

| Assessment | | 54 | 55 | 105 | 154 | 173 | 252 |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|--|---|
| Stage 1 - Sift | | | Completed | | | | |
| all sites 0.15Ha and above | 0.15 Ha or greater ++ Less than 0.15 Ha -- | (++)0.17ha | | (++)1.93ha | (++) 0.58ha | (++)0.99ha | (++)0.95ha |
| Check for conformity with Local Plan Strategy, Settlement Hierarchy SP1 | Conforms to Local Plan Strategy Spatial Strategy (SP1) ++ Does not meet Local Plan Strategy (Spatial Strategy) SP1 -- | (++) | | (++) | (++) | (++) | (++) |
| Sites which cause significant harm to national/international nature conservation sites (species or habitat) or would involve substantial harm or loss to designated heritage assets will not be considered further. | Will Not cause harm ++ Will cause harm -- | (++) 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 |
| Sites which fall wholly within Flood Zone 3b not considered further for built development. Where sites are partially in Flood Zone 3b, that part of the site will be not be considered further for built development. | Is not within Flood Zone 3b ++ Is within Flood Zone 3b -- | (++) | | (++) | (++) | (++) | (++) |
| Stage 2 - Site Assessment | | | | | | | |
| Q1A How accessible is the site to key services and facilities | Bus stop Local Shop * Nearest Primary School 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 -- Up to 5 minutes walking time ++ Up to 10 minutes walking time + Up to 15 minutes walking time -- 15 minutes walking time and over -- Up to 5 minutes walking time ++ Up to 10 minutes walking time + Up to 15 minutes walking time -- 15 minutes walking time and over -- Up to 5 minutes walking time ++ Up to 10 minutes walking time + Up to 15 minutes walking time -- 15 minutes walking time and over -- | (++) (+)There is no food shop. Within 10 minutes of Ryedale School (++) | (++) (+)There is no food shop. Within 10 minutes of Ryedale School (++) | (++) (+)There is no food shop. Within 10 minutes of Ryedale School (++) There is no food shop. Within 5 minutes of Ryedale School (Secondary) | (++) (++) There is no food shop. Within 5 minutes of Ryedale School (Secondary) | (++) (++) |

| Assessment | | 54 | 55 | 105 | 154 | 173 | 252 |
|--|---|--|----|---|---|---|---|
| Overall accessibility rating | Site has excellent accessibility ++ Site has good accessibility + Site has variable accessibility - Site has poor accessibility -- | (++) | | (++) | (++) | (++) | (++) |
| Q2A What flood zone does the site fall within? | Flood Zone 1++ Flood Zone 2 + Flood zone 3a - | (++) | | (++) | (++) | (++) | (++) |
| Q2B What vulnerability class does the site fall | Flood Zone 1++ Flood Zone 2 Less vulnerable ++ Less vulnerable + More vulnerable + More vulnerable - Highly vulnerable - Highly vulnerable -- | (++) | | (++) | (++) | (++) | (++) |
| Q2D Has a Flood Risk Assessment been | yes ++ No -- | (--) SFRA. FRA not required | | (--) SFRA. FRA required | (--) SFRA. FRA not required | (--) SFRA. FRA required, site is very close to 1ha | (--) SFRA. FRA not required |
| A Overall Flood Risk Assessment | Site has low overall flood risk ++ Site faces significant flood risk issues which can be mitigated + Site faces significant flood risk issues which could potentially be mitigated - Site faces significant flood risk issues and may be inappropriate for development -- | (++) | | (++) | (++) | (++) | (++) |
| 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 ++ 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 -- | (--) The County Highways Authority observed: Access and visibility would be difficult to achieve in this location. | | No observations from the Highways Authority. Access would be available from the A170, and from Station Road. But see comments in respect of 154 | (-) Access is acceptable onto Station Road. Accessibility and footpath links would need to be considered. | (++) Initially submitted it was not clear as to how the site was to be accessed. The site submitter has confirmed that the access is from Beckett Close, and that there is no legal or physical encumbrance to prevent such access. | (++) Initially submitted it was not clear as to how the site was to be accessed. The site submitter has confirmed that the access is from Beckett Close, and that there is no legal or physical encumbrance to prevent such access. |

| Assessment | | 54 | 55 | 105 | 154 | 173 | 252 |
|--|--|--|----|--|--|--|--|
| Biodiversity and Geo-diversity | | | | | | | |
| Q4 Would the development affect a regional or local site of biodiversity (including SINCs, LNRs or RIGS) or affect UK, NYMNPA 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 is no harm to the integrity of the designation. 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 is no harm to the integrity of the designation. 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 is no harm to the integrity of the designation. 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 is no harm to the integrity of the designation. 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 is no harm to the integrity of the designation. 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>No details have been submitted for landscaping, or linking into green infrastructure corridors. There would be an expectation that hedgerows would be retained.</p> | | <p>(--) This site is an open grazed paddock/field, which is fenced and surrounded by trees and dwellings. The field is an important element of green infrastructure in itself. It contributes to the character and setting of Nawton.</p> | <p>(-) This site is the former railway line, with the ability to allow green infrastructure opportunities. The site has a PROW, and currently contains a grouping of holiday lodges.</p> | <p>(-) There is a collection of trees, forming what appears to be the remnants of an orchard to the north eastern part of the site. No details have been provided as to their retention.</p> | <p>(-) There is a collection of trees, forming what appears to be the remnants of an orchard to the north eastern part of the site. No details have been provided as to their retention</p> |

| Assessment | | 54 | 55 | 105 | 154 | 173 | 252 |
|---|--|--|----|---|---|--|--|
| Q6 Would the development impact on protected and unprotected trees, hedgerows and ancient woodland? | <p>Positive impact. Enhancement of feature possible and mitigation not required ++</p> <p>Neutral impact. No effect or effect can be fully mitigated +</p> <p>Adverse impact but mitigation possible –</p> <p>Serious impact with limited or no means of mitigation--</p> | <p>(+) Currently there is a substantial, mature hedge which also contains trees. The established hedgerow should be retained. The existing conifer species on the site are not considered to be appropriate for retention should the site be developed either because they are in the wrong place or because more appropriate species should be preferred. It is therefore recommended that new tree planting should be strategically located in small groups to soften immediate views of the site from the A170.</p> | | <p>(-) Tree and Landscape Officer views: provides a significant sense of openness to the entrance to the village from the east. The boundaries form an attractive feature. In the eastern corner of the field, adjacent to the hedge, stands a mature oak tree which is prominent in the landscape locally. Summary of landscape criteria: Retain a minimum 10-15m wide strip along northern boundary of the site, together with the existing parkland fencing, to retain some sense of openness. Plant a small number of heavy standard trees at wide spacing along the length of the above open strip of land. Retain the western boundary hedge and plant new native hedging along the southern boundary of the site. Form a new native hedge/post along the eastern boundary of the site set some 3-4m in from existing boundary. Retain existing large mature oak to British Standard. At least 5% of plots made large enough to accommodate one forest type tree without hindrance to property owners on maturity. Ensure a good spread of ornamental trees species throughout the development, and a high standard of landscaping.</p> | <p>(-) The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer advises: Retain existing mature trees as a priority where practically possible (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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that layout design considers the retention of existing native hedges. • 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. <p>(-) The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer advises: • Retain existing mature trees along southern and western boundaries 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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide additional screen planting to western boundary incorporating a footpath link between Castle Howard Road and Middlecave Road, and appropriate separation between planting and the backs of new properties. • Provide sufficient plots across the layout (approximately 2-3%) that are large enough to accommodate at least one native forest type tree that can grow to maturity without hindrance to the enjoyment of individual gardens/properties, and or, on areas of open space outside of private gardens. • 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. | <p>(-) The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer advises: • Retain existing mature trees along southern and western boundaries 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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide additional screen planting to western boundary incorporating a footpath link between Castle Howard Road and Middlecave Road, and appropriate separation between planting and the backs of new properties. • Provide sufficient plots across the layout (approximately 2-3%) that are large enough to accommodate at least one native forest type tree that can grow to maturity without hindrance to the enjoyment of individual gardens/properties, and or, on areas of open space outside of private gardens. • 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. | <p>(-) The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer advises: • Retain existing mature trees along southern and western boundaries 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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide additional screen planting to western boundary incorporating a footpath link between Castle Howard Road and Middlecave Road, and appropriate separation between planting and the backs of new properties. • Provide sufficient plots across the layout (approximately 2-3%) that are large enough to accommodate at least one native forest type tree that can grow to maturity without hindrance to the enjoyment of individual gardens/properties, and or, on areas of open space outside of private gardens. • 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. |
| B Overall rating for 'Biodiversity and Geodiversity' | <p>Positive impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements and no mitigation required++</p> <p>Neutral impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements however any effect can be fully mitigated +</p> <p>Adverse impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements by effects are capable of some mitigation –</p> <p>Significant impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements and effects are unable to be satisfactorily mitigated --</p> | (+) | | (-) | (-) | (-) | (-) |

| Assessment | | 54 | 55 | 105 | 154 | 173 | 252 |
|---|---|---|----|---|---|--|--|
| C Special Qualities, Landscape and Setting | | | | | | | |
| Q7 What is the capacity of the landscape to accommodate the site according to the Landscape Character Assessments which cover the Ryedale Area and Special Qualities Study (including views and open spaces)? | <p>Site has a very low landscape sensitivity to being developed or existing landscape features are retained or enhanced. Site will not detract from landscape character ++</p> <p>Site has a low landscape sensitivity to being developed and some existing landscape features can be retained. Site is unlikely to detract from landscape character +</p> <p>Site has medium landscape sensitivity to being developed and may affect landscape features, however mitigation is possible. Site may detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved –</p> <p>Site has high landscape sensitivity to being developed and will affect landscape features with limited/no means of mitigation. Site will detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved --</p> | <p>(-) This is a relatively small site, on sloping ground at the eastern entrance to the village. The site straddles two national character areas, but at this small scale, their defining characteristics are on a bigger scale. The local landscape character is described as 'undulating farmland', the complex topography (linking into other landscape types), which states that it is gently rolling, sometimes sloping relief, with a varied patchwork of farmland, woods and hedgerows. With nucleated villages. It is considered that this is a rural area in character. The development of the site, given the topography may have more of a localised impact, but would be prominent because of the topography. The presence of the hedging will provide some degree of screening. The site is within the designated Area of High Landscape Value, which recognises the visual sensitivities of the land which is to the southern fringe of the Moors.</p> | | <p>(-) In wider landscape terms the site straddles the national character areas, the local landscape type is described as 'undulating farmland', the complex topography (linking into other landscape types), which states that it is gently rolling, sometimes sloping relief, with a varied patchwork of farmland, woods and hedgerows. With nucleated villages. This site is physically separate from the village-proper, and the site is thin and linear (given its historic use), and such it is a feature which is not in keeping with the natural landscape and physiographic features of the area, nor would permanent development be reflecting a nucleated settlement form. It is also at the southernmost extent of the settlement, as the land gently falls away to the lower elevations of the Vale of Pickering. It is considered that permanent development would not within the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development. The site is within the designated Area of High Landscape Value, which recognises the visual sensitivities of the land which is to the southern fringe of the Moors.</p> | <p>(--) Local Landscape Character type is described as undulating farmland, the complex topography (linking into other landscape types), which states that it is gently rolling, sometimes sloping relief, with a varied patchwork of farmland, woods and hedgerows. With nucleated villages. This site is to the south of residential (and commercial) development within a central situation within the village. The site, by virtue of previous development, and the presence of a high, mature hedge, would mean that this site is physically well screened. The topography is flat, and to the south the land undulates and then begins to fall away, gradually, into the Vale of Pickering. The site is within the designated Area of High Landscape Value, which recognises the visual sensitivities of the land which is to the southern fringe of the Moors.</p> | <p>(+) Local Landscape Character type is described as undulating farmland, the complex topography (linking into other landscape types), which states that it is gently rolling, sometimes sloping relief, with a varied patchwork of farmland, woods and hedgerows. With nucleated villages. This site is to the south of residential (and commercial) development within a central situation within the village. The site, by virtue of previous development, and the presence of a high, mature hedge, would mean that this site is physically well screened. The topography is flat, and to the south the land undulates and then begins to fall away, gradually, into the Vale of Pickering. The site is within the designated Area of High Landscape Value, which recognises the visual sensitivities of the land which is to the southern fringe of the Moors.</p> | <p>(+) Local Landscape Character type is described as undulating farmland, the complex topography (linking into other landscape types), which states that it is gently rolling, sometimes sloping relief, with a varied patchwork of farmland, woods and hedgerows. With nucleated villages. This site is to the south of residential (and commercial) development within a central situation within the village. The site, by virtue of previous development, and the presence of a high, mature hedge, would mean that this site is physically well screened. The topography is flat, and to the south the land undulates and then begins to fall away, gradually, into the Vale of Pickering. The site is within the designated Area of High Landscape Value, which recognises the visual sensitivities of the land which is to the southern fringe of the Moors.</p> |
| Q8. 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>(+) Site of a scale unlikely to adversely affect the character and setting of the National Park. However, the site is rural and open, and on the edge of the village, and the paddock/field helps provide an attractive vista into the village, so that the impact would be more localised.</p> | | <p>(+) There is unlikely to be adverse impact on the setting of the National Park, as the site is at some distance from the national park boundary, and the topography in this area is flat. However, the site is in the Fringe of the Moors Area of High Landscape Value, and as such it contributes to the character of the settlement.</p> | <p>(+) There is unlikely to be adverse impact on the setting of the National Park, as the boundary is at some distance from the village. However, the site is in the Fringe of the Moors Area of High Landscape Value, and as such it is considered that the wider landscape setting of the Park could be adversely affected by development of this site as the topography is more undulating and falls away to the lower, flatter area of the Vale of Pickering.</p> | <p>(++) The site is to the south of the existing village, and by virtue of existing development and the topography, in combination with the distance from the National Park, it is not considered that the site would have any impact on the National Park, or its setting.</p> | <p>(++) The site is to the south of the existing village, and by virtue of existing development and the topography, in combination with the distance from the National Park, it is not considered that the site would have any impact on the National Park, or its setting.</p> |

| Assessment | | 54 | 55 | 105 | 154 | 173 | 252 |
|--|---|---|-----------|--|---|--|---|
| Q10 Is the site capable of utilising existing landscape features to minimise its impact or provide adequate landscape mitigation measures? | Site is capable of retaining and enhancing existing landscape features ++ Site is capable of retaining some existing landscape features and limited or no landscape mitigation is required + Site will not retain most existing landscape features, however landscape mitigation is possible – Site will not retain any existing landscape features and limited or no landscape mitigation is possible/proposed – | (-) The mature hedging may offer some limited screening, but the topography is such that development could be visually prominent. | | (-) The site is open, and the topography is flat. It is these qualities which make the site an important element of the character of this part of Nawton. The Council's Tree Officer has advised some landscaping mitigation measures, but it will adversely affect the character of this currently open site, which gives the eastern extent of Nawton its rural qualities. | (--) This site is physically separate from the village-proper, and the site is thin and linear (given its historic use), and such it is a feature which is not in keeping with the natural landscape and physiographic features of the area, and not reflecting a nucleated settlement form. As such it is considered that permanent development would not within the capacity of the landscape to be accommodated. | (+) The established hedging to the south of the site is a strong physical feature, the form of the site is open and flat. It is considered that the landscape in this area is capable of accommodating development without adversely harming the village | (+) The established hedging to the south of the site is a strong physical feature, the form of the site is open and flat. It is considered that the landscape in this area is capable of accommodating development without adversely harming the village. The site submitter has referred to the retention of this. |
| Q11 Will the site lead to the coalescence of settlements which will impact on their character and setting? | Development within the built form of the settlement ++ Development is on the edge of a settlement which is not affected by coalescence with another settlement + Development is on the edge of the settlement and will lead to coalescence with another settlement however mitigation possible – Development is on the edge of the settlement and will lead to significant coalescence with another settlement and limited/no mitigation possible -- | (+) Coalescence with Beadlam has occurred. No proximal settlement to the east. | | (++) it is surrounded on three sides by development, and as such would not cause further coalescence. | (--) It is a site which runs close to Beadlam, but the villages are already merged, however, this site is physically poorly related to Nawton, and would represent a new 'direction' in Nawton's evolution of form and character. | (+) No impact in exacerbating any sense of enclosure and therefore would not contribute to further settlement coalescence. | (+) No impact in exacerbating any sense of enclosure and therefore would not contribute to further settlement coalescence. |
| C Overall Rating for 'Special Qualities, Landscape and Setting' | Positive impact – the proposal will retain and enhance the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement ++ Neutral impact – the proposal will not have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement + Negative impact – the proposal will have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement, however mitigation is possible – Significant impact – the proposal will have a significant adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement and limited or no mitigation is possible -- | (-) | | (-) | (--) | (+) | (+) |

