overbearing effects.	The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site + The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible - The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --	(+) No scheme has been submitted which would allow the assessment of potential impacts on residential amenity for both existing and potential occupants, this would be considered at the planning application stage. There are existing residents to the north of the site.	(+) No scheme has been submitted which would allow the assessment of potential impacts on residential amenity for both existing and potential occupants, this would be considered at the planning application stage. There are no properties adjacent.	(+) No scheme has been submitted which would allow the assessment of potential impacts on residential amenity for both existing and potential occupants, this would be considered at the planning application stage. There are existing residents to the south of the site.	(+) No scheme has been submitted which would allow the assessment of potential impacts on residential amenity for both existing and potential occupants, this would be considered at the planning application stage. There are no properties adjacent.	(+) Including the above matter, no scheme has been submitted which would allow the assessment of potential impacts on residential amenity for both existing and potential occupants, this would be considered at the planning application stage. There are no properties adjacent.	(+) The sites is distanced from residential properties. There are no adverse uses in close proximity.
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 --	(-)	(+)	(-)	(-)	(--)	(+)

Thornton le Dale Full Site Assessment

Assessment		82	97	109	465	592	593
Flood Risk							
Q. 31 Is the site potentially affected by groundwater flooding?	No ++	(--)	(--)	(--)	(--)	(--)	(--)
	Yes further investigation required --	(--)	(--)	(--)	(--)	(--)	(--)
Q. 32 Is the site potentially affected by surface water flooding and is this site considered to be within a critical drainage area?	No ++	(--)	(--)	(--)	(--)	(--)	(--)
	Yes further investigation required --	(--)	(--)	(--)	(--)	(--)	(--)
Q. 33 Is the site potentially affected by sewer flooding?	No ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Yes further investigation required --	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
Q. 34 Have Sustainable Drainage Systems (SDS) been proposed as part of the development?	Site capable of accommodating SDS and have been proposed as part of the development ++	(+)	(+)	(-)	(-)	(+)	(-)
	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. 36 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 --	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
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 --	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
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 --	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)

Thornton le Dale Full Site Assessment

Assessment		82	97	109	465	592	593
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 -	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that 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 --	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.
Q. 39 For sites over 1ha or over 80 houses- Has a Travel Plan been produced which assesses alternative options and initiatives?	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 --	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.
Q. 40 Will the proposed development attract a balanced living and/or working population, reducing inequality of opportunity?	Development proposed is clearly designed to attract a balanced living and/or working community ++ 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 -	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.
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 --	No information is submitted at this stage.	No information is submitted at this stage.	No information is submitted at this stage.	No information is submitted at this stage.	No information is submitted at this stage.	No information is submitted at this stage.
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 ++ 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 --	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 'Thornton le Dale' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 62 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 6. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 18 dwellings.	The site submitter is keen for the site to be a mixed development of both housing and employment. The ELR (2006) and update (2010) confirmed that Employment Land requirements were, for the most part, to be concentrated in the Market Towns, and that policies should be used to support the diversification of Ryedale's economic base, and the support in principle the expansion of existing established businesses. No details have been provided concerning the nature of the employment, and it is not to support an existing enterprise, and given the overall strategy it is unlikely that this site is capable of addressing the requirements of the ELR and update.	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Thornton le Dale' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 62 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 6. 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 'Thornton le Dale' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 62 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 6. 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 'Thornton le Dale' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 62 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 6. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 18 dwellings. However, these sites are so distanced from the settlement.	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 'Thornton le Dale' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 62 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 6. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 18 dwellings. However, these sites are so distanced from the settlement.

Thornton le Dale Full Site Assessment

Assessment		82	97	109	465	592	593
Q. 42 What level and type of affordable housing is proposed?	<p>Development offers appropriate level and type of affordable housing which meets the needs as set out in the SHMA ++</p> <p>Development offers some affordable housing which meets some of the need as set out in the SHMA +</p> <p>Development does not offer the appropriate level and type of affordable housing or does not meet the need for affordable housing as set out in the SHMA -</p> <p>The development makes no provision for affordable housing --</p>	No specific information but site proposer states "high proportion of affordable/local needs housing". Based on a theoretical yield of 51 units on-site affordable housing provision would be required in accordance with SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy.	No specific information. Based on a theoretical yield of 546 units on-site affordable housing provision would be required in accordance with SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy.	No specific information. Based on a theoretical yield of 61 units on-site affordable housing provision would be required in accordance with SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy.	No specific information. Based on a theoretical yield of 57 units on-site affordable housing provision would be required in accordance with SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy.	No specific information. Based on a theoretical yield of 153 units on-site affordable housing provision would be required in accordance with SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy.	No specific information. Based on a theoretical yield of 81 units on-site affordable housing provision would be required in accordance with SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy.
Q. 43 What provision has been made for Ryedale's elderly population?	<p>Development addresses and meets the needs of Ryedale's elderly population ++</p> <p>Development takes into account and meets some of the needs of Ryedale's elderly population +</p> <p>Development does not address the needs of Ryedale's elderly population -</p> <p>The development makes no provision for the needs of Ryedale's elderly population --</p>	No extra-care units are proposed within the Service Villages, in line with the County Council's delivery strategy for meeting the needs of the Elderly. The site is above the threshold for the delivery of bungalows on site (as per SP4 of the LPS). The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.	No extra-care units are proposed within the Service Villages, in line with the County Council's delivery strategy for meeting the needs of the Elderly. The site is above the threshold for the delivery of bungalows on site (as per SP4 of the LPS). The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.	No extra-care units are proposed within the Service Villages, in line with the County Council's delivery strategy for meeting the needs of the Elderly. The site is above the threshold for the delivery of bungalows on site (as per SP4 of the LPS). The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.	No extra-care units are proposed within the Service Villages, in line with the County Council's delivery strategy for meeting the needs of the Elderly. The site is above the threshold for the delivery of bungalows on site (as per SP4 of the LPS). The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.	No extra-care units are proposed within the Service Villages, in line with the County Council's delivery strategy for meeting the needs of the Elderly. The site is above the threshold for the delivery of bungalows on site (as per SP4 of the LPS). The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.	No extra-care units are proposed within the Service Villages, in line with the County Council's delivery strategy for meeting the needs of the Elderly. The site is above the threshold for the delivery of bungalows on site (as per SP4 of the LPS). The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.
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>	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
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 information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.
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>	The client's agent has said that there are two accesses off the site.		The site is within the 30mph zone.			
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>	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.

