

Malton and Norton Other Development Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		21	68 (542)	184a	184b	184c	184d	
Stage 1 - Sift		employment only Planning consent granted and site being developed out	542 forms a smaller extent of site 68					
all sites 0.3Ha and above	0.3 Ha or greater ++	(++)6.86	(++) 8.13ha	(++) 14.9ha	(++) 2.3ha	(++) 3.2ha	(++) 2.3ha	
	Less than 0.3 Ha --							
Check for conformity with Local Plan Strategy, Settlement Hierarchy SP1	Conforms to Local Plan Strategy Spatial Strategy (SP1) ++	(++)	(--) Not in or adjacent to the Principal Town	(++)	(--) Not in or adjacent to the Principal Town	(--) Not in or adjacent to the Principal Town	(++)	
	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 ++	(++)		(--) Would involve significant development directly adjacent to the Derwent SAC and would cause substantial harm the setting of St Mary's Priory Church and Site of former Priory SM	(--) Would involve development directly adjacent to the Derwent SAC. May cause harm the setting of St Mary's Priory Church and Site of former Priory SM.	(--) Would involve development directly adjacent to the Derwent SAC	(++) However site directly adjacent to grade 2 listed Quarry House - development would have an impact.	
	Will cause harm --							
Sites which fall wholly within Flood Zone 3b not considered further for built development. Where sites are partially in Flood Zone 3b, that part of the site will be not be considered further for built development.	Is not within Flood Zone 3b ++	(++) Southern tip of site slightly within but not included in part of the site to be developed		(--) Site is substantially within Flood Zone 3b.	(--) Large part of site either in Flood Zone 3b and 3a (iii)	(--) Part of site either in Flood Zone 3b and 3a (iii) and would not allow a developable scheme to take place.	(++) Substantially in Flood Zone 2.	
	Is within Flood Zone 3b --							
Stage 2 - Site Assessment								
Q1A How accessible is the site to key services and facilities	Bus stop	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++					(++)	
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +						
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -						
		15 minutes walking time and over --						
	Railway Station (Malton and Norton)	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++						(--)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +						
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -						
		15 minutes walking time and over --						
	Nearest commercial limit	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	N/A					NA
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +						
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -						
		15 minutes walking time and over --						

Assessment		21	68 (542)	184a	184b	184c	184d	
	Nearest employment area	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++					(++)	
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +						
		Up to 15 minutes walking time –						
		15 minutes walking time and over --						
	Nearest Primary School	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++						NA
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +						
		Up to 15 minutes walking time –						
		15 minutes walking time and over --						
	Nearest Secondary School	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++						NA
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +						
		Up to 15 minutes walking time –						
		15 minutes walking time and over --						
Nearest Development Limit	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++						(++)	
	Up to 10 minutes walking time +							
	Up to 15 minutes walking time –							
	15 minutes walking time and over --							
Nearest Doctors Surgery	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++						NA	
	Up to 10 minutes walking time +							
	Up to 15 minutes walking time –							
	15 minutes walking time and over --							
Hospital (Malton and Norton)	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++						NA	
	Up to 10 minutes walking time +							
	Up to 15 minutes walking time –							
	15 minutes walking time and over --							

Assessment		21	68 (542)	184a	184b	184c	184d
Q1B (Retail) How does the site location relate to the Town Centre in terms of the NPPF Sequential Test?	Town Centre ++						N/A
	Edge of Centre +						
	Out of Centre -						
	Out of Town --						
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 --					
Q2C (Malton and Norton only) which sub-category of flood zone 3a does the site fall within?	Flood Zone 3a (i) defence <1:50						N/A
	Flood Zone 3a (ii) defence 1:100 +						
	Flood zone 3a (iii) defence 1:50 < 1:100 -						
Q2D Has a Flood Risk Assessment been undertaken?	yes ++						(-- SFRA only site would require a FRA due to flood risk)
	No --						
Q2E (Malton/Norton/Old Malton) If within the Rapid Inundation Zone (RIZ), what level of hazard would exist?	Low - 'Caution' +						N/A
	Moderate - 'Danger for some people' -						
	Significant - 'Danger for most people' --						
	Extreme 'Danger for all people' --						
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 (HA) (where appropriate) initial highway assessment?	Site has no highway issues identified ++						(+) NYCC comments awaited. It is considered that a suitable access could be achieved onto Scarborough Road as the is directly adjacent.
	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 -						

Assessment		21	68 (542)	184a	184b	184c	184d
	Site has multiple highway issues which may be difficult to mitigate unless further investigation demonstrates otherwise --						

Assessment		21	68 (542)	184a	184b	184c	184d
Biodiversity and Geo-diversity							
Q4 Would the development affect a regional or local site of biodiversity (including SINC, LNR or RIGS) or affect UK, NYMNP or Ryedale Biodiversity Plan protected species	Enhancement of feature/species possible – mitigation not required ++						(-) The site is proximal to the River Derwent SAC, although it has been assessed through the overall Habitats Regulations Assessment has determined that there could be a likely significant effect from development at a settlement-wide level (diffuse pollution and recreational activity disturbance), but that through the appropriate assessment the impact can be mitigated as part of the planning application consideration. The site is not subject to any other national/local designation. Given the potential time frame, protected species may be present. Therefore surveys may be required in the future, and any protected species will be under the statutory protection that they are afforded.
	Neutral impact – no effect or effect can be fully mitigated +						
	Adverse impact but mitigation possible –						
	Serious impact with limited means of mitigation --						
Q5 Would the development provide opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure, including linking in with existing green infrastructure/corridors	Excellent opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors ++						(-) Site is substantially treed being partially a residential curtilage and therefore could accommodate green infrastructure links.
	Some opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors +						
	No opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors, however the site has the potential to accommodate these –						
	No opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure corridors, however the site does not have the potential to accommodate these --						

Assessment		21	68 (542)	184a	184b	184c	184d
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>						(--) Meaningful commercial development would significantly affect the treed nature of this site.
B Overall rating for 'Biodiversity and Geo-diversity'	<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		21	68 (542)	184a	184b	184c	184d
C Special Qualities, Landscape and Setting							
Q7 What is the capacity of the landscape to accommodate the site according to the Landscape Character Assessments which cover the Ryedale Area and Special Qualities Study (including views and open spaces)?	Site has a very low landscape sensitivity to being developed or existing landscape features are retained or enhanced. Site will not detract from landscape character ++						(+) The Settlements of Malton and Norton are within an area of Landscape Transition: the Howardian Hills LCA extends into the western half of Malton, resulting in land which is elevated, undulating, then gently falls to the north, east and south, to the Vale of Pickering LCA, covering the rest of the Malton and Norton which is generally flatter and low lying. To the south of Norton, the land begins to rise into the Wolds. This site is situated to the east of Norton, close to the railway line and north of Scarborough Road, on low lying, flatter land. The site is defined as being within the Wooded Open Vale of the District-level LCA, and is on the whole reflective of the character description: flat, low lying terrain, open countryside, with long views punctuated by geometric woodland blocks. It is considered that in wider landscape the site has low landscape sensitivity, and landscaping and tree planting can soften the site's appearance. But there are immediate landscape concerns identified.
	Site has a low landscape sensitivity to being developed and some existing landscape features can be retained. Site is unlikely to detract from landscape character +						
	Site has medium landscape sensitivity to being developed and may affect landscape features, however mitigation is possible. Site may detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved –						
	Site has high landscape sensitivity to being developed and will affect landscape features with limited/no means of mitigation. Site will detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved --						
Q8 What impact would the site have on nationally protected landscapes the North York Moors NP and Howardian Hills AONB?	Site has a very low landscape sensitivity to being developed or existing landscape features are retained or enhanced. Site will not detract from landscape character ++						(++) No impact on the Howardian Hills AONB, or North York Moors National Park
	Site has a low landscape sensitivity to being developed and some existing landscape features can be retained. Site is unlikely to detract from landscape character +						
	Site has medium landscape sensitivity to being developed and may affect landscape features, however mitigation is possible. Site may detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved –						
	Site has high landscape sensitivity to being developed and will affect landscape features with limited/no means of mitigation. Site will detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved --						

Assessment		21	68 (542)	184a	184b	184c	184d
Q9 (sites within York Greenbelt) What impact would the sites have on a defined York Greenbelt	Positive Impact, mitigation not required ++						N/A
	Neutral impact- limited or no landscape mitigation is required +						
	Negative impact with potential for harm but landscape mitigation is possible –						
	Significant harm with limited means of mitigation --						
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 ++						(-) Landscape mitigation will be necessary, but it can be achieved.
	Site is capable of retaining some existing landscape features and limited or no landscape mitigation is required +						
	Site will not retain most existing landscape features, however landscape mitigation is possible –						
	Site will not retain any existing landscape features and limited or no landscape mitigation is possible/proposed –						
Q11 Will the site lead to the coalescence of settlements which will impact on their character and setting?	Development within the built form of the settlement ++						(+)
	Development is on the edge of a settlement which is not affected by coalescence with another settlement +						
	Development is on the edge of the settlement and will lead to coalescence with another settlement however mitigation possible –						
	Development is on the edge of the settlement and will lead to significant coalescence with another settlement and limited/no mitigation possible --						
C Overall Rating for 'Special Qualities, Landscape and Setting'	Positive impact – the proposal will retain and enhance the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement ++						(+)
	Neutral impact – the proposal will not have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement +						
	Negative impact – the proposal will have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement, however mitigation is possible –						
	Significant impact – the proposal will have a significant adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement and limited or no mitigation is possible --						

Assessment		21	68 (542)	184a	184b	184c	184d
Culture and Heritage							
Q12 Will the site affect a designated heritage asset, either directly or indirectly through its setting?	<p>Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++</p> <p>Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +</p> <p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –</p> <p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --</p>						(--) The site is adjacent to the grade II listed Quarry House. The development site is abutting not just the extent of the curtilage associated with the property, but, based on the position of the dwelling, would be abutting the property. It is considered to have development of the scale form and massing of buildings for modern business enterprise would be incompatible with the currently afforded setting to this property. Also the site has the potential to be viewed from Old Malton, particularly the land which is to the south of St. Mary's Church Grade I Listed, the nature of the development could affect the setting.
Q13 Will the site affect a non-designated heritage asset which the Council identifies as having a degree of significance that is worthy of consideration?	<p>Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++</p> <p>Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +</p> <p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –</p>						(-) Various sites. under 184 site ID All have similar potential for the survival of prehistoric, Romano-British and/or medieval remains except the one polygon which is a former quarry. Advise archaeological evaluation by means of geophysical survey and trial trenching advised to clarify the nature and significance of archaeological remains

Assessment		21	68 (542)	184a	184b	184c	184d
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --						

Assessment		21	68 (542)	184a	184b	184c	184d
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 --						
Low Carbon Development and Renewable Energy							
Q14 Is the site adopting the Energy Hierarchy of the Local Plan Strategy?	Site capable and developer willing++						No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.
	Site capable but developer unwilling -						
	Site not capable --						
Q15 Is the site capable of linking in or supporting off site renewable energy schemes?	Site capable linking in with off site renewable energy scheme and developer willing to take it forward ++						No such schemes within the locality.
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 within the locality.
E Overall rating for 'Low Carbon Development and Renewable Energy'	Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer willing ++						No such schemes within the locality.
	Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer unwilling -						
	Site not capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology --						
Sustainable Building and Waste Reduction							
Q17 Can the site accommodate higher sustainable building standards than currently required?	Site can accommodate 2 levels higher than mandatory limit ++						No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be included.
	Site can accommodate 1 level higher than mandatory limit –						
	Development cannot accommodate higher standards than mandatory level --						
Q18 Does the development contain proposals for waste reduction in both its construction and when in operation?	Proposals for waste reduction incorporated into both the construction and operation of the development++						No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be included.
	Proposals have investigated waste reduction, however only limited measures are achievable -						
	No proposals suggested for waste reduction -						

Assessment		21	68 (542)	184a	184b	184c	184d
Q. 19 Does the development contain individual/communal recycling facilities/ infrastructure?	Yes +						No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be included.
	No --						
F Overall Rating for 'Sustainable Building and Waste Minimisation'	Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development and developer willing ++						No information submitted at this stage
	Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development but developer unwilling -						
	Site not capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development --						
Efficient Use of Land							
Q.20 Is the site or any part of the site considered previously developed land?	Site is over 50% to 100% Brownfield ++						Greenfield
	Site is up to 50% Brownfield +						
Q.21 Can the site achieve an appropriate density to achieve the most efficient use of the land?	Excellent density achieved taking into account location and context ++						(-) There is constraints around managing the flood risk and the consideration of the preservation of the setting of Quarry house
	Appropriate density achieved taking into account location and context +						
	Lower density proposed as site faces some constraints in its development -						
	Lower density necessary as site faces significant constraints in its development --						
Q.22 Would the development of the site lead to the remediation of contaminated land?	Development is located on land which is likely to be highly contaminated and will be remediated ++						(-) Clay bricks & tiles [manufacture] 1854-92; General Quarrying 1854-1892; Heap, unknown constituents 1983; Railways 1854- 1983; and Unknown Filled Ground (Pit, quarry etc) 1983; and Unknown Filled Ground (Pond, marsh, river, stream, dock etc) 1958 Low to Medium risk
	Development is located on land which may be contaminated and will be remediated +						
	Development is located on land which may be contaminated and no proposals for remediation have been put forward -						
	Development is located on land which is likely to be highly contaminated no proposals for remediation have been put forward --						
G Overall Rating for 'Efficient Use of Land'	Site represents very efficient use of land with mitigation to fully overcome concerns where necessary ++						(-)
	Site represents efficient use of land but further mitigation required to fully overcome concerns where necessary +						
	Site does not represent efficient use of land. Further investigation of mitigation measures to overcome concerns required -						
	Site does not represent efficient use of land and mitigation is not possible --						

Assessment		21	68 (542)	184a	184b	184c	184d
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)?	<p>No loss of best and most versatile agricultural land ++</p> <p>Up to 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost –</p> <p>More than 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost --</p>						(-) majority of site is in Grade 2
Q. 24 Would the development lead to the sterilisation of mineral resources?	<p>Site not within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search, or Mineral Consultation Zone ++?</p> <p>Site within the buffer of a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone –?</p> <p>Site within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone --</p>						(-) within 2014 minerals safeguarding area. Historically a quarry. Proximity to residential development would curtail activity
Q. 25 Would the development have an adverse impact on a Groundwater Source Protection Zone?	<p>Development is not located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone ++</p> <p>Development is located in a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but mitigation is possible to reduce the risk of groundwater pollution risk +</p> <p>Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but no risk assessment has been undertaken -</p> <p>Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone and mitigation of the risk of groundwater pollution is not possible --</p>						(++)
Q. 26 Would the development have an adverse impact on the Malton Air Quality Management Area or any other site of poor air quality?	<p>Site falls outside any area of poor air quality and development is unlikely to result in any reduction in air quality. ++</p> <p>Site falls outside any area of poor air quality and development is unlikely to result in a significant reduction in air quality. +</p> <p>Site is within an area of poor air quality and mitigation is possible. Development may lead to a reduction in air quality. -</p> <p>Site is within an area of poor air quality and limited/no mitigation is possible or no assessment has been made by the proposer. Development is likely to lead to a further significant reduction in air quality. --</p>						(+) Malton has an AQMA which includes the streets of Castlegate/Wheelgate/eastern Yorkersgate/Old Malton Rd where they converge at Butcher Corner. This is due to breaches of NO2 concentrations. The primary source is road traffic. The site is well away from the AQMA. Traffic will predominantly use the A64/Scarborough Road. The site will allow the avoidance of AQMA unless needing to enter the Town Centre. As a site within a settlement which is subject to an AQMA, a proportionate AQA should be completed as part of any planning application.

Assessment		21	68 (542)	184a	184b	184c	184d
Q. 27 Is any part of the development on suspected unstable land?	Land has no instability concerns ++						(-) Clay bricks & tiles [manufacture] 1854-92; General Quarrying 1854-1892; Heap, unknown constituents 1983; Railways 1854- 1983; and Unknown Filled Ground (Pit, quarry etc) 1983; and Unknown Filled Ground (Pond, marsh, river, stream, dock etc) 1958 Low to Medium risk
	Land potentially unstable but investigation has shown that mitigation is possible +						
	Land potentially unstable but no investigation has been carried out –						
	Land suffers from significant instability problems and either no mitigation has been proposed or instability problems are not possible to mitigate --						
Q. 28 Will the site impact on major hazard sites or pipelines?	HSE Standing Advice states "do not advise against development" ++						(++)
	HSE Standing Advice states "advise against development"						
H Overall Rating for 'Natural Resources'	Site would not adversely affect any natural resources ++						(+)
	Site would not have any significant adverse effect on natural resources +						
	Site would have an adverse effect on natural resources but mitigation is possible –						
	Site would have a significant adverse effect on natural resources and limited/no mitigation is possible --						
Amenity Q. 29 Is the development in an area where noise, light, dust or smell is likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to generate noise, light or dust which will affect existing users?	The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +						(--) uses are likely to be incompatible with residential development site is adjacent to such uses
	The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible –						
	The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --						
Q. 30 Is the development in an area where other factors are likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to generate forms of nuisance which may affect the amenity of existing users? These may include issues such as privacy, lack of sunlight overbearing effects.	The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +						(+)
	The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -						
	The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --						

Assessment		21	68 (542)	184a	184b	184c	184d
I Overall Rating for 'Amenity'	The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +						(-) harm to residential amenity
	The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -						
	The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of this site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --						
Flood Risk							
Q. 31 Is the site potentially affected by groundwater flooding?	No ++						(++)
	Yes further investigation required --						
Q. 32 Is the site potentially affected by surface water flooding and is this site considered to be within a critical drainage area?	No ++						(-)
	Yes further investigation required --						
Q. 33 Is the site potentially affected by sewer flooding?	No ++						(++)
	Yes further investigation required --						
Q. 34 Have Sustainable Drainage Systems (SDS) been proposed as part of the development?	Site capable of accommodating SDS and have been proposed as part of the development ++						(+) No information is submitted at this stage, but seeks principle to be established. Site would be expected to accommodate SDS
	Site capable of accommodating SDS though no information on whether SDS proposed as part of the development +						
	Site capable of accommodating SDS however SDS not being proposed on site -						
	Site not suitable for accommodating SDS --						
Q. 35 What other measures* have been considered which ensure the development is resilient to climate change? * variable	Multiple additional measures proposed which build in resilience to climate change ++						(-) No information is submitted at this stage, but seeks principle to be established. No reason to suggest the measures could not be implemented
	Single additional measure proposed to build in resilience to climate change +						
	No information provided on measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change -						

Assessment		21	68 (542)	184a	184b	184c	184d
	No measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change --						
J Overall Rating for 'Flood Risk'	No flood risk associated with the site ++						(-)
	Limited flood risk associated with the site which can be fully mitigated +						
	Site affected by a number of flood risk issues, however mitigation possible-						
	Site affected by significant flood risk issues and limited mitigation possible --						

Assessment		21	68 (542)	184a	184b	184c	184d
People							
Q. 36 Would the development of the site lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of the settlement?	Development incorporates existing use(s), as part of the overall scheme ++						No loss of any such use
	Development proposes relocation of use to suitable alternative location +						
	Development will result in the loss of a valued facility/use and no justification or alternative provided --						
Q. 37 Will the site incorporate the principles of Secured By Design, reducing the potential for crime and discouraging anti-social behaviour?	Yes – SBD principles taken into account or will be taken into account following liaison with North Yorkshire police +						(-) No details have been provided but there is no reason to suggest that such principles could not be taken into account.
	No – SBD principles not taken into account -						
Q. 38 Does the design of the development encourage people to walk and cycle rather than travel by car?	Cycleways and footpaths effectively integrated into the development encouraging walking and cycling ++						(+) No details submitted, as establishing principle. There is no reason to suggest such features could not be provided.
	Some cycleways and/or footpaths shown encouraging walking and cycling +						
	No cycleways and footpaths indicated as part of this development --						
Q. 39 For sites over 1ha or over 80 houses- Has a Travel Plan been produced which assesses alternative options and initiatives?	Travel Plan undertaken and clear implementable initiatives for promoting modal shift set out ++						(--) No Travel Plan provided, due to establishing principle. A Travel Plan would be required.
	Travel Plan undertaken and some initiatives identified for promoting modal shift +						
	Travel Plan undertaken which identifies limited opportunities for modal shift or Travel Plan not undertaken --						
Q. 40 Will the proposed development attract a balanced living and/or working population, reducing inequality of opportunity?	Development proposed is clearly designed to attract a balanced living and/or working community ++						(+) Employment land is a much needed element of meeting a balanced working community. No details have been supplied but the scheme is establishing principle.
	Development takes into account the need to attract a balanced and/or working community +						
	Development takes no account of the need to attract a balanced living and/or working community -						
K Overall Rating for 'People'	Development actively planned to encourage the development of sustainable communities ++						(+)
	Development has taken into account the need to develop sustainable communities +						
	Development has little regard to the need to develop sustainable communities -						
	Development has no regard for the need to develop sustainable communities --						