| Assessment | | 54 | 55 | 105 | 154 | 173 | 252 |
|---|--|--|----|--|---|--|--|
| Culture and Heritage | | | | | | | |
| Q12 Will the site affect a designated heritage asset, either directly or indirectly through its setting? | Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++ | (+) The site is within the Conservation Area buffer for Wombleton Conservation Area, and Scheduled Monument Buffer. The SM buffer covers SM 25656 , which is a wayside cross called Stony Cross on the A170. It is not considered that development which is in and around Nawton would harm the setting of this SM. | | (+)The site is within the Conservation Area buffer for Wombleton Conservation Area, and Scheduled Monument Buffer. The SM buffer covers SM 25656 , which is a wayside cross called Stony Cross on the A170. It is not considered that development which is in and around Nawton would harm the setting of this SM. | (+) The site is within the Conservation Area buffer for Wombleton Conservation Area, and Scheduled Monument Buffer. The SM buffer covers SM 25656 , which is a wayside cross called Stony Cross on the A170. It is not considered that development which is in and around Nawton would harm the setting of this SM. | (+) The site is within the Conservation Area buffer for Wombleton Conservation Area, and Scheduled Monument Buffer. The SM buffer covers SM 25656 , which is a wayside cross called Stony Cross on the A170. It is not considered that development which is in and around Nawton would harm the setting of this SM. | (+)The site is within the Conservation Area buffer for Wombleton Conservation Area, and Scheduled Monument Buffer. The SM buffer covers SM 25656 , which is a wayside cross called Stony Cross on the A170. It is not considered that development which is in and around Nawton would harm the setting of this SM. |
| | Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset + | | | | | | |
| | Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible – | | | | | | |
| | Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible -- | | | | | | |
| 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 the site could adversely affect the entrance to the village, and the Development Limits have been drawn around this paddock to exclude it. Development on this sloping paddock, would be visually intrusive. The character and development form of Nawton in this part of the village is open and rural in character. NYCC Heritage Unit advises: Less is known about this area than many of the other villages. However, there is still felt to be potential for the survival of prehistoric and Roman period remains from finds and sites in the wider area, including Beadlam Roman villa to the west and a number of scheduled Bronze Age burial mounds or 'tumuli'. There are also crop marks seen on aerial photographs to the south of Nawton of a track way and enclosures which also suggest a pattern of linear settlement, similar to those seen along the southern edge of the Vale of Pickering. Therefore, would advise a condition to secure a programme of archaeological mitigation recording. | | (-) It is considered that development of this site would harm the character and setting of the village of Nawton, the land is designated a Visually Important Area, and there has been no change to the physical state of the site which would warrant this designation to be lost. It is within the Area of High Landscape Value, and the open field represents a focal point for this part of the village, and contributes to the rural character of the eastern entrance to Nawton. NYCC Heritage Unit advises: Less is known about this area than many of the other villages. However, there is still felt to be potential for the survival of prehistoric and Roman period remains from finds and sites in the wider area, including Beadlam Roman villa to the west and a number of scheduled Bronze Age burial mounds or 'tumuli'. There are also crop marks seen on aerial photographs to the south of Nawton of a track way and enclosures which also suggest a pattern of linear settlement, similar to those seen along the southern edge of the Vale of Pickering. Therefore, would advise a condition to secure a programme of archaeological mitigation recording. | (--) It is considered that development of this site would harm the character and setting of the village of Nawton, it is within the Area of High Landscape Value, and the site is on a prominent location, and it is considered that development of this, physically distanced and linear site, would be contrary to the established nucleated form of Nawton, to the detriment of its character. | (+) The land is subject to the Area of High Landscape designation. However, it is considered that development of this site would not be harmful to the character of the village, because it would be a continuation of nucleated extension of the settlement, and the site is not a visually prominent site, by virtue of the topography and established screening. As such it is considered that the objectives of the Area of High Landscape Value would not be compromised. NYCC Heritage Unit advises: Less is known about this area than many of the other villages. However, there is still felt to be potential for the survival of prehistoric and Roman period remains from finds and sites in the wider area, including Beadlam Roman villa to the west and a number of scheduled Bronze Age burial mounds or 'tumuli'. There are also crop marks seen on aerial photographs to the south of Nawton of a track way and enclosures which also suggest a pattern of linear settlement, similar to those seen along the southern edge of the Vale of Pickering. Therefore, would advise a condition to secure a programme of archaeological mitigation recording. | (+) The land is subject to the Area of High Landscape designation. However, it is considered that development of this site would not be harmful to the character of the village, because it would be a continuation of nucleated extension of the settlement, and the site is not a visually prominent site, by virtue of the topography and established screening. As such it is considered that the objectives of the Area of High Landscape Value would not be compromised. NYCC Heritage Unit advises: Less is known about this area than many of the other villages. However, there is still felt to be potential for the survival of prehistoric and Roman period remains from finds and sites in the wider area, including Beadlam Roman villa to the west and a number of scheduled Bronze Age burial mounds or 'tumuli'. There are also crop marks seen on aerial photographs to the south of Nawton of a track way and enclosures which also suggest a pattern of linear settlement, similar to those seen along the southern edge of the Vale of Pickering. Therefore, would advise a condition to secure a programme of archaeological mitigation recording. |
| | 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 -- | | | | | | |

Beadlam and Nawton Full Site Selection Methodology

| Assessment | | 54 | 55 | 105 | 154 | 173 | 252 |
|---|--|---|----|---|---|--|---|
| D Overall Rating for 'Culture and Heritage' | Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++ | (-)Subject to archaeological investigation | | (--)Subject to archaeological investigation | (--) | (+)Subject to archaeological investigation | (+)Subject to archaeological investigation |
| | Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset + | | | | | | |
| | Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible - | | | | | | |
| | Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible -- | | | | | | |
| Low Carbon Development and Renewable Energy | | | | | | | |
| Q14 Is the site adopting the Energy Hierarchy of the Local Plan Strategy? | Site capable and developer willing ++ | No information has been submitted considering application of the energy hierarchy but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of applying the Hierarchy subject to feasibility and viability. | | No information has been submitted considering application of the energy hierarchy but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of applying the Hierarchy subject to feasibility and viability. | No information has been submitted considering application of the energy hierarchy but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of applying the Hierarchy subject to feasibility and viability. | (-) The site submitter has said that the scheme expected to achieve energy conservation and use of renewable resources expected through 'building design features'. This information was provided prior to the adoption of the Local Plan Strategy. As such there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of applying the Hierarchy subject to feasibility and viability. | No information has been submitted considering application of the energy hierarchy but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of applying the Hierarchy subject to feasibility and viability. |
| | Site capable but developer unwilling - | | | | | | |
| | Site not capable -- | | | | | | |
| Q15 Is the site capable of linking in with off site renewable energy scheme and developer willing to take it forward ++ | Site capable linking in with off site renewable energy scheme and developer willing to take it forward ++ | No such schemes in the area | | No such schemes in the area | No such schemes in the area | No such schemes in the area | No such schemes in the area |
| Q16 Can the site link in to existing heat or power sources available in the District? | Site capable of linking in with existing heat or power source and developer willing to take it forward ++ | No such schemes in the area | | No such schemes in the area | No such schemes in the area | No such schemes in the area | No such schemes in the area |
| E Overall rating for 'Low Carbon Development and Renewable Energy' | Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer willing ++ | No information provided at this stage. | | No information provided at this stage. | No information provided at this stage. | (+) | No information provided at this stage. |
| | Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer unwilling - | | | | | | |
| | Site not capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology -- | | | | | | |
| Sustainable Building and Waste Reduction | | | | | | | |
| Q17 Can the site accommodate higher sustainable building standards than currently required? | Site can accommodate 2 levels higher than mandatory limit ++ | No information has been submitted considering application of higher sustainability standards but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. | | No information has been submitted considering application of higher sustainability standards but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. | No information has been submitted considering application of higher sustainability standards but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. | The site submitter has said that the scheme expected to achieve energy conservation and use of renewable resources expected through 'building design features'. | No information has been submitted considering application of higher sustainability standards but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. |
| | Site can accommodate 1 level higher than mandatory limit - | | | | | | |
| | Development cannot accommodate higher standards than mandatory level -- | | | | | | |

| Assessment | | 54 | 55 | 105 | 154 | 173 | 252 |
|--|--|---|----|--|---|--|---|
| Q18 Does the development contain proposals for waste reduction in both its construction and when in operation? | Proposals for waste reduction incorporated into both the construction and operation of the development++ Proposals have investigated waste reduction, however only limited measures achievable - No proposals suggested for waste reduction -- | No information has been submitted regarding proposals for waste reduction, but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. | | No information has been submitted regarding proposals for waste reduction, but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. | No information has been submitted regarding proposals for waste reduction, but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. | No information has been submitted regarding proposals for waste reduction, but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. | No information has been submitted regarding proposals for waste reduction, but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. |
| Q. 19 Does the development contain individual/communal recycling facilities/infrastructure? | Yes + No -- | No information has been submitted regarding proposals for recycling facilities, but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. | | No information has been submitted regarding proposals for recycling facilities, but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. | No information has been submitted regarding proposals for recycling facilities, but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. | No information has been submitted regarding proposals for recycling facilities, but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. | No information has been submitted regarding proposals for recycling facilities, but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. |
| F Overall Rating for 'Sustainable Building and Waste Minimisation' | Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development and developer willing ++ Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development but developer unwilling - Site not capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development -- | No information provided at this stage. | | No information provided at this stage. | No information provided at this stage. | No information provided at this stage. | No information provided at this stage. |
| Efficient Use of Land | | | | | | | |
| Q.20 Is the site or any part of the site considered previously developed land? | Site is over 50% to 100% Brownfield ++ Site is up to 50% Brownfield + | 0.17ha greenfield. But there are no Brownfield sites suitable and available in the villages. | | 1.93ha of greenfield. But there are no Brownfield sites suitable and available in the villages. | 0.58ha of greenfield. But there are no Brownfield sites suitable and available in the villages. | 0.99ha of greenfield. But there are no Brownfield sites suitable and available in the villages. | 0.95ha greenfield. But there are no Brownfield sites suitable and available in the villages. |
| Q.21 Can the site achieve an appropriate density to achieve the most efficient use of the land? | Excellent density achieved taking into account location and context ++ Appropriate density achieved taking into account location and context + Lower density proposed as site faces some constraints in its development - Lower density necessary as site faces significant constraints in its development -- | Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 3 dwellings. | | Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 40 dwellings. | (--) Yorkshire Water have concerns due to presence of 225mm sewer which would either require relocation or the design would need to factor it in. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 11 dwellings, but with the pipeline this would be reduced. | 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. 20 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. 19 dwellings. The site submission information indicates delivery of 30 dwellings |
| Q.22 Would the development of the site lead to the remediation of contaminated land? | Development is located on land which is likely to be highly contaminated and will be remediated ++ Development is located on land which may be contaminated and will be remediated + Development is located on land which may be contaminated and no proposals for remediation have been put forward - Development is located on land which is likely to be highly contaminated no proposals for remediation have been put forward -- | No evidence that the land is contaminated. | | No evidence that the land is contaminated. | Historical records show that this is the former railway land. | No evidence that the land is contaminated. | No evidence that the land is contaminated. |
| G Overall Rating for 'Efficient Use of Land' | Site represents very efficient use of land with mitigation to fully overcome concerns where necessary ++ Site represents efficient use of land but further mitigation required to fully overcome concerns where necessary + Site does not represent efficient use of land. Further investigation of mitigation measures to overcome concerns required - Site does not represent efficient use of land and mitigation is not possible -- | (+) | | (+) | (+) | (+) | (+) |

| Assessment | | 54 | 55 | 105 | 154 | 173 | 252 |
|---|---|--|----|--|---|--|--|
| 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 ++ Up to 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost – More than 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost -- | (-) 0.17ha of grade 2 land. This is Best and Most Versatile Land, although the site is less than 5ha. The development of this site would result in BMVL, but this is a small paddock site which is not intensively cultivated. | | (-) 1.93ha Grade 2. This is Best and Most Versatile Land, although the site is less than 5ha. The land is grazed. | (-) 0.58ha of grade 3 (part covered by log cabins), and is a linear site, which would be a challenge to cultivate. | (-) 0.99ha of grade 3 land. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. Therefore there is a possibility that its development would result in the loss of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land. The land is not in intensive cultivation. | (-) 0.95ha of grade 3 land. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. Therefore there is a possibility that its development would result in the loss of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land. The land is not in intensive cultivation. |
| 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 -- | (++)The site is not within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search, or Mineral Consultation Zone. | | (++)The site is not within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search, or Mineral Consultation Zone. | (++)The site is not within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search, or Mineral Consultation Zone. | (++)The site is not within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search, or Mineral Consultation Zone. | (++)The site is not within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search, or Mineral Consultation Zone. |
| Q. 25 Would the development have an adverse impact on a Groundwater Source Protection Zone? | Development is not located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone ++ Development is located in a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but mitigation is possible to reduce the risk of groundwater pollution risk + Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but no risk assessment has been undertaken - Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone and mitigation of the risk of groundwater pollution is not possible -- | (-) No response from the Environment Agency was requested, but see comments from sites 173/252. Hydrogeological Risk Assessment would be needed. | | (-) No response from the Environment Agency was requested, but see comments from sites 173/252. Hydrogeological Risk Assessment would be needed. | (-) No response from the Environment Agency was requested, but see comments from sites 173/252. Hydrogeological Risk Assessment would be needed. | (-) The geology of the site is the Upper Calcareous Grit Formation, a member of the Corallian Group principal aquifer. There are no superficial drift deposits over the site. There is a groundwater abstraction whose purpose includes potable use, situated around 1.0km to the north of the site. This abstraction may be vulnerable to any pollution entering the groundwater environment, resulting from activities at the site. Therefore, any development of this site would need to consider measures to reduce the pollution risk to the Corallian aquifer. Hydrogeological Risk Assessment would be needed. | (-) The geology of the site is the Upper Calcareous Grit Formation, a member of the Corallian Group principal aquifer. There are no superficial drift deposits over the site. There is a groundwater abstraction whose purpose includes potable use, situated around 1.0km to the north of the site. This abstraction may be vulnerable to any pollution entering the groundwater environment, resulting from activities at the site. Therefore, any development of this site would need to consider measures to reduce the pollution risk to the Corallian aquifer. Hydrogeological Risk Assessment would be needed. |
| Q. 27 Is any part of the development on suspected unstable land? | Land has no instability concerns ++ 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 -- | No evidence that the land is unstable. On sloping sites, specialist geotechnical advice should be sought 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 sought detailing requirements for stabilisation and foundation design. This is also a former railway line, with previously worked land. | No evidence that the land is unstable. | No evidence that the land is unstable. |
| 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" | (++) | | (++) | (++) | (++) | (++) |