Thornton le Dale Full Site Assessment

Assessment		82	97	109	465	592	593
	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)?	<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>	(--) There is a series of PROWs. A PROW transects across the site from the road, which leads to Ordmerstones Lane. A second PROW joins this PROW at the south western corner of the site. This second PROW runs northward, and skirts round the existing development limits, linking into other PROWs which link to the village itself, and the open countryside. No details have been submitted concerning the incorporation of PROWs into the scheme.	(+) There are no PROWs proximal. No information has been submitted concerning the development of any PROWs.	(+)The site is adjacent to an established PROW, Outgang Lane, which is out with the site but runs up the western side of the site. No details have been submitted concerning any integration into this PROW.	(+) There are no PROWs proximal. No information has been submitted concerning the development of any PROWs.	(+) There are no PROWs proximal. No information has been submitted concerning the development of any PROWs.	(+) There are no PROWs proximal. No information has been submitted concerning the development of any 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 submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.
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>	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.	(--)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.	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.	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.	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.	(-) 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.

Assessment		82	97	109	465	592	593
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	(++)	(++)	(++)	(--) adjacent	(++)
	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 ++	No direct impact on an existing community facility	No direct impact on an existing community facility	No direct impact on an existing community facility	No direct impact on an existing community facility	No direct impact on an existing community facility	No direct impact on 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 an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be fully mitigated ++	(--)	(-)	(+)	(+)	(--)	(+)
	Site has limited to medium adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be satisfactorily mitigated +						
	Site has medium to high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation -						
	Site has high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation --						
Strong Economy							
Q53. 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 --						

Thornton le Dale Full Site Assessment

Assessment		82	97	109	465	592	593
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 ++ Mix of uses proposed will not diversify the economy but will support existing employment sectors in Ryedale +	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Q.55 (Employment or Retail) Does the proposal involve the creation of net additional or net loss of jobs in Ryedale?	Up to 250 net jobs created ++ Up to 50 net jobs created + Up to 50 net jobs lost - Up to 250 net jobs lost --	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
N Overall rating for 'Strong Economy'	Proposal will have a significant positive impact on the economy ++ Proposal will have a positive impact on the economy + Proposal will have a negative impact on the economy - Proposal will have a significant negative impact on the economy --	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
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) ++ Housing: Category 2 (Developable) + Housing: Category 3 (Not Currently Developable) -- Employment: Category I ++ Employment: Category II + Employment: Category III -	(--) Category 1 Site in 2009 SHLAA but HSE pipeline issues	(--) Category 2 Site in 2009 SHLAA	(++) Category 1 Site in 2009 SHLAA	Not considered in the 2009 SHLAA	Not considered in the 2009 SHLAA	Not considered in the 2009 SHLAA
Q57. Are there any other legal or physical constraints which may affect the ability of the site to come forward?	No constraints identified ++ Constraint(s) identified but resolution possible + Constraint(s) identified but resolution is uncertain --	(-) (HSE Advise Against Development)	Subject to archaeological investigation	Subject to archaeological investigation	Subject to archaeological investigation	(-) (HSE Advise Against Development)	Subject to archaeological investigation
Developer Contributions							
Q58 Will the development be capable of meeting the usual range of site-specific s106 requirements?	Normal range of contributions can be achieved ++ Some contributions can be achieved + Limited contributions can be achieved - No contributions can be achieved --	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.	Unknown	(+) Site submitter acknowledges need to meet range of s106 contributions.	(+) Site submitter acknowledges need to meet range of s106 contributions.
Q. 59 Can the development support the requirements of the CIL charging schedule?	Yes ++ No --	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.	Unknown	(+) Site submitter acknowledges need to meet CIL charging schedule	(+) Site submitter acknowledges need to meet CIL charging schedule
O Overall Deliverability / Developability Rating	Site is able to come forward without impairment and is able to provide a normal range of contributions ++ Site has some constraints and / or may not be able to support the full range of developer contributions + Site faces significant constraints and may not be able to support any developer contributions --	(--)	(+)	(+) Landowner has reiterated the availability of the land.	No response received	(--)	(+)