Assessment		21	68 (542)	184a	184b	184c	184d
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 ++		Included in the 2006 Employment Land Review and its update - proposed for B uses				(--) site of a situation and size which would not be compatible as a site for employment
	Proposal identifies what the needs are and how some needs will be met by the development +						
	Proposal either does not identify what the needs are or how any needs will be met by the development –						
	No assessment is undertaken of what the needs are and whether any needs will be met --						
Q. 42 What level and type of affordable housing is proposed?	Development offers appropriate level and type of affordable housing which meets the needs as set out in the SHMA ++						N/A
	Development offers some affordable housing which meets some of the need as set out in the SHMA +						
	Development does not offer the appropriate level and type of affordable housing or does not meet the need for affordable housing as set out in the SHMA –						
	The development makes no provision for affordable housing --						
Q. 43 What provision has been made for Ryedale's elderly population?	Development addresses and meets the needs of Ryedale's elderly population ++						N/A
	Development takes into account and meets some of the needs of Ryedale's elderly population +						
	Development does not address the needs of Ryedale's elderly population –						
	The development makes no provision for the needs of Ryedale's elderly population --						
L Overall Rating for 'Meeting Needs'	Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++						(--) from an employment land perspective
	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 --						

Assessment		21	68 (542)	184a	184b	184c	184d
Community Facilities, utilities and Infrastructure							
Q44 Malton/Norton only - Has Traffic Modelling or Transport Assessment been undertaken in the context of work already undertaken on the Malton and Norton STA?	Yes No - traffic modelling required						(-) traffic modelling required, strategic modelling considered through STA.
Q45 On sites greater than 1ha: Has a Transport Assessment been undertaken	Yes ++ No- transport assessment required --						(-)
Q. 46 Is highway mitigation required as part of the development and what is the impact of the development on the highway network following mitigation?	No mitigation required or no impact on the highway following mitigation ++ 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 --		Discussion with Highways England have occurred on site 542. Developer led solution is technically achievable. Includes a PFS and various B uses.				(-) unclear how the site can be accessed due to the significant variance in topography on the site.
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 site specific information submitted. Seeks to establish principle. Site size unlikely to allow unfettered vehicular movements where HGV/HDV are concerned, would preclude uses which involved these.
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 --						(+) No PROW on site

Assessment		21	68 (542)	184a	184b	184c	184d
Q. 49 Does the proposal involve new public realm or enhancements to the existing public realm as part of its development?	<p>Proposal will create high quality new public realm or significantly enhance existing public realm as part of its development ++</p> <p>Proposal will create some new public realm or partially enhance existing public realm as part of its development+</p> <p>Though capable of incorporating new or enhancing existing public realm, the proposal makes no provision for it --</p>						No site specific information submitted. Seeks to establish principle for employment/mixed use and this would not have significant areas of public realm, areas for workers to relax, obtain refreshment could be provided.
Q. 50 What is the capacity of existing utilities and infrastructure to cope with impact of the development?	<p>Site has limited or no adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be fully mitigated ++</p> <p>Site has limited to medium adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be satisfactorily mitigated +</p> <p>Site has medium to high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation –</p> <p>Site has high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation --</p>						<p>(+) Electricity and Gas – No capacity issue/constraint currently identified but reinforcement of the distribution network likely to be required</p> <p>Water Supply – No capacity issue/constraint identified, but reinforcement of distribution network likely to be required</p> <p>Sewerage Capacity and surface water drainage– Constraints in Norton. Existing pumps will need upgrading. Capacity to North of the Derwent. Ongoing maintenance/ enhancement of flood defences.</p> <p>Complementary town centre traffic management measures; Improvements to junctions in the internal road network; Improvements to bus/rail interchange; Improved cycle network and pedestrian facilities (including public realm improvements). No information has been provided, a site of this size is more capable of delivering site-specific mitigation, as opposed to meeting some key settlement infrastructure needs.</p>
Q. 51 What is the impact on Waste Water Treatment Works?	<p>Further than 400m from the boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works ++</p> <p>Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact undertaken and Yorkshire Water No Objection +</p> <p>Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact not undertaken –</p> <p>Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact undertaken Yorkshire Water consulted and likely to object --</p>						(++)

Assessment		21	68 (542)	184a	184b	184c	184d
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 --						
M Overall Rating for 'Community facilities, Utilities and Infrastructure'	Site has limited or no adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has a adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be fully mitigated ++						(--)
	Site has limited to medium adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be satisfactorily mitigated +						
	Site has medium to high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation -						
	Site has high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation -						
Strong Economy							
Q53 (town centre uses only) 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 ++						N/A
	Proposal will support the vitality and viability of the town centre in retaining key services and facilities +						
	Proposal could adversely harm the viability and vitality of the town centre leading to decline --						
Q. 54 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 ++						(+) due to site size
	Mix of uses proposed will not diversify the economy but will support existing employment sectors in Ryedale +						
Q. 55 (Employment/Retail uses) Does the proposal involve the creation of net additional or net loss of jobs in Ryedale?	Up to 250 net jobs created ++						(+) due to site size
	Up to 50 net jobs created +						
	Up to 50 net jobs lost -						
	Up to 250 net jobs lost --						

Malton and Norton Other Development Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		21	68 (542)	184a	184b	184c	184d
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 --						
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 through the ELR, but based on the site's size, situation and access issues it would be a category III site
	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 ++						(--). amenity concerns and access
	Constraint(s) identified but resolution possible +						
	Constraint(s) identified but resolution is uncertain --						
Developer Contributions							
Q58 Will the development be capable of meeting the usual range of site-specific s106 requirements?	Normal range of contributions can be achieved ++		Site submitter wishes to have the sites be continued in the assessment process. In light of policy obligations, including s278 agreements.				(+) contributions would pertain to those appropriate for an employment use. No information supplied.
	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 ++						Scheme would be exempt from the CIL charging - zero charge
	No --						
O Overall Deliverability / Developability Rating	Site is able to come forward without impairment and is able to provide a normal range of contributions ++						(--)
	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 --						

Malton and Norton Other Development Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		184e	184f	184g	184h	185	248	
Stage 1 - Sift				Includes Site 189			Employment only within Huttons Ambo parish	
all sites 0.3Ha and above	0.3 Ha or greater ++ Less than 0.3 Ha --	(++) 48.4ha	(++) 13.9ha	(++) 20.9 ha	(++) 11.9 ha	(++)1.7ha	(++)12.21ha	
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 --	(++)	(--) Not in or adjacent to the Principal Town	(--) Not in or adjacent to the Principal Town	(--) Not in or adjacent to the Principal Town	(++)	(++) adjacent to industrial estate extension (site 21) which has a number of vacant plots	
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 --	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++) Site proximal to River Derwent SSSI. Also River Derwent SAC to the East and West of Malton. HRA establishes that no likely significant effects cannot be ruled out.	
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 --	(++) Developable parts of the site however parts of the Site in Flood Zone 3a (iii) on SFRA and Flood Zone 3 and Flood Zone 2 on the Flood Map	(++) But a small portion of site in Flood Zone 3b and Flood Zone 3a (iii)	(--) Significant area within Flood Zone 3b which would not enable a developable scheme to be built	(++) But a portion of the site in Flood Zone 3b and Flood Zone 3a (iii)	(--) Significant area within Flood Zone 3b which would not enable a developable scheme to be built	(++)	
Stage 2 - Site Assessment								
Q1A How accessible is the site to key services and facilities	Bus stop	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(++)				(++)	
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +						
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -						
		15 minutes walking time and over --						
	Railway Station (Malton and Norton)	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(--)					(--)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +						
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -						
		15 minutes walking time and over --						
	Nearest commercial limit	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	NA					(--)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +						
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -						
		15 minutes walking time and over --						

Assessment		184e	184f	184g	184h	185	248
Nearest employment area	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(++)					(++)
	Up to 10 minutes walking time +						
	Up to 15 minutes walking time –						
	15 minutes walking time and over --						
Nearest Primary School	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	NA					NA
	Up to 10 minutes walking time +						
	Up to 15 minutes walking time –						
	15 minutes walking time and over --						
Nearest Secondary School	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	NA					NA
	Up to 10 minutes walking time +						
	Up to 15 minutes walking time –						
	15 minutes walking time and over --						
Nearest Development Limit	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(++)					(++)
	Up to 10 minutes walking time +						
	Up to 15 minutes walking time –						
	15 minutes walking time and over --						
Nearest Doctors Surgery	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	NA					NA
	Up to 10 minutes walking time +						
	Up to 15 minutes walking time –						
	15 minutes walking time and over --						
Hospital (Malton and Norton)	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	NA					NA
	Up to 10 minutes walking time +						
	Up to 15 minutes walking time –						
	15 minutes walking time and over --						

Assessment		184e	184f	184g	184h	185	248
Q1B (Retail) How does the site location relate to the Town Centre in terms of the NPPF Sequential Test?	Town Centre ++ Edge of Centre + Out of Centre -- Out of Town --	N/A					N/A
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 -	(+) with (-) for small elements of Flood Zone 3					(++)
Q2B What vulnerability class does the site fall	Flood Zone 1++ Flood Zone 2 Less vulnerable ++ More vulnerable + Highly vulnerable - Flood Zone 3a Less vulnerable + More vulnerable - Highly vulnerable --	(++) or (+) with flood zone 3					(++)
Q2C (Malton and Norton only) which sub-category of flood zone 3a does the site fall within?	Flood Zone 3a (i) defence <1:50 Flood Zone 3a (ii) defence 1:100 + Flood zone 3a (iii) defence 1:50 < 1:100 -	(-) for small elements of the site, rest is Flood Zone 2					N/A
Q2D Has a Flood Risk Assessment been undertaken?	yes ++ No --	(--) SFRA only site would require a FRA due to flood risk and size of the site					(--) SFRA only site would require a FRA due to size of the site
Q2E (Malton/Norton/Old Malton) If within the Rapid Inundation Zone (RIZ), what level of hazard would exist?	Low - 'Caution' + Moderate - 'Danger for some people' - Significant - 'Danger for most people' -- Extreme 'Danger for all people' --	N/A					N/A
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 (HA) (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 -	(+) NYCC comments awaited. It is considered that a suitable access could be achieved onto Scarborough Road as the site is directly adjacent.					(--) No direct access able to be achieved to the A64 due to proximity of Musley Bank junction irrespective of any potential junction alterations. Access would need to be achieved through site 21, which is the most eastern field of this submission, and which has been partly built out with the

Assessment		184e	184f	184g	184h	185	248
	<p>Site has multiple highway issues which may be difficult to mitigate unless further investigation demonstrates otherwise --</p>						<p>access road. The site submitter has provided documentation which would legally allow access through to site 21 access (which is the easternmost field of 248). The Highways Authority have advised that for the remainder of site 248 to come forward (i.e. both remaining fields) it may require a secondary access, which is not capable of being provided. Highways England have advised: As part of the consideration of employment sites at Malton and Norton, we would support the safety concerns identified in relation to site 248 given its proximity to the A64 at Musley Bank. In relation to the potential improvement at Musley Bank, although there is an aspiration locally to upgrade the junction, there is currently no scheme identified or proposal at this location.</p>

Assessment		184e	184f	184g	184h	185	248
Biodiversity and Geo-diversity							
Q4 Would the development affect a regional or local site of biodiversity (including SINC, LNR or RIGS) or affect UK, NYMNP or Ryedale Biodiversity Plan protected species	<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 not adjacent to the River Derwent SAC, but Priorpot Beck, a tributary, runs through the site. Although it has been assessed through the overall Habitats Regulations Assessment has determined that there could be a likely significant effect from development at a settlement-wide level (diffuse pollution and recreational activity disturbance), but that through the appropriate assessment the impact can be mitigated as part of the planning application consideration. The site is not subject to any other national/local designation. Given the potential time frame, protected species may be present. Therefore surveys may be required in the future, and any protected species will be under the statutory protection that they are afforded.</p>					<p>(-) The site is proximal to the River Derwent SAC, although it has been assessed through the overall Habitats Regulations Assessment has determined that there could be a likely significant effect from development at a settlement-wide level (diffuse pollution and recreational activity disturbance), but that through the appropriate assessment the impact can be mitigated as part of the planning application consideration. The site is not subject to any other national/local designation. Given the potential time frame, protected species may be present. Therefore surveys may be required in the future, and any protected species will be under the statutory protection that they are afforded.</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>(-) Existing opportunities available including substantial greenbelt, existing watercourse etc</p>					<p>No details have been submitted concerning green infrastructure networks. It is considered that there is no reason that such networks cannot be introduced, commensurate with the size of the site, and its ability to link with other sites.</p>

Assessment		184e	184f	184g	184h	185	248
Q6 Would the development impact on protected and unprotected trees, hedgerows and ancient woodland?	Positive impact. Enhancement of feature possible and mitigation not required ++	(--). Meaningful commercial development would significantly affect the tree belt on this site.					(+) There is a shelter belt of trees to the east of the site adjacent to the A64. There is also a hedgerow in the middle of the site between the two fields whose future would be uncertain depending on the layout of the proposals. The boundary hedges and trees are an important component of the landscape, being prominent from various vantage points, and their retention would be required. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that layouts respect the recommendations in BS 5837:2012 – Trees in relation to construction- Recommendations • Ensure that layout design considers the retention of existing boundary hedges where practically possible. • 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 landscape.
	Neutral impact. No effect or effect can be fully mitigated +						
	Adverse impact but mitigation possible --						
	Serious impact with limited or no means of mitigation--						
B Overall rating for 'Biodiversity and Geodiversity'	Positive impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements and no mitigation required++	(--)					(+)
	Neutral impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements however any effect can be fully mitigated +						
	Adverse impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements by effects are capable of some mitigation -						
	Significant impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements and effects are unable to be satisfactorily mitigated --						

Assessment		184e	184f	184g	184h	185	248
C Special Qualities, Landscape and Setting							
Q7 What is the capacity of the landscape to accommodate the site according to the Landscape Character Assessments which cover the Ryedale Area and Special Qualities Study (including views and open spaces)?	Site has a very low landscape sensitivity to being developed or existing landscape features are retained or enhanced. Site will not detract from landscape character ++	(-) The Settlements of Malton and Norton are within an area of Landscape Transition: the Howardian Hills LCA extends into the western half of Malton, resulting in land which is elevated, undulating, then gently falls to the north, east and south, to the Vale of Pickering LCA, covering the rest of the Malton and Norton which is generally flatter and low lying. To the south of Norton, the land begins to rise into the Wolds. This site is a very large site situated to the east of Norton, on low lying, flatter land. The site is defined as being within the Wooded Open Vale of the District-level LCA, and is on the whole reflective of the character description: flat, low lying terrain, open countryside, with long views punctuated by geometric woodland blocks. It is considered that despite the lower landscape sensitivity, and use of landscaping and tree planting to soften the site's appearance, the scale of the site increases the prominence of the development. There are immediate landscape concerns identified regarding Norton Grove Stud.					(+) The Settlements of Malton and Norton are within an area of Landscape Transition: the Howardian Hills LCA extends into the western half of Malton, resulting in land which is elevated, undulating, then gently falls to the north, east and south, to the Vale of Pickering LCA, covering the rest of the Malton and Norton which is generally flatter and low lying. To the south of Norton, the land begins to rise into the Wolds. This site is situated to the west of Malton, south of York Road, on low lying, flatter land. It is viewable at distance on elevated land of the Howardian Hills. The site is defined as being within the Wooded Open Vale of the District-level LCA, and is on the whole reflective of the character description: flat, low lying terrain, open countryside, with long views punctuated by geometric woodland blocks. The site is adjacent to the existing Industrial Estate Extension, it is considered that in wider landscape the site has low landscape sensitivity, and landscaping and tree planting can soften the site's appearance.
	Site has a low landscape sensitivity to being developed and some existing landscape features can be retained. Site is unlikely to detract from landscape character +						
	Site has medium landscape sensitivity to being developed and may affect landscape features, however mitigation is possible. Site may detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved –						
	Site has high landscape sensitivity to being developed and will affect landscape features with limited/no means of mitigation. Site will detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved --						
Q8 What impact would the site have on nationally protected landscapes the North York Moors NP and Howardian Hills AONB?	Site has a very low landscape sensitivity to being developed or existing landscape features are retained or enhanced. Site will not detract from landscape character ++	(+++) No impact on the Howardian Hills AONB, or North York Moors National Park					(+) Site would be viewed from the A64 (within the AONB) within the context of existing industrial development and the town beyond. Landscaping would assist in amelioration of any impacts in shorter distances. No impact concerning the National Park
	Site has a low landscape sensitivity to being developed and some existing landscape features can be retained. Site is unlikely to detract from landscape character +						
	Site has medium landscape sensitivity to being developed and may affect landscape features, however mitigation is possible. Site may detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved –						
	Site has high landscape sensitivity to being developed and will affect landscape features with limited/no means of mitigation. Site will detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved --						

Assessment		184e	184f	184g	184h	185	248
Q9 (sites within York Greenbelt) What impact would the sites have on a defined York Greenbelt	Positive Impact, mitigation not required ++	N/A					N/A
	Neutral impact- limited or no landscape mitigation is required +						
	Negative impact with potential for harm but landscape mitigation is possible -						
	Significant harm with limited means of mitigation --						
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 ++	(-) substantial site, landscaping would need to be comprehensive, mitigation may be through considering smaller components of the area					(-) Landscape mitigation will be necessary, but it can be achieved.
	Site is capable of retaining some existing landscape features and limited or no landscape mitigation is required +						
	Site will not retain most existing landscape features, however landscape mitigation is possible -						
	Site will not retain any existing landscape features and limited or no landscape mitigation is possible/proposed -						
Q11 Will the site lead to the coalescence of settlements which will impact on their character and setting?	Development within the built form of the settlement ++	(+)					(+)
	Development is on the edge of a settlement which is not affected by coalescence with another settlement +						
	Development is on the edge of the settlement and will lead to coalescence with another settlement however mitigation possible -						
	Development is on the edge of the settlement and will lead to significant coalescence with another settlement and limited/no mitigation possible --						
C Overall Rating for 'Special Qualities, Landscape and Setting'	Positive impact – the proposal will retain and enhance the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement ++	(-)					(+)
	Neutral impact – the proposal will not have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement +						
	Negative impact – the proposal will have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement, however mitigation is possible -						
	Significant impact – the proposal will have a significant adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement and limited or no mitigation is possible --						

Assessment		184e	184f	184g	184h	185	248
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 --						
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 –						

Assessment		184e	184f	184g	184h	185	248
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --	The area is considered that development of an industrial estate which incorporated this part of the site (northern) would detract from the park-land character of this area. Equine activity is a key socio-economic feature. Sites under 148 have similar potential for the survival of prehistoric, Romano-British and/or medieval remains except the former quarry. Advise archaeological evaluation by means of geophysical survey and trial trenching advised to clarify the nature and significance of archaeological remains. English Heritage have advised that the site is part of the extensive Vale of Pickering archaeological landscape. Evidence through excavations show human habitation from the Mesolithic to present day. There is a high probability that remains will be of at least national importance. As such they are of demonstrable significance to that of Scheduled Monuments.					As no previous archaeological or similar evaluation has been undertaken in the western part of the site to date. Therefore, geophysical survey of the western part of the site is advised, to be followed by trial trenching to clarify the nature and significance of any archaeological remains.