| Assessment | | 54 | 55 | 105 | 154 | 173 | 252 |
|--|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|
| H Overall Rating for 'Natural Resources' | <p>Site would not adversely affect any natural resources ++</p> <p>Site would not have any significant adverse effect on natural resources +</p> <p>Site would have an adverse effect on natural resources but mitigation is possible -</p> <p>Site would have a significant adverse effect on natural resources and limited/no mitigation is possible --</p> | (-) | | (-) | (-) | (-) | (-) |
| Amenity | <p>Q. 29 Is the development in an area where noise, light, dust or smell is likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to generate noise, light or dust which will affect existing users?</p> <p>The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +</p> <p>The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -</p> <p>The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --</p> | (+) The site is not located in close proximity to any activity that will generate noise, light, dust, or any other pollution nuisance. The development would result in houses adjacent to residential properties. | | (+) The site is not located in close proximity to any activity that will generate noise, light, dust, or any other pollution nuisance. The development would result in houses adjacent to residential properties. | (-) There is a carpet warehouse which is adjacent to the site. There may be noise levels above that of a residential area, mitigation could potentially be considered. | (+) The site is not located in close proximity to any activity that will generate noise, light, dust, or any other pollution nuisance. The development would result in houses adjacent to residential properties. | (+) The site is not located in close proximity to any activity that will generate noise, light, dust, or any other pollution nuisance. The development would result in houses adjacent to residential properties. |
| Q. 30 Is the development in an area where other factors are likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to generate forms of nuisance which may affect the amenity of existing users? These may include issues such as privacy, lack of sunlight overbearing effects. | <p>The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +</p> <p>The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -</p> <p>The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --</p> | (+) Issues concerning residential amenity (in terms of privacy/overbearing effects/reduced light) would be considered within the specific context of the site, and mitigated accordingly. | | (+) Issues concerning residential amenity (in terms of privacy/overbearing effects/reduced light) would be considered within the specific context of the site, and mitigated accordingly. | (+) Issues concerning residential amenity (in terms of privacy/overbearing effects/reduced light) would be considered within the specific context of the site, and mitigated accordingly. | (+) Issues concerning residential amenity (in terms of privacy/overbearing effects/reduced light) would be considered within the specific context of the site, and mitigated accordingly. | (+) Issues concerning residential amenity (in terms of privacy/overbearing effects/reduced light) would be considered within the specific context of the site, and mitigated accordingly. |
| I Overall Rating for 'Amenity' | <p>The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +</p> <p>The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -</p> <p>The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of this site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --</p> | (+) | | (+) | (-) | (+) | (+) |

| Assessment | | 54 | 55 | 105 | 154 | 173 | 252 |
|--|--|--|----|---|--|--|--|
| Flood Risk | | | | | | | |
| Q. 31 Is the site potentially affected by groundwater flooding? | No ++ Yes further investigation required -- | (--) Settlement lies in a zone of potential ground water and surface water flood risk Zone C | | (--) Settlement lies in a zone of potential ground water and surface water flood risk Zone C | (--) Settlement lies in a zone of potential ground water and surface water flood risk Zone C | (--) Settlement lies in a zone of potential ground water and surface water flood risk Zone C | (--) Settlement lies in a zone of potential ground water and surface water flood risk Zone C |
| 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 within a critical drainage area, but settlement lies in a zone of potential ground water and surface water flood risk Zone C | | (--) Not within a critical drainage area, but settlement lies in a zone of potential ground water and surface water flood risk Zone C | (--) Not within a critical drainage area, but settlement lies in a zone of potential ground water and surface water flood risk Zone C | (--) Not within a critical drainage area, but settlement lies in a zone of potential ground water and surface water flood risk Zone C | (--) Not within a critical drainage area, but settlement lies in a zone of potential ground water and surface water flood risk Zone C |
| Q. 33 Is the site potentially affected by sewer flooding? | No ++ Yes further investigation required -- | (++) | | (++) | (++) | (++) | (++) |
| Q. 34 Have Sustainable Drainage Systems (SDS) been proposed as part of the development? | Site capable of accommodating SDS and have been proposed as part of the development ++ Site capable of accommodating SDS though no information on whether SDS proposed as part of the development + Site capable of accommodating SDS however SDS not being proposed on site - Site not suitable for accommodating SDS -- | No information has been submitted concerning the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems, but there is reason to suggest that they could not be implemented on the site. | | No information has been submitted concerning the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems, but there is reason to suggest that they could not be implemented on the site. | No information has been submitted concerning the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems, but there is reason to suggest that they could not be implemented on the site. | No information has been submitted concerning the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems, but there is reason to suggest that they could not be implemented on the site. | No information has been submitted concerning the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems, but there is reason to suggest that they could not be implemented on the site. |
| Q. 35 What other measures* have been considered which ensure the development is resilient to climate change? *variable to site | 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 concerning the use of other climate change resilience measures, but there is reason to suggest that they could not be implemented on the site. | | No information has been submitted concerning the use of other climate change resilience measures, but there is reason to suggest that they could not be implemented on the site. | No information has been submitted concerning the use of other climate change resilience measures, but there is reason to suggest that they could not be implemented on the site. | No information has been submitted concerning the use of other climate change resilience measures, but there is reason to suggest that they could not be implemented on the site. | No information has been submitted concerning the use of other climate change resilience measures, but there is reason to suggest that they could not be implemented on the site. |
| 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 -- | There is no such use per see, but the parcel of land contributes to the open and rural character of this part of Newton. | | There is no such use per see, but the site contributes significantly to the rurality of this part of Newton, the grazed field, in combination with the presence of trees gives residents an attractive area around which to walk. | The site does not contribute to the social character and distinctiveness of the settlement. It is adjacent to a PRoW. | The site does not contribute to the social character and distinctiveness of the settlement. It is adjacent to a PRoW. | The site does not contribute to the social character and distinctiveness of the settlement. It is adjacent to a PRoW. |
| 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 concerning the application of Secured by Design principles, were the site to progress, this could be considered with the context of the village. | | No information has been submitted concerning the application of Secured by Design principles, were the site to progress, this could be considered with the context of the village. | No information has been submitted concerning the application of Secured by Design principles, were the site to progress, this could be considered with the context of the village. | No information has been submitted concerning the application of Secured by Design principles, were the site to progress, this could be considered with the context of the village. | No information has been submitted concerning the application of Secured by Design principles, were the site to progress, this could be considered with the context of the village. |
| Q. 38 Does the design of the development encourage people to walk and cycle rather than travel by car? | Cycle ways and footpaths effectively integrated into the development encouraging walking and cycling ++ Some cycle ways and/or footpaths shown encouraging walking and cycling + No cycleways and footpaths indicated as part of this development -- | No information has been submitted concerning measures to promote walking and cycling, although there is no reason to suggest elements could not be incorporated. | | No information has been submitted concerning measures to promote walking and cycling, although there is no reason to suggest elements could not be incorporated. | No information has been submitted concerning measures to promote walking and cycling, although there is no reason to suggest elements could not be incorporated. | No information has been submitted concerning measures to promote walking and cycling, although there is no reason to suggest elements could not be incorporated. | No information has been submitted concerning measures to promote walking and cycling, although there is no reason to suggest elements could not be incorporated. |

Beadlam and Nawton Full Site Selection Methodology

| Assessment | | 54 | 55 | 105 | 154 | 173 | 252 |
|---|--|---|----|---|---|---|--|
| Q. 39 For sites over 1ha or over 80 houses- Has a Travel Plan been produced which assesses alternative options and initiatives? | Travel Plan undertaken and clear implementable initiatives for promoting modal shift set out ++ Travel Plan undertaken and some initiatives identified for promoting modal shift + Travel Plan undertaken which identifies limited opportunities for modal shift or Travel Plan not undertaken -- | Not required | | No Travel Plan has been produced, but there is no reason to suggest that one could not be produced and implemented. | Not required | Not required | Not required |
| Q. 40 Will the proposed development attract a balanced living and/or working community, 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 details have been submitted considering the mix and tenure of the scheme. The site is of a size which would not deliver any affordable housing on-site or as a commuted sum. | | No details have been submitted considering the mix and tenure of the scheme. | No details have been submitted considering the mix and tenure of the scheme. | (+)No details have been submitted considering the mix and tenure of the scheme. The site is of a size which would bring forward provision of on-site affordable homes. The site submitter is investigating housing need requirements. | (+)No details have been submitted considering the mix and tenure of the scheme. The site is of a size which would bring forward provision of on-site affordable homes. The site submitter is investigating housing need requirements. |
| K Overall Rating for 'People' | Development actively planned to encourage the development of sustainable communities ++ Development has taken into account the need to develop sustainable communities + Development has little regard to the need to develop sustainable communities - Development has no regard for the need to develop sustainable communities -- | (-) | | (-) | (-) | (-) | (-) |
| Meeting needs | | | | | | | |
| Q.41 Does the type and mix of development proposed meet the needs identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), Employment Land Review Update 2010 (ELR), Ryedale Retail Capacity Studies (RRCs) and Malton Town Centre Strategy? | Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++ 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 'Helmsley' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 45 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 13. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 20 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 'Helmsley' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 45 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 13. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 20 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 'Helmsley' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 45 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 13. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 20 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 'Helmsley' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 45 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 13. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 20 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 'Helmsley' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 45 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 13. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 20 dwellings. |
| 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 ++ 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 -- | (--) No details have been submitted considering the mix and tenure of the scheme. At 3 units only a commuted sume for affordable housing can be sought as per SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy | | No details have been submitted concerning affordable housing provision. The site has a theoretical yield of 40 dwellings and would be expected to accord with SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy concerning on-site provision of affordable housing | The site submitter has suggested the delivery of a mix of housing, but nothing explicit. The site has a theoretical yield of 11 dwellings and would be expected to accord with SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy concerning on-site provision of affordable housing, but the contribution would be limited. | No details have been submitted concerning affordable housing provision. The site has a theoretical yield of 20 dwellings and would be expected to accord with SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy concerning on-site provision of affordable housing | (+) The site has a theoretical yield of 19 dwellings and would be expected to accord with SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy concerning on-site provision of affordable housing. The site submitter has identified that the 35% affordable housing can be met, stating 11 homes on the site. Although 28 units are counted on the plan- and this is a third more than the council indicated. |

| Assessment | | 54 | 55 | 105 | 154 | 173 | 252 |
|--|--|---|----|---|---|---|---|
| Q. 43 What provision has been made for Ryedale's elderly population? | Development addresses and meets the needs of Ryedale's elderly population ++ 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 -- | No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible. Although the size of the site would not necessitate the requirement for 5% bungalow provision. The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards. | | No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible. Although the size of the site could potentially necessitate the requirement for 5% bungalow provision. The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards. | No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible. Although the size of the site would not necessitate the requirement for 5% bungalow provision. The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards. | No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible. Although the size of the site would not necessitate the requirement for 5% bungalow provision. The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards. | No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible. Although the size of the site would not necessitate the requirement for 5% bungalow provision. The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards. |
| L Overall Rating for 'Meeting Needs' | Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++ Proposal identifies what the needs are and how some needs will be met by the development + Proposal either does not identify what the needs are or how any needs are or how any needs will be met by the development – No assessment is undertaken of what the needs are and whether any needs -- | (--) Due to site size | | (-) | (-) | (-) | (-) |
| Community Facilities, utilities and Infrastructure | | | | | | | |
| Q45 On sites greater than 1ha: Has a Transport Assessment been undertaken | Yes ++ No- transport assessment required -- | Not required | | A transport Assessment has not been provided, although there is no reason to suggest that such an assessment could not be required. | Not required | Not required | Not required |
| Q. 46 Is highway mitigation required as part of the development and what is the impact of the development on the highway network following mitigation? | No mitigation required or no impact on the highway following mitigation ++ 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 -- | (--) The County Highways Authority observed: Access and visibility would be difficult to achieve in this location. | | No observations from the Highways Authority. Access would be available from the A170, and from Station Road. But see comments in respect of 154 | (-) Access is acceptable onto Station Road. Accessibility and footpath links would need to be considered. | (++) Initial submission made no indication of access point. Material has now been submitted which demonstrates legal and physical ability to achieve this has now been resolved. | (++) Initial submission made no indication of access point. Material has now been submitted which demonstrates legal and physical ability to achieve this has now been resolved. |
| Q. 47 Can the site accommodate adequate parking and servicing facilities? | Site meets highway guidelines for parking and servicing ++ Site does not currently meet parking and/or servicing requirements. However these issues can potentially be overcome or mitigated – Site does not meet highway requirements for parking and/or servicing and the issues identified are difficult/not practically possible to overcome -- | No details have been submitted at this stage, although there is no reason to suggest that such facilities could not be provided. | | No details have been submitted at this stage, although there is no reason to suggest that such facilities could not be provided. | No details have been submitted at this stage, although there is no reason to suggest that such facilities could not be provided. | No details have been submitted at this stage, although there is no reason to suggest that such facilities could not be provided. | No details have been submitted at this stage, although there is no reason to suggest that such facilities could not be provided. |
| Q. 48 Will the proposal provide, enable or improve access to public rights of way (PROW)? | Proposal will create new PROW or integrate existing PROW into the development ++ Proposal will not affect a PROW + Proposal would involve the diversion or loss of a PROW -- | (+) There is a PROW close to the site, but physically linking will not be possible- due to field in-between. | | (+) There is no proximal PROW, but there is a public footpath running to the west of the site which links into a PROW. No information has been submitted concerning integration into the PROW. | (+) There is a PROW which runs adjacent to the site, to the immediate north of the site. No information has been submitted concerning integration into the PROW. | (+) There is a PROW which runs adjacent to the site, to the immediate south of the site. No information has been submitted concerning integration into the PROW, but it is considered that there are opportunities to improve linkages to the PROW. | (+) There is a PROW which runs adjacent to the site, to the immediate south of the site. No information has been submitted concerning integration into the PROW, but it is considered that there are opportunities to improve linkages to the PROW. |

| Assessment | | 54 | 55 | 105 | 154 | 173 | 252 |
|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|
| Q. 49 Does the proposal involve new public realm or enhancements to the existing public realm as part of its development? | Proposal will create high quality new public realm or significantly enhance existing public realm as part of its development ++ Proposal will create some new public realm or partially enhance existing public realm as part of its development + Though capable of incorporating new or enhancing existing public realm, the proposal makes no provision for it -- | No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible. | | No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible. This land, although not publicly accessible, makes an important contribution to the character of Nawton, the Council's tree and landscape Officer has stressed the need to retain some of the land to remain open. | No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible. | No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible. | No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible. |
| Q. 50 What is the capacity of existing utilities and infrastructure to cope with impact of the development? | Site has limited or no adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be fully mitigated ++ Site has limited to medium adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be satisfactorily mitigated + Site has medium to high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation – Site has high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation -- | 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 at Ryedale School. 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 at Ryedale School. 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 at Ryedale School. 225mm sewer present, will require either relocation, or site layout will need to reflect site infrastructure. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water. Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer. 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 at Ryedale School. 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 at Ryedale School. 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. |
| 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 -- | (++) There are no Waste Water Treatment Works near the settlement. | | (++) There are no Waste Water Treatment Works near the settlement. | (++) There are no Waste Water Treatment Works near the settlement. | (++) There are no Waste Water Treatment Works near the settlement. | (++) There are no Waste Water Treatment Works near the settlement. |

| Assessment | | 54 | 55 | 105 | 154 | 173 | 252 |
|--|---|--|----|--|--|--|--|
| 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 ++ 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 -- | (++) There are no community facilities on site, or proximal to the site. | | (++) There are no community facilities on site, or proximal to the site. | (++) There are no community facilities on site, or proximal to the site. | (++) There are no community facilities on site, or proximal to the site. | (++) There are no community facilities on site, or proximal to the site. |
| 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. (Town centre uses) 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 ++ 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 -- | NA | | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Q. 54 (Employment) Will the mix of uses proposed by the development assist in diversifying the economy as set out in the ELR? | Mix of uses proposed will diversify the economy as set out in the ELR ++ Mix of uses proposed will not diversify the economy but will support existing employment sectors in Ryedale + | NA | | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Q. 55 (Employment/Retail) Does the proposal involve the creation of net additional or net loss of | 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 |

| Assessment | | 54 | 55 | 105 | 154 | 173 | 252 |
|---------------------------------------|--|----------------|----|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| 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 |