Assessment		594	595	596	662		
Stage 1 - Sift							
all sites 0.15Ha and above	0.15 Ha or greater ++	(++) 9.34ha	(++)1.4ha	(++) 18.83 ha	(++)1.1ha		
	Less than 0.15 Ha --						
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 --						
Sites which cause significant harm to national/international nature conservation sites (species or habitat) or would involve substantial harm or loss to designated heritage assets will not be considered further	Will Not cause harm ++	(++) No harm identified to the North York Moors SPA	(++) No harm identified to the North York Moors SPA	(++) No harm identified to the North York Moors SPA	(++) No harm identified to the North York Moors SPA		
	Will cause harm --						
Sites which fall wholly within Flood Zone 3b not considered further for built development. Where sites are partially in Flood for built development. Zone 3b, that part of the site will be not be considered further	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		594	595	596	662
Biodiversity and Geo-diversity					
Q4. Would the development affect a regional or local site of biodiversity (including SINC, LNR or RIGS) or affect UK, NYMNP or Ryedale Biodiversity Plan protected species	Enhancement of feature/species possible – mitigation not required ++	(+) The site is within the buffer zone of the North York Moors SPA designation so designated for ground nesting moorland birds, in particular the Golden Plover. A survey was undertaken to assess the impact of development on such birds, and other protected species. The findings of the survey demonstrate that there would be no harm to the integrity of the site. The site, or surrounding land is not subject to any biodiversity designations. Any protected species, and their habitats would be afforded their statutory protection. A single pair of Lapwings were recorded on the land to the immediate east. Single pair of Skylarks holding territory. Single pair of Linnets found on site. Single Yellowhammer territory found. Single territory of Whitethroat.	(+) The site is within the buffer zone of the North York Moors SPA designation so designated for ground nesting moorland birds, in particular the Golden Plover. A survey was undertaken to assess the impact of development on such birds, and other protected species. The findings of the survey demonstrate that there would be no harm to the integrity of the site. The site, or surrounding land is not subject to any biodiversity designations. Any protected species, and their habitats would be afforded their statutory protection. Skylark territories east of site.	(+) The site is within the buffer zone of the North York Moors SPA designation so designated for ground nesting moorland birds, in particular the Golden Plover. A survey was undertaken to assess the impact of development on such birds, and other protected species. The findings of the survey demonstrate that there would be no harm to the integrity of the site. The site, or surrounding land is not subject to any biodiversity designations. Any protected species, and their habitats would be afforded their statutory protection. There is a pond which may have significant biodiversity value. Single pair of Skylarks holding territory. Single pair of Linnets found on site. Two Yellowhammer territories found. Single territory of Whitethroat. Single pair of Bullfinches on southern edge of site.	(+) The site is within the HRA buffer zone for the North York Moors SPA designation, so designated for ground nesting moorland birds, in particular the Golden Plover. The site has not been subject to the bird survey undertaken to assess the impact on ground nesting birds. However, the site does not require a survey because it is not open farmland which the Golden Plover use for foraging, or loafing. An ecological survey would be required to be undertaken in order to ensure that protected species can be given due protection. The site has been assessed against Natural England's Impact Risk Zones in connection with biodiversity designations. Specific Consultation is not required as the site is less than 100 residential dwellings.
	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 ++	(-)	(-)	(-) The south of the site is bounded by the disused railway line. No proposals have been submitted regarding the nature of the scheme.	(+) The site has, to the (south)western half of the site, a group Tree Preservation Order which covers a mixed coniferous trees. TPO 120/1988. An arboricultural survey has been provided to assess both protected and unprotected trees. Whilst a number of conifers are protected, their removal is indicated. This is not objected to by the Council's Tree and Landscape Officer. However, there are a number of deciduous trees, which make a significant contribution to the site. Their retention would be expected.
	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 --				

Assessment		594	595	596	662
Q6 Would the development impact on protected and unprotected trees, hedgerows and ancient woodland?	Positive impact. Enhancement of feature possible and mitigation not required ++				(-) An indicative design scheme has been provided to establish the nature and scale of the loss of trees on the site. There is protected trees (TPO 120/1988) It is a group TPO, and a arboricultural survey has been provided to assess the condition of the trees, and set out which trees are to be retained. The TPO'd trees are a block of conifers, which do not complement the more heterogenic nature of tree cover elsewhere in this part of the village. They were a relic of a previous land use, and have a screening effect, which in part was retained to screen the now demolished Hurrell Lane Care Home. The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer would not object to the rescinding of the current TPO, on the proviso that there is retention of some of the trees of merit in the site, particularly on the eastern boundary, which is an attractive, softening edge to the village, and which is important to retain and in places enhance.
	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 Geo-diversity'	Positive impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements and no mitigation required++	(-)	(-)	(-)	(+) Subject to a full arboricultural assessment
	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 --				