Assessment		184e	184f	184g	184h	185	248
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 --						
Low Carbon Development and Renewable Energy							
Q14 Is the site adopting the Energy Hierarchy of the Local Plan Strategy?	Site capable and developer willing++	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.					No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.
	Site capable but developer unwilling -						
	Site not capable --						
Q15 Is the site capable of linking in or supporting off site renewable energy schemes?	Site capable linking in with off site renewable energy scheme and developer willing to take it forward ++	No such schemes within the locality.					No such schemes within the locality.
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 within the locality.					No such schemes within the locality.
E Overall rating for 'Low Carbon Development and Renewable Energy'	Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer willing ++	No such schemes within the locality.					No such schemes within the locality.
	Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer unwilling -						
	Site not capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology --						
Sustainable Building and Waste Reduction							
Q17 Can the site accommodate higher sustainable building standards than currently required?	Site can accommodate 2 levels higher than mandatory limit ++	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be included.					No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be included.
	Site can accommodate 1 level higher than mandatory limit –						
	Development cannot accommodate higher standards than mandatory level --						
Q18 Does the development contain proposals for waste reduction in both its construction and when in operation?	Proposals for waste reduction incorporated into both the construction and operation of the development++	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be included.					No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be included.
	Proposals have investigated waste reduction, however only limited measures are achievable -						
	No proposals suggested for waste reduction -						

Malton and Norton Other Development Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		184e	184f	184g	184h	185	248
Q. 19 Does the development contain individual/communal recycling facilities/ infrastructure?	Yes + No --	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be included.					No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be included.
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 submitted at this stage					No information submitted 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 +	Greenfield					Greenfield
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 --	(+) Parts of the site contain land which is designated with a high flood risk, and this will not be capable of being developed. Taking the site in totality, this is a large site, which means that a reasonable developable area is achievable					(+)
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 --	(-) Clay bricks & tiles [manufacture] 1854-92; General Quarrying 1854-1892; Heap, unknown constituents 1983; Railways 1854- 1983; and Unknown Filled Ground (Pit, quarry etc) 1983; and Unknown Filled Ground (Pond, marsh, river, stream, dock etc) 1958 Low to Medium risk					(-) Sewage - medium risk
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		184e	184f	184g	184h	185	248
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)?	<p>No loss of best and most versatile agricultural land ++</p> <p>Up to 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost –</p> <p>More than 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost --</p>	(--) majority of site is in Grade 2					(--) 12.2ha grade 3 land. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as grade 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.
Q. 24 Would the development lead to the sterilisation of mineral resources?	<p>Site not within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search, or Mineral Consultation Zone ++?</p> <p>Site within the buffer of a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone –?</p> <p>Site within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone --</p>	(--) within 2014 minerals safeguarding area.					(++)
Q. 25 Would the development have an adverse impact on a Groundwater Source Protection Zone?	<p>Development is not located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone ++</p> <p>Development is located in a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but mitigation is possible to reduce the risk of groundwater pollution risk +</p> <p>Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but no risk assessment has been undertaken -</p> <p>Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone and mitigation of the risk of groundwater pollution is not possible --</p>	(++)					(++)
Q. 26 Would the development have an adverse impact on the Malton Air Quality Management Area or any other site of poor air quality?	<p>Site falls outside any area of poor air quality and development is unlikely to result in any reduction in air quality. ++</p> <p>Site falls outside any area of poor air quality and development is unlikely to result in a significant reduction in air quality. +</p> <p>Site is within an area of poor air quality and mitigation is possible. Development may lead to a reduction in air quality. -</p> <p>Site is within an area of poor air quality and limited/no mitigation is possible or no assessment has been made by the proposer. Development is likely to lead to a further significant reduction in air quality. --</p>	(+) Malton has an AQMA which includes the streets of Castlegate/Wheelgate/eastern Yorkersgate/Old Malton Rd where they converge at Butcher Corner. This is due to breaches of NO2 concentrations. The primary source is road traffic. The site is well away from the AQMA. Traffic will predominantly use the A64/Scarborough Road. The site will allow the avoidance of AQMA unless needing to enter the Town Centre. As a site within a settlement which is subject to an AQMA, a proportionate AQA should be completed as part of any planning application.					(+) Malton has an AQMA which includes the streets of Castlegate/Wheelgate/eastern Yorkersgate/Old Malton Rd where they converge at Butcher Corner. This is due to breaches of NO2 concentrations. The primary source is road traffic. The site is well away from the AQMA. Traffic will predominantly use the A64/York Road. The site will allow the avoidance of AQMA unless needing to enter the Town Centre. As a site within a settlement which is subject to an AQMA, a proportionate AQA should be completed as part of any planning application.

Assessment		184e	184f	184g	184h	185	248
Q. 27 Is any part of the development on suspected unstable land?	Land has no instability concerns ++	(-) Clay bricks & tiles [manufacture] 1854-92; General Quarrying 1854-1892; Heap, unknown constituents 1983; Railways 1854- 1983; and Unknown Filled Ground (Pit, quarry etc) 1983; and Unknown Filled Ground (Pond, marsh, river, stream, dock etc) 1958 Low to Medium risk					No evidence of land instability
	Land potentially unstable but investigation has shown that mitigation is possible +						
	Land potentially unstable but no investigation has been carried out –						
	Land suffers from significant instability problems and either no mitigation has been proposed or instability problems are not possible to mitigate --						
Q. 28 Will the site impact on major hazard sites or pipelines?	HSE Standing Advice states "do not advise against development" ++	(++)					(++)
	HSE Standing Advice states "advise against development"						
H Overall Rating for 'Natural Resources'	Site would not adversely affect any natural resources ++	(+)					(-)
	Site would not have any significant adverse effect on natural resources +						
	Site would have an adverse effect on natural resources but mitigation is possible –						
	Site would have a significant adverse effect on natural resources and limited/no mitigation is possible --						
Amenity							
Q. 29 Is the development in an area where noise, light, dust or smell is likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to generate noise, light or dust which will affect existing users?	The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +	(+) uses are likely to be incompatible with residential development but site is well distanced from such uses					(+) uses are likely to be incompatible with residential development but site is well distanced from such uses
	The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible –						
	The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --						
Q. 30 Is the development in an area where other factors are likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to generate forms of nuisance which may affect the amenity of existing users? These may include issues such as privacy, lack of sunlight overbearing effects.	The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +	(+)					(+)
	The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -						
	The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --						

Assessment		184e	184f	184g	184h	185	248
Overall Rating for 'Amenity'	The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +	(+)					(+)
	The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -						
	The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of this site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --						
Flood Risk							
Q. 31 Is the site potentially affected by groundwater flooding?	No ++ Yes further investigation required --	(++)					(++)
Q. 32 Is the site potentially affected by surface water flooding and is this site considered to be within a critical drainage area?	No ++ Yes further investigation required --	(--)					(++)
Q. 33 Is the site potentially affected by sewer flooding?	No ++ Yes further investigation required --	(++)					(++)
Q. 34 Have Sustainable Drainage Systems (SDS) been proposed as part of the development?	Site capable of accommodating SDS and have been proposed as part of the development ++ Site capable of accommodating SDS though no information on whether SDS proposed as part of the development + Site capable of accommodating SDS however SDS not being proposed on site - Site not suitable for accommodating SDS --	(+) No information is submitted at this stage, but seeks principle to be established. Site would be expected to accommodate SDS					(+) No information is submitted at this stage, but seeks principle to be established. Site would be expected to accommodate SDS
Q. 35 What other measures* have been considered which ensure the development is resilient to climate change? * variable	Multiple additional measures proposed which build in resilience to climate change ++ Single additional measure proposed to build in resilience to climate change + No information provided on measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change -	(-) No information is submitted at this stage, but seeks principle to be established. No reason to suggest the measures could not be implemented					(-) No information is submitted at this stage, but seeks principle to be established. No reason to suggest the measures could not be implemented

Assessment		184e	184f	184g	184h	185	248
	No measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change --						
J Overall Rating for 'Flood Risk'	No flood risk associated with the site ++	(-)					(+)
	Limited flood risk associated with the site which can be fully mitigated +						
	Site affected by a number of flood risk issues, however mitigation possible-						
	Site affected by significant flood risk issues and limited mitigation possible --						

Assessment		184e	184f	184g	184h	185	248
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 ++	Potential loss of Norton Grove Stud.					No loss of any such use
	Development proposes relocation of use to suitable alternative location +						
	Development will result in the loss of a valued facility/use and no justification or alternative provided --						
Q. 37 Will the site incorporate the principles of Secured By Design, reducing the potential for crime and discouraging anti-social behaviour?	Yes – SBD principles taken into account or will be taken into account following liaison with North Yorkshire police +	(-) No details have been provided but there is no reason to suggest that such principles could not be taken into account.					(-) No details have been provided but there is no reason to suggest that such principles could not be taken into account.
	No – SBD principles not taken into account -						
Q. 38 Does the design of the development encourage people to walk and cycle rather than travel by car?	Cycleways and footpaths effectively integrated into the development encouraging walking and cycling ++	(+) No details submitted, as establishing principle. There is no reason to suggest such features could not be provided.					(+) No details submitted, as establishing principle. There is no reason to suggest such features could not be provided.
	Some cycleways and/or footpaths shown encouraging walking and cycling +						
	No cycleways and footpaths indicated as part of this development --						
Q. 39 For sites over 1ha or over 80 houses- Has a Travel Plan been produced which assesses alternative options and initiatives?	Travel Plan undertaken and clear implementable initiatives for promoting modal shift set out ++	(--) No Travel Plan provided, due to establishing principle. A Travel Plan would be required.					(--) No Travel Plan provided, due to establishing principle. A Travel Plan would be required.
	Travel Plan undertaken and some initiatives identified for promoting modal shift +						
	Travel Plan undertaken which identifies limited opportunities for modal shift or Travel Plan not undertaken --						
Q. 40 Will the proposed development attract a balanced living and/or working population, reducing inequality of opportunity?	Development proposed is clearly designed to attract a balanced living and/or working community ++	(+) Employment land is a much needed element of meeting a balanced working community. No details have been supplied but the scheme is establishing principle.					(+) Employment land is a much needed element of meeting a balanced working community. No details have been supplied but the scheme is establishing principle.
	Development takes into account the need to attract a balanced and/or working community +						
	Development takes no account of the need to attract a balanced living and/or working community -						
K Overall Rating for 'People'	Development actively planned to encourage the development of sustainable communities ++	(+)					(+)
	Development has taken into account the need to develop sustainable communities +						
	Development has little regard to the need to develop sustainable communities -						
	Development has no regard for the need to develop sustainable communities --						

Assessment		184e	184f	184g	184h	185	248
Meeting needs							
Q.41 Does the type and mix of development proposed meet the needs identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), Employment Land Review Update 2010 (ELR), Ryedale Retail Capacity Studies (RRCS) and Malton Town Centre Strategy?	<p>Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++</p> <p>Proposal identifies what the needs are and how some needs will be met by the development +</p> <p>Proposal either does not identify what the needs are or how any needs will be met by the development –</p> <p>No assessment is undertaken of what the needs are and whether any needs will be met --</p>	(+) submission is to identify principle. site is of a size which has potential					(--) The site submission seeks the principle of use for employment- a logical extension to the Industrial Estate. However, the access concerns identified with the site mean is not considered developable at this time
Q. 42 What level and type of affordable housing is proposed?	<p>Development offers appropriate level and type of affordable housing which meets the needs as set out in the SHMA ++</p> <p>Development offers some affordable housing which meets some of the need as set out in the SHMA +</p> <p>Development does not offer the appropriate level and type of affordable housing or does not meet the need for affordable housing as set out in the SHMA –</p> <p>The development makes no provision for affordable housing --</p>	N/A					N/A
Q. 43 What provision has been made for Ryedale's elderly population?	<p>Development addresses and meets the needs of Ryedale's elderly population ++</p> <p>Development takes into account and meets some of the needs of Ryedale's elderly population +</p> <p>Development does not address the needs of Ryedale's elderly population –</p> <p>The development makes no provision for the needs of Ryedale's elderly population --</p>	N/A					N/A
L Overall Rating for 'Meeting Needs'	<p>Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++</p> <p>Proposal identifies what the needs are and how some needs will be met by the development +</p> <p>Proposal either does not identify what the needs are or how any needs are or how any needs will be met by the development –</p> <p>No assessment is undertaken of what the needs are and whether any needs --</p>	(+) from and employment land perspective					(--) capability in principle but there are access concerns

Assessment		184e	184f	184g	184h	185	248
Community Facilities, utilities and Infrastructure							
Q44 Malton/Norton only - Has Traffic Modelling or Transport Assessment been undertaken in the context of work already undertaken on the Malton and Norton STA?	<p>Yes</p> <p>No - traffic modelling required</p>	(--) traffic modelling required, strategic modelling considered through STA. This site was considered as part of that work.					(++) strategic modelling considered this site. No site specific TA
Q45 On sites greater than 1ha: Has a Transport Assessment been undertaken	<p>Yes ++</p> <p>No- transport assessment required --</p>	(--)					(--)
Q. 46 Is highway mitigation required as part of the development and what is the impact of the development on the highway network following mitigation?	<p>No mitigation required or no impact on the highway following mitigation ++</p> <p>Mitigation required but no unacceptable impact following mitigation +</p> <p>Mitigation required and development would have a significant impact though not unacceptable impact after mitigation -</p> <p>Mitigation required and development would still have an unacceptable impact following mitigation --</p>	(--) A site of this size would require significant transport infrastructural improvements					(--) Access concerns
Q. 47 Can the site accommodate adequate parking and servicing facilities?	<p>Site meets highway guidelines for parking and servicing ++</p> <p>Site does not currently meet parking and/or servicing requirements. However these issues can potentially be overcome or mitigated -</p> <p>Site does not meet highway requirements for parking and/or servicing and the issues identified are difficult/not practically possible to overcome --</p>	No site specific information submitted. Seeks to establish principle. No reason to suggest that such features cannot be implemented.					No site specific information submitted. Seeks to establish principle. No reason to suggest that such features cannot be implemented.
Q. 48 Will the proposal provide, enable or improve access to public rights of way (PROW)?	<p>Proposal will create new PROW or integrate existing PROW into the development ++</p> <p>Proposal will not affect a PROW +</p> <p>Proposal would involve the diversion or loss of a PROW --</p>	PROW on site, runs laterally across the middle of the site (Norton Grove Stud), and the retention of this would need to be considered. No details provided as principle is sought at this stage.					PROW on site, and the retention of this would need to be considered. No details provided as principle is sought at this stage.

Assessment		184e	184f	184g	184h	185	248
Q. 49 Does the proposal involve new public realm or enhancements to the existing public realm as part of its development?	<p>Proposal will create high quality new public realm or significantly enhance existing public realm as part of its development ++</p> <p>Proposal will create some new public realm or partially enhance existing public realm as part of its development+</p> <p>Though capable of incorporating new or enhancing existing public realm, the proposal makes no provision for it --</p>	No site specific information submitted. Seeks to establish principle for employment/mixed use and this would not have significant areas of public realm, areas for workers to relax, obtain refreshment could be provided.					No site specific information submitted. Seeks to establish principle for employment/mixed use and this would not have significant areas of public realm, areas for workers to relax, obtain refreshment could be provided.
Q. 50 What is the capacity of existing utilities and infrastructure to cope with impact of the development?	<p>Site has limited or no adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be fully mitigated ++</p> <p>Site has limited to medium adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be satisfactorily mitigated +</p> <p>Site has medium to high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation –</p> <p>Site has high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation --</p>	<p>(--) Electricity and Gas – No capacity issue/constraint currently identified but reinforcement of the distribution network likely to be required</p> <p>Water Supply – No capacity issue/constraint identified, but reinforcement of distribution network likely to be required</p> <p>Sewerage Capacity and surface water drainage– Constraints in Norton. Existing pumps will need upgrading. Capacity to North of the Derwent. Ongoing maintenance/ enhancement of flood defences.</p> <p>Complementary town centre traffic management measures; Improvements to junctions in the internal road network; Improvements to bus/rail interchange; Improved cycle network and pedestrian facilities (including public realm improvements). No information has been provided, a site of this very substantial size would be expected to look to meet key settlement infrastructure needs, as well as mitigating site-specific impacts.</p>					<p>(+)Electricity and Gas – No capacity issue/constraint currently identified but reinforcement of the distribution network likely to be required</p> <p>Water Supply – No capacity issue/constraint identified, but reinforcement of distribution network likely to be required</p> <p>Sewerage Capacity and surface water drainage– Constraints in Norton. Existing pumps will need upgrading. Capacity to North of the Derwent. Ongoing maintenance/ enhancement of flood defences.</p> <p>Complementary town centre traffic management measures; Improvements to junctions in the internal road network; Improvements to bus/rail interchange; Improved cycle network and pedestrian facilities (including public realm improvements). No information has been provided, a site of this size would be expected to mitigating site-specific impacts, with some contribution to meeting wider infrastructure needs.</p>
Q. 51 What is the impact on Waste Water Treatment Works?	<p>Further than 400m from the boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works ++</p> <p>Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact undertaken and Yorkshire Water No Objection +</p> <p>Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact not undertaken –</p> <p>Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact undertaken Yorkshire Water consulted and likely to object --</p>	(++)					(-) within 250m but employment uses

Assessment		184e	184f	184g	184h	185	248
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 --						
M Overall Rating for 'Community facilities, Utilities and Infrastructure'	Site has limited or no adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has a adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be fully mitigated ++	(--)					(--)
	Site has limited to medium adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be satisfactorily mitigated +						
	Site has medium to high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation -						
	Site has high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation -						
Strong Economy							
Q53 (town centre uses only) 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 ++	A/a					N/A
	Proposal will support the vitality and viability of the town centre in retaining key services and facilities +						
	Proposal could adversely harm the viability and vitality of the town centre leading to decline --						
Q. 54 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 ++	(++)					(++) has potential
	Mix of uses proposed will not diversify the economy but will support existing employment sectors in Ryedale +						
Q. 55 (Employment/Retail uses) Does the proposal involve the creation of net additional or net loss of jobs in Ryedale?	Up to 250 net jobs created ++	(++)					(++)
	Up to 50 net jobs created +						
	Up to 50 net jobs lost -						
	Up to 250 net jobs lost --						

Assessment		184e	184f	184g	184h	185	248
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 --						
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 ++	(+) Considered through ELR as a Category II site				(--) Adjacent to York Road Industrial Estate, but access concerns mean site would be a category III site in the ELR
	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 ++	(--) site is very large, and will require significant infrastructure					(--) concerns around access delivery
	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 ++	(+) contributions would pertain to those appropriate for an employment use. No information supplied.					(+) contributions would pertain to those appropriate for an employment use. No information supplied.
	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 ++	Scheme would be exempt from the CIL charging - zero charge					Scheme would be exempt from the CIL charging - zero charge
	No --						
O Overall Deliverability / Developability Rating	Site is able to come forward without impairment and is able to provide a normal range of contributions ++	(--) Concerns about the scale of site in relation to plan requirements					(--) concerns about access delivery
	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 --						

Malton and Norton Other Development Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		379	442 (250)	452	474	567	543
Stage 1 - Sift		Employment only within Huttons Ambo Parish	Also site submission 250 Retail scheme granted upon appeal	planning permission quashed. Application yet to be re-submitted	Mixed use site also considered through residential SSM	Employment only	
all sites 0.3Ha and above	0.3 Ha or greater ++ Less than 0.3 Ha --	(++) 2.92ha	(++)	(++) 1.72ha	(++) 13.38ha		(++) 6.16ha
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 --	(++) adjacent to industrial estate. Previously developed	(++) subject to RCS and Sequential and Impact Tests	(++) subject to RCS and Sequential and Impact Tests	(++)	(--) Not in or adjacent to the Principal Town	(--) Not in or adjacent to the Principal Town
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 --	(++) Site proximal to River Derwent SSSI. Also River Derwent SAC to the East and West of Malton. HRA establishes that no likely significant effects cannot be ruled out.	(++)	(++)	(++)		
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 --	(++) part of site is within flood zone 2 and very edge of site is flood zone 3.	(++)	(++)	(++)		
Stage 2 - Site Assessment							
Q1A How accessible is the site to key services and facilities	Bus stop	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(+)	
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +					
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -					
		15 minutes walking time and over --					
	Railway Station (Malton and Norton)	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(--)	(++)	(+)	(--)	
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +					
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -					
		15 minutes walking time and over --					
	Nearest commercial 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 --					