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 - | Not considered in the 2009 SHLAA | | (++) Category 1 Site in 2009 SHLAA | (++) Category 1 Site in 2009 SHLAA | (++) Category 1 Site in 2009 SHLAA. | (++) Category 1 Site in 2009 SHLAA. |
| | No constraints identified ++ Constraint(s) identified but resolution possible + Constraint(s) identified but resolution is uncertain -- | Subject to archaeological investigation | | Subject to archaeological investigation | Subject to archaeological investigation | (+) Subject to archaeological investigation. Access issues have now been resolved. | (+) Subject to archaeological investigation. Access issues have now been resolved. | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| 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 - | Unknown | | Unknown | Unknown | (+) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified. | (++) Viability work undertaken confirms infrastructure costs, CIL payments and policy compliant affordable housing delivery | |
| | No contributions can be achieved -- | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Q. 59 Can the development support the requirements of the CIL charging schedule? | Yes ++ No -- | Unknown | | Unknown | Unknown | (++) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified. | (++) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. Aware of CIL and ability to deliver policy compliant affordable housing | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| 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 -- | No response received | | No response received | No response received | (+) | (++) | |

| Assessment | | 261 | 367 | 522 | 610 | 611 | 13 |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| Stage 1 - Sift | | | | | | | |
| all sites 0.15Ha and above | 0.15 Ha or greater ++ Less than 0.15 Ha -- | (++)0.17ha | (++)6.63ha | (++)0.19ha (with access road) | (++)0.17ha | (++)2ha | (++) 0.16ha |
| Check for conformity with Local Plan Strategy, Settlement Hierarchy SP1 | Conforms to Local Plan Strategy Spatial Strategy (SP1) ++ Does not meet Local Plan Strategy (Spatial Strategy) SP1 -- | (++) | (--) Significant distance from Nawton | (++) | (++) | (--) Significant distance from Nawton | (++) |
| Sites which cause significant harm to national/international nature conservation sites (species or habitat) or would involve substantial harm or loss to designated heritage assets will not be considered further. | Will Not cause harm ++ Will cause harm -- | (++) No harm identified to 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 |
| Sites which fall wholly within Flood Zone 3b not considered further for built development. Where sites are partially in Flood Zone 3b, that part of the site will be not be considered further for built development. | Is not within Flood Zone 3b ++ Is within Flood Zone 3b -- | (++) | (++) | (++) | (++) | (++) | (++) |
| Stage 2 - Site Assessment | | | | | | | |
| Q1A How accessible is the site to key services and facilities | Bus stop Local Shop * Nearest Primary School 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 -- Up to 5 minutes walking time ++ Up to 10 minutes walking time + Up to 15 minutes walking time -- 15 minutes walking time and over -- Up to 5 minutes walking time ++ Up to 10 minutes walking time + Up to 15 minutes walking time -- 15 minutes walking time and over -- Up to 5 minutes walking time ++ Up to 10 minutes walking time + Up to 15 minutes walking time -- 15 minutes walking time and over -- | (++) (+)There is no food shop. Within 10 minutes of Ryedale School (++) | (++) (+)There is no food shop. Within 10 minutes of Ryedale School (++) | (++) (+)There is no food shop. Within 10 minutes of Ryedale School (++) | | |

| Assessment | | 261 | 367 | 522 | 610 | 611 | 13 |
|--|---|--|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Overall accessibility rating | Site has excellent accessibility ++ Site has good accessibility + Site has variable accessibility - Site has poor accessibility -- | (++) | (-) | (++) | (++) | (-) | |
| Q2A What flood zone does the site fall within? | Flood Zone 1++ Flood Zone 2 + Flood zone 3a - | (++) | (++) | (++) | (++) | (++) | (++) |
| Q2B What vulnerability class does the site fall | Flood Zone 1++ Flood Zone 2 Flood Zone 3a Less vulnerable ++ Less vulnerable + More vulnerable + More vulnerable - Highly vulnerable - Highly vulnerable -- | (++) | (++) | (++) | (++) | (++) | (++) |
| Q2D Has a Flood Risk Assessment been | yes ++ No -- | (--) SFRA. FRA not required | (--) SFRA. FRA required | (--) SFRA. FRA not required | (--) SFRA. FRA not required | (--) SFRA. FRA required | (--) SFRA. FRA not required |
| A Overall Flood Risk Assessment | Site has low overall flood risk ++ Site faces significant flood risk issues which can be mitigated + Site faces significant flood risk issues which could potentially be mitigated - Site faces significant flood risk issues and may be inappropriate for development -- | (++) | (++) | (++) | (++) | (++) | (++) |
| 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 ++ 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 -- | (--) The County Highways Authority observed: Access and visibility would be difficult to achieve in this location. | | (--) Initial submission had no access identified. Land submitter had then identified land in their ownership which would provide access onto the A170, and it has been incorporated into the site submission. However, planning permission has been sought and granted on the site which provided the access. 15/00333/FUL. | (--) The County Highways Authority observed: Access and visibility would be difficult to achieve in this location. | No response provided by the County Highways Authority as site is excessive in distance from existing settlement. | (-) Elevation of plot to the north, abutting the A170 is significantly higher than the road, no demonstration of access. Site submitter has said that discussions have been had with the County Highways and that "acceptable access could be achieved in principle". Correspondence from the Highways Authority has identified the substantial, land-heavy, costly and visually significant works that would be required to have an access off the A170 which would then serve two properties that would be to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority. |

| Assessment | | 261 | 367 | 522 | 610 | 611 | 13 |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Biodiversity and Geo-diversity | | | | | | | |
| Q4 Would the development affect a regional or local site of biodiversity (including SINCs, LNRs or RIGS) or affect UK, NYMNPA 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 is no harm to the integrity of the designation. 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 is no harm to the integrity of the designation. 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 is no harm to the integrity of the designation. 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 is no harm to the integrity of the designation. 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 is no harm to the integrity of the designation. 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 is no harm to the integrity of the designation. 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>(+) No details have been submitted for landscaping, or linking into green infrastructure corridors. There would be an expectation that hedgerows would be retained.</p> | <p>(-) Site is physically distanced from any settlement, and as such there is no opportunity to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme</p> | <p>(-) The site is a small field, which is grassed and overgrown and surrounded by trees and residential development. In itself, due to its nature, it forms a green infrastructure network. No details have been submitted concerning landscaping and boundary treatment. There would be an expectation that hedgerows would be retained.</p> | <p>No details have been submitted for landscaping, or linking into green infrastructure corridors. There would be an expectation that hedgerows would be retained.</p> | <p>(-) The site is an isolated field, physically distanced from any settlement, and as such there is no opportunity to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme</p> | <p>No information has been submitted concerning the potential for green infrastructure, although there is no reason to suggest that it could not be incorporated. At present this is a garden, with mature trees in it, so development in the site could prove challenging in terms of the impact on these trees.</p> |

| Assessment | | 261 | 367 | 522 | 610 | 611 | 13 |
|---|--|---|--|--|---|--|--|
| Q6 Would the development impact on protected and unprotected trees, hedgerows and ancient woodland? | <p>Positive impact. Enhancement of feature possible and mitigation not required ++</p> <p>Neutral impact. No effect or effect can be fully mitigated +</p> <p>Adverse impact but mitigation possible –</p> <p>Serious impact with limited or no means of mitigation--</p> | <p>(+) Currently there is a substantial, mature hedge which also contains trees. The established hedgerow should be retained . The existing conifer species on the site are not considered to be appropriate for retention should the site be developed either because they are in the wrong place or because more appropriate species should be preferred. It is therefore recommended that new tree planting should be strategically located in small groups to soften immediate views of the site from the A170.</p> | <p>(-) This site is distanced from the settlement. No details have been provided concerning the impact on trees and hedgerows.</p> | <p>(+) The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer advises: Retain existing trees and hedgerows along the eastern and western boundaries subject to BS 5837:2012 tree survey.</p> | <p>(+) Currently there is a substantial, mature hedge which also contains trees. The established hedgerow should be retained . The existing conifer species on the site are not considered to be appropriate for retention should the site be developed either because they are in the wrong place or because more appropriate species should be preferred. It is therefore recommended that new tree planting should be strategically located in small groups to soften immediate views of the site from the A170.</p> | <p>(-) This site is distanced from the settlement. No details have been provided concerning the impact on trees and hedgerows.</p> | <p>This is a heavily treed area., any development would have the potential to impact on trees. Tree Officer did not survey as site below threshold, and site submitted no longer wishes to progress the sites.</p> |
| B Overall rating for 'Biodiversity and Geodiversity' | <p>Positive impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements and no mitigation required++</p> <p>Neutral impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements however any effect can be fully mitigated +</p> <p>Adverse impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements by effects are capable of some mitigation –</p> <p>Significant impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements and effects are unable to be satisfactorily mitigated --</p> | <p>(+)</p> | <p>(-)</p> | <p>(-)</p> | <p>(+)</p> | <p>(-)</p> | <p>(+)</p> |

| Assessment | | 261 | 367 | 522 | 610 | 611 | 13 |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 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 a relatively small site, on sloping ground at the eastern entrance to the village. The site straddles two national character areas, but at this small scale, their defining characteristics are on too bigger scale. The local landscape character is described as 'undulating farmland', the complex topography (linking into other landscape types), which states that it is gently rolling, sometimes sloping relief, with a varied patchwork of farmland, woods and hedgerows. With nucleated villages. It is considered that this is a rural area in character. The development of the site, given the topography may have more of a localised impact, but would be prominent because of the topography. The presence of the hedging will provide some degree of screening. The site is within the designated Area of High Landscape Value, which recognises the visual sensitivities of the land which is to the southern fringe of the Moors.</p> | <p>(-) The site is physically distanced from any settlement. It's development would not be in accordance with the spatial strategy, and would not be in keeping with the nucleated settlement character. The site is close to the Wombleton Aerodrome, demonstrating that the land is open and flat, making development in this location visually intrusive. The site is within the designated Area of High Landscape Value, which recognises the visual sensitivities of the land which is to the southern fringe of the Moors.</p> | <p>(+) The local landscape character is described as 'undulating farmland', the complex topography (linking into other landscape types), which states that it is gently rolling, sometimes sloping relief, with a varied patchwork of farmland, woods and hedgerows. With nucleated villages. The site is surrounded by development, the land gently rises to the north. The site is an attractive feature within this part of Nawton, and its development would have a localised impact, but the boundary treatment and retention of some trees could ameliorate some impact. The site is within the designated Area of High Landscape Value, which recognises the visual sensitivities of the land which is to the southern fringe of the Moors.</p> | <p>(-) This a relatively small site, on sloping ground at the eastern entrance to the village. The site straddles two national character areas, but at this small scale, their defining characteristics are on too bigger scale. The local landscape character is described as 'undulating farmland', the complex topography (linking into other landscape types), which states that it is gently rolling, sometimes sloping relief, with a varied patchwork of farmland, woods and hedgerows. With nucleated villages. It is considered that this is a rural area in character. The development of the site, given the topography may have more of a localised impact, but would be prominent because of the topography. The presence of the hedging will provide some degree of screening. The site is within the designated Area of High Landscape Value, which recognises the visual sensitivities of the land which is to the southern fringe of the Moors.</p> | <p>(-) The site is physically distanced from any settlement. It's development would not be in accordance with the spatial strategy, and would not be in keeping with the nucleated settlement character. The site is close to the Wombleton Aerodrome, demonstrating that the land is open and flat, making development in this location visually intrusive. The site is within the designated Area of High Landscape Value, which recognises the visual sensitivities of the land which is to the southern fringe of the Moors.</p> | <p>(-) This is a small plot, part of a domestic garden area, below the site allocation threshold. Visibility of the plot is currently limited. However, the ability to provide an access may impact on the impact on this lack of visibility. The site is within the National Character Area of the North York Moors and Cleveland Hills Character area, but the Local Landscape type is split between 'Sloping Wooded Farmland' and Riverside Farmland. The site is adjacent to the A170 (albeit elevated up). Despite its size, it has the potential to be visually intrusive, particularly through the delivery of an access. The retention of the established boundaries would help to assimilated any development on the site from the wider landscape. The site is within the designated Area of High Landscape Value, which recognises the visual sensitivities of the land which is to the southern fringe of the Moors.</p> |
| Q8. 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>(+) Site of a scale unlikely to adversely affect the character and setting of the National Park. However, the site is rural and open, and on the edge of the village, and the paddock/field helps provide an attractive vista into the village.</p> | <p>(+) The site, given its topography is unlikely to adversely affect the setting of the National Park (not notwithstanding the physical distance from established settlements).</p> | <p>(++)The site is enclosed and not visually prominent. It is not considered that this site has any capability to adversely affect the setting of the National Park</p> | <p>(+)Site of a scale unlikely to adversely affect the character and setting of the National Park. However, the site is rural and open, and on the edge of the village, and the paddock/field helps provide an attractive vista into the village.</p> | <p>(+) The site, given its topography is unlikely to adversely affect the setting of the National Park (not notwithstanding the physical distance from established settlements).</p> | <p>(++) It is considered by virtue of its distance from the National Park, in combination with the existing development, the development of this site would not adversely affect the setting of the National Park.</p> |

| Assessment | | 261 | 367 | 522 | 610 | 611 | 13 |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| 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 mature hedging may offer some limited screening, but the topography is such that development could be visually prominent. | (-) The topography is open, with large fields, the development of this site would be visually prominent due to the fact it is not physically related to any settlement. | (-) Existing features, including existing development may reduce the impact, it is considered important that the existing boundary treatments are important to be retained. | (-) The mature hedging may offer some limited screening, but the topography is such that development could be visually prominent. | (-) The topography is open, with large fields, the development of this site would be visually prominent due to the fact it is not physically related to any settlement. | (-) The site could utilise existing landscape features in terms of mitigating any impact from a dwelling, but the access to the dwelling would be visually intrusive. |
| 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> | (+) Coalescence with Beadlam has occurred. No proximal settlement to the east. | (-) Given its distance from settlements it would not in itself contribute to a sense of coalescence. However, development would help to break down the visual separation of the settlements in this area, and harm the established character of nucleated settlements. | (++) within the build extent of Nawton | (+) Coalescence with Beadlam has occurred. No proximal settlement to the east. | (-) Given its distance from settlements it would not in itself contribute to a sense of coalescence. However, development would help to break down the visual separation of the settlements in this area, and harm the established character of nucleated settlements. | (++) Within the built extent of the village |
| C Overall Rating for 'Special Qualities, Landscape and Setting' | <p>Positive impact – the proposal will retain and enhance the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement ++</p> <p>Neutral impact – the proposal will not have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement +</p> <p>Negative impact – the proposal will have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement, however mitigation is possible –</p> <p>Significant impact – the proposal will have a significant adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement and limited or no mitigation is possible --</p> | (-) | (-) | (+) | (-) | (-) | (-) |

| Assessment | | 261 | 367 | 522 | 610 | 611 | 13 |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| Culture and Heritage | | | | | | | |
| Q12 Will the site affect a designated heritage asset, either directly or indirectly through its setting? | Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++ | (+)The site is within the Conservation Area buffer for Wombleton Conservation Area, and Scheduled Monument Buffer. The SM buffer covers SM 25656 , which is a wayside cross called Stony Cross on the A170. It is not considered that development which is in and around Nawton would harm the setting of this SM. | (+)The site is within the Conservation Area buffer for Wombleton Conservation Area, and Scheduled Monument Buffer. The site is some considerable distance from Nawton, and abuts the boundary with Wombleton Parish. It is not physically related to any settlement, and would represent isolated, sporadic development. The SM buffer covers SM 25656 , which is a wayside cross called Stony Cross on the A170. It is not considered that development which is in and around Nawton would harm the setting of this SM. | (+)The site is within the Conservation Area buffer for Wombleton Conservation Area, and Scheduled Monument Buffer. The SM buffer covers SM 25656 , which is a wayside cross called Stony Cross on the A170. It is not considered that development which is in and around Nawton would harm the setting of this SM. | (+)The site is within the Conservation Area buffer for Wombleton Conservation Area, and Scheduled Monument Buffer. The SM buffer covers SM 25656 , which is a wayside cross called Stony Cross on the A170. It is not considered that development which is in and around Nawton would harm the setting of this SM. | (+)The site is within the Conservation Area buffer for Wombleton Conservation Area, and Scheduled Monument Buffer. The site is some considerable distance from Nawton, and abuts the boundary with Wombleton Parish. It is not physically related to any settlement, and would represent isolated, sporadic development. The SM buffer covers SM 25656 , which is a wayside cross called Stony Cross on the A170. It is not considered that development which is a considerable distance from the A170 would harm the setting of the SM. | (+) The site is a considerable distance from the Scheduled Monument 25656, although it is within the SM buffer zone. It is considered that development would not adversely affect the character and setting of the SM |
| | Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset + | | | | | | |
| | Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible – | | | | | | |
| | Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible -- | | | | | | |
| 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 the site could adversely affect the entrance to the village, and the Development Limits have been drawn around this paddock to exclude it. Development on this sloping paddock, would be visually intrusive. The character and development form of Nawton in this part of the village is open and rural in character. NYCC Heritage Unit advises: Less is known about this area than many of the other villages. However, there is still felt to be potential for the survival of prehistoric and Roman period remains from finds and sites in the wider area, including Beadlam Roman villa to the west and a number of scheduled Bronze Age burial mounds or 'tumuli'. There are also crop marks seen on aerial photographs to the south of Nawton of a track way and enclosures which also suggest a pattern of linear settlement, similar to those seen along the southern edge of the Vale of Pickering. Therefore, would advise a condition to secure a programme of archaeological mitigation recording. | (-) It is considered that isolated sporadic development, which has no association with any village would be detrimental to the wider character of the area, which is characterised by nucleated settlements. | (+) is considered that with appropriate landscaping and boundary treatment it is considered that development of the site would not harm the character of Nawton. NYCC Heritage Unit advises: Less is known about this area than many of the other villages. However, there is still felt to be potential for the survival of prehistoric and Roman period remains from finds and sites in the wider area, including Beadlam Roman villa to the west and a number of scheduled Bronze Age burial mounds or 'tumuli'. There are also crop marks seen on aerial photographs to the south of Nawton of a track way and enclosures which also suggest a pattern of linear settlement, similar to those seen along the southern edge of the Vale of Pickering. Therefore, would advise a condition to secure a programme of archaeological mitigation recording. | (-) It is considered that development of the site could adversely affect the entrance to the village, and the Development Limits have been drawn around this paddock to exclude it. Development on this sloping paddock, would be visually intrusive. The character and development form of Nawton in this part of the village is open and rural in character. NYCC Heritage Unit advises: Less is known about this area than many of the other villages. However, there is still felt to be potential for the survival of prehistoric and Roman period remains from finds and sites in the wider area, including Beadlam Roman villa to the west and a number of scheduled Bronze Age burial mounds or 'tumuli'. There are also crop marks seen on aerial photographs to the south of Nawton of a track way and enclosures which also suggest a pattern of linear settlement, similar to those seen along the southern edge of the Vale of Pickering. Therefore, would advise a condition to secure a programme of archaeological mitigation recording. | (-) It is considered that isolated sporadic development, which has no association with any village would be detrimental to the wider character of the area, which is characterised by nucleated settlements. | (-) scale of site would not adversely affect the character and situation of Beadlam, which although not subject to any statutory designation, it is within the Area of High Landscape Value. However, the access to the site could be visually intrusive. |
| | Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset + | | | | | | |
| | Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible – | | | | | | |
| | Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible -- | | | | | | |