Thornton le Dale Full Site Assessment

Assessment		594	595	596	662
C Special Qualities, Landscape and Setting					
Q7 What is the capacity of the landscape to accommodate the site according to the Landscape Character Assessments which cover the Ryedale Area and Special Qualities Study (including views and open spaces)?	<p>Site has a very low landscape sensitivity to being developed or existing landscape features are retained or enhanced. Site will not detract from landscape character ++</p> <p>Site has a low landscape sensitivity to being developed and some existing landscape features can be retained. Site is unlikely to detract from landscape character +</p> <p>Site has medium landscape sensitivity to being developed and may affect landscape features, however mitigation is possible. Site may detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved –</p> <p>Site has high landscape sensitivity to being developed and will affect landscape features with limited/no means of mitigation. Site will detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved --</p>	<p>(--) This site, which is a linear field, perpendicular to the road, is in the North York Moors and Cleveland Hills National Landscape Character Area, and Linear Scarp Farmland in the local landscape Character type. The land is rising from the Vale, and so the topography is steepening in gradient. The land is to the north of the A170, where the land begins to rise considerably, into the Fringe of the Moors Area of High Landscape Value. It is considered that development of this land would in effect be very visually intrusive by virtue of its scale and positioning on the rising land of the Vale. The topography in combination within the nature of the linear, 'strip field' form of field pattern, means that the development of this site, and the adjacent proposal would be visually intrusive, in particular given the absence of development in this area. The linear field patterns are considered in the landscape character assessment to be an important visual characteristics which should be retained.</p>	<p>(+) On lower ground, in the Vale of Pickering the topography is lower, and as such this site. It is on 'Enclosed Linear Farmland', although the land is gently sloping to the north. It is considered that given the open nature of this area, although not as visually sensitive as other sites, development would be intrusive within the character of this area.</p>	<p>(--) This field straddles two National Character Areas, The Vale of Pickering, and the North York Moors and Cleveland Hills. The land is rising from the Vale, and so the topography is steepening in gradient. It is defined as Linear Scarp Farmland in the local landscape Character type. The land is to the south of the A170, where the land begins to rise considerably. It is considered that development of this land would in effect be very visually intrusive by virtue of its scale and positioning on the rising land of the Vale. The linear field patterns are considered in the landscape character assessment to be an important visual characteristics which should be retained.</p>	<p>(-) This site is adjacent to the village, broadly rectangular, and perpendicular to the road, is in the North York Moors and Cleveland Hills National Landscape Character Area, and Linear Scarp Farmland in the local landscape Character type. The land is rising from the Vale, and so the topography is steepening in gradient. The land is to the immediate south of the A170, where the land begins to rise considerably, into the Fringe of the Moors Area of High Landscape Value. The linear field patterns are considered in the landscape character assessment to be an important visual characteristics which should be retained. This site extent perpetuates the prevailing field patterns. It is adjacent to the existing built extent of Thornton le Dale, and so it is more physically related to the settlement. This is considered to provide a key means of integrating some development on the site, but landscape mitigation will be required, particularly in respect of the trees, and massing of any development.</p>
What impact would the site have on the nationally designated landscapes of the North York Moors National Park and/or Howardian Hills AONB?	<p>Site has a very low landscape sensitivity to being developed or existing landscape features are retained or enhanced. Site will not detract from landscape character ++</p> <p>Site has a low landscape sensitivity to being developed and some existing landscape features can be retained. Site is unlikely to detract from landscape character +</p> <p>Site has medium landscape sensitivity to being developed and may affect landscape features, however mitigation is possible. Site may detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved –</p> <p>Site has high landscape sensitivity to being developed and will affect landscape features with limited/no means of mitigation. Site will detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved --</p>	<p>(--) This site is proximal to the boundary with the National Park, it is considered that by virtue of its nature, in terms of its isolation, scale, and situation on the topographical variations, it is considered that development would be akin to a new settlement, on a visually prominent elevation and it is considered that development in this location would have an adverse impact on the setting and qualities of the National Park.</p>	<p>(--) This site on lower level land, and proximal to the National Park. By virtue of its distance from any settlement, and the open character of this area it is considered that development of the site would have an adverse impact on the setting of the National Park.</p>	<p>(--) This site is proximal to the boundary with the National Park, it is considered that by virtue of its nature, in terms of its isolation, scale, and situation on the topographical variations, it is considered that development would be akin to a new settlement, on a visually prominent elevation and it is considered that development in this location would have an adverse impact on the setting and qualities of the National Park.</p>	<p>(+) This site has a built up frontage, adjacent to both the edge of Thornton le Dale, and is proximal to the National Park. Half of the site is heavily treed, which has provided screening to the former nursing home to the west. There are mixed deciduous and coniferous trees on the eastern boundary which provide a softening edge to the edge of the settlement. It is considered that the site has medium landscape sensitivity, and mitigation will be necessary to ensure that the setting of both the village and the National Park is not compromised.</p>