Malton and Norton Other Development Site Selection Methodology

Assessment			379	442 (250)	452	474	567	543
Nearest employment area	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(++)		(+)	(++)	(+)		
	Up to 10 minutes walking time +							
	Up to 15 minutes walking time –							
	15 minutes walking time and over --							
Nearest Primary School	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A		
	Up to 10 minutes walking time +							
	Up to 15 minutes walking time –							
	15 minutes walking time and over --							
Nearest Secondary School	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A		
	Up to 10 minutes walking time +							
	Up to 15 minutes walking time –							
	15 minutes walking time and over --							
Nearest Development Limit	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(++)		(++)	(++)	(++)		
	Up to 10 minutes walking time +							
	Up to 15 minutes walking time –							
	15 minutes walking time and over --							
Nearest Doctors Surgery	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	NA		N/A	N/A	N/A		
	Up to 10 minutes walking time +							
	Up to 15 minutes walking time –							
	15 minutes walking time and over --							
Hospital (Malton and Norton)	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	NA		N/A	N/A	N/A		
	Up to 10 minutes walking time +							
	Up to 15 minutes walking time –							
	15 minutes walking time and over --							

Malton and Norton Other Development Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		379	442 (250)	452	474	567	543
Q1B (Retail) How does the site location relate to the Town Centre in terms of the NPPF Sequential Test?	Town Centre ++ Edge of Centre + Out of Centre -- Out of Town --	N/A	(+)	(+) with potential of functioning as part of the town centre once developed. Site falls within the Northern Arc, identified by the Development Plan for retail opportunities.	N/A		
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 -	(+) with a small area of flood zone 3	(++)	(++)	(++)		
Q2B What vulnerability class does the site fall	Flood Zone 1++ Flood Zone 2 Flood Zone 3a Less vulnerable ++ More vulnerable + Highly vulnerable - Less vulnerable + More vulnerable - Highly vulnerable --	(++) and (+) for area in flood zone 3		(++)	(++)		
Q2C (Malton and Norton only) which sub-category of flood zone 3a does the site fall within?	Flood Zone 3a (i) defence <1:50 Flood Zone 3a (ii) defence 1:100 + Flood zone 3a (iii) defence 1:50 < 1:100 -	(--) for southern part of the site. Rest of site is flood zone 1 and 2.		N/A	N/A		
Q2D Has a Flood Risk Assessment been undertaken?	yes ++ No --	(--) SFRA only site would require a FRA due to flood risk and size of the site		(++) FRA done for previously considered application- will need to consider again through the reconsideration of the application	(--) SFRA only site would require a FRA due to size of the site		
Q2E (Malton/Norton/Old Malton) If within the Rapid Inundation Zone (RIZ), what level of hazard would exist?	Low - 'Caution' + Moderate - 'Danger for some people' - Significant - 'Danger for most people' -- Extreme 'Danger for all people' --	N/A		N/A	N/A		
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 --	(+) Subject to exclusion of flood zone 3 element of the site	(++)	(++)	(++)		
Q3 What are the conclusions of the Highways Authorities (NYCC) and Highways England (HA) (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 -	(--) Public access to site from a public highway not achievable.		(+)	(+) Subject to TA and cumulative effect of Sites 372/388.		

Assessment		379	442 (250)	452	474	567	543
	Site has multiple highway issues which may be difficult to mitigate unless further investigation demonstrates otherwise --						

Assessment		379	442 (250)	452	474	567	543
Biodiversity and Geo-diversity							
Q4 Would the development affect a regional or local site of biodiversity (including SINC, LNRs or RIGS) or affect UK, NYMNP or Ryedale Biodiversity Plan protected species	<p>Enhancement of feature/species possible – mitigation not required ++</p> <p>Neutral impact – no effect or effect can be fully mitigated +</p> <p>Adverse impact but mitigation possible –</p> <p>Serious impact with limited means of mitigation --</p>	<p>(-)The site is adjacent to the River Derwent SAC, although it has been assessed through the overall Habitats Regulations Assessment has determined that there could be a likely significant effect from development at a settlement-wide level (diffuse pollution and recreational activity disturbance), but that through the appropriate assessment the impact can be mitigated as part of the planning application consideration. The site is not subject to any other national/local designation. Given the potential time frame, protected species may be present. Therefore surveys may be required in the future, and any protected species will be under the statutory protection that they are afforded.</p>		<p>(-) The site is not adjacent to the River Derwent SAC, although it has been assessed through the overall Habitats Regulations Assessment has determined that there could be a likely significant effect from development at a settlement-wide level (diffuse pollution and recreational activity disturbance), but that through the appropriate assessment the impact can be mitigated as part of the planning application consideration.</p>	<p>(-) The site is not adjacent to the River Derwent SAC, although it has been assessed through the overall Habitats Regulations Assessment has determined that there could be a likely significant effect from development at a settlement-wide level (diffuse pollution and recreational activity disturbance), but that through the appropriate assessment the impact can be mitigated as part of the planning application consideration. The site is adjacent to a SINC site and Ecological Appraisal would be required.</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 concerning green infrastructure networks. It is considered that there is no reason that such networks cannot be introduced, commensurate with the size of the site, and its ability to link with other sites.</p>		<p>(+) No information submitted with the site submission. Adjacent to the site is the cemetery. Although such spaces are not in common usage as a recreational resource, they can be a place of quiet reflection, and provide a place for wildlife to inhabit.</p>	<p>No details have been submitted concerning green infrastructure networks. It is considered that there is no reason that such networks cannot be introduced, commensurate with the size of the site.</p>		

Assessment		379	442 (250)	452	474	567	543
Q6 Would the development impact on protected and unprotected trees, hedgerows and ancient woodland?	Positive impact. Enhancement of feature possible and mitigation not required ++	(-) The site has numerous treed areas including a shelterbelt to the south. There are also a number of hedgerows to the boundary and within the boundary of the site. A comprehensive landscape scheme would be required as part of the development of this site for commercial purposes.		(+)	Mature belt of trees on eastern boundary provides screening for residential properties. On the boundary between the lower and upper car parks there is a collection of smaller trees and scrub. To the south west, at the Wentworth Street entrance is a group of trees.	(+)	
	Neutral impact. No effect or effect can be fully mitigated +						
	Adverse impact but mitigation possible --						
	Serious impact with limited or no means of mitigation--						
B Overall rating for 'Biodiversity and Geodiversity'	Positive impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements and no mitigation required++	(-)		(+)	(+)		
	Neutral impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements however any effect can be fully mitigated +						
	Adverse impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements by effects are capable of some mitigation --						
	Significant impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements and effects are unable to be satisfactorily mitigated --						

Malton and Norton Other Development Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		379	442 (250)	452	474	567	543
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>	(++) within the built form of the settlement, as part of the industrial estate		(+) Current Low landscape sensitivity as within the built form of the settlement. Car park has limited wider views from the site due to topography. Height of buildings will need consideration to ensure a sympathetic integration and backdrop from Pasture Lane.	(--) The Howardian Hills LCA extends into the western half of Malton, resulting in land which is elevated, undulating, then gently falls to the north, east and south, to the Vale of Pickering LCA, covering the rest of the Malton and Norton which is generally flatter and low lying. To the south of Norton, the land begins to rise into the Wolds. This site is part of the Howardian Hills LCA limb before it falls away to the Vale of Pickering to the north, and the land is to the north of the A64 cutting, on land which is undulating and elevated. The site has no relationship with the existing settlement, and the land here is elevated, and any form of development would be particularly intrusive.		
Q8 What impact would the site have on nationally protected landscapes the North York Moors NP and Howardian Hills AONB?	<p>Site has a very low landscape sensitivity to being developed or existing landscape features are retained or enhanced. Site will not detract from landscape character ++</p> <p>Site has a low landscape sensitivity to being developed and some existing landscape features can be retained. Site is unlikely to detract from landscape character +</p> <p>Site has medium landscape sensitivity to being developed and may affect landscape features, however mitigation is possible. Site may detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved –</p> <p>Site has high landscape sensitivity to being developed and will affect landscape features with limited/no means of mitigation. Site will detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved --</p>	(+) Site would be viewed from the A64 (within the AONB) within the context of existing industrial development and the town beyond. Landscaping would assist in amelioration of any impacts in shorter distances. No impact concerning the National Park		(++) No impact.	(+) This site is beyond the A64 cutting to the north, but it is not viewable from the substantial distance from the North York Moors National Park. No impact on the Howardian Hills AONB. Landscape impacts identified		

Assessment		379	442 (250)	452	474	567	543
Q9 (sites within York Greenbelt) What impact would the sites have on a defined York Greenbelt	Positive Impact, mitigation not required ++	N/A		N/A	N/A		
	Neutral impact- limited or no landscape mitigation is required +						
	Negative impact with potential for harm but landscape mitigation is possible –						
	Significant harm with limited means of mitigation --						
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 ++	(-) Landscape mitigation will be necessary, but it can be achieved.		(-) Landscape mitigation will be necessary, but it can be achieved particularly form and height of buildings, and use of some trees to provide visual interest	(--) landform, distance from settlement make site challenging to assimilate development		
	Site is capable of retaining some existing landscape features and limited or no landscape mitigation is required +						
	Site will not retain most existing landscape features, however landscape mitigation is possible –						
	Site will not retain any existing landscape features and limited or no landscape mitigation is possible/proposed –						
Q11 Will the site lead to the coalescence of settlements which will impact on their character and setting?	Development within the built form of the settlement ++	(+)		(++)	(+)		
	Development is on the edge of a settlement which is not affected by coalescence with another settlement +						
	Development is on the edge of the settlement and will lead to coalescence with another settlement however mitigation possible –						
	Development is on the edge of the settlement and will lead to significant coalescence with another settlement and limited/no mitigation possible --						
C Overall Rating for 'Special Qualities, Landscape and Setting'	Positive impact – the proposal will retain and enhance the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement ++	(++)		(++) potential for enhancement should be sought, existing site makes limited contribution.	(--)		
	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 --						

Malton and Norton Other Development Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		379	442 (250)	452	474	567	543
Culture and Heritage							
Q12 Will the site affect a designated heritage asset, either directly or indirectly through its setting?	<p>Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++</p> <p>Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +</p> <p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –</p> <p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --</p>	(+) There are no designated heritage assets which would be directly or indirectly affected, including consideration of their setting.		(+) The New Malton Cemetery Chapel to the north of the site, and the Mausoleum (Behrens of Swinton Grange) are both grade II listed, but the boundary wall is not curtilage listed because it has no physical/functional association with the chapel or mausoleum, (it clearly has a functional relationship to the cemetery). English Heritage have advised that if the site is allocated, the Plan should make clear that development proposals for this area would need to ensure that those elements which constitute to the significance of the buildings are not harmed.	(+) There are no designated heritage assets which would be directly or indirectly affected, including consideration of their setting.		
Q13 Will the site affect a non-designated heritage asset which the Council identifies as having a degree of significance that is worthy of consideration?	<p>Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++</p> <p>Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +</p> <p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –</p>	(-) Site is within the existing industrial estate. Area with potential for the survival of prehistoric and Romano-British remains. Eastern part of site occupied by treatment works which will have disturbed/destroyed any archaeological remains, so no archaeological action advised. However, geophysical survey of the western, Greenfield, part of the site is advised, to be followed by trial trenching to clarify the nature and significance of any		(++) The redevelopment of the site represents an opportunity to improve the appearance and experience of this site for the town.	(--) The elevated and exposed nature of the site means that any development would be visually prominent. Also, it is to the other side of the A64, no related to the main settlement of Malton. It is considered that development of this site would have a significant adverse impact on the form and character of Malton. Area with known potential for the survival of prehistoric, Romano-British and medieval remains from finds recovered during field walking survey in advance of construction of		

Assessment		379	442 (250)	452	474	567	543
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --	nature and significance of any archaeological remains.			likely in advance of construction of Malton bypass. Crop marks recorded in the HER of a ditched enclosure and track way/field system in the north-eastern part of the site and other crop marks in the vicinity to the west showing a double ditched track way heading into the site. Indicates present of an Iron Age/Romano-British settlement or farmstead. Advise archaeological evaluation by means of geophysical survey and trial trenching advised to clarify the nature and significance of archaeological remains		

Malton and Norton Other Development Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		379	442 (250)	452	474	567	543
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 --						
Low Carbon Development and Renewable Energy							
Q14 Is the site adopting the Energy Hierarchy of the Local Plan Strategy?	Site capable and developer willing++	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.		No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.		
	Site capable but developer unwilling -						
	Site not capable --						
Q15 Is the site capable of linking in or supporting off site renewable energy schemes?	Site capable linking in with off site renewable energy scheme and developer willing to take it forward ++	No such schemes within the locality.		No such schemes within the locality.	No such schemes within the locality.		
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 within the locality.		No such schemes within the locality.	No such schemes within the locality.		
E Overall rating for 'Low Carbon Development and Renewable Energy'	Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer willing ++	No information provided 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 details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be included.		No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be included.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be included.		
	Site can accommodate 1 level higher than mandatory limit –						
	Development cannot accommodate higher standards than mandatory level --						
Q18 Does the development contain proposals for waste reduction in both its construction and when in operation?	Proposals for waste reduction incorporated into both the construction and operation of the development++	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be included.		No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be included.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be included.		
	Proposals have investigated waste reduction, however only limited measures are achievable -						
	No proposals suggested for waste reduction -						

Malton and Norton Other Development Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		379	442 (250)	452	474	567	543
Q. 19 Does the development contain individual/communal recycling facilities/ infrastructure?	Yes + No --	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be included.		No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be included.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be included.		
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 submitted 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 +	(++)		(++)	Greenfield		
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 --	(+) The element of flood zone 3 could be discounted, and this would still provide a reasonable area		(++)	(+)		
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 --	(-) Sewage - medium risk.		No known contamination	(-) Railways 1854-1958. Medium risk.		
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 --	(++) but only on the basis the site is available		(++)	(+)		

Malton and Norton Other Development Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		379	442 (250)	452	474	567	543
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)?	<p>No loss of best and most versatile agricultural land ++</p> <p>Up to 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost –</p> <p>More than 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost --</p>	(++) The site is Previously Developed Land. But only if it becomes available		(++)	(--) Quarter of site in grade 2, small area urban, rest grade 3. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as grades 2 and 3, and therefore there is the strong possibility that its development would result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The site is more than 5ha.		
Q. 24 Would the development lead to the sterilisation of mineral resources?	<p>Site not within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search, or Mineral Consultation Zone ++?</p> <p>Site within the buffer of a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone –?</p> <p>Site within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone --</p>	(++)		(++)	(--)		
Q. 25 Would the development have an adverse impact on a Groundwater Source Protection Zone?	<p>Development is not located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone ++</p> <p>Development is located in a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but mitigation is possible to reduce the risk of groundwater pollution risk +</p> <p>Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but no risk assessment has been undertaken -</p> <p>Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone and mitigation of the risk of groundwater pollution is not possible --</p>	(++)		(++)	(++)		
Q. 26 Would the development have an adverse impact on the Malton Air Quality Management Area or any other site of poor air quality?	<p>Site falls outside any area of poor air quality and development is unlikely to result in any reduction in air quality. ++</p> <p>Site falls outside any area of poor air quality and development is unlikely to result in a significant reduction in air quality. +</p> <p>Site is within an area of poor air quality and mitigation is possible. Development may lead to a reduction in air quality. -</p> <p>Site is within an area of poor air quality and limited/no mitigation is possible or no assessment has been made by the proposer. Development is likely to lead to a further significant reduction in air quality. --</p>	(+) Malton has an AQMA which includes the streets of Castlegate/Wheelgate/eastern Yorkersgate/Old Malton Rd where they converge at Butcher Corner. This is due to breaches of NO2 concentrations. The primary source is road traffic. The site is well away from the AQMA. Traffic will predominantly use the A64/York Road. The site will allow the avoidance of AQMA unless needing to enter the Town Centre. As a site within a settlement which is subject to an AQMA, a proportionate AQA should be completed as part of any planning application.		(+) Malton has an AQMA which includes the streets of Castlegate/Wheelgate/eastern Yorkersgate/Old Malton Rd where they converge at Butcher Corner. This is due to breaches of NO2 concentrations. The primary source is road traffic. The site is physically some distance away from the AQMA, but adjacent roads link into roads which pass through it. The site for a retail enterprise will allow the avoidance of AQMA. It will be expected to retain the car park, reducing the need to enter the Town Centre by car. It will also reduce the traffic movements at Morrison's on Castlegate within the AQMA. As a site within a settlement which is subject to an AQMA, a proportionate AQA should be completed as part of any planning application.	(-) Malton has an AQMA which includes the streets of Castlegate/Wheelgate/eastern Yorkersgate/Old Malton Rd where they converge at Butcher Corner. This is due to breaches of NO2 concentrations. The primary source is road traffic. Although not in the AQMA this site would produce traffic which will pass through the AQMA. These will be larger vehicles than would be for a residential scheme, and no direct access to the A64 is achievable. As a site within a settlement which is subject to an AQMA, a proportionate AQA should be completed as part of any planning application.		

Assessment		379	442 (250)	452	474	567	543
Q. 27 Is any part of the development on suspected unstable land?	Land has no instability concerns ++	(-) based on current uses		Not aware of any land instability	(-) Railways 1854-1958. Medium risk.		
	Land potentially unstable but investigation has shown that mitigation is possible +						
	Land potentially unstable but no investigation has been carried out -						
	Land suffers from significant instability problems and either no mitigation has been proposed or instability problems are not possible to mitigate --						
Q. 28 Will the site impact on major hazard sites or pipelines?	HSE Standing Advice states "do not advise against development" ++	(++)		(++)	(++)		
	HSE Standing Advice states "advise against development"						
H Overall Rating for 'Natural Resources'	Site would not adversely affect any natural resources ++	(++)		(++)	(-)		
	Site would not have any significant adverse effect on natural resources +						
	Site would have an adverse effect on natural resources but mitigation is possible -						
	Site would have a significant adverse effect on natural resources and limited/no mitigation is possible --						
Amenity							
Q. 29 Is the development in an area where noise, light, dust or smell is likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to generate noise, light or dust which will affect existing users?	The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +	(+)		(-) The increased use of the site would mean increased traffic around the residential properties adjacent. Screening and noise mitigation could assist. Lighting and times of delivery vehicles will also need to be considered to ensure no adverse level of impact on the amenity of adjacent residences.	(+)		
	The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -						
	The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --						
Q. 30 Is the development in an area where other factors are likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to generate forms of nuisance which may affect the amenity of existing users? These may include issues such as privacy, lack of sunlight overbearing effects.	The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +	(+)		(+)	(+)		
	The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -						
	The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --						

Assessment		379	442 (250)	452	474	567	543
I Overall Rating for 'Amenity'	The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +	(+)		(+) subject to appropriate mitigation	(+)		
	The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -						
	The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of this site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --						
Flood Risk							
Q. 31 Is the site potentially affected by groundwater flooding?	No ++ Yes further investigation required --	(++)		(++)	(++)		
Q. 32 Is the site potentially affected by surface water flooding and is this site considered to be within a critical drainage area?	No ++ Yes further investigation required --	(++)		(++) Within CDA but not potentially affected by surface water runoff	(++)		
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 is submitted at this stage, but seeks principle to be established. Site would be expected to accommodate SDS		(+) No information is submitted at this stage, but seeks principle to be established. Site would be expected to accommodate SDS	(+) No information is submitted at this stage, but seeks principle to be established. Site would be expected to accommodate SDS		
Q. 35 What other measures* have been considered which ensure the development is resilient to climate change? * variable	Multiple additional measures proposed which build in resilience to climate change ++ Single additional measure proposed to build in resilience to climate change + No information provided on measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change -	(-) No information is submitted at this stage, but seeks principle to be established. No reason to suggest the measures could not be implemented		(-) No information is submitted at this stage, but seeks principle to be established. No reason to suggest the measures could not be implemented	(-) No information is submitted at this stage, but seeks principle to be established. No reason to suggest the measures could not be implemented		