| Assessment | | 261 | 367 | 522 | 610 | 611 | 13 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| D Overall Rating for 'Culture and Heritage' | Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++ Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset + Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible - Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible -- | (-)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? | Site capable and developer willing++ Site capable but developer unwilling - Site not capable -- | No information has been submitted considering application of the energy hierarchy but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of applying the Hierarchy subject to feasibility and viability. | No information has been submitted considering application of the energy hierarchy but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of applying the Hierarchy subject to feasibility and viability. | No information has been submitted considering application of the energy hierarchy but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of applying the Hierarchy subject to feasibility and viability. | No information has been submitted considering application of the energy hierarchy but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of applying the Hierarchy subject to feasibility and viability. | No information has been submitted considering application of the energy hierarchy but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of applying the Hierarchy subject to feasibility and viability. | No information has been submitted considering application of the energy hierarchy but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of applying the Hierarchy subject to feasibility and viability. |
| Q15 Is the site capable of linking in or supporting off site renewable energy schemes? | Site capable linking in with off site renewable energy scheme and developer willing to take it forward ++ | No such schemes in the area |
| Q16 Can the site link in to existing heat or power sources available in the District? | Site capable of linking in with existing heat or power source and developer willing to take it forward ++ | No such schemes in the area |
| E Overall rating for 'Low Carbon Development and Renewable Energy' | Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer willing ++ Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer unwilling - Site not capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology -- | No information provided at this stage. |
| Sustainable Building and Waste Reduction | | | | | | | |
| Q17 Can the site accommodate higher sustainable building standards than currently required? | Site can accommodate 2 levels higher than mandatory limit ++ Site can accommodate 1 level higher than mandatory limit - Development cannot accommodate higher standards than mandatory level -- | No information has been submitted considering application of higher sustainability standards but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. | No information has been submitted considering application of higher sustainability standards but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. | No information has been submitted considering application of higher sustainability standards but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. | No information has been submitted considering application of higher sustainability standards but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. | No information has been submitted considering application of higher sustainability standards but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. | No information has been submitted considering application of higher sustainability standards but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. |

| Assessment | | 261 | 367 | 522 | 610 | 611 | 13 |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| Q18 Does the development contain proposals for waste reduction in both its construction and when in operation? | Proposals for waste reduction incorporated into both the construction and operation of the development++ Proposals have investigated waste reduction, however only limited measures achievable - No proposals suggested for waste reduction -- | No information has been submitted regarding proposals for waste reduction, but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. | No information has been submitted regarding proposals for waste reduction, but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. | No information has been submitted regarding proposals for waste reduction, but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. | No information has been submitted regarding proposals for waste reduction, but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. | No information has been submitted regarding proposals for waste reduction, but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. | No information has been submitted regarding proposals for waste reduction, but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. |
| Q. 19 Does the development contain individual/communal recycling facilities/infrastructure? | Yes + No -- | No information has been submitted regarding proposals for recycling facilities, but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. | No information has been submitted regarding proposals for recycling facilities, but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. | No information has been submitted regarding proposals for recycling facilities, but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. | No information has been submitted regarding proposals for recycling facilities, but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. | No information has been submitted regarding proposals for recycling facilities, but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. | No information has been submitted regarding proposals for recycling facilities, but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. |
| F Overall Rating for 'Sustainable Building and Waste Minimisation' | Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development and developer willing ++ Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development but developer unwilling - Site not capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development -- | No information provided at this stage. | No information provided at this stage. | No information provided at this stage. | No information provided at this stage. | No information provided at this stage. | No information provided at this stage. |
| Efficient Use of Land | | | | | | | |
| Q.20 Is the site or any part of the site considered previously developed land? | Site is over 50% to 100% Brownfield ++ Site is up to 50% Brownfield + | 0.17ha of greenfield. But there are no Brownfield sites suitable and available in the villages. | 6.63ha of greenfield. But there are no Brownfield sites suitable and available in the villages. The site is over 5ha in size. | 0.19ha of greenfield. But there are no Brownfield sites suitable and available in the villages. | 0.17ha of greenfield. But there are no Brownfield sites suitable and available in the villages. | 2ha of greenfield. But there are no Brownfield sites suitable and available in the villages. | 0.16ha greenfield land. But there are no Brownfield sites suitable and available in the villages. |
| Q.21 Can the site achieve an appropriate density to achieve the most efficient use of the land? | Excellent density achieved taking into account location and context ++ Appropriate density achieved taking into account location and context + Lower density proposed as site faces some constraints in its development - Lower density necessary as site faces significant constraints in its development -- | Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 3 dwellings. | The information provided identifies the site for residential. It is not adjacent to the settlement. | Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 8 dwellings. | Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 8 dwellings. | The information provided just identifies the site for mixed use. It is not adjacent to the settlement. | 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. 2 dwellings. |
| Q.22 Would the development of the site lead to the remediation of contaminated land? | Development is located on land which is likely to be highly contaminated and will be remediated ++ Development is located on land which may be contaminated and will be remediated + Development is located on land which may be contaminated and no proposals for remediation have been put forward - Development is located on land which is likely to be highly contaminated no proposals for remediation have been put forward -- | No evidence that the land is contaminated. | No evidence that the land is contaminated. | No evidence that the land is contaminated. | No evidence that the land is contaminated. | No evidence that the land is contaminated. | No information |
| G Overall Rating for 'Efficient Use of Land' | Site represents very efficient use of land with mitigation to fully overcome concerns where necessary ++ Site represents efficient use of land but further mitigation required to fully overcome concerns where necessary + Site does not represent efficient use of land. Further investigation of mitigation measures to overcome concerns required - Site does not represent efficient use of land and mitigation is not possible -- | (+) | (+) | (+) | (+) | (+) | (+) |

| Assessment | | 261 | 367 | 522 | 610 | 611 | 13 |
|---|---|--|---|---|--|---|---|
| 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 ++ Up to 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost – More than 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost -- | (-) 0.17ha of grade 2 land. This is Best and Most Versatile Land, although the site is less than 5ha. The development of this site would result in BMVL, but this is a small paddock site which is not intensively cultivated. | (--) 6.63ha of grade 3 land. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. Therefore there is a possibility that its development would result in the loss of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land. The land is within the open countryside, is a very substantial area. The land is cropped. | (-) 0.19ha grade 3 land. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. Therefore there is a possibility that its development would result in the loss of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land. The land is not in intensive cultivation. | (-) 0.17ha of grade 2 land. This is Best and Most Versatile Land, although the site is less than 5ha. The development of this site would result in BMVL, but this is a small paddock site which is not intensively cultivated. | (-) 2ha of grade 3 land. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. Therefore there is a possibility that its development would result in the loss of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land. The land is within the open countryside, is a very substantial area. The land is cropped. | (-) 0.16ha of grade 3 land. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. Therefore there is a possibility that its development would result in the loss of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land. This is a garden area. |
| 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 -- | (++)The site is not within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search, or Mineral Consultation Zone. | (++)The site is not within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search, or Mineral Consultation Zone. | (++)The site is not within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search, or Mineral Consultation Zone. | (++)The site is not within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search, or Mineral Consultation Zone. | (++)The site is not within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search, or Mineral Consultation Zone. | (++)The site is not within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search, or Mineral Consultation Zone. |
| Q. 25 Would the development have an adverse impact on a Groundwater Source Protection Zone? | Development is not located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone ++ Development is located in a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but mitigation is possible to reduce the risk of groundwater pollution risk + Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but no risk assessment has been undertaken - Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone and mitigation of the risk of groundwater pollution is not possible -- | (-) No response from the Environment Agency was requested, but see comments from sites 173/252. Hydrogeological Risk Assessment would be needed. | No response from Environment Agency requested | (-) No response from the Environment Agency was requested, but see comments from sites 173/252. Hydrogeological Risk Assessment would be needed. | (-) No response from the Environment Agency was requested, but see comments from sites 173/252. Hydrogeological Risk Assessment would be needed. | No response from Environment Agency requested | No response from Environment Agency requested. |
| Q. 27 Is any part of the development on suspected unstable land? | Land has no instability concerns ++ 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 -- | 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. | 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. |
| 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" | (++) | (++) | (++) | (++) | (++) | (++) |

| Assessment | | 261 | 367 | 522 | 610 | 611 | 13 |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| H Overall Rating for 'Natural Resources' | <p>Site would not adversely affect any natural resources ++</p> <p>Site would not have any significant adverse effect on natural resources +</p> <p>Site would have an adverse effect on natural resources but mitigation is possible -</p> <p>Site would have a significant adverse effect on natural resources and limited/no mitigation is possible --</p> | (-) | (-) | (-) | (-) | (-) | (-) |
| Amenity | <p>Q. 29 Is the development in an area where noise, light, dust or smell is likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to generate noise, light or dust which will affect existing users?</p> <p>The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +</p> <p>The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -</p> <p>The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --</p> | <p>The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +</p> <p>The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -</p> <p>The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --</p> | <p>(+) The site is not located in close proximity to any activity that will generate noise, light, dust, or any other pollution nuisance. The development would result in houses adjacent to residential properties.</p> | <p>(+) The site is not located in close proximity to any activity that will generate noise, light, dust, or any other pollution nuisance. The development would result in houses adjacent to residential properties.</p> | <p>(+) The site is not located in close proximity to any activity that will generate noise, light, dust, or any other pollution nuisance. The development would result in houses adjacent to residential properties.</p> | <p>(+) The site is not located in close proximity to any activity that will generate noise, light, dust, or any other pollution nuisance. The scheme proposed a mixed use, but the nature of this is not identified.</p> | <p>(+) The site is not located in close proximity to any activity that will generate noise, light, dust, or any other pollution nuisance. The development would result in houses adjacent to residential properties.</p> |
| Q. 30 Is the development in an area where other factors are likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to generate forms of nuisance which may affect the amenity of existing users? These may include issues such as privacy, lack of sunlight overbearing effects. | <p>The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +</p> <p>The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -</p> <p>The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --</p> | <p>(+) Issues concerning residential amenity (in terms of privacy/overbearing effects/reduced light) would be considered within the specific context of the site, and mitigated accordingly.</p> | <p>(+) Issues concerning residential amenity (in terms of privacy/overbearing effects/reduced light) would be considered within the specific context of the site, and mitigated accordingly.</p> | <p>(+) Issues concerning residential amenity (in terms of privacy/overbearing effects/reduced light) would be considered within the specific context of the site, and mitigated accordingly.</p> | <p>(+) Issues concerning residential amenity (in terms of privacy/overbearing effects/reduced light) would be considered within the specific context of the site, and mitigated accordingly.</p> | <p>(+) Issues concerning residential amenity (in terms of privacy/overbearing effects/reduced light) would be considered within the specific context of the site, and mitigated accordingly.</p> | <p>(+) Issues concerning residential amenity (in terms of privacy/overbearing effects/reduced light) would be considered within the specific context of the site, and mitigated accordingly.</p> |
| I Overall Rating for 'Amenity' | <p>The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +</p> <p>The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -</p> <p>The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of this site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --</p> | (+) | (+) | (+) | (+) | (+) | (+) |

| Assessment | | 261 | 367 | 522 | 610 | 611 | 13 |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Flood Risk | | | | | | | |
| Q. 31 Is the site potentially affected by groundwater flooding? | No ++ Yes further investigation required -- | (--) Settlement lies in a zone of potential ground water and surface water flood risk Zone C | (--) Settlement lies in a zone of potential ground water and surface water flood risk Zone C | (--) Settlement lies in a zone of potential ground water and surface water flood risk Zone C | (--) Settlement lies in a zone of potential ground water and surface water flood risk Zone C | (--) Settlement lies in a zone of potential ground water and surface water flood risk Zone C | (--) Settlement lies in a zone of potential ground water and surface water flood risk Zone C |
| 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 within a critical drainage area, but settlement lies in a zone of potential ground water and surface water flood risk Zone C | (--) Not within a critical drainage area, but settlement lies in a zone of potential ground water and surface water flood risk Zone C | (--) Not within a critical drainage area, but settlement lies in a zone of potential ground water and surface water flood risk Zone C | (--) Not within a critical drainage area, but settlement lies in a zone of potential ground water and surface water flood risk Zone C | (--) Not within a critical drainage area, but settlement lies in a zone of potential ground water and surface water flood risk Zone C | (--) Not within a critical drainage area, but settlement lies in a zone of potential ground water and surface water flood risk Zone C |
| Q. 33 Is the site potentially affected by sewer flooding? | No ++ Yes further investigation required -- | (++) | (++) | (++) | (++) | (++) | (++) |
| Q. 34 Have Sustainable Drainage Systems (SDS) been proposed as part of the development? | Site capable of accommodating SDS and have been proposed as part of the development ++ Site capable of accommodating SDS though no information on whether SDS proposed as part of the development + Site capable of accommodating SDS however SDS not being proposed on site - Site not suitable for accommodating SDS -- | No information has been submitted concerning the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems, but there is reason to suggest that they could not be implemented on the site. | No information has been submitted concerning the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems, but there is reason to suggest that they could not be implemented on the site. | No information has been submitted concerning the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems, but there is reason to suggest that they could not be implemented on the site. | No information has been submitted concerning the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems, but there is reason to suggest that they could not be implemented on the site. | No information has been submitted concerning the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems, but there is reason to suggest that they could not be implemented on the site. | No information has been submitted concerning the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems, but there is reason to suggest that they could not be implemented on the site. |
| Q. 35 What other measures* have been considered which ensure the development is resilient to climate change? *variable to site | 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 concerning the use of other climate change resilience measures, but there is reason to suggest that they could not be implemented on the site. | No information has been submitted concerning the use of other climate change resilience measures, but there is reason to suggest that they could not be implemented on the site. | No information has been submitted concerning the use of other climate change resilience measures, but there is reason to suggest that they could not be implemented on the site. | No information has been submitted concerning the use of other climate change resilience measures, but there is reason to suggest that they could not be implemented on the site. | No information has been submitted concerning the use of other climate change resilience measures, but there is reason to suggest that they could not be implemented on the site. | No information has been submitted concerning the use of other climate change resilience measures, but there is reason to suggest that they could not be implemented on the site. |
| 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 -- | There is no such use per see, but the parcel of land contributes to the open and rural character of this part of Nawton. | The site does not contribute to the social character and distinctiveness of the settlement. | The site does not contribute to the social character and distinctiveness of the settlement. | There is no such use per see, but the parcel of land contributes to the open and rural character of this part of Nawton. | The site does not contribute to the social character and distinctiveness of the settlement. | The site does not contribute to the social character and distinctiveness of the settlement. |
| Q. 37 Will the site incorporate the principles of Secured By Design, reducing the potential for crime and discouraging anti-social behaviour? | Yes – SBD principles taken into account or will be taken into account following liaison with North Yorkshire police + No – SBD principles not taken into account - | No information has been submitted concerning the application of Secured by Design principles, were the site to progress, this could be considered with the context of the village. | Isolated development. | No information has been submitted concerning the application of Secured by Design principles, were the site to progress, this could be considered with the context of the village. | No information has been submitted concerning the application of Secured by Design principles, were the site to progress, this could be considered with the context of the village. | Isolated development. | No information has been submitted concerning the application of Secured by Design principles, were the site to progress, this could be considered with the context of the village. |
| Q. 38 Does the design of the development encourage people to walk and cycle rather than travel by car? | Cycle ways and footpaths effectively integrated into the development encouraging walking and cycling ++ Some cycle ways and/or footpaths shown encouraging walking and cycling + No cycleways and footpaths indicated as part of this development -- | No information has been submitted concerning measures to promote walking and cycling, although there is no reason to suggest elements could not be incorporated. | The site is isolated from the village, and as such accessing services and facilities will not be possible in walking distance. | No information has been submitted concerning measures to promote walking and cycling, although there is no reason to suggest elements could not be incorporated. | No information has been submitted concerning measures to promote walking and cycling, although there is no reason to suggest elements could not be incorporated. | The site is isolated from the village, and as such accessing services and facilities will not be possible in walking distance. | No information has been submitted concerning measures to promote walking and cycling, although there is no reason to suggest elements could not be incorporated. |

