

Sherburn Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		12	71	74	77	126	251
Stage 1 - Sift		Planning consent 'minded to approve' for 73 units			planning approval for 9 units. 16/01088/FUL- covers 126 and land to front		
all sites 0.15Ha and above	0.15 Ha or greater ++	(++) 0.34ha	(++) 5.34ha	(++) 0.56ha	(++)0.51ha	(++) 0.17ha	(++) 0.8ha
	Less than 0.15 Ha --						
Check for conformity with Local Plan Strategy, Settlement Hierarchy SP1	Conforms to Local Plan Strategy Spatial Strategy (SP1) ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Does not meet Local Plan Strategy (Spatial Strategy) SP1 --						
Sites which cause significant harm to national/international nature conservation sites (species or habitat) or would involve substantial harm or loss to designated heritage assets will not be considered further.	Will Not cause harm ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Will cause harm --						
Sites which fall wholly within Flood Zone 3b not considered further for built development. Where sites are partially in Flood Zone 3b, that part of the site will be not be considered further for built development.	Is not within Flood Zone 3b ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Is within Flood Zone 3b --						
Stage 2 - Site Assessment							
Q1A How accessible is the site to key services and facilities	Bus stop	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(+)	(++)	(+)	(++)	(++)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +					
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -					
		15 minutes walking time and over --					
	Local Shop	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(+)	(++)	(+)	(++)	(++)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +					
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -					
		15 minutes walking time and over --					
	Nearest Primary School	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(+)	(++)	(+)	(++)	(++)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +					
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -					
		15 minutes walking time and over --					
	Nearest Development Limit	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +					
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -					
		15 minutes walking time and over --					

Sherburn Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		12	71	74	77	126	251
Overall accessibility rating	Site has excellent accessibility ++	(+)	(++)	(+)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Site has good accessibility +						
	Site has variable accessibility -						
	Site has poor accessibility --						
Q2A What flood zone does the site fall within?	Flood Zone 1++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Flood Zone 2 +						
	Flood zone 3a -						
Q2B What vulnerability class does the site fall	Flood Zone 1++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Flood Zone 2						
	Flood Zone 3a						
	Less vulnerable ++						
	More vulnerable +						
	Highly vulnerable -						
Q2D Has a Flood Risk Assessment been	yes ++	(++) SFRA. FRA not required due to site size.	(-) SFRA. FRA required.	(++) SFRA. FRA not required due to site size.	(++) SFRA. FRA not required due to site size.	(++) SFRA. FRA not required due to site size.	(++) SFRA. FRA not required due to site size.
	No --						
A Overall Flood Risk Assessment	Site has low overall flood risk ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Site faces significant flood risk issues which can be mitigated +						
	Site faces significant flood risk issues which could potentially be mitigated -						
	Site faces significant flood risk issues and may be inappropriate for development --						
Q3. What are the conclusions of the Highways Authorities (NYCC) and Highways Agency (HA) (where appropriate) initial highway assessment?	Site has no highway issues identified ++	(++) Highways England have confirmed that by virtue of size and ability of the site to access the traffic-lighted junction this would be acceptable. The County Council Highways Officer has advised: access from existing highway acceptable onto Eastbeck Court; Accessibility criteria has been met. Junction spacing should be considered carefully, adhering to NYCC's residential design guide.	(+) Highways England have advised that due to the size of the site, the scheme could utilise or relocate an existing access, and providing no conflict with existing access (i.e. no access opposite each other). The County Council Highways Officer has advised: access acceptable onto St. Hilda's Street. Accessibility Criteria can be met. Sites with over 50 dwellings will require a secondary access (emergency as a minimum). Consideration should be given to the cumulative impact. Junction spacing should be considered carefully.	(++) Highways England have confirmed that by virtue of size and ability of the site to access the traffic-lighted junction this would be acceptable. The County Council Highways Officer has advised: access from existing highway acceptable onto Eastbeck Court; Accessibility criteria has been met. Junction spacing should be considered carefully, adhering to NYCC's residential design guide.	(-) Highways England have confirmed that an existing access, providing no conflicts with other access, could be used directly onto the A64. They also could close up the existing access and provide a new access. The County Council Highways Officer has advised: access acceptable onto High Street (subject to HA approval). Accessibility Criteria can be met. Consideration should be given to the cumulative impact of sites accessing the High Street. Junction spacing should be considered carefully, adhering to NYCC's residential design guide. However, there is no indication that the access is capable of being used to access the site. It is part of Corner Farm, which has undertaken a scheme of extension and alterations to the listed barns for holiday accommodation. Proposals show no future access onto the adjacent land to the east.	(++) The access position has changed with regards to this site. Originally no access identified onto the A64. Highways England are satisfied with the access, and this has been established through the determination of a planning application.	(+) Highways England are satisfied that the site could utilise the established junction. The County Council Highways Officer has advised: access acceptable onto St. Hilda's Street. Accessibility Criteria can be met. Junction spacing should be considered carefully, adhering to NYCC's residential design guide.
	Site has some highways issues identified which can be mitigated subject to further investigation +						
	Site has multiple highways issues which can be mitigated subject to further investigation -						
	Site has multiple highway issues which may be difficult to mitigate unless further investigation demonstrates otherwise --						