Assessment		379	442 (250)	452	474	567	543
	No measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change --						
J Overall Rating for 'Flood Risk'	No flood risk associated with the site ++	(-)		(++)	(++)		
	Limited flood risk associated with the site which can be fully mitigated +						
	Site affected by a number of flood risk issues, however mitigation possible-						
	Site affected by significant flood risk issues and limited mitigation possible --						

Malton and Norton Other Development Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		379	442 (250)	452	474	567	543
People							
Q. 36 Would the development of the site lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of the settlement?	Development incorporates existing use(s), as part of the overall scheme ++	No loss of any such use		No loss of any such use	No loss of any such use		
	Development proposes relocation of use to suitable alternative location +						
	Development will result in the loss of a valued facility/use and no justification or alternative provided --						
Q. 37 Will the site incorporate the principles of Secured By Design, reducing the potential for crime and discouraging anti-social behaviour?	Yes – SBD principles taken into account or will be taken into account following liaison with North Yorkshire police +	(-) No details have been provided but there is no reason to suggest that such principles could not be taken into account.		(-) No details have been provided but there is no reason to suggest that such principles could not be taken into account. Particularly given the presence of the car park	(-) No details have been provided but there is no reason to suggest that such principles could not be taken into account.		
	No – SBD principles not taken into account -						
Q. 38 Does the design of the development encourage people to walk and cycle rather than travel by car?	Cycleways and footpaths effectively integrated into the development encouraging walking and cycling ++	(+) No details submitted, as establishing principle. There is no reason to suggest such features could not be provided.		(+) No details submitted, as establishing principle. There is no reason to suggest such features could not be provided. The accessibility threshold information demonstrates an excellent level of accessibility	(+) No details submitted, as establishing principle. There is no reason to suggest such features could not be provided.		
	Some cycleways and/or footpaths shown encouraging walking and cycling +						
	No cycleways and footpaths indicated as part of this development --						
Q. 39 For sites over 1ha or over 80 houses- Has a Travel Plan been produced which assesses alternative options and initiatives?	Travel Plan undertaken and clear implementable initiatives for promoting modal shift set out ++	(-- No Travel Plan provided, due to establishing principle. A Travel Plan would be required.		(-- No Travel Plan provided, due to establishing principle. A Travel Plan would be required.	(-- No Travel Plan provided, due to establishing principle. A Travel Plan would be required.		
	Travel Plan undertaken and some initiatives identified for promoting modal shift +						
	Travel Plan undertaken which identifies limited opportunities for modal shift or Travel Plan not undertaken --						
Q. 40 Will the proposed development attract a balanced living and/or working population, reducing inequality of opportunity?	Development proposed is clearly designed to attract a balanced living and/or working community ++	(+) Employment land is a much needed element of meeting a balanced working community. No details have been supplied but the scheme is establishing principle.	(++) site has potential to deliver enhanced retail offer	(++) site has potential to deliver enhanced retail offer	(+) Employment land is a much needed element of meeting a balanced working community. No details have been supplied but the scheme is establishing principle.		
	Development takes into account the need to attract a balanced and/or working community +						
	Development takes no account of the need to attract a balanced living and/or working community -						
K Overall Rating for 'People'	Development actively planned to encourage the development of sustainable communities ++	(+)	(++) site has potential to deliver enhanced retail offer	(++) site has potential to deliver enhanced retail offer	(+)		
	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 --						

Malton and Norton Other Development Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		379	442 (250)	452	474	567	543
Meeting needs							
Q.41 Does the type and mix of development proposed meet the needs identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), Employment Land Review Update 2010 (ELR), Ryedale Retail Capacity Studies (RRCS) and Malton Town Centre Strategy?	<p>Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++</p> <p>Proposal identifies what the needs are and how some needs will be met by the development +</p> <p>Proposal either does not identify what the needs are or how any needs will be met by the development –</p> <p>No assessment is undertaken of what the needs are and whether any needs will be met --</p>	(--) The site submission seeks the principle of use for employment- a logical extension to the Industrial Estate. However, the site is in occupation for an important infrastructural function as a Waste Water Treatment Works	(++)	Depends significantly on the nature of the proposal. RRCS identifies that quantitative convenience retail needs would be met with existing permissions, but that quantitative needs may not. There is some outstanding comparison retail needs. Northern Arc in Local Plan Strategy identifies area for focusing on town centre uses, this includes this site alongside other buildings.	(-) Site submission seeks principle. Site would have no synergies with other industrial estates/business parks. The access to and from the site will be not commensurate with facilities provided at other sites.		Included in the 2006 Employment Land Review and its update - proposed for B uses
Q. 42 What level and type of affordable housing is proposed?	<p>Development offers appropriate level and type of affordable housing which meets the needs as set out in the SHMA ++</p> <p>Development offers some affordable housing which meets some of the need as set out in the SHMA +</p> <p>Development does not offer the appropriate level and type of affordable housing or does not meet the need for affordable housing as set out in the SHMA –</p> <p>The development makes no provision for affordable housing --</p>	N/A		N/A	N/A		
Q. 43 What provision has been made for Ryedale's elderly population?	<p>Development addresses and meets the needs of Ryedale's elderly population ++</p> <p>Development takes into account and meets some of the needs of Ryedale's elderly population +</p> <p>Development does not address the needs of Ryedale's elderly population –</p> <p>The development makes no provision for the needs of Ryedale's elderly population --</p>	N/A		N/A	N/A		
L Overall Rating for 'Meeting Needs'	<p>Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++</p> <p>Proposal identifies what the needs are and how some needs will be met by the development +</p> <p>Proposal either does not identify what the needs are or how any needs are or how any needs will be met by the development –</p> <p>No assessment is undertaken of what the needs are and whether any needs --</p>	(--) concerns about current use of WWTW being operational with no clear cessation of use	(++)	(+) dependant on the nature of the development but sequentially preferable site to out of centre or further afield	(-)		

Malton and Norton Other Development Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		379	442 (250)	452	474	567	543
Community Facilities, utilities and Infrastructure							
Q44 Malton/Norton only - Has Traffic Modelling or Transport Assessment been undertaken in the context of work already undertaken on the Malton and Norton STA?	Yes No - traffic modelling required	(--)		(--)	(--)		(--)
Q45 On sites greater than 1ha: Has a Transport Assessment been undertaken	Yes ++ No- transport assessment required --	(--)		(++) through the planning application- would need to be revisited to take into account recent planning consents for residential development	(--)		
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 --	(++) site size would be capable of using existing infrastructure		(+) mitigation measures considered necessary	(-) Sites is capable of accessing Broughton Road, but this road has no direct link to the A64, and would increase town centre traffic movement getting onto the Trunk Road.		Discussion with Highways England have occurred on site 542. Developer led solution is technically achievable.
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 site specific information submitted. Seeks to establish principle. No reason to suggest that such features cannot be implemented.		No site specific information submitted. Seeks to establish principle. The site is currently a car park, and there has been a longstanding expectation that there will be no loss of parking spaces as a result of the scheme. Servicing will also be important due the proposed use of the site for retail (supermarket convenience)	No site specific information submitted. Seeks to establish principle. No reason to suggest that such features cannot be implemented.		
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 --	PROW on site, and the retention of this would need to be considered. No details provided as principle is sought at this stage.		No PROW.	A PROW skirts round the site and the retention of this would need to be considered. No details provided as principle is sought at this stage.		

Malton and Norton Other Development Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		379	442 (250)	452	474	567	543
Q. 49 Does the proposal involve new public realm or enhancements to the existing public realm as part of its development?	<p>Proposal will create high quality new public realm or significantly enhance existing public realm as part of its development ++</p> <p>Proposal will create some new public realm or partially enhance existing public realm as part of its development+</p> <p>Though capable of incorporating new or enhancing existing public realm, the proposal makes no provision for it --</p>	No site specific information submitted. Seeks to establish principle for employment/mixed use and this would not have significant areas of public realm, areas for workers to relax, obtain refreshment could be provided.		No site specific information submitted. Seeks to establish principle for retail use for a food store. Public realm will be of key importance in integrating the site with the town centre	No site specific information submitted. Seeks to establish principle for employment/mixed use and this would not have significant areas of public realm, areas for workers to relax, obtain refreshment could be provided.		
Q. 50 What is the capacity of existing utilities and infrastructure to cope with impact of the development?	<p>Site has limited or no adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be fully mitigated ++</p> <p>Site has limited to medium adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be satisfactorily mitigated +</p> <p>Site has medium to high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation –</p> <p>Site has high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation --</p>	<p>(--) Electricity and Gas – No capacity issue/constraint currently identified but reinforcement of the distribution network likely to be required</p> <p>Water Supply – No capacity issue/constraint identified, but reinforcement of distribution network likely to be required</p> <p>Sewerage Capacity and surface water drainage– Constraints in Norton. Existing pumps will need upgrading. Capacity to North of the Derwent. Ongoing maintenance/ enhancement of flood defences.</p> <p>Complementary town centre traffic management measures; Improvements to junctions in the internal road network; Improvements to bus/rail interchange; Improved cycle network and pedestrian facilities (including public realm improvements). No information has been provided, a site of this size is more capable of delivering site-specific mitigation, as opposed to meeting some key settlement infrastructure needs. It is also the site of the Waste Water Treatment Works</p>		<p>(+) Electricity and Gas – No capacity issue/constraint currently identified but reinforcement of the distribution network likely to be required</p> <p>Water Supply – No capacity issue/constraint identified, but reinforcement of distribution network likely to be required</p> <p>Sewerage Capacity and surface water drainage– Constraints in Norton. Existing pumps will need upgrading. Capacity to North of the Derwent. Ongoing maintenance/ enhancement of flood defences.</p> <p>Complementary town centre traffic management measures; Improvements to junctions in the internal road network; Improvements to bus/rail interchange; Improved cycle network and pedestrian facilities (including public realm improvements). No information has been provided, a site of this size would be expected to mitigating site-specific impacts, with some contribution to meeting wider infrastructure needs.</p>	<p>(+) Electricity and Gas – No capacity issue/constraint currently identified but reinforcement of the distribution network likely to be required</p> <p>Water Supply – No capacity issue/constraint identified, but reinforcement of distribution network likely to be required</p> <p>Sewerage Capacity and surface water drainage– Constraints in Norton. Existing pumps will need upgrading. Capacity to North of the Derwent. Ongoing maintenance/ enhancement of flood defences. Complementary town centre traffic management measures; Improvements to junctions in the internal road network; Improvements to bus/rail interchange; Improved cycle network and pedestrian facilities (including public realm improvements). No information has been provided, a site of this size would be expected to mitigating site-specific impacts, with some contribution to meeting wider infrastructure needs.</p>		
Q. 51 What is the impact on Waste Water Treatment Works?	<p>Further than 400m from the boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works ++</p> <p>Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact undertaken and Yorkshire Water No Objection +</p> <p>Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact not undertaken –</p> <p>Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact undertaken Yorkshire Water consulted and likely to object --</p>	<p>(--) is a WWTW site, which would be lost if site were to be developed. No alternative is proposed</p>		<p>(++)</p>	<p>(++)</p>		

Assessment		379	442 (250)	452	474	567	543
Q. 52 Would the development on its own, have an impact on an existing community facility and has mitigation of this impact been proposed as part of the development?	<p>Site has no adverse impact on community facilities or where there is an adverse impact this is fully mitigated through the provision of new, expanded or alternative facilities ++</p> <p>Site does not have a significant adverse impact on community facilities or where there is a significant adverse impact this is mitigated through the provision of new, expanded or alternative facilities +</p> <p>Site has an adverse impact on community facilities and limited mitigation is indicated -</p> <p>Site has a significant adverse impact on community facilities and no mitigation is indicated --</p>	(--) loss of waste water treatment works, and capacity to expand		(+) The site is a car park, if a retail scheme in the form of a supermarket is proposed, then car parking would be an important component of the retail offer, as car parking would be essential for the operation of the store.	(++)		
M Overall Rating for 'Community facilities, Utilities and Infrastructure'	<p>Site has limited or no adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has a adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be fully mitigated ++</p> <p>Site has limited to medium adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be satisfactorily mitigated +</p> <p>Site has medium to high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation -</p> <p>Site has high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation -</p>	(--)		(+)	(+)		
Strong Economy							
Q53 (town centre uses only) Will the site promote the viability and vitality of the Principal Town or Local Service Centre?	<p>Proposal will support and enhance the vitality and viability of the town centre, encouraging new investment ++</p> <p>Proposal will support the vitality and viability of the town centre in retaining key services and facilities +</p> <p>Proposal could adversely harm the viability and vitality of the town centre leading to decline --</p>	N/a	(++) Site is within Northern Arc, an area broadly defined in the Local Plan Strategy as an area of focus for edge of centre opportunities to enhance new retail space. Proposes full convenience and some comparison needs in quantum	(++) Site is within Northern Arc, an area broadly defined in the Local Plan Strategy as an area of focus for edge of centre opportunities to enhance new retail space. This would be subject to sequential and impact tests, and a retail capacity study will be required.	N/A		
Q. 54 Will the mix of uses proposed by the development assist in diversifying the economy as set out in the ELR?	<p>Mix of uses proposed will diversify the economy as set out in the ELR ++</p> <p>Mix of uses proposed will not diversify the economy but will support existing employment sectors in Ryedale +</p>	(++) has potential	(+)	(+)	(++) has potential		
Q. 55 (Employment/Retail uses) Does the proposal involve the creation of net additional or net loss of jobs in Ryedale?	<p>Up to 250 net jobs created ++</p> <p>Up to 50 net jobs created +</p> <p>Up to 50 net jobs lost -</p> <p>Up to 250 net jobs lost --</p>	(++)	(+)	(+)No detail submitted. But consider that there will be a net increase in job creation	(++)		

Malton and Norton Other Development Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		379	442 (250)	452	474	567	543
N Overall rating for 'Strong Economy'	Proposal will have a significant positive impact on the economy ++	(++)	(++) Improve retail choice and experience for residents of Malton.	(++) Improve retail choice and experience for residents of Malton.	(++) potential		
	Proposal will have a positive impact on the economy +						
	Proposal will have a negative impact on the economy -						
	Proposal will have a significant negative impact on the economy --						
Stage 3 - Deliverability / Developability							
Q56. How does the site perform against the SHLAA Update (housing), ELR Update (employment) and RRCS (retail) in terms of its ability to come forward and its suitability for development?	Housing: Category 1 (Deliverable)++	Employment: Category I ++	(--). Within York Road Industrial Estate, but no prospect of site being available mean site would be a category III site in the ELR	(++) edge of centre site. Historic configuration of town centre makes for challenges to reconfigure existing town centre part of the Northern Arc in Local Plan Strategy	(++) edge of centre site. Historic configuration of town centre makes for challenges to reconfigure existing town centre part of the Northern Arc in Local Plan Strategy	(+)No considered through the ELR. Site would be a category II site in the ELR	
	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 ++	(--). Active use of site, and amenity issues	(++)	Presence of the Livestock Market Scheme and impact of the delivery of this (identified in the Legal Challenge being upheld and decision quashing)	(+)No considered through the ELR. Site would be a category II site in the ELR		
	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 ++	(+) contributions would pertain to those appropriate for an employment use. No information supplied.	(++) scheme subject to planning permission	(+) contributions would pertain to those appropriate for an employment use. No information supplied.	(+) contributions would pertain to those appropriate for an employment use. No information supplied.		Site submitter wishes to have the sites be continued in the assessment process. In light of policy obligations, including s278 agreements.
	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 ++	Scheme would be exempt from the CIL charging - zero charge	CIL is a non-negotiable tariff levy.	CIL is a non-negotiable tariff levy.	Scheme would be exempt from the CIL charging - zero charge		Scheme would be exempt from the CIL charging - zero charge
	No --						
O Overall Deliverability / Developability Rating	Site is able to come forward without impairment and is able to provide a normal range of contributions ++	(--). site is in use- and likely to need to expand	(++) proven range of developer contributions	(++) no evidence of constraints affecting viability	(+)No considered through the ELR. Site would be a category II site in the ELR		
	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 --						

Malton and Norton Other Development Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		572	573	578	579	582	583
Stage 1 - Sift		Agri-business and business and technology park approved on site in conjunction with 573 and 588.	Agri-business and business and technology park approved on site in conjunction with 572 and 588.	In conjunction with 579	In conjunction with 578		
all sites 0.3Ha and above	0.3 Ha or greater ++ Less than 0.3 Ha --	(++)	(++)	(++) 13.93ha	(++) 16.46ha		
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 --	(++) as part of employment land supply (qualitative) and need to deliver Livestock Market	(++) as part of employment land supply (qualitative) and need to deliver Livestock Market	(++) Not adjacent to principle town. Mixed scheme. Larger than current Plan requirements	(++) Not adjacent to principle town. Mixed scheme. Larger than current Plan requirements	(--) Not in or adjacent to principle town. Mixed scheme. Larger than current Plan requirements	(--) Not in or adjacent to principle town. Mixed scheme. Larger than current Plan requirements
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 --	(++)	(++)	(++) Site proximal to River Derwent SSSI. Also River Derwent SAC to the East and West of Malton. HRA Screening establishes that no likely significant effects cannot be ruled out. Appropriate Assessment confirms that through mitigation no likely significant effects.	(++) Site proximal to River Derwent SSSI. Also River Derwent SAC to the East and West of Malton. HRA Screening establishes that no likely significant effects cannot be ruled out. Appropriate Assessment confirms that through mitigation no likely significant effects		
Sites which fall wholly within Flood Zone 3b not considered further for built development. Where sites are partially in Flood Zone 3b, that part of the site will be not be considered further for built development.	Is not within Flood Zone 3b ++ Is within Flood Zone 3b --	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)		
Stage 2 - Site Assessment							
Q1A How accessible is the site to key services and facilities	Bus stop	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++			(++)	(++)	
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +					
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -					
		15 minutes walking time and over --					
	Railway Station (Malton and Norton)	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++			(--)	(--)	
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +					
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -					
		15 minutes walking time and over --					
	Nearest commercial limit	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++			NA	NA	
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +					
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -					
		15 minutes walking time and over --					

Malton and Norton Other Development Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		572	573	578	579	582	583	
	Nearest employment area	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++			(--) but this is does not take into account the scheme for the agribusiness park and livestock market	(--) but this is does not take into account the scheme for the agribusiness park and livestock market		
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +						
		Up to 15 minutes walking time –						
		15 minutes walking time and over --						
	Nearest Primary School	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++			NA	NA		
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +						
		Up to 15 minutes walking time –						
		15 minutes walking time and over --						
	Nearest Secondary School	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++			NA	NA		
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +						
		Up to 15 minutes walking time –						
		15 minutes walking time and over --						
	Nearest Development Limit	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++			(++)	(+)		
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +						
		Up to 15 minutes walking time –						
		15 minutes walking time and over --						
Nearest Doctors Surgery	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++			NA	NA			
	Up to 10 minutes walking time +							
	Up to 15 minutes walking time –							
	15 minutes walking time and over --							
Hospital (Malton and Norton)	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++			NA	NA			
	Up to 10 minutes walking time +							
	Up to 15 minutes walking time –							
	15 minutes walking time and over --							

Malton and Norton Other Development Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		572	573	578	579	582	583
Q1B (Retail) How does the site location relate to the Town Centre in terms of the NPPF Sequential Test?	Town Centre ++ Edge of Centre + Out of Centre -- Out of Town --			Out of town location, but site may be appropriate for some bulky (non-food/comparison) goods retail if which a town-centre location would not be realistic/feasible	Out of town location, but site may be appropriate for some bulky (non-food/comparison) goods retail if which a town-centre location would not be realistic/feasible		
Overall accessibility rating	Site has excellent accessibility ++ Site has good accessibility + Site has variable accessibility -- Site has poor accessibility --			(++) based on employment uses	(++) based on employment uses		
Q2A What flood zone does the site fall within?	Flood Zone 1++ Flood Zone 2 + Flood zone 3a -			(++) very small area in flood zone 2	(++)		
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 --			(++)	(++)		
Q2C (Malton and Norton only) which sub-category of flood zone 3a does the site fall within?	Flood Zone 3a (i) defence <1:50 Flood Zone 3a (ii) defence 1:100 + Flood zone 3a (iii) defence 1:50 < 1:100 -			N/A	N/A		
Q2D Has a Flood Risk Assessment been undertaken?	yes ++ No --			(--) SFRA only site would require a FRA due to size of the site	(--) SFRA only site would require a FRA due to size of the site		
Q2E (Malton/Norton/Old Malton) If within the Rapid Inundation Zone (RIZ), what level of hazard would exist?	Low - 'Caution' + Moderate - 'Danger for some people' - Significant - 'Danger for most people' -- Extreme 'Danger for all people' --			N/A	N/A		
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 (HA) (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 -			Response is awaited. Site would access A169, and then utilise the Old Malton Junction	Response is awaited. Site would access A169, and then utilise the Old Malton Junction		