Thornton le Dale Full Site Assessment

Assessment		594	595	596	662
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 open, with sweeping topography on rising land. Within strongly defined, linear field form. It is considered that the landscape is not able to accommodate development without it having an adverse impact on this area of the Vale of Pickering, but also the Fringe of the Moors Area of High Landscape Value.	(--) the site is not as visually exposed as other sites in this area, and the site is relatively small, compared to other sites, but the site is open, with mature hedges, is a significant distance from the settlement. It is considered that neither the landscape, nor any new landscaping would provide adequate mitigation.	(--) The site is open, with sweeping topography on rising land. Within strongly defined, linear field form. It is considered that the landscape is not able to accommodate development without it having an adverse impact on this area of the Vale of Pickering.	(+) The existing TPO covers a group of densely planted pines. Which create a visually prominent feature. Because the site has the potential to be prominent, due to being edge of settlement, on the eastern entrance to the village, the landscaping of the site, including the retention of trees on the eastern boundary of the site will be important to be retained.
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>	(--) the site is not on the edge of the settlement, but it has the potential to give the impression of coalescence between Thornton le Dale and Wilton, the adjacent settlement to the east of the A170.	(++) but not physically related in any way to the village	(--) the site is not on the edge of the settlement, but it has the potential to give the impression of coalescence between Thornton le Dale and Wilton, the adjacent settlement to the east of the A170.	(+) this site is adjacent to the settlement, but there is a distinct separation between Thornton le Dale and Wilton and this would not be eroded by this site.
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>	(--)	(--)	(--)	(+) subject to landscaping, tree considerations and the scale and design of the development
Culture and Heritage					
Q12 Will the site affect a designated heritage asset, either directly or indirectly through its setting?	<p>Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++</p> <p>Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +</p> <p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –</p> <p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --</p>	(+) The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of a number of SMs, but is not in a discernible distance to the SMs.	(+) The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of a number of SMs, but is not in a discernible distance to the SMs.	(+) The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of a number of SMs, but is not in a discernible distance to the SMs.	(+) The site is within the buffer zone of a series of Listed cottages on High Street, it is not considered that development of this site would have any affect on the setting-the site is a considerable distance from the properties and there is further development which surrounds the Listed properties, and provides a physical and visual screen.

Thornton le Dale Full Site Assessment

Assessment		594	595	596	662
Q13 Will the site affect a non-designated heritage asset which the Council identifies as having a degree of significance that is worthy of consideration?	Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++	(--) it is considered that development of this isolated field which is substantial in scale, would detract from the individual and distinctive identities of Thornton le Dale and Wilton.	(--) It is considered that development of this small but isolated site would not physically alter the appearance of either Thornton le Dale or Wilton, but it is not physically related to any settlement, and would be a isolated sporadic development in the open countryside.	(--) it is considered that development of this isolated field which is substantial in scale, would detract from the individual and distinctive identities of Thornton le Dale and Wilton	Due to the late submission of the site, a response from the County Council's archaeology unit has not been sourced. A response for the site to the north was provided: This is an area with potential for remains and finds of the prehistoric and Roman periods. Aerial photographic evidence indicates prehistoric and/or Roman period track ways and a dyke, as well as finds of prehistoric flints and querns, which suggest prehistoric and later settlement and activity in this area. Advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching to clarify the nature and significance of any archaeological remains. The site currently provides a softening entrance to the village, with trees.
	Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +				
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –				
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --				
D Overall Rating for 'Culture and Heritage'	Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++	(--)	(--)	(--)	(+) Subject to archaeological investigation, and situation with the presence of trees.
	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 proposals have been submitted. The site, subject to feasibility and viability considerations, would be capable of complying with some elements of the Energy Hierarchy.	No proposals have been submitted. The site, subject to feasibility and viability considerations, would be capable of complying with some elements of the Energy Hierarchy.	No proposals have been submitted. The site, subject to feasibility and viability considerations, would be capable of complying with some elements of the Energy Hierarchy.	(++) proposed PV, and will be looking at energy efficiency
	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 schemes available.	No schemes available.	No schemes available.	No schemes 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 schemes available.	No schemes available.	No schemes available.	No schemes 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.	(++)
	Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer unwilling -				

Assessment		594	595	596	662
	Site not capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology --				

Thornton le Dale Full Site Assessment

Assessment		594	595	596	662
Sustainable Building and Waste Reduction					
Q17 Can the site accommodate higher sustainable building standards than currently required?	<p>Site can accommodate 2 levels higher than mandatory limit ++</p> <p>Site can accommodate 1 level higher than mandatory limit -</p> <p>Development cannot accommodate higher standards than mandatory level --</p>	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	(++) proposes to exceed building regulations
Q18 Does the development contain proposals for waste reduction in both its construction and when in operation?	<p>Proposals for waste reduction incorporated into both the construction and operation of the development++</p> <p>Proposals have investigated waste reduction, however only limited measures are achievable -</p> <p>No proposals suggested for waste reduction --</p>	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	(++) based on submissions
Q. 19 Does the development contain individual/communal recycling facilities/ infrastructure?	<p>Yes +</p> <p>No -</p>	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, 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 submitted.	No information submitted.	No information submitted.	(++)
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>	9.34ha of Greenfield	1.4ha of Greenfield	18.83ha of Greenfield	(++)
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.196 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.29 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.378 dwellings. A scheme of this size would need a substantial amount of social infrastructure, this would be reducing the developable area	(+) Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c.21 dwellings. An indicative scheme indicates 26 dwellings.
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>	There is no contaminated land.	There is no contaminated land.	There is no contaminated land.	Evidence provided that the site has low risk of contaminated land.