Sherburn Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		12	71	74	77	126	251
Biodiversity and Geo-diversity							
Q4 Would the development affect a regional or local site of biodiversity (including SINC, LNRs or RIGS) or affect UK, NYMNP or Ryedale Biodiversity Plan protected species	Enhancement of feature/species possible – mitigation not required ++	(+). The site is not designated, or identified as a site of biodiversity. However, were there to protected species, these would be considered under their statutory framework.	(+). The site is not designated, or identified as a site of biodiversity. However, were there to protected species, these would be considered under their statutory framework. There are a series of old barns on the site, which could well be inhabited by owls/bats	(+). The site is not designated, or identified as a site of biodiversity. However, were there to protected species, these would be considered under their statutory framework.	(+). The site is not designated, or identified as a site of biodiversity. However, were there to protected species, these would be considered under their statutory framework.	(+). The site is not designated, or identified as a site of biodiversity. However, were there to protected species, these would be considered under their statutory framework.	(+). The site is not designated, or identified as a site of biodiversity. However, were there to protected species, these would be considered under their statutory framework.
	Neutral impact – no effect or effect can be fully mitigated +						
	Adverse impact but mitigation possible –						
	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 ++	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible. The site has a water course in close proximity to the site. There would be a need to ensure the retention of hedgerows.	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible. The site has a water course in close proximity to the site. There would be a need to ensure the retention of hedgerows.	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.
	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 --						

Sherburn Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		12	71	74	77	126	251	
Q6 Would the development impact on protected and unprotected trees, hedgerows and ancient woodland?	Positive impact. Enhancement of feature possible and mitigation not required ++	<p>(+)The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer advises: The eastern and northern boundaries are formed by a strong line of mature trees and hedge which are an important landscape feature.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain existing mature trees on northern and eastern boundaries as a priority (subject to a health and safety assessment) and ensure that layouts respect the recommendations in BS 5837:2012 – Trees in relation to demolition design and construction – Recommendations Retain selected mature trees within the site where layout design allows (subject to a health and safety assessment) and ensure that layouts respect the recommendations in BS 5837:2012 – Trees in relation to demolition design and construction - Recommendations Ensure that layout design considers the retention of existing native hedges along boundaries. open space outside of private gardens. Ensure that the development is generally well treed utilising a mixture of native and non-native species appropriate to the available space to provide a greened environment in harmony with existing local residential areas, and in the interests of longer-distance views from the west. 	<p>(+) The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer advises: The site is bounded to the east and the majority of the northern boundary by native hedges and scrubby trees which contain numerous gaps, with a couple of large mature native trees. At the north eastern corner of the site (adjacent to the A64 and the farm) there is a line of Norway maple. The southern boundary is formed by scrubby native trees including numerous gaps. The western boundary is formed by a native hedge and closely planted native trees which are semi-mature. This boundary is adjacent to the road leading to Sked Dale.</p>	<p>(+) This site is almost the same extent as site 12, but includes garden areas to 54 and 56 St. Hilda's St. The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer advises: The eastern and northern boundaries are formed by a strong line of mature trees and hedge which are an important landscape feature.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain existing mature trees on northern and eastern boundaries as a priority (subject to a health and safety assessment) and ensure that layouts respect the recommendations in BS 5837:2012 – Trees in relation to demolition design and construction – Recommendations Retain selected mature trees within the site where layout design allows (subject to a health and safety assessment) and ensure that layouts respect the recommendations in BS 5837:2012 – Trees in relation to demolition design and construction - Recommendations Ensure that layout design considers the retention of existing native hedges along boundaries. open space outside of private gardens. Ensure that the development is generally well treed utilising a mixture of native and non-native species appropriate to the available space to provide a greened environment in harmony with existing local residential areas, and in the interests of longer-distance views from the west. 	<p>(+) An L-shaped open parcel of land adjacent to the A-64 on its northern side and immediately south of a small residential development known as Sycamore Grove and immediately west of Wards factory. The site contains no landscape features. The site is open to views along the A-64 both east and west.</p> <p>There are no wider landscape views of the site</p>		<p>(+) A triangular field to the south of and detached from the village envelope formed at the junction of three roads the southerly of which is known as Sands Lane. The boundaries of the site are formed by high native hedges. Positioned centrally along the eastern boundary just within the field there are two mature sycamore trees which are prominent along the highway. The site is currently under grass.</p> <p>Owing to high roadside hedges there are no wider landscape views of the site. The Council's Tree and Landscape Office advises that the Two Sycamores should be retained.</p>	
	Neutral impact. No effect or effect can be fully mitigated +							
	Adverse impact but mitigation possible –							
	Serious impact with limited or no means of mitigation--							

Sherburn Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		12	71	74	77	126	251
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 --						
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 --		(--)	(--)			