Beadlam and Nawton Full Site Selection Methodology

| Assessment | | 261 | 367 | 522 | 610 | 611 | 13 |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|--------------|
| Q. 39 For sites over 1ha or over 80 houses- Has a Travel Plan been produced which assesses alternative options and initiatives? | Travel Plan undertaken and clear implementable initiatives for promoting modal shift set out ++ Travel Plan undertaken and some initiatives identified for promoting modal shift + Travel Plan undertaken which identifies limited opportunities for modal shift or Travel Plan not undertaken -- | Not required | A Travel Plan has not been submitted. The site is isolated from the village, and as such accessing services and facilities will not be possible in walking distance, reducing opportunities to promote modal shift. | Not required | Not required | A Travel Plan has not been submitted. The site is isolated from the village, and as such accessing services and facilities will not be possible in walking distance, reducing opportunities to promote modal shift. | Not required |
| Q. 40 Will the proposed development attract a balanced living and/or working community, 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 details have been submitted considering the mix and tenure of the scheme. The site is of a size which would not deliver any affordable housing on-site or as a commuted sum. | No details have been submitted, but it is considered by virtue of its isolation from established settlement, development would not seek to attract a balanced, living/working population, and reducing inequality of opportunity. | (+) No details have been submitted considering the mix and tenure of the scheme. Could deliver pro-rated financial contributions. | (--) No details have been submitted considering the mix and tenure of the scheme. The site is of a size which would not deliver any affordable housing on-site or as a commuted sum. | | |
| K Overall Rating for 'People' | Development actively planned to encourage the development of sustainable communities ++ Development has taken into account the need to develop sustainable communities + Development has little regard to the need to develop sustainable communities - Development has no regard for the need to develop sustainable communities -- | (-) | (-) | (-) | (-) | (-) | (-) |
| Meeting needs | | | | | | | |
| Q.41 Does the type and mix of development proposed meet the needs identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), Employment Land Review Update 2010 (ELR), Ryedale Retail Capacity Studies (R RCS) 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 'Helmsley' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 45 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 13. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 20 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 'Helmsley' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 45 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 13. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 20 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 'Helmsley' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 45 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 13. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 20 dwellings. | | |
| 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 ++ 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 -- | (--) No details have been submitted considering the mix and tenure of the scheme. At 3 units no affordable housing provision (either on site or a commuted sum) can be achieved. | | No details have been submitted concerning affordable housing provision. The site has a theoretical yield of 8 dwellings and would be expected to accord with SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy concerning a commuted sum for affordable housing. | (--) No details have been submitted considering the mix and tenure of the scheme. At 3 units no affordable housing provision (either on site or a commuted sum) can be achieved. | The site proposes residential development in terms of a residential exception site for local needs, and a camp site of over 5 acres. | |

| Assessment | | 261 | 367 | 522 | 610 | 611 | 13 |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| Q. 43 What provision has been made for Ryedale's elderly population? | Development addresses and meets the needs of Ryedale's elderly population ++ 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 -- | No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible. Although the size of the site would not necessitate the requirement for 5% bungalow provision. The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards. | | No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible. Although the size of the site would not necessitate the requirement for 5% bungalow provision. The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards. | No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible. Although the size of the site would not necessitate the requirement for 5% bungalow provision. The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards. | | |
| L Overall Rating for 'Meeting Needs' | Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++ Proposal identifies what the needs are and how some needs will be met by the development + Proposal either does not identify what the needs are or how any needs are or how any needs will be met by the development - No assessment is undertaken of what the needs are and whether any needs -- | (-) | | (--) Due to site size | (--) Due to site size | | |
| Community Facilities, utilities and Infrastructure | | | | | | | |
| Q45 On sites greater than 1ha: Has a Transport Assessment been undertaken | Yes ++ No- transport assessment required -- | Not required | | Not required | Not required | A transport Assessment has not been provided, although there is no reason to suggest that such an assessment could not be 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 ++ 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 -- | (--) The County Highways Authority observed: Access and visibility would be difficult to achieve in this location. | | (++) Initial submission had no access identified. Land submitter has identified land in their ownership which would provide access onto the A170, and it has been incorporated into the site submission. | (--) The County Highways Authority observed: Access and visibility would be difficult to achieve in this location. | | |
| Q. 47 Can the site accommodate adequate parking and servicing facilities? | Site meets highway guidelines for parking and servicing ++ Site does not currently meet parking and/or servicing requirements. However these issues can potentially be overcome or mitigated - Site does not meet highway requirements for parking and/or servicing and the issues identified are difficult/not practically possible to overcome -- | No details have been submitted at this stage, although there is no reason to suggest that such facilities could not be provided. | | No details have been submitted at this stage, although there is no reason to suggest that such facilities could not be provided. | No details have been submitted at this stage, although there is no reason to suggest that such facilities could not be provided. | | |
| Q. 48 Will the proposal provide, enable or improve access to public rights of way (PROW)? | Proposal will create new PROW or integrate existing PROW into the development ++ Proposal will not affect a PROW + Proposal would involve the diversion or loss of a PROW -- | (+) There is a PROW close to the site, but physically linking will not be possible- due to field in-between. | (+) A PROW runs along the northern boundary of the site. It links Wombleton Village, to Gale Lane, which runs northwards to Beadlam. No information has been submitted concerning the PROW. | (+) A PROW runs along the boundary of the eastern extent of the site. No details have been submitted concerning this PROW, and whether there will be integration. | (+) There is a PROW close to the site, but physically linking will not be possible- due to field in-between. | (+) A PROW runs along the northern boundary of the site. It links Wombleton Village, to Gale Lane, which runs northwards to Beadlam. No information has been submitted concerning the PROW. | The site is not proximal to a PROW. No details have been submitted concerning PROW implications. |

Beadlam and Nawton Full Site Selection Methodology

| Assessment | | 261 | 367 | 522 | 610 | 611 | 13 |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Q. 49 Does the proposal involve new public realm or enhancements to the existing public realm as part of its development? | Proposal will create high quality new public realm or significantly enhance existing public realm as part of its development ++ Proposal will create some new public realm or partially enhance existing public realm as part of its development + Though capable of incorporating new or enhancing existing public realm, the proposal makes no provision for it -- | No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible. | No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible. | No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible. | No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible. | No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible. | No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible. |
| Q. 50 What is the capacity of existing utilities and infrastructure to cope with impact of the development? | Site has limited or no adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be fully mitigated ++ Site has limited to medium adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be satisfactorily mitigated + Site has medium to high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation – Site has high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation -- | 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 at Ryedale School. 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 at Ryedale School. 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 at Ryedale School. 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 at Ryedale School. 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 at Ryedale School. 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 at Ryedale School. 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. |
| 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 -- | (++) There are no Waste Water Treatment Works near the settlement. | (++) There are no Waste Water Treatment Works near the settlement. | (++) There are no Waste Water Treatment Works near the settlement. | (++) There are no Waste Water Treatment Works near the settlement. | (++) There are no Waste Water Treatment Works near the settlement. | (++) There are no Waste Water Treatment Works near the settlement. |

| Assessment | | 261 | 367 | 522 | 610 | 611 | 13 |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 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 ++ 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 -- | (++) There are no community facilities on site, or proximal to the site. | (++) There are no community facilities on site, or proximal to the site. | (++) There are no community facilities on site, or proximal to the site. | (++) There are no community facilities on site, or proximal to the site. | (++) There are no community facilities on site, or proximal to the site. | (++) There are no community facilities on site, or proximal to the site. |
| 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. (Town centre uses) 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 ++ 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 -- | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Q. 54 (Employment) Will the mix of uses proposed by the development assist in diversifying the economy as set out in the ELR? | Mix of uses proposed will diversify the economy as set out in the ELR ++ 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/Retail) Does the proposal involve the creation of net additional or net loss of | 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 | No details have been submitted concerning potential jobs created. | NA | NA | NA | NA |

| Assessment | | 261 | 367 | 522 | 610 | 611 | 13 |
|---------------------------------------|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| 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 |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

Stage 3 - Deliverability / Developability

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|----------------------------|---|---|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Q56. How does the site perform against the SHLAA Update (housing), ELR Update (employment) and RRCS (retail) in terms of its ability to come forward and its suitability for development? | Housing: Category 1 (Deliverable)++ | Employment: Category I ++ | Not considered in the 2009 SHLAA | | Not considered in the 2009 SHLAA | Not considered in the 2009 SHLAA | | | | | | |
| | Housing: Category 2 (Developable) + | Employment: Category II + | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Housing: Category 3 (Not Currently Developable) -- | Employment: Category III - | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q57. Are there any other legal or physical constraints which may affect the ability of the site to come forward? | No constraints identified ++ | | Subject to archaeological investigation | Subject to archaeological investigation | (-) Access is no longer achievable or available since planning permission has been granted for a dwelling on the site access | Subject to archaeological investigation | Subject to archaeological investigation (-) former land owner who submitted the site has sold the property and no longer wants to develop the site | | | | | |
| | Constraint(s) identified but resolution possible + | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Constraint(s) identified but resolution is uncertain -- | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Developer Contributions | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q58 Will the development be capable of meeting the usual range of site-specific s106 requirements? | Normal range of contributions can be achieved ++ | | Unknown | (+) Continue to consider 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 | Unknown | | | | | |
| | Some contributions can be achieved + | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Limited contributions can be achieved - | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | No contributions can be achieved -- | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q. 59 Can the development support the requirements of the CIL charging schedule? | Yes ++ | | 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 | Unknown | | | | | |
| | No -- | | | | | | | | | | | |
| O Overall Deliverability / Developability Rating | Site is able to come forward without impairment and is able to provide a normal range of contributions ++ | | No response received | Site fails stage 1 landowner wants site considered further | (-) no access is achievable | No response received | No response received (-) | | | | | |
| | Site has some constraints and / or may not be able to support the full range of developer contributions + | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site faces significant constraints and may not be able to support any developer contributions -- | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Assessment | | 147 | 267 | 481 | 639 |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|
| Stage 1 - Sift | | | | | |
| all sites 0.15Ha and above | 0.15 Ha or greater ++ Less than 0.15 Ha -- | (++)3.14ha | (++)4.82ha | (++)5.17ha | (--)0.01ha |
| Check for conformity with Local Plan Strategy, Settlement Hierarchy SP1 | Conforms to Local Plan Strategy Spatial Strategy (SP1) ++ Does not meet Local Plan Strategy (Spatial Strategy) SP1 -- | (++) | (++) | (++) | (++) |
| Sites which cause significant harm to national/international nature conservation sites (species or habitat) or would involve substantial harm or loss to designated heritage assets will not be considered further. | Will Not cause harm ++ Will cause harm -- | (++) 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 |
| Sites which fall wholly within Flood Zone 3b not considered further for built development. Where sites are partially in Flood Zone 3b, that part of the site will be not be considered further for built development. | Is not within Flood Zone 3b ++ Is within Flood Zone 3b -- | (++) | (++) | (++) | (--) |
| Stage 2 - Site Assessment | | | | | |
| Q1A How accessible is the site to key services and facilities | Bus stop Local Shop * Nearest Primary School 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 -- Up to 5 minutes walking time ++ Up to 10 minutes walking time + Up to 15 minutes walking time -- 15 minutes walking time and over -- Up to 5 minutes walking time ++ Up to 10 minutes walking time + Up to 15 minutes walking time -- 15 minutes walking time and over -- Up to 5 minutes walking time ++ Up to 10 minutes walking time + Up to 15 minutes walking time -- 15 minutes walking time and over -- | (++) (+)There is no food shop. Within 10 minutes of Ryedale School (+) (++) | (++) (+)There is no food shop. Within 10 minutes of Ryedale School (+) (++) | (++) (++) There is no food shop. Within 5 minutes of Ryedale School (Secondary) (+) (++) |

| Assessment | | 147 | 267 | 481 | 639 |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| Overall accessibility rating | Site has excellent accessibility ++ Site has good accessibility + Site has variable accessibility - Site has poor accessibility -- | (+) | (+) | (++) | |
| Q2A What flood zone does the site fall within? | Flood Zone 1++ Flood Zone 2 + Flood zone 3a - | (++) | (++) | (++) | (--) |
| Q2B What vulnerability class does the site fall | Flood Zone 1++ Flood Zone 2 Flood Zone 3a Less vulnerable ++ Less vulnerable + More vulnerable + More vulnerable - Highly vulnerable - Highly vulnerable -- | (++) | (++) | (++) | (--) |
| Q2D Has a Flood Risk Assessment been | yes ++ No -- | (--) SFRA. FRA required | (--) SFRA. FRA required | (--) SFRA. FRA required | (--) SFRA. FRA not required |
| A Overall Flood Risk Assessment | Site has low overall flood risk ++ Site faces significant flood risk issues which can be mitigated + Site faces significant flood risk issues which could potentially be mitigated - Site faces significant flood risk issues and may be inappropriate for development -- | (++) | (++) | (++) | (--) |
| 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 ++ Site has some highways issues identified which can be mitigated subject to further investigation + Site has multiple highways issues which can be mitigated subject to further investigation - Site has multiple highway issues which may be difficult to mitigate unless further investigation demonstrates otherwise -- | (+) County Highways Officer advises: Access acceptable onto High Lane. Improvements may be required to improve High Lane, to extend existing footway and street lighting. Consider this site in conjunction with 267. | (+) County Highways Officer advises: Access acceptable onto High Lane. Improvements may be required to improve High Lane, to extend existing footway and street lighting. Consider this site in conjunction with 147. | (-) Submitter of the site suggested provision of a new access to Ryedale School through the site, and giving an 'improved access' onto the A170. From the existing access point onto the A170 which is within the 30 mph speed restriction. County Highways Officer advises: Access is considered acceptable onto Birklands. Visibility will need to be addressed, trees on the corner may need to be removed. Accessibility criteria can be met. | (-) The site is proximal to the entrance to the school. The County Highways Officer advises: Access acceptable onto Gale Lane. Significant improvements to gale Lane will be required, including widening and the introduction of an acceptable footpath link. |

| Assessment | | 147 | 267 | 481 | 639 |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| Biodiversity and Geo-diversity | | | | | |
| Q4 Would the development affect a regional or local site of biodiversity (including SINCs, LNRs or RIGS) or affect UK, NYMNPA 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 is no harm to the integrity of the designation. 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 is no harm to the integrity of the designation. The site, or surrounding land is not subject to any biodiversity designations. Any protected species, and their habitats would be afforded their statutory protection. A pair of Linnet 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 is no harm to the integrity of the designation. The site, or surrounding land is not subject to any biodiversity designations. Any protected species, and their habitats would be afforded their statutory protection. A pair of Grey Partridges have been seen. A pair of Lapwings were seen in the field to the west. A single territory of Yellowhammer found on western edge. A pair of Linnet 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 is no harm to the integrity of the designation. 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 Tree Sparrows were present.</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>No information has been submitted concerning potential for green infrastructure, although there is no reason to suggest that it could not be incorporated. At present, the site is made up of one field which is grazed.</p> | <p>No information has been submitted concerning potential for green infrastructure, although there is no reason to suggest that it could not be incorporated. At present, the site is made up of one field which is cropped.</p> | <p>No information has been submitted concerning potential for green infrastructure, although there is no reason to suggest that it could not be incorporated. At present, the site is made up of two fields, one cropped, one pasture.</p> | <p>No details have been submitted for landscaping, or linking into green infrastructure corridors. There would be an expectation that hedgerows would be retained.</p> |