Thornton le Dale Full Site Assessment

Assessment		594	595	596	662
G Overall Rating for 'Efficient Use of Land'	Site represents very efficient use of land with mitigation to fully overcome concerns where necessary ++	(-)	(+)	(--)	(+) Subject to more detailed proposals
	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 ++	(--) 9.34ha of grade 3. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site contains land which is classified as grade 3 and therefore there is the possibility that development would result in the loss of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land. However, the land area of the site is more than 5ha.	(-) 1.4ha of grade 3. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site contains land which is classified as grade 3 and therefore there is the possibility that development would result in the loss of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land. The land area of the site is less than 5ha.	(--) 18.83ha of grade 3. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site contains land which is classified as grade 3 and therefore there is the possibility that development would result in the loss of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land. However, the land area of the site is more than 5ha.	(++) 2.91ha of grade 3. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site contains land which is classified as grade 3 and therefore there is the possibility that development would result in the loss of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land. However, the land area of the site is less than 5ha. It is also not in agricultural operations: it is a holiday chalet scheme with farm shop. It is heavily treed.
	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 ++?	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)The Joint Minerals and Waste Plan (2016) Publication version shows the Hurrell Lane gas processing plant as a safeguarded ancillary infrastructure site. This is over 1km from the site.
	Site within the buffer of a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone –?				
	Site within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone --				

Assessment		594	595	596	662
<p>Q. 25 Would the development have an adverse impact on a Groundwater Source Protection Zone?</p>	<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>	<p>No response sought from the Environment Agency</p>	<p>No response sought from the Environment Agency</p>	<p>No response sought from the Environment Agency</p>	<p>(++) Due to the late submission of the site, direct Environment Agency response is not available. Below is some of the response submitted for site 109, which is directly to the north, which identifies that "the southern part of the site is underlain by the Ampthill Clay & Kimmeridge Clay formations. North of this is the Hambleton Oolite which is member of the Corallian Group principal aquifer." As such this site being to the south would not be over the aquifer. It is also not within the Source Protection Zone. Overlying the southernmost part of the site there are superficial drift deposits of Till which is generally a clay rich deposit with low permeability. As such the Environment Agency concluded that Development taking place on the southern part of site 109 should not present a risk to groundwater as any pollution would not infiltrate the geological formation to a significant degree. Surface water from the site will need consideration.</p>
<p>Q. 27 Is any part of the development on suspected unstable land?</p>	<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>	<p>No evidence that the land is unstable. On sloping sites, specialist geotechnical advice should be sort detailing requirements for stabilisation and foundation design.</p>	<p>No evidence that the land is unstable.</p>	<p>No evidence that the land is unstable. On sloping sites, specialist geotechnical advice should be sort detailing requirements for stabilisation and foundation design.</p>	<p>(++) No evidence that the land is unstable. On sloping sites, specialist geotechnical advice should be sort detailing requirements for stabilisation and foundation design. A ground survey has been undertaken which raises no concerns and proposes foundation design.</p>

Assessment		594	595	596	662
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"	(++)	(--) HSE standing advice is 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 + The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible - The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --	(+) The sites is distanced from residential properties. There are no adverse uses in close proximity.	(+) The sites is distanced from residential properties. There are no adverse uses in close proximity.	(+) The sites is distanced from residential properties. There are no adverse uses in close proximity.	(+)
Q. 30 Is the development in an area where other factors are likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to generate forms of nuisance which may affect the amenity of existing users? These may include issues such as privacy, lack of sunlight overbearing effects.	The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site + The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible - The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --	(+) The sites is distanced from residential properties. There are no adverse uses in close proximity.	(+) The sites is distanced from residential properties. There are no adverse uses in close proximity.	(+) The sites is distanced from residential properties. There are no adverse uses in close proximity.	(+) No scheme has been submitted which would allow the assessment of potential impacts on residential amenity for both existing and potential occupants, this would be considered at the planning application stage
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 --	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+) Subject to further information