Assessment		572	573	578	579	582	583
	Site has multiple highway issues which may be difficult to mitigate unless further investigation demonstrates otherwise --						

Assessment		572	573	578	579	582	583
Biodiversity and Geo-diversity							
Q4 Would the development affect a regional or local site of biodiversity (including SINC, LNRs or RIGS) or affect UK, NYMNP or Ryedale Biodiversity Plan protected species	<p>Enhancement of feature/species possible – mitigation not required ++</p> <p>Neutral impact – no effect or effect can be fully mitigated +</p> <p>Adverse impact but mitigation possible –</p> <p>Serious impact with limited means of mitigation --</p>			<p>(+) The site is not adjacent to the River Derwent SAC, but there is a drain which does directly link into the SAC. The site has been assessed through the overall Habitats Regulations Assessment has determined that a likely significant effect from development at a settlement-wide level (diffuse pollution), could not be ruled out, so that through the appropriate assessment the impact can be mitigated as part of the planning application consideration. The site is not subject to any other national/local designation. Given the potential time frame, protected species may be present. Therefore surveys may be required in the future, and any protected species will be under the statutory protection that they are afforded. The site has been assessed against the Natural England (NE) Impact Risk Zones. For based on the site being used for employment land, including large infrastructure, discharges and water supply automatic requirement to consult NE. However, NE has been consulted. The site is subject to Appropriate Assessment.</p>	<p>(+) The site is not adjacent to the River Derwent SAC, but there is a drain, through another site which does directly link into the SAC. The site has been assessed through the overall Habitats Regulations Assessment has determined that a likely significant effect from development at a settlement-wide level (diffuse pollution), could not be ruled out, so that through the appropriate assessment the impact can be mitigated as part of the planning application consideration. The site is not subject to any other national/local designation. Given the potential time frame, protected species may be present. Therefore surveys may be required in the future, and any protected species will be under the statutory protection that they are afforded. The site has been assessed against the Natural England (NE) Impact Risk Zones. For based on the site being used for employment land, including large infrastructure, discharges and water supply automatic requirement to consult NE. However, NE has been consulted. The site is subject to Appropriate Assessment.</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 concerning green infrastructure networks. It is considered that there is no reason that such networks cannot be introduced, commensurate with the size of the site.</p>	<p>No details have been submitted concerning green infrastructure networks. It is considered that there is no reason that such networks cannot be introduced, commensurate with the size of the site.</p>		

Assessment		572	573	578	579	582	583
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>(+) Although adjacent to Malton Bypass the site is north of the A-64 and within open countryside. Any development of the site should therefore aim to retain as many as the existing landscape features as possible and retain the open character of the site. This suggests that buildings should be inter-dispersed with native vegetation/trees to provide backdrops to buildings from various aspects, and to place buildings within a rural setting. Where required the external boundaries of the site should be bolstered with additional planting in character with the prevailing landscape. Retain as much of the existing landscape features as possible, especially the existing prominent oak trees; Retain the openness of the site creating a development within a natural landscape; Bolster existing boundaries where required with additional planting; and Make TPO on selected trees subject to inspection</p>	<p>(+) Although adjacent to Malton Bypass the site is north of the A-64 and within open countryside. Any development of the site should therefore aim to retain as many as the existing landscape features as possible and retain the open character of the site. This suggests that buildings should be inter-dispersed with native vegetation/trees to provide backdrops to buildings from various aspects, and to place buildings within a rural setting. Where required the external boundaries of the site should be bolstered with additional planting in character with the prevailing landscape. Retain as much of the existing landscape features as possible, especially the existing prominent oak trees; Retain the openness of the site creating a development within a natural landscape; Bolster existing boundaries where required with additional planting; and Make TPO on selected trees subject to inspection</p>		
B Overall rating for 'Biodiversity and Geo-diversity'	<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		572	573	578	579	582	583
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>(+) The Settlements of Malton and Norton are within an area of Landscape Transition: the Howardian Hills LCA extends into the western half of Malton, resulting in land which is elevated, undulating, then gently falls to the north, east and south, to the Vale of Pickering LCA, covering the rest of the Malton and Norton which is generally flatter and low lying. To the south of Norton, the land begins to rise into the Wolds. This site is situated to the north of Malton , adjacent to the A64/A169 junction. The site is defined as being within the Wooded Open Vale of the District-level LCA, and is very reflective of the character description: flat, low lying terrain, open countryside, with long views punctuated by geometric woodland blocks. It is considered that in the wider and immediate landscape the site has low landscape sensitivity, and landscaping and tree planting can soften the site's appearance, and indeed enhance the landscape character in this area .</p>	<p>(+) The Settlements of Malton and Norton are within an area of Landscape Transition: the Howardian Hills LCA extends into the western half of Malton, resulting in land which is elevated, undulating, then gently falls to the north, east and south, to the Vale of Pickering LCA, covering the rest of the Malton and Norton which is generally flatter and low lying. To the south of Norton, the land begins to rise into the Wolds. This site is situated to the north of Malton , adjacent to the A64/A169 junction. The site is defined as being within the Wooded Open Vale of the District-level LCA, and is very reflective of the character description: flat, low lying terrain, open countryside, with long views punctuated by geometric woodland blocks. It is considered that in the wider and immediate landscape the site has low landscape sensitivity, and landscaping and tree planting can soften the site's appearance, and indeed enhance the landscape character in this area .</p>		
Q8 What impact would the site have on nationally protected landscapes the North York Moors NP and Howardian Hills AONB?	<p>Site has a very low landscape sensitivity to being developed or existing landscape features are retained or enhanced. Site will not detract from landscape character ++</p> <p>Site has a low landscape sensitivity to being developed and some existing landscape features can be retained. Site is unlikely to detract from landscape character +</p> <p>Site has medium landscape sensitivity to being developed and may affect landscape features, however mitigation is possible. Site may detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved –</p> <p>Site has high landscape sensitivity to being developed and will affect landscape features with limited/no means of mitigation. Site will detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved --</p>			<p>(++) sites distance from these areas, and the site-specific land topography ensure very low landscape sensitivity</p>	<p>(++) sites distance from these areas, and the site-specific land topography ensure very low landscape sensitivity</p>		

Assessment		572	573	578	579	582	583
Q9 (sites within York Greenbelt) What impact would the sites have on a defined York Greenbelt	Positive Impact, mitigation not required ++			N/A	N/A		
	Neutral impact- limited or no landscape mitigation is required +						
	Negative impact with potential for harm but landscape mitigation is possible –						
	Significant harm with limited means of mitigation --						
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 ++			(++) current shelter belts and the A64 landscaping would be incorporated. Site is large, flat open field. Opportunity to enhance the site's appearance	(++) current shelter belts and the A64 landscaping would be incorporated. Site is large, flat open field. Opportunity to enhance the site's appearance		
	Site is capable of retaining some existing landscape features and limited or no landscape mitigation is required +						
	Site will not retain most existing landscape features, however landscape mitigation is possible –						
	Site will not retain any existing landscape features and limited or no landscape mitigation is possible/proposed –						
Q11 Will the site lead to the coalescence of settlements which will impact on their character and setting?	Development within the built form of the settlement ++			(+)	(+)		
	Development is on the edge of a settlement which is not affected by coalescence with another settlement +						
	Development is on the edge of the settlement and will lead to coalescence with another settlement however mitigation possible –						
	Development is on the edge of the settlement and will lead to significant coalescence with another settlement and limited/no mitigation possible --						
C Overall Rating for 'Special Qualities, Landscape and Setting'	Positive impact – the proposal will retain and enhance the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement ++			(++)	(++)		
	Neutral impact – the proposal will not have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement +						
	Negative impact – the proposal will have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement, however mitigation is possible –						
	Significant impact – the proposal will have a significant adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement and limited or no mitigation is possible --						

Malton and Norton Other Development Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		572	573	578	579	582	583
Culture and Heritage							
Q12 Will the site affect a designated heritage asset, either directly or indirectly through its setting?	<p>Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++</p> <p>Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +</p> <p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –</p> <p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --</p>			(+) There are no designated heritage assets which would be directly or indirectly affected, including consideration of their setting. The A64 and the changes in topography mean that some landscaping will be required to ensure that the setting of Old Malton Conservation Area is preserved.	(+) There are no designated heritage assets which would be directly or indirectly affected, including consideration of their setting. The A64 and the changes in topography mean that some landscaping will be required to ensure that the setting of Old Malton Conservation Area is preserved.		
Q13 Will the site affect a non-designated heritage asset which the Council identifies as having a degree of significance that is worthy of consideration?	<p>Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++</p> <p>Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +</p> <p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –</p>			(-) The land is separated off from the built form of the settlement. It is currently part of a series of fields. Subject to the use of appropriate landscaping and the development of the site would not harm the setting of Malton or Old Malton . Area with high potential for the survival of prehistoric and Romano-British remains. A number of metal-detected finds of this date range recorded from the area. Advise archaeological evaluation by means of geophysical survey and trial	(-) The land is separated off from the built form of the settlement. It is currently part of a series of fields. Subject to the use of appropriate landscaping and the development of the site would not harm the setting of Malton or Old Malton. Area with high potential for the survival of prehistoric and Romano-British remains. A number of metal-detected finds of this date range recorded from the area. Advise archaeological evaluation by means of geophysical survey and trial		

Assessment		572	573	578	579	582	583
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --			geophysical survey and trenching advised to clarify the nature and significance of archaeological remains. English Heritage have advised that this area lies within the extensive Vale of Pickering Archaeological landscape. It is internationally significant for the evidence of human habitation from the Mesolithic to the present day. There is a high probability that remains exist, and that archaeological sites which are of demonstrable equivalent significance to Scheduled Monuments, are to be considered subject to the same policies.	geophysical survey and trenching advised to clarify the nature and significance of archaeological remains. English Heritage have advised that this area lies within the extensive Vale of Pickering Archaeological landscape. It is internationally significant for the evidence of human habitation from the Mesolithic to the present day. There is a high probability that remains exist, and that archaeological sites which are of demonstrable equivalent significance to Scheduled Monuments, are to be considered subject to the same policies.		

Malton and Norton Other Development Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		572	573	578	579	582	583
D Overall Rating for 'Culture and Heritage'	Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++			(+ consider that through appropriate landscaping the site will not adversely harm the setting of either Malton or Old Malton	(+ consider that through appropriate landscaping the site will not adversely harm the setting of either Malton or Old Malton		
	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 specific information provided, the submission material refers to the generation of renewable energy. although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.		
	Site capable but developer unwilling -						
	Site not capable --						
Q15 Is the site capable of linking in or supporting off site renewable energy schemes?	Site capable linking in with off site renewable energy scheme and developer willing to take it forward ++			No such schemes within the locality.	No such schemes within the locality.		
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 within the locality.	No such schemes within the locality.		
E Overall rating for 'Low Carbon Development and Renewable Energy'	Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer willing ++			(++ No specific information provided at this stage. Site submitter is acknowledging sites' potential to contribute some form of renewable/low carbon energy	(++ No specific information provided at this stage. Site submitter is acknowledging sites' potential to contribute some form of renewable/low carbon energy		
	Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer unwilling -						
	Site not capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology --						
Sustainable Building and Waste Reduction							
Q17 Can the site accommodate higher sustainable building standards than currently required?	Site can accommodate 2 levels higher than mandatory limit ++			No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be included.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be included.		
	Site can accommodate 1 level higher than mandatory limit -						
	Development cannot accommodate higher standards than mandatory level --						
Q18 Does the development contain proposals for waste reduction in both its construction and when in operation?	Proposals for waste reduction incorporated into both the construction and operation of the development ++			No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be included.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be included.		
	Proposals have investigated waste reduction, however only limited measures are achievable -						
	No proposals suggested for waste reduction -						

Malton and Norton Other Development Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		572	573	578	579	582	583
Q. 19 Does the development contain individual/communal recycling facilities/ infrastructure?	Yes +			No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be included.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be included.		
	No --						
F Overall Rating for 'Sustainable Building and Waste Minimisation'	Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development and developer willing ++			No information provided at this stage	No information provided at this stage		
	Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development but developer unwilling -						
	Site not capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development --						
Efficient Use of Land							
Q.20 Is the site or any part of the site considered previously developed land?	Site is over 50% to 100% Brownfield ++			Greenfield	Greenfield		
	Site is up to 50% Brownfield +						
Q.21 Can the site achieve an appropriate density to achieve the most efficient use of the land?	Excellent density achieved taking into account location and context ++			(+ The site developable area will need to factor in the need to provide surface water attenuation, and the presence of overhead power lines	(+ The site developable area will need to factor in the need to provide surface water attenuation, and the presence of overhead power lines		
	Appropriate density achieved taking into account location and context +						
	Lower density proposed as site faces some constraints in its development -						
	Lower density necessary as site faces significant constraints in its development --						
Q.22 Would the development of the site lead to the remediation of contaminated land?	Development is located on land which is likely to be highly contaminated and will be remediated ++			(-) Unknown Filled Ground (Pond, marsh, river, stream, dock etc)	No evidence of contamination		
	Development is located on land which may be contaminated and will be remediated +						
	Development is located on land which may be contaminated and no proposals for remediation have been put forward -						
	Development is located on land which is likely to be highly contaminated no proposals for remediation have been put forward --						
G Overall Rating for 'Efficient Use of Land'	Site represents very efficient use of land with mitigation to fully overcome concerns where necessary ++			(+) (+)	(+) (+)		
	Site represents efficient use of land but further mitigation required to fully overcome concerns where necessary +						
	Site does not represent efficient use of land. Further investigation of mitigation measures to overcome concerns required -						
	Site does not represent efficient use of land and mitigation is not possible --						

Malton and Norton Other Development Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		572	573	578	579	582	583
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)?	<p>No loss of best and most versatile agricultural land ++</p> <p>Up to 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost –</p> <p>More than 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost --</p>			(--) Grade3 , There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as grade 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The site is more than 5ha.	(--) Grade3 , There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as grade 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The site is more than 5ha.		
Q. 24 Would the development lead to the sterilisation of mineral resources?	<p>Site not within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search, or Mineral Consultation Zone ++?</p> <p>Site within the buffer of a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone –?</p> <p>Site within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone --</p>			(++)	(++)		
Q. 25 Would the development have an adverse impact on a Groundwater Source Protection Zone?	<p>Development is not located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone ++</p> <p>Development is located in a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but mitigation is possible to reduce the risk of groundwater pollution risk +</p> <p>Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but no risk assessment has been undertaken -</p> <p>Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone and mitigation of the risk of groundwater pollution is not possible --</p>			(++) Unproductive Aquifer, not in groundwater Source Protection Zone	(++) Unproductive Aquifer, not in groundwater Source Protection Zone		
Q. 26 Would the development have an adverse impact on the Malton Air Quality Management Area or any other site of poor air quality?	<p>Site falls outside any area of poor air quality and development is unlikely to result in any reduction in air quality. ++</p> <p>Site falls outside any area of poor air quality and development is unlikely to result in a significant reduction in air quality. +</p> <p>Site is within an area of poor air quality and mitigation is possible. Development may lead to a reduction in air quality. -</p> <p>Site is within an area of poor air quality and limited/no mitigation is possible or no assessment has been made by the proposer. Development is likely to lead to a further significant reduction in air quality. --</p>			(+) Malton has an AQMA which includes the streets of Castlegate/Wheelgate/eastern Yorkersgate/Old Malton Rd where they converge at Butcher Corner. This is due to breaches of NO2 concentrations. The primary source is road traffic. The site is well away from the AQMA. Traffic will predominantly use the A64/A169. The site will allow the avoidance of AQMA unless needing to enter the Town Centre. As a site within a settlement which is subject to an AQMA, a proportionate AQA should be completed as part of any planning application.	(+) Malton has an AQMA which includes the streets of Castlegate/Wheelgate/eastern Yorkersgate/Old Malton Rd where they converge at Butcher Corner. This is due to breaches of NO2 concentrations. The primary source is road traffic. The site is well away from the AQMA. Traffic will predominantly use the A64/A169. The site will allow the avoidance of AQMA unless needing to enter the Town Centre. As a site within a settlement which is subject to an AQMA, a proportionate AQA should be completed as part of any planning application.		

Assessment		572	573	578	579	582	583
Q. 27 Is any part of the development on suspected unstable land?	Land has no instability concerns ++			(-) Unknown Filled Ground (Pond, marsh, river, stream, dock etc)	No evidence of land instability		
	Land potentially unstable but investigation has shown that mitigation is possible +						
	Land potentially unstable but no investigation has been carried out –						
	Land suffers from significant instability problems and either no mitigation has been proposed or instability problems are not possible to mitigate --						
Q. 28 Will the site impact on major hazard sites or pipelines?	HSE Standing Advice states "do not advise against development" ++			(++)	(++)		
	HSE Standing Advice states "advise against development"						
H Overall Rating for 'Natural Resources'	Site would not adversely affect any natural resources ++			(-)	(-)		
	Site would not have any significant adverse effect on natural resources +						
	Site would have an adverse effect on natural resources but mitigation is possible –						
	Site would have a significant adverse effect on natural resources and limited/no mitigation is possible --						
Amenity							
Q. 29 Is the development in an area where noise, light, dust or smell is likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to generate noise, light or dust which will affect existing users?	The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +			(+) uses are likely to be incompatible with residential development but site is well distanced from such uses	(+) uses are likely to be incompatible with residential development but site is well distanced from such uses		
	The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible –						
	The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --						
Q. 30 Is the development in an area where other factors are likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to generate forms of nuisance which may affect the amenity of existing users? These may include issues such as privacy, lack of sunlight overbearing effects.	The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +			(+) uses are likely to be incompatible with residential development but site is well distanced from such uses	(+) uses are likely to be incompatible with residential development but site is well distanced from such uses		
	The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -						
	The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --						

Assessment		572	573	578	579	582	583
Overall Rating for 'Amenity'	The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +			(+)	(+)		
	The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -						
	The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of this site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --						
Flood Risk							
Q. 31 Is the site potentially affected by groundwater flooding?	No ++ Yes further investigation required --			(++)	(++)		
Q. 32 Is the site potentially affected by surface water flooding and is this site considered to be within a critical drainage area?	No ++ Yes further investigation required --			(++) some susceptibility to surface water flooding. The Environment Agency have advised that this site and site 579 form much of the catchment for the Riggs Road Drain Catchment. Which is a contributor to the flooding incidences in Old Malton. The EA would like to be involved in early discussions regarding the layout of developments and how watercourses and surface water features are managed to optimise benefits. The LLFA advise that EA plans demonstrate no specific risk of surface water flooding within the site area indicated. As the location is in the Vale of Pickering IDB district they should be consulted on any application.	(++) some susceptibility to surface water flooding. The Environment Agency have advised that this site and site 578 form much of the catchment for the Riggs Road Drain Catchment. Which is a contributor to the flooding incidences in Old Malton. The EA would like to be involved in early discussions regarding the layout of developments and how watercourses and surface water features are managed to optimise benefits. The LLFA advise that EA plans demonstrate no specific risk of surface water flooding within the site area indicated. As the location is in the Vale of Pickering IDB district they should be consulted on any application.		
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 is submitted at this stage, but seeks principle to be established. Site would be expected to accommodate SDS.	(+) No information is submitted at this stage, but seeks principle to be established. Site would be expected to accommodate SDS		
Q. 35 What other measures* have been considered which ensure the development is resilient to climate change? * variable	Multiple additional measures proposed which build in resilience to climate change ++ Single additional measure proposed to build in resilience to climate change + No information provided on measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change -			(-) No information is submitted at this stage, but seeks principle to be established. No reason to suggest the measures could not be implemented	(-) No information is submitted at this stage, but seeks principle to be established. No reason to suggest the measures could not be implemented		