| Assessment | | 147 | 267 | 481 | 639 |
|---|--|---|---|--|-----|
| Q6 Would the development impact on protected and unprotected trees, hedgerows and ancient woodland? | <p>Positive impact. Enhancement of feature possible and mitigation not required ++</p> <p>(+) The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer advises: Very prominent parcel of steeply rising agricultural land on the western edge of the village bounded by a low intermittent native hedge along high lane to the south and mature native trees along the meandering eastern boundary which are prominent from the south, this feature reducing in prominence as the land rises to the north west obscuring the lower section of the trees towards the northern point of the site. The north western boundary is currently open providing middle distance open views of the site from the western approach whilst immediate views of the site from the west are screened by a belt of trees which follows the curve in the road (High lane) immediately to the west of the site.</p> <p>It is suggested that any development of this site would be dependent upon the development being set within natural woodland edges planted to break up the prominence of the site.</p> | <p>(+) The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer advises: bounded by a native hedge to the south, western boundary is formed by a low, incomplete native hedge., containing a number of native trees. The northern boundary is a fairly spartan hedge and a sporadic plantation of mature beech in only fair condition. The beech trees are protected under a tree preservation order. Retain existing mature trees along northern and western boundaries (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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that layout design retains existing native hedges along boundaries. • Ensure that the open boundaries are enclosed with new hedges and native trees. • Provide sufficient plots across the layout (approximately 2-3%) that are large enough to accommodate at least one native forest type tree that can grow to maturity without hindrance to the enjoyment of individual gardens/properties, and or, on areas of open space outside of private gardens. • 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. | <p>(+) The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer advises: • Retain existing mature trees along boundaries 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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that layout design retains existing native hedges along boundaries. • Ensure that the open boundaries are enclosed with new hedges and native trees. • Provide sufficient plots across the layout (approximately 2-3%) that are large enough to accommodate at least one native forest type tree that can grow to maturity without hindrance to the enjoyment of individual gardens/properties, and or, on areas of open space outside of private gardens. • 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. | <p>(--) Large, mature trees on the eastern boundary of the site. There retention is unlikely to be possible.</p> | |
| | <p>Neutral impact. No effect or effect can be fully mitigated +</p> | | | | |
| | <p>Adverse impact but mitigation possible –</p> | | | | |
| | <p>Serious impact with limited or no means of mitigation--</p> | | | | |
| B Overall rating for 'Biodiversity and Geodiversity' | <p>Positive impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements and no mitigation required++</p> <p>Neutral impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements however any effect can be fully mitigated +</p> <p>Adverse impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements by effects are capable of some mitigation –</p> <p>Significant impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements and effects are unable to be satisfactorily mitigated --</p> | (+) | (+) | (+) | (-) |

| Assessment | | 147 | 267 | 481 | 639 |
|---|--|--|--|---|---|
| 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>(--) The site is on elevated land, which is sloping downwards to the south. The site is large, and the land is open. It is considered that the site would be visually intrusive. To the north of the A170 at this point, the Local Landscape Character type is "Sloping Wooded Farmland", which includes elevated and sloping limestone plateau, with medium sized, regular and linear shaped arable fields, and that there is strong linearity in the landscape features and form. It is considered that the landscape form is sensitive to accommodating development. The site is within the designated Area of High Landscape Value, which recognises the visual sensitivities of the land which is to the southern fringe of the Moors.</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 on elevated land, which is sloping downwards to the south. The site is large, and the land is open. It is considered that the site would be visually intrusive. To the north of the A170 at this point, the Local Landscape Character type is "Sloping Wooded Farmland", which includes elevated and sloping limestone plateau, with medium sized, regular and linear shaped arable fields, and that there is strong linearity in the landscape features and form. It is considered that the landscape form is sensitive to accommodating development. The site is within the designated Area of High Landscape Value, which recognises the visual sensitivities of the land which is to the southern fringe of the Moors.</p> | <p>(--) The site is on elevated land, which is sloping downwards to the south. The site is large, and the land is open. It is considered that the site would be visually intrusive. To the north of the A170 at this point, the Local Landscape Character type is "Sloping Wooded Farmland", which includes elevated and sloping limestone plateau, with medium sized, regular and linear shaped arable fields, and that there is strong linearity in the landscape features and form. It is considered that the landscape form is sensitive to accommodating development. The site is within the designated Area of High Landscape Value, which recognises the visual sensitivities of the land which is to the southern fringe of the Moors.</p> | <p>(--) The site is on elevated land, which is sloping downwards to the south. The site is large, and the land is open. It is considered that the development of this site would be visually intrusive. To the south of the A170 at this point, the Local Landscape Character type is "Riverside Wooded Farmland", but, this area has characteristics which are more akin to the adjoining LCA "Sloping Wooded Farmland" which includes elevated and sloping limestone plateau, with medium sized, regular and linear shaped arable fields, and that there is strong linearity in the landscape features and form. This field perpetuates that character, and then the landform levels out. It is considered that the landscape impact is as significant here as in the two sites to the north of the A170. The site is within the designated Area of High Landscape Value, which recognises the visual sensitivities of the land which is to the southern fringe of the Moors.</p> | <p>(-) Site between school and existing development, and wider landscape terms unlikely to be visually sensitive, but could represent a change in direction of settlement form and character. The site is within the designated Area of High Landscape Value, which recognises the visual sensitivities of the land which is to the southern fringe of the Moors.</p> |
| Q8. 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>(--) It is considered that although distanced from the National Park boundary, the scale of this site, coupled with the open sloping nature of the site will mean that from distance the site will be very visually prominent and would detract from the setting of the National Park</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>(--) It is considered that although distanced from the National Park boundary, the scale of this site, coupled with the open sloping nature of the site will mean that from distance the site will be very visually prominent and would detract from the setting of the National Park</p> | <p>(--) It is considered that although distanced from the National Park boundary, the scale of this site, coupled with the open sloping nature of the site will mean that from distance the site will be very visually prominent and would detract from the setting of the National Park</p> | <p>(--) It is considered that although distanced from the National Park boundary, the scale of this site, coupled with the open sloping nature of the site will mean that from distance the site will be very visually prominent and would detract from the setting of the National Park</p> | <p>(++) Below site allocation threshold. Site between school and existing development.</p> |

Beadlam and Nawton Full Site Selection Methodology

| Assessment | | 147 | 267 | 481 | 639 |
|--|---|--|--|--|---|
| Q10 Is the site capable of utilising existing landscape features to minimise its impact or provide adequate landscape mitigation measures? | Site is capable of retaining and enhancing existing landscape features ++ Site is capable of retaining some existing landscape features and limited or no landscape mitigation is required + Site will not retain most existing landscape features, however landscape mitigation is possible – Site will not retain any existing landscape features and limited or no landscape mitigation is possible/proposed – | (--) it is the nature of the site which makes it challenging to assimilate development into this landscape. | (--) it is the nature of the site which makes it challenging to assimilate development into this landscape. | (--) it is the nature of the site which makes it challenging to assimilate development into this landscape. | (+) Site between school and existing development. Open paddock with mature trees, it is unlikely that these landscape features can be retained. |
| Q11 Will the site lead to the coalescence of settlements which will impact on their character and setting? | Development within the built form of the settlement ++ Development is on the edge of a settlement which is not affected by coalescence with another settlement + Development is on the edge of the settlement and will lead to coalescence with another settlement however mitigation possible – Development is on the edge of the settlement and will lead to significant coalescence with another settlement and limited/no mitigation possible -- | (+) Beadlam and Newton have become coalesced. This site is to the western extent of Beadlam, and as such would not enhance any sense of coalescence. | (+) Beadlam and Newton have become coalesced. This site is to the western extent of Beadlam, and as such would not enhance any sense of coalescence. | (+) Beadlam and Newton have become coalesced. This site is to the western extent of Beadlam, and as such would not enhance any sense of coalescence. | (+) This site is adjacent to the Beadlam parish boundary, along Gale Lane, which has had some development. It is unlikely that development would enhance coalescence further. |
| C Overall Rating for 'Special Qualities, Landscape and Setting' | Positive impact – the proposal will retain and enhance the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement ++ Neutral impact – the proposal will not have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement + Negative impact – the proposal will have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement, however mitigation is possible – Significant impact – the proposal will have a significant adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement and limited or no mitigation is possible -- | (--) | (--) | (--) | (+) |

| Assessment | | 147 | 267 | 481 | 639 |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| Culture and Heritage | | | | | |
| Q12 Will the site affect a designated heritage asset, either directly or indirectly through its setting? | Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++ Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset + Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible – Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible -- | (+) The site is on the edge of the buffer zone of a trio of Scheduled Monuments, including the Romano-British Villa. | (+) The site is on the edge of the buffer zone of a trio of Scheduled Monuments, including the Romano-British Villa. | (+) The site is a considerable distance from the Scheduled Monument 25656, although it is within the SM buffer zone. It is considered that development would not adversely affect the character and setting of the SM | (+) The site is a considerable distance from the Scheduled Monument 25656, although it is within the SM buffer zone. It is considered that development would not adversely affect the character and setting of the SM |
| 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 ++ 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 -- | (--) It is considered that the scale, situation and landscaping of this site would result in development which was visually prominent, and would harm the character and setting of Beadlam as a result, and this would be harmful to the Fringe of the Moors Area of High Landscape Value, so designated for the visual sensitivities of the land in this part of the District. NYCC Heritage Unit advises: Less is known about this area than many of the other villages. However, there is still felt to be potential for the survival of prehistoric and Roman period remains from finds and sites in the wider area, including Beadlam Roman villa to the west and a number of scheduled Bronze Age burial mounds or 'tumuli'. There are also crop marks seen on aerial photographs to the south of Nawton of a track way and enclosures which also suggest a pattern of linear settlement, similar to those seen along the southern edge of the Vale of Pickering. Therefore, would advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching to clarify the nature and significance of any archaeological remains. | (--) It is considered that the scale, situation and landscaping of this site would result in development which was visually prominent, and would harm the character and setting of Beadlam as a result, and this would be harmful to the Fringe of the Moors Area of High Landscape Value, so designated for the visual sensitivities of the land in this part of the District. NYCC Heritage Unit advises: Less is known about this area than many of the other villages. However, there is still felt to be potential for the survival of prehistoric and Roman period remains from finds and sites in the wider area, including Beadlam Roman villa to the west and a number of scheduled Bronze Age burial mounds or 'tumuli'. There are also crop marks seen on aerial photographs to the south of Nawton of a track way and enclosures which also suggest a pattern of linear settlement, similar to those seen along the southern edge of the Vale of Pickering. Therefore, would advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching to clarify the nature and significance of any archaeological remains. | (--) It is considered that the scale, situation and landscaping of this site would result in development which was visually prominent, and would harm the character and setting of Beadlam as a result, and this would be harmful to the Fringe of the Moors Area of High Landscape Value, so designated for the visual sensitivities of the land in this part of the District. NYCC Heritage Unit advises: Less is known about this area than many of the other villages. However, there is still felt to be potential for the survival of prehistoric and Roman period remains from finds and sites in the wider area, including Beadlam Roman villa to the west and a number of scheduled Bronze Age burial mounds or 'tumuli'. There are also crop marks seen on aerial photographs to the south of Nawton of a track way and enclosures which also suggest a pattern of linear settlement, similar to those seen along the southern edge of the Vale of Pickering. Therefore, would advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching to clarify the nature and significance of any archaeological remains. | (-) Site between school and existing development. Existing landscape features would not assist in assimilation, and it represents the physical break between the settlement and the school. |

| Assessment | | 147 | 267 | 481 | 639 |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| D Overall Rating for 'Culture and Heritage' | Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++ Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset + Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible – Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible -- | (--) 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? | Site capable and developer willing++ Site capable but developer unwilling - Site not capable -- | No information has been submitted considering application of the energy hierarchy but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of applying the Hierarchy subject to feasibility and viability. | No information has been submitted considering application of the energy hierarchy but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of applying the Hierarchy subject to feasibility and viability. | No information has been submitted considering application of the energy hierarchy but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of applying the Hierarchy subject to feasibility and viability. | No information has been submitted considering application of the energy hierarchy but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of applying the Hierarchy subject to feasibility and viability. |
| Q15 Is the site capable of linking in or supporting off site renewable energy schemes? | Site capable linking in with off site renewable energy scheme and developer willing to take it forward ++ | No such schemes in the area | No such schemes in the area | No such schemes in the area | No such schemes in the area |
| Q16 Can the site link in to existing heat or power sources available in the District? | Site capable of linking in with existing heat or power source and developer willing to take it forward ++ | No such schemes in the area | No such schemes in the area | No such schemes in the area | No such schemes in the area |
| E Overall rating for 'Low Carbon Development and Renewable Energy' | Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer willing ++ Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer unwilling - Site not capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology -- | No information provided at this stage. | No information provided at this stage. | No information provided at this stage. | No information provided at this stage. |
| Sustainable Building and Waste Reduction | | | | | |
| Q17 Can the site accommodate higher sustainable building standards than currently required? | Site can accommodate 2 levels higher than mandatory limit ++ Site can accommodate 1 level higher than mandatory limit – Development cannot accommodate higher standards than mandatory level -- | No information has been submitted considering application of higher sustainability standards but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. | No information has been submitted considering application of higher sustainability standards but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. | No information has been submitted considering application of higher sustainability standards but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. | Site submitter states that the resulting properties would be 'energy efficient'. |

| Assessment | | 147 | 267 | 481 | 639 |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| Q18 Does the development contain proposals for waste reduction in both its construction and when in operation? | Proposals for waste reduction incorporated into both the construction and operation of the development++ Proposals have investigated waste reduction, however only limited measures achievable - No proposals suggested for waste reduction -- | No information has been submitted regarding proposals for waste reduction, but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. | No information has been submitted regarding proposals for waste reduction, but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. | No information has been submitted regarding proposals for waste reduction, but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. | No information has been submitted regarding proposals for waste reduction, but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. |
| Q. 19 Does the development contain individual/communal recycling facilities/infrastructure? | Yes + No -- | No information has been submitted regarding proposals for recycling facilities, but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. | No information has been submitted regarding proposals for recycling facilities, but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. | No information has been submitted regarding proposals for recycling facilities, but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. | No information has been submitted regarding proposals for recycling facilities, but there is no reason to suggest that the site would be incapable of achieving this subject to feasibility and viability. |
| F Overall Rating for 'Sustainable Building and Waste Minimisation' | Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development and developer willing ++ Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development but developer unwilling - Site not capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development -- | No information provided at this stage. | No information provided at this stage. | No information provided at this stage. | (+) |
| Efficient Use of Land | | | | | |
| Q.20 Is the site or any part of the site considered previously developed land? | Site is over 50% to 100% Brownfield ++ Site is up to 50% Brownfield + | 3.14ha of greenfield land. But there are no Brownfield sites suitable and available in the villages. | 4.82ha of greenfield land. But there are no Brownfield sites suitable and available in the villages. | 5.17ha of greenfield land. But there are no Brownfield sites suitable and available in the villages. The site is over 5ha in size. | 0.1ha of greenfield land. But there are no Brownfield sites suitable and available in the villages. |
| Q.21 Can the site achieve an appropriate density to achieve the most efficient use of the land? | Excellent density achieved taking into account location and context ++ Appropriate density achieved taking into account location and context + Lower density proposed as site faces some constraints in its development - Lower density necessary as site faces significant constraints in its development -- | 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. 66 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. 100 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. 109 dwellings. | (--) This site has a high flood risk, which covers the whole site. Had there been no consents, assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 2 dwellings. |
| Q.22 Would the development of the site lead to the remediation of contaminated land? | Development is located on land which is likely to be highly contaminated and will be remediated ++ Development is located on land which may be contaminated and will be remediated + Development is located on land which may be contaminated and no proposals for remediation have been put forward - Development is located on land which is likely to be highly contaminated no proposals for remediation have been put forward -- | Unknown filled ground (pond, marsh, stream etc) | No information | Former railway at the southernmost extent of the site | Former railway at the southernmost extent of the site. Medium risk of contamination. |
| G Overall Rating for 'Efficient Use of Land' | Site represents very efficient use of land with mitigation to fully overcome concerns where necessary ++ Site represents efficient use of land but further mitigation required to fully overcome concerns where necessary + Site does not represent efficient use of land. Further investigation of mitigation measures to overcome concerns required - Site does not represent efficient use of land and mitigation is not possible -- | (+) | (+) | (+) | (+) |