Thornton le Dale Full Site Assessment

Assessment		594	595	596	662
Flood Risk					
Q. 31 Is the site potentially affected by groundwater flooding?	No ++ Yes further investigation required --	(--) Settlement lies within the Zone C of the SFRA potential groundwater and surface water runoff flood risk	(--) Settlement lies within the Zone C of the SFRA potential groundwater and surface water runoff flood risk	(--) Settlement lies within the Zone C of the SFRA potential groundwater and surface water runoff flood risk	(--) Settlement lies within the Zone C of the SFRA potential groundwater and surface water runoff flood risk
Q. 32 Is the site potentially affected by surface water flooding and is this site considered to be within a critical drainage area?	No ++ Yes further investigation required --	(--)Not a critical drainage area. Settlement lies within the Zone C of the SFRA potential groundwater and surface water runoff flood risk. FRA required due to size of site, zone of potential flood risk. Environment Agency requires no increase in the rate of surface water runoff.	(--)Not a critical drainage area. Settlement lies within the Zone C of the SFRA potential groundwater and surface water runoff flood risk. FRA required due to size of site, zone of potential flood risk. Environment Agency requires no increase in the rate of surface water runoff.	(--)Not a critical drainage area. Settlement lies within the Zone C of the SFRA potential groundwater and surface water runoff flood risk. FRA required due to size of site, zone of potential flood risk. Environment Agency requires no increase in the rate of surface water runoff.	(--)Not a critical drainage area. Settlement lies within the Zone C of the SFRA potential groundwater and surface water runoff flood risk. FRA required due to size of site, zone of potential flood risk. Environment Agency requires no increase in the rate of surface water runoff. The site contains some less vulnerable areas of surface water flooding.
Q. 33 Is the site potentially affected by sewer flooding?	No ++ Yes further investigation required --	(++)	(++)	(++)	(--) SFRA highlights reported drainage issue, on land to the west of the site
Q. 34 Have Sustainable Drainage Systems (SDS) been proposed as part of the development?	Site capable of accommodating SDS and have been proposed as part of the development ++ Site capable of accommodating SDS though no information on whether SDS proposed as part of the development + Site capable of accommodating SDS however SDS not being proposed on site – Site not suitable for accommodating SDS –	(--) No scheme has been submitted which shows any Sustainable Drainage System. However, this is a Ground Source Protection Zone 3, which means that the application of Sustainable Drainage Systems would need approval from the Environment Agency.	(+) No scheme has been submitted which shows any Sustainable Drainage System.	(+) No scheme has been submitted which shows any Sustainable Drainage System.	No information has been submitted at this stage which identifies the use of such features, proposal seeks to use underground on site storage.
Q. 36 What other measures have been considered which ensure the development is resilient to climate change?	Multiple additional measures proposed which build in resilience to climate change ++ Single additional measure proposed to build in resilience to climate change + No information provided on measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change - No measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change --	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted at this stage which identifies the use of such features
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 --	(-)	(-)	(-)	(+) FRA required.
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 --	No such uses on this site.	No such uses on this site.	No such uses on this site.	No such uses on this site.

Thornton le Dale Full Site Assessment

Assessment		594	595	596	662
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, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.
Q. 38 Does the design of the development encourage people to walk and cycle rather than travel by car?	<p>Cycleways and footpaths effectively integrated into the development encouraging walking and cycling ++</p> <p>Some cycleways and/or footpaths shown encouraging walking and cycling +</p> <p>No cycleways and footpaths indicated as part of this development --</p>	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	(+) the transport statement indicates a footway connect of suitable width to access existing foot paths
Q. 39 For sites over 1ha or over 80 houses- Has a Travel Plan been produced which assesses alternative options and initiatives?	<p>Travel Plan undertaken and clear implementable initiatives for promoting modal shift set out ++</p> <p>Travel Plan undertaken and some initiatives identified for promoting modal shift +</p> <p>Travel Plan undertaken which identifies limited opportunities for modal shift or Travel Plan not undertaken --</p>	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.
Q. 40 Will the proposed development attract a balanced living and/or working population, reducing inequality of opportunity?	<p>Development proposed is clearly designed to attract a balanced living and/or working community ++</p> <p>Development takes into account the need to attract a balanced and/or working community +</p> <p>Development takes no account of the need to attract a balanced living and/or working community -</p>	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.
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>	No information is submitted at this stage.	No information is submitted at this stage.	No information is submitted at this stage.	No information is submitted at this stage.
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 'Thornton le Dale' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 62 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 6. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 18 dwellings. However, these sites are so distanced from the settlement.	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 'Thornton le Dale' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 62 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 6. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 18 dwellings. However, these sites are so distanced from the settlement.	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 'Thornton le Dale' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 62 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 6. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 18 dwellings. However, these sites are so distanced from the settlement.	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 'Thornton le Dale' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 62 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 6. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 18 dwellings