Assessment		572	573	578	579	582	583
	No measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change --						
J Overall Rating for 'Flood Risk'	No flood risk associated with the site ++			(+)	(+)		
	Limited flood risk associated with the site which can be fully mitigated +						
	Site affected by a number of flood risk issues, however mitigation possible-						
	Site affected by significant flood risk issues and limited mitigation possible --						

Malton and Norton Other Development Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		572	573	578	579	582	583
People							
Q. 36 Would the development of the site lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of the settlement?	<p>Development incorporates existing use(s), as part of the overall scheme ++</p> <p>Development proposes relocation of use to suitable alternative location +</p> <p>Development will result in the loss of a valued facility/use and no justification or alternative provided --</p>			No loss of any such use	No loss of any such use		
Q. 37 Will the site incorporate the principles of Secured By Design, reducing the potential for crime and discouraging anti-social behaviour?	<p>Yes – SBD principles taken into account or will be taken into account following liaison with North Yorkshire police +</p> <p>No – SBD principles not taken into account -</p>			(-) No details have been provided but there is no reason to suggest that such principles could not be taken into account.	(-) No details have been provided but there is no reason to suggest that such principles could not be taken into account.		
Q. 38 Does the design of the development encourage people to walk and cycle rather than travel by car?	<p>Cycleways and footpaths effectively integrated into the development encouraging walking and cycling ++</p> <p>Some cycleways and/or footpaths shown encouraging walking and cycling +</p> <p>No cycleways and footpaths indicated as part of this development --</p>			(+) No details submitted, as establishing principle. There is no reason to suggest such features could not be provided.	(+) No details submitted, as establishing principle. There is no reason to suggest such features could not be provided.		
Q. 39 For sites over 1ha or over 80 houses- Has a Travel Plan been produced which assesses alternative options and initiatives?	<p>Travel Plan undertaken and clear implementable initiatives for promoting modal shift set out ++</p> <p>Travel Plan undertaken and some initiatives identified for promoting modal shift +</p> <p>Travel Plan undertaken which identifies limited opportunities for modal shift or Travel Plan not undertaken --</p>			(--) No Travel Plan provided, due to establishing principle. A Travel Plan would be required.	(--) No Travel Plan provided, due to establishing principle. A Travel Plan would be required.		
Q. 40 Will the proposed development attract a balanced living and/or working population, reducing inequality of opportunity?	<p>Development proposed is clearly designed to attract a balanced living and/or working community ++</p> <p>Development takes into account the need to attract a balanced and/or working community +</p> <p>Development takes no account of the need to attract a balanced living and/or working community -</p>			(+) Employment land is a much needed element of meeting a balanced working community. No details have been supplied but the scheme is establishing principle.	(+) Employment land is a much needed element of meeting a balanced working community. No details have been supplied but the scheme is establishing principle.		
K Overall Rating for 'People'	<p>Development actively planned to encourage the development of sustainable communities ++</p> <p>Development has taken into account the need to develop sustainable communities +</p> <p>Development has little regard to the need to develop sustainable communities -</p> <p>Development has no regard for the need to develop sustainable communities --</p>			(+)	(+)		

Assessment		572	573	578	579	582	583
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 ++			(++) Site submission establishes principle. Clear synergies to new agribusiness park, and site has good transport linkages. Site could provide land to a range of business types - meeting identified and latent demand	(++) Site submission establishes principle. Clear synergies to new agribusiness park, and site has good transport linkages. Site could provide land to a range of business types - meeting identified and latent demand		
	Proposal identifies what the needs are and how some needs will be met by the development +						
	Proposal either does not identify what the needs are or how any needs will be met by the development –						
	No assessment is undertaken of what the needs are and whether any needs will be met --						
Q. 42 What level and type of affordable housing is proposed?	Development offers appropriate level and type of affordable housing which meets the needs as set out in the SHMA ++			N/A	N/A		
	Development offers some affordable housing which meets some of the need as set out in the SHMA +						
	Development does not offer the appropriate level and type of affordable housing or does not meet the need for affordable housing as set out in the SHMA –						
	The development makes no provision for affordable housing --						
Q. 43 What provision has been made for Ryedale's elderly population?	Development addresses and meets the needs of Ryedale's elderly population ++			N/A	N/A		
	Development takes into account and meets some of the needs of Ryedale's elderly population +						
	Development does not address the needs of Ryedale's elderly population –						
	The development makes no provision for the needs of Ryedale's elderly population --						
L Overall Rating for 'Meeting Needs'	Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++			(++) based on principle	(++) based on principle		
	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 --						

Malton and Norton Other Development Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		572	573	578	579	582	583
Community Facilities, utilities and Infrastructure							
Q44 Malton/Norton only - Has Traffic Modelling or Transport Assessment been undertaken in the context of work already undertaken on the Malton and Norton STA?	Yes No - traffic modelling required	(++) Modelled as a commitment	(++) Modelled as a commitment	(++)	(++)		
Q45 On sites greater than 1ha: Has a Transport Assessment been undertaken	Yes ++ No- transport assessment required --			(--)	(--)		
Q. 46 Is highway mitigation required as part of the development and what is the impact of the development on the highway network following mitigation?	No mitigation required or no impact on the highway following mitigation ++ 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 agric- business park on land to the west of this site is to be served by a roundabout. This site would be expected to utilise this roundabout, subject to assessing the cumulative impact	(+) The agric- business park on land to the west of this site is to be served by a roundabout. This site would be expected to utilise this roundabout, subject to assessing the cumulative impact		
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 site specific information submitted. Seeks to establish principle. No reason to suggest that such features cannot be implemented.	No site specific information submitted. Seeks to establish principle. No reason to suggest that such features cannot be implemented.		
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 --			(+) No PROW on site	(+) No PROW on site		

Malton and Norton Other Development Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		572	573	578	579	582	583
Q. 49 Does the proposal involve new public realm or enhancements to the existing public realm as part of its development?	<p>Proposal will create high quality new public realm or significantly enhance existing public realm as part of its development ++</p> <p>Proposal will create some new public realm or partially enhance existing public realm as part of its development+</p> <p>Though capable of incorporating new or enhancing existing public realm, the proposal makes no provision for it --</p>			No site specific information submitted. Seeks to establish principle for employment/mixed use and this would not have significant areas of public realm, areas for workers to relax, obtain refreshment could be provided.	No site specific information submitted. Seeks to establish principle for employment/mixed use and this would not have significant areas of public realm, areas for workers to relax, obtain refreshment could be provided.		
Q. 50 What is the capacity of existing utilities and infrastructure to cope with impact of the development?	<p>Site has limited or no adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be fully mitigated ++</p> <p>Site has limited to medium adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be satisfactorily mitigated +</p> <p>Site has medium to high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation –</p> <p>Site has high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation --</p>			<p>(+)Electricity and Gas – No capacity issue/constraint currently identified but reinforcement of the distribution network likely to be required</p> <p>Water Supply – No capacity issue/constraint identified, but reinforcement of distribution network likely to be required</p> <p>Sewerage Capacity and surface water drainage– Constraints in Norton. Existing pumps will need upgrading. Capacity to North of the Derwent. Ongoing maintenance/ enhancement of flood defences.</p> <p>Complementary town centre traffic management measures; Improvements to junctions in the internal road network; Improvements to bus/rail interchange; Improved cycle network and pedestrian facilities (including public realm improvements). No information has been provided, a site of this size would be expected to mitigating site-specific impacts, with some contribution to meeting wider infrastructure needs.</p>	<p>(+) Electricity and Gas – No capacity issue/constraint currently identified but reinforcement of the distribution network likely to be required</p> <p>Water Supply – No capacity issue/constraint identified, but reinforcement of distribution network likely to be required</p> <p>Sewerage Capacity and surface water drainage– Constraints in Norton. Existing pumps will need upgrading. Capacity to North of the Derwent. Ongoing maintenance/ enhancement of flood defences.</p> <p>Complementary town centre traffic management measures; Improvements to junctions in the internal road network; Improvements to bus/rail interchange; Improved cycle network and pedestrian facilities (including public realm improvements). No information has been provided, a site of this size would be expected to mitigating site-specific impacts, with some contribution to meeting wider infrastructure needs.</p>		
Q. 51 What is the impact on Waste Water Treatment Works?	<p>Further than 400m from the boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works ++</p> <p>Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact undertaken and Yorkshire Water No Objection +</p> <p>Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact not undertaken –</p> <p>Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact undertaken Yorkshire Water consulted and likely to object --</p>			(-) within 250m but for employment uses	(++)		

Assessment		572	573	578	579	582	583
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 --						
M Overall Rating for 'Community facilities, Utilities and Infrastructure'	Site has limited or no adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has a adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be fully mitigated ++			(+)	(+)		
	Site has limited to medium adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be satisfactorily mitigated +						
	Site has medium to high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation -						
	Site has high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation --						
Strong Economy							
Q53 (town centre uses only) 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 ++			N/A	N/A		
	Proposal will support the vitality and viability of the town centre in retaining key services and facilities +						
	Proposal could adversely harm the viability and vitality of the town centre leading to decline --						
Q. 54 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 ++			(++) no detail provided but site capable of meeting latent demand	(++) no detail provided but site capable of meeting latent demand		
	Mix of uses proposed will not diversify the economy but will support existing employment sectors in Ryedale +						
Q. 55 (Employment/Retail uses) Does the proposal involve the creation of net additional or net loss of jobs in Ryedale?	Up to 250 net jobs created ++			(++) potentially	(++) potentially		
	Up to 50 net jobs created +						
	Up to 50 net jobs lost -						
	Up to 250 net jobs lost --						

Assessment		572	573	578	579	582	583
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 --						
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 within ELR, but adjacent sites which form the new Livestock Market and Agri-business Park were category I sites	(++) Not within ELR, but adjacent sites which form the new Livestock Market and Agri-business Park were category I sites	
	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 ++			(++)	(+) presence of electricity pipelines		
	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 ++			(+) contributions would pertain to those appropriate for an employment use. No information supplied.	(+) contributions would pertain to those appropriate for an employment use. No information supplied.		
	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 ++			Scheme would be exempt from the CIL charging - zero charge	Scheme would be exempt from the CIL charging - zero charge		
	No --						
O Overall Deliverability / Developability Rating	Site is able to come forward without impairment and is able to provide a normal range of contributions ++	(++) proven range of developer contributions	(++) proven range of developer contributions	(+)	(+)	Site submitter promoting land for future plan	Site submitter promoting land for future plan
	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 --						

Malton and Norton Other Development Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		584	585	588	617	618	619	
Stage 1 - Sift				Agri-business and business and technology park approved on site in conjunction with 572 and 573.	Mixed - employment- PFS and hotel service station- a supermarket linked with 618 and 619	Mixed - employment- PFS and hotel service station- a supermarket linked with 617 and 619	Mixed - employment- PFS and hotel service station- a supermarket linked with 618 and 619	
all sites 0.3Ha and above	0.3 Ha or greater ++			(++)				
	Less than 0.3 Ha --							
Check for conformity with Local Plan Strategy, Settlement Hierarchy SP1	Conforms to Local Plan Strategy Spatial Strategy (SP1) ++	(--) Not in or adjacent to principle town. Mixed scheme. Larger than current Plan requirements	(--) Not in or adjacent to principle town. Mixed scheme. Larger than current Plan requirements	(++) as part of employment land supply (qualitative) and need to deliver Livestock Market	(--) Not in or adjacent to the Principal Town retail elements fail sequential tests. Not a destination in its own right	(--) Not in or adjacent to the Principal Town retail elements fail sequential tests. Not a destination in its own right	(--) Not in or adjacent to the Principal Town retail elements fail sequential tests. Not a destination in its own right	
	Does not meet Local Plan Strategy (Spatial Strategy) SP1 --							
Sites which cause significant harm to national/international nature conservation sites (species or habitat) or would involve substantial harm or loss to designated heritage assets will not be considered further	Will Not cause harm ++			(++)				
	Will cause harm --							
Sites which fall wholly within Flood Zone 3b not considered further for built development. Where sites are partially in Flood Zone 3b, that part of the site will be not be considered further for built development.	Is not within Flood Zone 3b ++			(++)				
	Is within Flood Zone 3b --							
Stage 2 - Site Assessment								
Q1A How accessible is the site to key services and facilities	Bus stop	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++						
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +						
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -						
		15 minutes walking time and over --						
	Railway Station (Malton and Norton)	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++						
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +						
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -						
		15 minutes walking time and over --						
	Nearest commercial limit	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++						
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +						
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -						
		15 minutes walking time and over --						

Assessment		584	585	588	617	618	619
	Nearest employment area	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++					
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +					
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -					
		15 minutes walking time and over --					
	Nearest Primary School	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++					
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +					
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -					
		15 minutes walking time and over --					
	Nearest Secondary School	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++					
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +					
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -					
		15 minutes walking time and over --					
	Nearest Development Limit	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++					
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +					
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -					
		15 minutes walking time and over --					
	Nearest Doctors Surgery	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++					
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +					
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -					
		15 minutes walking time and over --					
	Hospital (Malton and Norton)	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++					
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +					
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -					
		15 minutes walking time and over --					

Assessment		584	585	588	617	618	619
Q1B (Retail) How does the site location relate to the Town Centre in terms of the NPPF Sequential Test?	Town Centre ++						
	Edge of Centre +						
	Out of Centre -						
	Out of Town --						
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 --					
Q2C (Malton and Norton only) which sub-category of flood zone 3a does the site fall within?	Flood Zone 3a (i) defence <1:50						
	Flood Zone 3a (ii) defence 1:100 +						
	Flood zone 3a (iii) defence 1:50 < 1:100 -						
Q2D Has a Flood Risk Assessment been undertaken?	yes ++						
	No --						
Q2E (Malton/Norton/Old Malton) If within the Rapid Inundation Zone (RIZ), what level of hazard would exist?	Low - 'Caution' +						
	Moderate - 'Danger for some people' -						
	Significant - 'Danger for most people' --						
	Extreme 'Danger for all people' --						
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 (HA) (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 -						

Assessment		584	585	588	617	618	619
	<p>Site has multiple highway issues which may be difficult to mitigate unless further investigation demonstrates otherwise --</p>						

Assessment		584	585	588	617	618	619
Biodiversity and Geo-diversity							
Q4 Would the development affect a regional or local site of biodiversity (including SINC, LNR or RIGS) or affect UK, NYMNP or Ryedale Biodiversity Plan protected species	Enhancement of feature/species possible – mitigation not required ++						
	Neutral impact – no effect or effect can be fully mitigated +						
	Adverse impact but mitigation possible –						
	Serious impact with limited means of mitigation --						
Q5 Would the development provide opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure, including linking in with existing green infrastructure/corridors	Excellent opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors ++						
	Some opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors +						
	No opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors, however the site has the potential to accommodate these –						
	No opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure corridors, however the site does not have the potential to accommodate these --						

Assessment		584	585	588	617	618	619
Q6 Would the development impact on protected and unprotected trees, hedgerows and ancient woodland?	Positive impact. Enhancement of feature possible and mitigation not required ++						
	Neutral impact. No effect or effect can be fully mitigated +						
	Adverse impact but mitigation possible --						
	Serious impact with limited or no means of mitigation--						
B Overall rating for 'Biodiversity and Geodiversity'	Positive impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements and no mitigation required++						
	Neutral impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements however any effect can be fully mitigated +						
	Adverse impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements by effects are capable of some mitigation -						
	Significant impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements and effects are unable to be satisfactorily mitigated --						

Assessment		584	585	588	617	618	619
C Special Qualities, Landscape and Setting							
Q7 What is the capacity of the landscape to accommodate the site according to the Landscape Character Assessments which cover the Ryedale Area and Special Qualities Study (including views and open spaces)?	Site has a very low landscape sensitivity to being developed or existing landscape features are retained or enhanced. Site will not detract from landscape character ++						
	Site has a low landscape sensitivity to being developed and some existing landscape features can be retained. Site is unlikely to detract from landscape character +						
	Site has medium landscape sensitivity to being developed and may affect landscape features, however mitigation is possible. Site may detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved –						
	Site has high landscape sensitivity to being developed and will affect landscape features with limited/no means of mitigation. Site will detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved --						
Q8 What impact would the site have on nationally protected landscapes the North York Moors NP and Howardian Hills AONB?	Site has a very low landscape sensitivity to being developed or existing landscape features are retained or enhanced. Site will not detract from landscape character ++						
	Site has a low landscape sensitivity to being developed and some existing landscape features can be retained. Site is unlikely to detract from landscape character +						
	Site has medium landscape sensitivity to being developed and may affect landscape features, however mitigation is possible. Site may detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved –						
	Site has high landscape sensitivity to being developed and will affect landscape features with limited/no means of mitigation. Site will detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved --						

Assessment		584	585	588	617	618	619
Q9 (sites within York Greenbelt) What impact would the sites have on a defined York Greenbelt	Positive Impact, mitigation not required ++						
	Neutral impact- limited or no landscape mitigation is required +						
	Negative impact with potential for harm but landscape mitigation is possible –						
	Significant harm with limited means of mitigation --						
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 –						
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 --						
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		584	585	588	617	618	619
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 --						
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 –						

Assessment		584	585	588	617	618	619
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --						

Assessment		584	585	588	617	618	619
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 --						
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 --						
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 ++						
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 ++						
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 --						
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 --						
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 are achievable -						
	No proposals suggested for waste reduction -						

Assessment		584	585	588	617	618	619
Q. 19 Does the development contain individual/communal recycling facilities/ infrastructure?	Yes +						
	No --						
F Overall Rating for 'Sustainable Building and Waste Minimisation'	Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development and developer willing ++						
	Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development but developer unwilling -						
	Site not capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development --						
Efficient Use of Land							
Q.20 Is the site or any part of the site considered previously developed land?	Site is over 50% to 100% Brownfield ++						
	Site is up to 50% Brownfield +						
Q.21 Can the site achieve an appropriate density to achieve the most efficient use of the land?	Excellent density achieved taking into account location and context ++						
	Appropriate density achieved taking into account location and context +						
	Lower density proposed as site faces some constraints in its development -						
	Lower density necessary as site faces significant constraints in its development --						
Q.22 Would the development of the site lead to the remediation of contaminated land?	Development is located on land which is likely to be highly contaminated and will be remediated ++						
	Development is located on land which may be contaminated and will be remediated +						
	Development is located on land which may be contaminated and no proposals for remediation have been put forward -						
	Development is located on land which is likely to be highly contaminated no proposals for remediation have been put forward --						
G Overall Rating for 'Efficient Use of Land'	Site represents very efficient use of land with mitigation to fully overcome concerns where necessary ++						
	Site represents efficient use of land but further mitigation required to fully overcome concerns where necessary +						
	Site does not represent efficient use of land. Further investigation of mitigation measures to overcome concerns required -						
	Site does not represent efficient use of land and mitigation is not possible --						

Assessment		584	585	588	617	618	619
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 --						
Q. 24 Would the development lead to the sterilisation of mineral resources?	Site not within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search, or Mineral Consultation Zone ++?						
	Site within the buffer of a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone –?						
	Site within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone --						
Q. 25 Would the development have an adverse impact on a Groundwater Source Protection Zone?	Development is not located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone ++						
	Development is located in a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but mitigation is possible to reduce the risk of groundwater pollution risk +						
	Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but no risk assessment has been undertaken -						
	Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone and mitigation of the risk of groundwater pollution is not possible --						
Q. 26 Would the development have an adverse impact on the Malton Air Quality Management Area or any other site of poor air quality?	Site falls outside any area of poor air quality and development is unlikely to result in any reduction in air quality. ++						
	Site falls outside any area of poor air quality and development is unlikely to result in a significant reduction in air quality. +						
	Site is within an area of poor air quality and mitigation is possible. Development may lead to a reduction in air quality. -						
	Site is within an area of poor air quality and limited/no mitigation is possible or no assessment has been made by the proposer. Development is likely to lead to a further significant reduction in air quality. --						