| Assessment | | 147 | 267 | 481 | 639 |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| 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 ++ Up to 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost – More than 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost -- | (-) 3.14ha of grade 3 land. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. Therefore there is a possibility that its development would result in the loss of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land. The land is currently grazed. | (-) 4.82ha of grade 3 land. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. Therefore there is a possibility that its development would result in the loss of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land. The land is currently cropped, and is close to being 5ha in size. | (--) 5.17ha of grade 3 land. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. Therefore there is a possibility that its development would result in the loss of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land. The land is cropped. | (-) 0.1ha of grade 3 land. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. Therefore there is a possibility that its development would result in the loss of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land. This is currently land that forms part of a paddock area. |
| 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 -- | (++)The site is not within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search, or Mineral Consultation Zone. | (++)The site is not within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search, or Mineral Consultation Zone. | (++)The site is not within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search, or Mineral Consultation Zone. | (++)The site is not within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search, or Mineral Consultation Zone. |
| Q. 25 Would the development have an adverse impact on a Groundwater Source Protection Zone? | Development is not located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone ++ Development is located in a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but mitigation is possible to reduce the risk of groundwater pollution risk + Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but no risk assessment has been undertaken - Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone and mitigation of the risk of groundwater pollution is not possible -- | No response from Environment Agency requested. But findings on sites 173/252 are noted, Further investigation may be required. | No response from Environment Agency requested. But findings on sites 173/252 are noted, Further investigation may be required. | No response from Environment Agency requested. But findings on sites 173/252 are noted, Further investigation may be required. | No response from Environment Agency requested. |
| Q. 27 Is any part of the development on suspected unstable land? | Land has no instability concerns ++ 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 -- | 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. |
| 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" | (++) | (++) | (++) | (++) |

| Assessment | | 147 | 267 | 481 | 639 |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|
| H Overall Rating for 'Natural Resources' | <p>Site would not adversely affect any natural resources ++</p> <p>Site would not have any significant adverse effect on natural resources +</p> <p>Site would have an adverse effect on natural resources but mitigation is possible –</p> <p>Site would have a significant adverse effect on natural resources and limited/no mitigation is possible --</p> | (-) | (-) | (-) | (-) |
| Amenity | | | | | |
| | <p>Q. 29 Is the development in an area where noise, light, dust or smell is likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to generate noise, light or dust which will affect existing users?</p> <p>The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +</p> <p>The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible –</p> <p>The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --</p> | <p>(+) The site is not located in close proximity to any activity that will generate noise, light, dust, or any other pollution nuisance. The development would result in houses adjacent to a small number of residential properties.</p> | <p>(+) The site is not located in close proximity to any activity that will generate noise, light, dust, or any other pollution nuisance. The development would result in houses adjacent to a small number of residential properties on the eastern boundary of the site.</p> | <p>(+) The site is not located in close proximity to any activity that will generate noise, light, dust, or any other pollution nuisance. The development would result in houses adjacent to a small number of residential properties on the northern boundary of the site.</p> <p>(-) The site is proximal to Ryedale School, one of four secondary schools in the District, there will be, at particular times of the day, increased vehicular movements, including buses.</p> | |
| | <p>Q. 30 Is the development in an area where other factors are likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to generate forms of nuisance which may affect the amenity of existing users? These may include issues such as privacy, lack of sunlight overbearing effects.</p> <p>The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +</p> <p>The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible –</p> <p>The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --</p> | <p>(+) Issues concerning residential amenity (in terms of privacy/overbearing effects/reduced light) would be considered within the specific context of the site, and mitigated accordingly. The development would result in houses adjacent to a small number of residential properties.</p> | <p>(+) Issues concerning residential amenity (in terms of privacy/overbearing effects/reduced light) would be considered within the specific context of the site, and mitigated accordingly. The development would result in houses adjacent to a small number of residential properties.</p> | <p>(+) Issues concerning residential amenity (in terms of privacy/overbearing effects/reduced light) would be considered within the specific context of the site, and mitigated accordingly. The development would result in houses adjacent to a small number of residential properties.</p> | <p>(+) Issues concerning residential amenity (in terms of privacy/overbearing effects/reduced light) would be considered within the specific context of the site, and mitigated accordingly. The development would result in houses adjacent to one residential property.</p> |
| I Overall Rating for 'Amenity' | <p>The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +</p> <p>The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible –</p> <p>The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of this site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --</p> | (+) | (+) | (+) | (-) |

| Assessment | | 147 | 267 | 481 | 639 |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Flood Risk | | | | | |
| Q. 31 Is the site potentially affected by groundwater flooding? | No ++ Yes further investigation required -- | (--) Settlement lies in a zone of potential ground water and surface water flood risk Zone C | (--) Settlement lies in a zone of potential ground water and surface water flood risk Zone C | (--) Settlement lies in a zone of potential ground water and surface water flood risk Zone C | (--) Settlement lies in a zone of potential ground water and surface water flood risk Zone C |
| 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 within a critical drainage area, but settlement lies in a zone of potential ground water and surface water flood risk Zone C | (--) Not within a critical drainage area, but settlement lies in a zone of potential ground water and surface water flood risk Zone C | (--) Not within a critical drainage area, but settlement lies in a zone of potential ground water and surface water flood risk Zone C | (--) Not within a critical drainage area, but settlement lies in a zone of potential ground water and surface water flood risk Zone C |
| Q. 33 Is the site potentially affected by sewer flooding? | No ++ Yes further investigation required -- | (++) | (++) | (++) | (++) |
| Q. 34 Have Sustainable Drainage Systems (SDS) been proposed as part of the development? | Site capable of accommodating SDS and have been proposed as part of the development ++ Site capable of accommodating SDS though no information on whether SDS proposed as part of the development + Site capable of accommodating SDS however SDS not being proposed on site - Site not suitable for accommodating SDS -- | No information has been submitted concerning the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems, but there is reason to suggest that they could not be implemented on the site. | No information has been submitted concerning the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems, but there is reason to suggest that they could not be implemented on the site. | No information has been submitted concerning the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems, but there is reason to suggest that they could not be implemented on the site. | No information has been submitted concerning the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems, but there is reason to suggest that they could not be implemented on the site. |
| Q. 35 What other measures* have been considered which ensure the development is resilient to climate change? *variable to site | 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 concerning the use of other climate change resilience measures, but there is reason to suggest that they could not be implemented on the site. | No information has been submitted concerning the use of other climate change resilience measures, but there is reason to suggest that they could not be implemented on the site. | No information has been submitted concerning the use of other climate change resilience measures, but there is reason to suggest that they could not be implemented on the site. | No information has been submitted concerning the use of other climate change resilience measures, but there is reason to suggest that they could not be implemented on the site. |
| 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 -- | The site does not contribute to the social character and distinctiveness of the settlement. | The site does not contribute to the social character and distinctiveness of the settlement. | The site does not contribute to the social character and distinctiveness of the settlement. | The site does not contribute to the social character and distinctiveness of the settlement. |
| Q. 37 Will the site incorporate the principles of Secured By Design, reducing the potential for crime and discouraging anti-social behaviour? | Yes – SBD principles taken into account or will be taken into account following liaison with North Yorkshire police + No – SBD principles not taken into account - | No information has been submitted concerning the application of Secured by Design principles, were the site to progress, this could be considered with the context of the village. | No information has been submitted concerning the application of Secured by Design principles, were the site to progress, this could be considered with the context of the village. | No information has been submitted concerning the application of Secured by Design principles, were the site to progress, this could be considered with the context of the village. | No information has been submitted concerning the application of Secured by Design principles, were the site to progress, this could be considered with the context of the village. |
| Q. 38 Does the design of the development encourage people to walk and cycle rather than travel by car? | Cycle ways and footpaths effectively integrated into the development encouraging walking and cycling ++ Some cycle ways and/or footpaths shown encouraging walking and cycling + No cycleways and footpaths indicated as part of this development -- | No information has been submitted concerning measures to promote walking and cycling, although there is no reason to suggest elements could not be incorporated. | No information has been submitted concerning measures to promote walking and cycling, although there is no reason to suggest elements could not be incorporated. | No information has been submitted concerning measures to promote walking and cycling, although there is no reason to suggest elements could not be incorporated. | No information has been submitted concerning measures to promote walking and cycling, although there is no reason to suggest elements could not be incorporated. |

| Assessment | | 147 | 267 | 481 | 639 |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| 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 Travel Plan has been produced, but there is no reason to suggest that one could not be produced and implemented. | No Travel Plan has been produced, but there is no reason to suggest that one could not be produced and implemented. | No Travel Plan has been produced, but there is no reason to suggest that one could not be produced and implemented. | |
| 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 details have been submitted considering the mix and tenure of the scheme. The site is of a size which would bring forward provision of on-site affordable homes. The site submitter is investigating housing need requirements. | (+)No details have been submitted considering the mix and tenure of the scheme. The site is of a size which would bring forward provision of on-site affordable homes. The site submitter is investigating housing need requirements. | (+)No details have been submitted considering the mix and tenure of the scheme. The site is of a size which would bring forward provision of on-site affordable homes. The site submitter is investigating housing need requirements. | |
| K Overall Rating for 'People' | Development actively planned to encourage the development of sustainable communities ++ Development has taken into account the need to develop sustainable communities + Development has little regard to the need to develop sustainable communities - Development has no regard for the need to develop sustainable communities -- | (-) | (-) | (-) | (-) |
| Meeting needs | Q.41 Does the type and mix of development proposed meet the needs identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), Employment Land Review Update 2010 (ELR), Ryedale Retail Capacity Studies (RRCs) and Malton Town Centre Strategy? | Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++ 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 'Helmsley' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 45 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 13. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 20 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 'Helmsley' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 45 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 13. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 20 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 'Helmsley' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 45 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 13. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 20 dwellings. |
| 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 ++ 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 -- | No details have been submitted concerning affordable housing provision. The site has a theoretical yield of 66 dwellings and would be expected to accord with SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy concerning on-site provision of affordable housing | No details have been submitted concerning affordable housing provision. The site has a theoretical yield of 100 dwellings and would be expected to accord with SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy concerning on-site provision of affordable housing | No details have been submitted concerning affordable housing provision. The site has a theoretical yield of 109 dwellings and would be expected to accord with SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy concerning on-site provision of affordable housing | |

| Assessment | | 147 | 267 | 481 | 639 |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| Q. 43 What provision has been made for Ryedale's elderly population? | Development addresses and meets the needs of Ryedale's elderly population ++ 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 -- | No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible. Although the size of the site would be likely to necessitate the requirement for 5% bungalow provision. The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards. | No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible. Although the size of the site would be likely to necessitate the requirement for 5% bungalow provision. The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards. | No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible. Although the size of the site would be likely to necessitate the requirement for 5% bungalow provision. The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards. | No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible. Although the size of the site would not necessitate the requirement for 5% bungalow provision. The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards. |
| L Overall Rating for 'Meeting Needs' | Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++ Proposal identifies what the needs are and how some needs will be met by the development + Proposal either does not identify what the needs are or how any needs are or how any needs will be met by the development – No assessment is undertaken of what the needs are and whether any needs -- | (-) | (-) | (-) | (-) |
| Community Facilities, utilities and Infrastructure | | | | | |
| Q45 On sites greater than 1ha: Has a Transport Assessment been undertaken | Yes ++ No- transport assessment required -- | A transport Assessment has not been provided, although there is no reason to suggest that such an assessment could not be required. | A transport Assessment has not been provided, although there is no reason to suggest that such an assessment could not be required. | A transport Assessment has not been provided, although there is no reason to suggest that such an assessment could not be 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 ++ 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 -- | (+) County Highways Officer advises: Access acceptable onto High Lane. Improvements may be required to improve High Lane, to extend existing footway and street lighting. Consider this site in conjunction with 267. | (+) County Highways Officer advises: Access acceptable onto High Lane. Improvements may be required to improve High Lane, to extend existing footway and street lighting. Consider this site in conjunction with 267. | (+) The site submitter has suggested that a new access road could be provided so that traffic to Ryedale School could bypass the centre of the villages. Support for this has been received from Ryedale School's Head teacher. | |
| Q. 47 Can the site accommodate adequate parking and servicing facilities? | Site meets highway guidelines for parking and servicing ++ Site does not currently meet parking and/or servicing requirements. However these issues can potentially be overcome or mitigated – Site does not meet highway requirements for parking and/or servicing and the issues identified are difficult/not practically possible to overcome -- | No details have been submitted at this stage, although there is no reason to suggest that such facilities could not be provided. | No details have been submitted at this stage, although there is no reason to suggest that such facilities could not be provided. | No details have been submitted at this stage, although there is no reason to suggest that such facilities could not be provided. | |
| Q. 48 Will the proposal provide, enable or improve access to public rights of way (PROW)? | Proposal will create new PROW or integrate existing PROW into the development ++ Proposal will not affect a PROW + Proposal would involve the diversion or loss of a PROW -- | The site is not proximal to a PROW. No details have been submitted concerning PROW implications. | The site is not proximal to a PROW. No details have been submitted concerning PROW implications. | The site is not proximal to a PROW. No details have been submitted concerning PROW implications. | The site is adjacent to the PROW which just runs just to the north of the site. The site is also adjacent to Gale Lane. |

| Assessment | | 147 | 267 | 481 | 639 |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Q. 49 Does the proposal involve new public realm or enhancements to the existing public realm as part of its development? | Proposal will create high quality new public realm or significantly enhance existing public realm as part of its development ++ Proposal will create some new public realm or partially enhance existing public realm as part of its development + Though capable of incorporating new or enhancing existing public realm, the proposal makes no provision for it -- | No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible. | No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible. | No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible. | No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible. |
| Q. 50 What is the capacity of existing utilities and infrastructure to cope with impact of the development? | Site has limited or no adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be fully mitigated ++ Site has limited to medium adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be satisfactorily mitigated + Site has medium to high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation – Site has high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation -- | 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 at Ryedale School. 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 at Ryedale School. 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 at Ryedale School. 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 at Ryedale School. 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. |
| 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 -- | (++) There are no Waste Water Treatment Works near the settlement. | (++) There are no Waste Water Treatment Works near the settlement. | (++) There are no Waste Water Treatment Works near the settlement. | (++) There are no Waste Water Treatment Works near the settlement. |

| Assessment | | 147 | 267 | 481 | 639 |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| 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 ++ 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 -- | (++) There are no community facilities on site, or proximal to the site. | (++) There are no community facilities on site, or proximal to the site. | (++) There are no community facilities on site, or proximal to the site. | (++) There are no community facilities on site, or proximal to the site. |
| 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. (Town centre uses) 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 ++ 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 -- | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Q. 54 (Employment) Will the mix of uses proposed by the development assist in diversifying the economy as set out in the ELR? | Mix of uses proposed will diversify the economy as set out in the ELR ++ Mix of uses proposed will not diversify the economy but will support existing employment sectors in Ryedale + | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Q. 55 (Employment/Retail) Does the proposal involve the creation of net additional or net loss of | 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 |

| Assessment | | 147 | 267 | 481 | 639 |
|---------------------------------------|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| 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 |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

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. | (++) Category 1 Site in 2009 SHLAA. | Not considered in the 2009 SHLAA | |
| | No constraints identified ++ Constraint(s) identified but resolution possible + Constraint(s) identified but resolution is uncertain -- | 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 -- | (+) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified. | (+) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified. | (+) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified. | (+) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified. | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Q. 59 Can the development support the requirements of the CIL charging schedule? | Yes ++ No -- | (++) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified. | (++) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified. | (++) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified. | (++) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified. | |
| | | | | | | |
| 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 -- | (+) | (+) | (+) | (-- Is aware that site is below the site size threshold. | |
| | | | | | | |