Thornton le Dale Full Site Assessment

Assessment		594	595	596	662
Q. 42 What level and type of affordable housing is proposed?	Development offers appropriate level and type of affordable housing which meets the needs as set out in the SHMA ++	No specific information. Based on a theoretical yield of 196 units on-site affordable housing provision would be required in accordance with SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy.	No specific information. Based on a theoretical yield of 29 units on-site affordable housing provision would be required in accordance with SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy.	No specific information. Based on a theoretical yield of 387 units on-site affordable housing provision would be required in accordance with SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy.	(+) Based on a theoretical yield of 21 units on-site affordable housing provision would be required in accordance with SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy. The indicative scheme is for 26 dwellings 9 of which are identified as affordable. This is just less than 35% (34.6%)
	Development offers some affordable housing which meets some of the need as set out in the SHMA +				
	Development does not offer the appropriate level and type of affordable housing or does not meet the need for affordable housing as set out in the SHMA -				
	The development makes no provision for affordable housing --				
Q. 43 What provision has been made for Ryedale's elderly population?	Development addresses and meets the needs of Ryedale's elderly population ++	No extra-care units are proposed within the Service Villages, in line with the County Council's delivery strategy for meeting the needs of the Elderly. The site is above the threshold for the delivery of bungalows on site (as per SP4 of the LPS). The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.	No extra-care units are proposed within the Service Villages, in line with the County Council's delivery strategy for meeting the needs of the Elderly. The site is below the threshold for the delivery of bungalows on site (as per SP4 of the LPS). The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.	No extra-care units are proposed within the Service Villages, in line with the County Council's delivery strategy for meeting the needs of the Elderly. The site is above the threshold for the delivery of bungalows on site (as per SP4 of the LPS). The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.	No extra-care units are proposed within the Service Villages, in line with the County Council's delivery strategy for meeting the needs of the Elderly. The site is below the threshold for the delivery of bungalows on site (as per SP4 of the LPS). The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.
	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 ++	(-)	(-)	(-)	(+) site submission provides some indicative information
	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 information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	There is an existing access onto the A170. A transport Statement has been prepared which indicates access for the up to 27 dwellings can be achieved. .
	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 ++				There is an existing access onto the A170. A transport Statement has been prepared which indicates access for the up to 27 dwellings can be achieved.
	Mitigation required but no unacceptable impact following mitigation +				
	Mitigation required and development would have a significant impact though not unacceptable impact after mitigation -				
	Mitigation required and development would still have an unacceptable impact following mitigation --				
Q. 47 Can the site accommodate adequate parking and servicing facilities?	Site meets highway guidelines for parking and servicing ++	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	Information has been submitted.
	Site does not currently meet parking and/or servicing requirements. However these issues can potentially be overcome or mitigated -				

Thornton le Dale Full Site Assessment

Assessment		594	595	596	662
	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)?	<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>	(+) There is a PROWs which is outside the site boundary, but runs to the north of the site. No information has been submitted concerning the development of any PROWs.	(+) There are no PROWs proximal. No information has been submitted concerning the development of any PROWs.	(+) There are no PROWs proximal. No information has been submitted concerning the development of any PROWs.	(+) There are no PROWs proximal. No information has been submitted concerning the development of any 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 submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information has been submitted, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.
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>	(-) 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.	(-)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.	(-)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.	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.

Assessment		594	595	596	662
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 --				
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 ++	No direct impact on an existing community facility	No direct impact on an existing community facility	No direct impact on an existing community facility	No direct impact on 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 an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be fully mitigated ++	(+)	(+)	(-)	(+)
	Site has limited to medium adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be satisfactorily mitigated +				
	Site has medium to high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation -				
	Site has high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation --				
Strong Economy					
Q53. 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	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 --				

Thornton le Dale Full Site Assessment

Assessment		594	595	596	662
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	N/A
	Mix of uses proposed will not diversify the economy but will support existing employment sectors in Ryedale +				
Q.55 (Employment or 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	NA	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 ++	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	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 --				
Stage 3 - Deliverability / Developability					
Q56. How does the site perform against the SHLAA Update (housing), ELR Update (employment) and RRCS (retail) in terms of its ability to come forward and its suitability for development?	Housing: Category 1 (Deliverable)++ Employment: Category I ++	Not considered in the 2009 SHLAA	Not considered in the 2009 SHLAA	Not considered in the 2009 SHLAA	Not considered in the 2009 SHLAA
	Housing: Category 2 (Developable) + Employment: Category II +				
	Housing: Category 3 (Not Currently Developable) -- Employment: Category III -				
Q57. Are there any other legal or physical constraints which may affect the ability of the site to come forward?	No constraints identified ++	Subject to archaeological investigation	(--) (HSE Advise Against Development)	Subject to archaeological investigation	Subject to archaeological investigation
	Constraint(s) identified but resolution possible +				
	Constraint(s) identified but resolution is uncertain --				
Developer Contributions					
Q58 Will the development be capable of meeting the usual range of site-specific s106 requirements?	Normal range of contributions can be achieved ++	(+) Site submitter acknowledges need to meet range of s106 contributions.	(+) Site submitter acknowledges need to meet range of s106 contributions.	(+) Site submitter acknowledges need to meet range of s106 contributions.	(+) Site submitter acknowledges need to meet range of s106 contributions.
	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 ++	(+) Site submitter acknowledges need to meet CIL charging schedule	(+) Site submitter acknowledges need to meet CIL charging schedule	(+) Site submitter acknowledges need to meet CIL charging schedule	No details have been provided.
	No --				
O Overall Deliverability / Developability Rating	Site is able to come forward without impairment and is able to provide a normal range of contributions ++	(+)	(--)	(+)	(+)
	Site has some constraints and / or may not be able to support the full range of developer contributions +				
	Site faces significant constraints and may not be able to support any developer contributions --				