Assessment		584	585	588	617	618	619
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 --						
Q. 28 Will the site impact on major hazard sites or pipelines?	HSE Standing Advice states "do not advise against development" ++						
	HSE Standing Advice states "advise against development"						
H Overall Rating for 'Natural Resources'	Site would not adversely affect any natural resources ++						
	Site would not have any significant adverse effect on natural resources +						
	Site would have an adverse effect on natural resources but mitigation is possible –						
	Site would have a significant adverse effect on natural resources and limited/no mitigation is possible --						
Amenity							
Q. 29 Is the development in an area where noise, light, dust or smell is likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to generate noise, light or dust which will affect existing users?	The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +						
	The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible –						
	The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --						
Q. 30 Is the development in an area where other factors are likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to generate forms of nuisance which may affect the amenity of existing users? These may include issues such as privacy, lack of sunlight overbearing effects.	The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +						
	The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -						
	The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --						

Assessment		584	585	588	617	618	619
Overall Rating for 'Amenity'	The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +						
	The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -						
	The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of this site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --						
Flood Risk							
Q. 31 Is the site potentially affected by groundwater flooding?	No ++						
	Yes further investigation required --						
Q. 32 Is the site potentially affected by surface water flooding and is this site considered to be within a critical drainage area?	No ++						
	Yes further investigation required --						
Q. 33 Is the site potentially affected by sewer flooding?	No ++						
	Yes further investigation required --						
Q. 34 Have Sustainable Drainage Systems (SDS) been proposed as part of the development?	Site capable of accommodating SDS and have been proposed as part of the development ++						
	Site capable of accommodating SDS though no information on whether SDS proposed as part of the development +						
	Site capable of accommodating SDS however SDS not being proposed on site -						
	Site not suitable for accommodating SDS --						
Q. 35 What other measures* have been considered which ensure the development is resilient to climate change? * variable	Multiple additional measures proposed which build in resilience to climate change ++						
	Single additional measure proposed to build in resilience to climate change +						
	No information provided on measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change -						

Assessment		584	585	588	617	618	619
	No measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change --						
J Overall Rating for 'Flood Risk'	No flood risk associated with the site ++						
	Limited flood risk associated with the site which can be fully mitigated +						
	Site affected by a number of flood risk issues, however mitigation possible-						
	Site affected by significant flood risk issues and limited mitigation possible --						

Assessment		584	585	588	617	618	619
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 --						
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 -						
Q. 38 Does the design of the development encourage people to walk and cycle rather than travel by car?	Cycleways and footpaths effectively integrated into the development encouraging walking and cycling ++ Some cycleways and/or footpaths shown encouraging walking and cycling + No cycleways and footpaths indicated as part of this development --						
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 --						
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 -						
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 --						

Assessment		584	585	588	617	618	619
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 --						
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 --						
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 --						
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 --						

Assessment		584	585	588	617	618	619
Community Facilities, utilities and Infrastructure							
Q44 Malton/Norton only - Has Traffic Modelling or Transport Assessment been undertaken in the context of work already undertaken on the Malton and Norton STA?	Yes No - traffic modelling required			(++) Modelled as a commitment			
Q45 On sites greater than 1ha: Has a Transport Assessment been undertaken	Yes ++ No- transport assessment required --						
Q. 46 Is highway mitigation required as part of the development and what is the impact of the development on the highway network following mitigation?	No mitigation required or no impact on the highway following mitigation ++ Mitigation required but no unacceptable impact following mitigation + Mitigation required and development would have a significant impact though not unacceptable impact after mitigation - Mitigation required and development would still have an unacceptable impact following mitigation --						
Q. 47 Can the site accommodate adequate parking and servicing facilities?	Site meets highway guidelines for parking and servicing ++ Site does not currently meet parking and/or servicing requirements. However these issues can potentially be overcome or mitigated - Site does not meet highway requirements for parking and/or servicing and the issues identified are difficult/not practically possible to overcome --						
Q. 48 Will the proposal provide, enable or improve access to public rights of way (PROW)?	Proposal will create new PROW or integrate existing PROW into the development ++ Proposal will not affect a PROW + Proposal would involve the diversion or loss of a PROW --						

Assessment		584	585	588	617	618	619
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 --						
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 --						
Q. 51 What is the impact on Waste Water Treatment Works?	Further than 400m from the boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works ++						
	Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact undertaken and Yorkshire Water No Objection +						
	Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact not undertaken -						
	Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact undertaken Yorkshire Water consulted and likely to object --						

Assessment		584	585	588	617	618	619
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 --						
M Overall Rating for 'Community facilities, Utilities and Infrastructure'	Site has limited or no adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has a adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be fully mitigated ++						
	Site has limited to medium adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be satisfactorily mitigated +						
	Site has medium to high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation -						
	Site has high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation -						
Strong Economy							
Q53 (town centre uses only) 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 --						
Q. 54 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 +						
Q. 55 (Employment/Retail uses) Does the proposal involve the creation of net additional or net loss of jobs in Ryedale?	Up to 250 net jobs created ++						
	Up to 50 net jobs created +						
	Up to 50 net jobs lost -						
	Up to 250 net jobs lost --						

Assessment		584	585	588	617	618	619
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 --						
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 ++						
	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 ++						
	Constraint(s) identified but resolution possible +						
	Constraint(s) identified but resolution is uncertain --						
Developer Contributions							
Q58 Will the development be capable of meeting the usual range of site-specific s106 requirements?	Normal range of contributions can be achieved ++						
	Some contributions can be achieved +						
	Limited contributions can be achieved -						
	No contributions can be achieved --						
Q. 59 Can the development support the requirements of the CIL charging schedule?	Yes ++						
	No --						
O Overall Deliverability / Developability Rating	Site is able to come forward without impairment and is able to provide a normal range of contributions ++	Site submitter promoting land for future plan	Site submitter promoting land for future plan	(++) proven range of developer 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 --						

Assessment		654	655	
Stage 1 - Sift		proposed a site for the livestock market		
all sites 0.3Ha and above	0.3 Ha or greater ++			
	Less than 0.3 Ha --			
Check for conformity with Local Plan Strategy, Settlement Hierarchy SP1	Conforms to Local Plan Strategy Spatial Strategy (SP1) ++	(--) Not in or adjacent to the Principal Town, nor an established employment land area	(++) but not well-related to either the built form of settlement or established employment land area	
	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 ++	(++)	(--) cannot rule out no likely significant affect (LSE) Adjacent to the River Derwent SAC - would be subject to AA to assess LSE already identified for sites in Malton and Norton	
	Will cause harm --			
Sites which fall wholly within Flood Zone 3b not considered further for built development. Where sites are partially in Flood Zone 3b, that part of the site will be not be considered further for built development.	Is not within Flood Zone 3b ++	FRA required to ascertain flood risk	(--) Large areas of site within Flood Zone 3B, land to the north of the road.	
	Is within Flood Zone 3b --			
Stage 2 - Site Assessment				
Q1A How accessible is the site to key services and facilities	Bus stop	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	Site is c.900 metres to the bus stop on the A169.	(++)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +		
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -		
		15 minutes walking time and over --		
	Railway Station (Malton and Norton)	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++		
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +		
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -		
		15 minutes walking time and over --		
	Nearest commercial limit	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++		
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +		
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -		
		15 minutes walking time and over --		

Assessment		654	655	
	Nearest employment area	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++		
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +		
		Up to 15 minutes walking time –		
		15 minutes walking time and over --		
	Nearest Primary School	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++		
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +		
		Up to 15 minutes walking time –		
		15 minutes walking time and over --		
	Nearest Secondary School	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++		
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +		
		Up to 15 minutes walking time –		
		15 minutes walking time and over --		
Nearest Development Limit	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++			
	Up to 10 minutes walking time +			
	Up to 15 minutes walking time –			
	15 minutes walking time and over --			
Nearest Doctors Surgery	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++			
	Up to 10 minutes walking time +			
	Up to 15 minutes walking time –			
	15 minutes walking time and over --			
Hospital (Malton and Norton)	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++			
	Up to 10 minutes walking time +			
	Up to 15 minutes walking time –			
	15 minutes walking time and over --			

Assessment		654	655
Q1B (Retail) How does the site location relate to the Town Centre in terms of the NPPF Sequential Test?	Town Centre ++		
	Edge of Centre +		
	Out of Centre -		
	Out of Town --		
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 --	
Q2C (Malton and Norton only) which sub-category of flood zone 3a does the site fall within?	Flood Zone 3a (i) defence <1:50		
	Flood Zone 3a (ii) defence 1:100 +		
	Flood zone 3a (iii) defence 1:50 < 1:100 -		
Q2D Has a Flood Risk Assessment been undertaken?	yes ++		
	No --		
Q2E (Malton/Norton/Old Malton) If within the Rapid Inundation Zone (RIZ), what level of hazard would exist?	Low - 'Caution' +		
	Moderate - 'Danger for some people' -		
	Significant - 'Danger for most people' --		
	Extreme 'Danger for all people' --		
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 (HA) (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 -		

Assessment		654	655
	<p>Site has multiple highway issues which may be difficult to mitigate unless further investigation demonstrates otherwise --</p>		

Assessment		654	655
Biodiversity and Geo-diversity			
Q4 Would the development affect a regional or local site of biodiversity (including SINC, LNR or RIGS) or affect UK, NYMNP or Ryedale Biodiversity Plan protected species	Enhancement of feature/species possible – mitigation not required ++		
	Neutral impact – no effect or effect can be fully mitigated +		
	Adverse impact but mitigation possible –		
	Serious impact with limited means of mitigation --		
Q5 Would the development provide opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure, including linking in with existing green infrastructure/corridors	Excellent opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors ++		
	Some opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors +		
	No opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors, however the site has the potential to accommodate these –		
	No opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure corridors, however the site does not have the potential to accommodate these --		

Assessment		654	655
Q6 Would the development impact on protected and unprotected trees, hedgerows and ancient woodland?	Positive impact. Enhancement of feature possible and mitigation not required ++		
	Neutral impact. No effect or effect can be fully mitigated +		
	Adverse impact but mitigation possible --		
	Serious impact with limited or no means of mitigation--		
B Overall rating for 'Biodiversity and Geo-diversity'	Positive impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements and no mitigation required++		
	Neutral impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements however any effect can be fully mitigated +		
	Adverse impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements by effects are capable of some mitigation -		
	Significant impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements and effects are unable to be satisfactorily mitigated --		

Assessment		654	655
C Special Qualities, Landscape and Setting			
Q7 What is the capacity of the landscape to accommodate the site according to the Landscape Character Assessments which cover the Ryedale Area and Special Qualities Study (including views and open spaces)?	Site has a very low landscape sensitivity to being developed or existing landscape features are retained or enhanced. Site will not detract from landscape character ++		(--) Discounting the land which has flood risk and infrastructure complexities leaves a triangular wedge of land to the south of Scarborough Road, in between submissions of 184F and 184E. Land is part of the entrance to Norton along Scarborough Road. As an individual site the site would represent a discordant form of development. Site is distanced from the settlement.
	Site has a low landscape sensitivity to being developed and some existing landscape features can be retained. Site is unlikely to detract from landscape character +		
	Site has medium landscape sensitivity to being developed and may affect landscape features, however mitigation is possible. Site may detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved –		
	Site has high landscape sensitivity to being developed and will affect landscape features with limited/no means of mitigation. Site will detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved --		
Q8 What impact would the site have on nationally protected landscapes the North York Moors NP and Howardian Hills AONB?	Site has a very low landscape sensitivity to being developed or existing landscape features are retained or enhanced. Site will not detract from landscape character ++		
	Site has a low landscape sensitivity to being developed and some existing landscape features can be retained. Site is unlikely to detract from landscape character +		
	Site has medium landscape sensitivity to being developed and may affect landscape features, however mitigation is possible. Site may detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved –		
	Site has high landscape sensitivity to being developed and will affect landscape features with limited/no means of mitigation. Site will detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved --		

Assessment		654	655
Q9 (sites within York Greenbelt) What impact would the sites have on a defined York Greenbelt	Positive Impact, mitigation not required ++		
	Neutral impact- limited or no landscape mitigation is required +		
	Negative impact with potential for harm but landscape mitigation is possible –		
	Significant harm with limited means of mitigation --		
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 –		
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 --		
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		654	655
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 --		
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 –		

Assessment		654	655
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --		

Assessment		654	655
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 --		
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 --		
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 ++		
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 ++		
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 --		
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 --		
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 are achievable -		
	No proposals suggested for waste reduction -		

Assessment		654	655
Q. 19 Does the development contain individual/communal recycling facilities/ infrastructure?	Yes +		
	No --		
F Overall Rating for 'Sustainable Building and Waste Minimisation'	Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development and developer willing ++		
	Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development but developer unwilling -		
	Site not capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development --		
Efficient Use of Land			
Q.20 Is the site or any part of the site considered previously developed land?	Site is over 50% to 100% Brownfield ++		
	Site is up to 50% Brownfield +		
Q.21 Can the site achieve an appropriate density to achieve the most efficient use of the land?	Excellent density achieved taking into account location and context ++		
	Appropriate density achieved taking into account location and context +		
	Lower density proposed as site faces some constraints in its development -		
	Lower density necessary as site faces significant constraints in its development --		
Q.22 Would the development of the site lead to the remediation of contaminated land?	Development is located on land which is likely to be highly contaminated and will be remediated ++		
	Development is located on land which may be contaminated and will be remediated +		
	Development is located on land which may be contaminated and no proposals for remediation have been put forward -		
	Development is located on land which is likely to be highly contaminated no proposals for remediation have been put forward --		
G Overall Rating for 'Efficient Use of Land'	Site represents very efficient use of land with mitigation to fully overcome concerns where necessary ++		
	Site represents efficient use of land but further mitigation required to fully overcome concerns where necessary +		
	Site does not represent efficient use of land. Further investigation of mitigation measures to overcome concerns required -		
	Site does not represent efficient use of land and mitigation is not possible --		

Assessment		654	655
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 --		
Q. 24 Would the development lead to the sterilisation of mineral resources?	Site not within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search, or Mineral Consultation Zone ++?		
	Site within the buffer of a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone –?		
	Site within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone --		
Q. 25 Would the development have an adverse impact on a Groundwater Source Protection Zone?	Development is not located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone ++		
	Development is located in a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but mitigation is possible to reduce the risk of groundwater pollution risk +		
	Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but no risk assessment has been undertaken -		
	Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone and mitigation of the risk of groundwater pollution is not possible --		
Q. 26 Would the development have an adverse impact on the Malton Air Quality Management Area or any other site of poor air quality?	Site falls outside any area of poor air quality and development is unlikely to result in any reduction in air quality. ++		
	Site falls outside any area of poor air quality and development is unlikely to result in a significant reduction in air quality. +		
	Site is within an area of poor air quality and mitigation is possible. Development may lead to a reduction in air quality. -		
	Site is within an area of poor air quality and limited/no mitigation is possible or no assessment has been made by the proposer. Development is likely to lead to a further significant reduction in air quality. --		

Assessment		654	655
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 --		
Q. 28 Will the site impact on major hazard sites or pipelines?	HSE Standing Advice states "do not advise against development" ++		
	HSE Standing Advice states "advise against development"		
H Overall Rating for 'Natural Resources'	Site would not adversely affect any natural resources ++		
	Site would not have any significant adverse effect on natural resources +		
	Site would have an adverse effect on natural resources but mitigation is possible –		
	Site would have a significant adverse effect on natural resources and limited/no mitigation is possible --		
Amenity			
Q. 29 Is the development in an area where noise, light, dust or smell is likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to generate noise, light or dust which will affect existing users?	The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +		
	The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible –		
	The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --		
Q. 30 Is the development in an area where other factors are likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to generate forms of nuisance which may affect the amenity of existing users? These may include issues such as privacy, lack of sunlight overbearing effects.	The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +		
	The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -		
	The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --		

Assessment		654	655
I Overall Rating for 'Amenity'	The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +		
	The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -		
	The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of this site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --		
Flood Risk			
Q. 31 Is the site potentially affected by groundwater flooding?	No ++		
	Yes further investigation required --		
Q. 32 Is the site potentially affected by surface water flooding and is this site considered to be within a critical drainage area?	No ++		
	Yes further investigation required --		
Q. 33 Is the site potentially affected by sewer flooding?	No ++		
	Yes further investigation required --		
Q. 34 Have Sustainable Drainage Systems (SDS) been proposed as part of the development?	Site capable of accommodating SDS and have been proposed as part of the development ++		
	Site capable of accommodating SDS though no information on whether SDS proposed as part of the development +		
	Site capable of accommodating SDS however SDS not being proposed on site -		
	Site not suitable for accommodating SDS --		
Q. 35 What other measures* have been considered which ensure the development is resilient to climate change? * variable	Multiple additional measures proposed which build in resilience to climate change ++		
	Single additional measure proposed to build in resilience to climate change +		
	No information provided on measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change -		

Assessment		654	655
	No measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change --		
J Overall Rating for 'Flood Risk'	No flood risk associated with the site ++		
	Limited flood risk associated with the site which can be fully mitigated +		
	Site affected by a number of flood risk issues, however mitigation possible-		
	Site affected by significant flood risk issues and limited mitigation possible --		

Assessment		654	655
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 --		
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 -		
Q. 38 Does the design of the development encourage people to walk and cycle rather than travel by car?	Cycleways and footpaths effectively integrated into the development encouraging walking and cycling ++		
	Some cycleways and/or footpaths shown encouraging walking and cycling +		
	No cycleways and footpaths indicated as part of this development --		
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 --		
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 -		
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 --		

Assessment		654	655
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 --		
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 --		
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 --		
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 --		

Assessment		654	655
Community Facilities, utilities and Infrastructure			
Q44 Malton/Norton only - Has Traffic Modelling or Transport Assessment been undertaken in the context of work already undertaken on the Malton and Norton STA?	Yes		
	No - traffic modelling required		
Q45 On sites greater than 1ha: Has a Transport Assessment been undertaken	Yes ++		
	No- transport assessment required --		
Q. 46 Is highway mitigation required as part of the development and what is the impact of the development on the highway network following mitigation?	No mitigation required or no impact on the highway following mitigation ++		
	Mitigation required but no unacceptable impact following mitigation +		
	Mitigation required and development would have a significant impact though not unacceptable impact after mitigation -		
	Mitigation required and development would still have an unacceptable impact following mitigation --		
Q. 47 Can the site accommodate adequate parking and servicing facilities?	Site meets highway guidelines for parking and servicing ++		
	Site does not currently meet parking and/or servicing requirements. However these issues can potentially be overcome or mitigated -		
	Site does not meet highway requirements for parking and/or servicing and the issues identified are difficult/not practically possible to overcome --		
Q. 48 Will the proposal provide, enable or improve access to public rights of way (PROW)?	Proposal will create new PROW or integrate existing PROW into the development ++		
	Proposal will not affect a PROW +		
	Proposal would involve the diversion or loss of a PROW --		

Assessment		654	655
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 --		
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 --		
Q. 51 What is the impact on Waste Water Treatment Works?	Further than 400m from the boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works ++		
	Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact undertaken and Yorkshire Water No Objection +		
	Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact not undertaken --		
	Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact undertaken Yorkshire Water consulted and likely to object --		

Assessment		654	655
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 --		
M Overall Rating for 'Community facilities, Utilities and Infrastructure'	Site has limited or no adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has a adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be fully mitigated ++		
	Site has limited to medium adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be satisfactorily mitigated +		
	Site has medium to high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation -		
	Site has high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation -		
Strong Economy			
Q53 (town centre uses only) 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 --		
Q. 54 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 +		
Q. 55 (Employment/Retail uses) Does the proposal involve the creation of net additional or net loss of jobs in Ryedale?	Up to 250 net jobs created ++		
	Up to 50 net jobs created +		
	Up to 50 net jobs lost -		
	Up to 250 net jobs lost --		

Assessment		654	655
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 --		
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 ++		
	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 ++		(-- the site is transected by the Railway, land to north of the railway could not be accessed.
	Constraint(s) identified but resolution possible +		
	Constraint(s) identified but resolution is uncertain --		
Developer Contributions			
Q58 Will the development be capable of meeting the usual range of site-specific s106 requirements?	Normal range of contributions can be achieved ++		
	Some contributions can be achieved +		
	Limited contributions can be achieved -		
	No contributions can be achieved --		
Q. 59 Can the development support the requirements of the CIL charging schedule?	Yes ++		
	No --		
O Overall Deliverability / Developability Rating	Site is able to come forward without impairment and is able to provide a normal range of contributions ++		(-- Flood risk concerns over much of the northern sites. No means of providing the appropriate crossing over the railway.
	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 --		