Sherburn Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		12	71	74	77	126	251
Q8. What impact would the site have on the nationally designated landscapes of the North York Moors National Park 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 ++	(++) The site's situation means that there would be no impact on the designated landscapes of the Howardian Hills AONB or the North York Moors NP.	(++) The site's situation means that there would be no impact on the designated landscapes of the Howardian Hills AONB or the North York Moors NP.	(++) The site's situation means that there would be no impact on the designated landscapes of the Howardian Hills AONB or the North York Moors NP.	(++) The site's situation means that there would be no impact on the designated landscapes of the Howardian Hills AONB or the North York Moors NP.	(++) The site's situation means that there would be no impact on the designated landscapes of the Howardian Hills AONB or the North York Moors NP.	(++) The site's situation means that there would be no impact on the designated landscapes of the Howardian Hills AONB or the North York Moors NP.
	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 --						
Q10 Is the site capable of utilising existing landscape features to minimise its impact or provide adequate landscape mitigation measures?	Site is capable of retaining and enhancing existing landscape features ++	(++) The most notable landscape features relate to the presence of the mature trees which would provide some form of natural, intermediate screening. The land is flat, and this is not a feature which could, or indeed should be mitigated.	(-) The open sweeping nature of this site, in relation to the absence of development (other than the farm) mean that the landscape features make the ability for development to be assimilated into the landscape difficult.	(++) The most notable landscape features relate to the presence of the mature trees which would provide some form of natural, intermediate screening. The land is flat, and this is not a feature which could, or indeed should be mitigated.	(++) The site is adjacent to existing development, relatively flat, and has some hedging which provides some screening. It is considered that in landscape terms the site could be accommodated, and indeed there is an opportunity to enhance the entrance to the village.	(++) The proximity of residential development, and the flatter topography means that the site in the wider landscape could be accommodated.	(-) This site is not capable of utilising existing landscape features. The site is a triangular plot which follows the form of the field boundaries, and which straddled between two roads, and set back from the village does not have a strong association with the village. The land is gently rising, as the land rises into the Wolds, and so it would be visually prominent.
	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 ++	(+) Sherburn is a village which is not affected by coalescence with another settlement.	(+) Sherburn is a village which is not affected by coalescence with another settlement.	(+) Sherburn is a village which is not affected by coalescence with another settlement.	(+) Sherburn is a village which is not affected by coalescence with another settlement.	(++) Sherburn is a village which is not affected by coalescence with another settlement. This site has development surrounding it to the south, west and east.	(+) Sherburn is a village which is not affected by coalescence with another 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 --						

Sherburn Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		12	71	74	77	126	251
C Overall Rating for 'Special Qualities, Landscape and Setting'	Positive impact – the proposal will retain and enhance the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement ++	(+)	(--)	(+)	(++)	(++)	(-)
	Neutral impact – the proposal will not have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement +						
	Negative impact – the proposal will have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement, however mitigation is possible –						
	Significant impact – the proposal will have a significant adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement and limited or no mitigation is possible --						
Culture and Heritage							
Q12 Will the site affect a designated heritage asset, either directly or indirectly through its setting?	Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++	(+)	(+)	(+)	(--)	(+)	(+)
	Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +						
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –						
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --						
		(+)	(+)	(+)	(--)	(+)	(+)

Sherburn Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		12	71	74	77	126	251
Q13 Will the site affect a non-designated heritage asset which the Council identifies as having a degree of significance that is worthy of consideration?	Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++	(+)	(--)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(--)
	Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +	(+)	(--)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(--)
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –	(+)	(--)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(--)
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --	(+)	(--)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(--)

Sherburn Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		12	71	74	77	126	251
D Overall Rating for 'Culture and Heritage'	Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++	(-) Subject to archaeological investigation	(-- Subject to an archaeological investigation	(+)Subject to archaeological investigation	(-)Subject to archaeological investigation	(+)Subject to archaeological investigation, which is required by condition of the planning approval	(-- Subject to archaeological
	Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +						
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –						
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --						
Low Carbon Development and Renewable Energy							
Q14 Is the site adopting the Energy Hierarchy of the Local Plan Strategy?	Site capable and developer willing++	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.
	Site capable but developer unwilling -						
	Site not capable --						
Q15 Is the site capable of linking in or supporting off site renewable energy schemes?	Site capable linking in with off site renewable energy scheme and developer willing to take it forward ++	No such schemes would serve Sherburn.	No such schemes would serve Sherburn.	No such schemes would serve Sherburn.	No such schemes would serve Sherburn.	No such schemes would serve Sherburn.	No such schemes would serve Sherburn.
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 currently serve Sherburn.	No such schemes currently serve Sherburn.	No such schemes currently serve Sherburn.	No such schemes currently serve Sherburn.	No such schemes currently serve Sherburn.	No such schemes currently serve Sherburn.
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 currently submitted	No information currently submitted	No information currently submitted	No information currently submitted	No information currently submitted	No information currently submitted
	Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer unwilling -						
	Site not capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology --						

Sherburn Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		12	71	74	77	126	251
Sustainable Building and Waste Reduction							
Q17 Can the site accommodate higher sustainable building standards than currently required?	<p>Site can accommodate 2 levels higher than mandatory limit ++</p> <p>Site can accommodate 1 level higher than mandatory limit –</p> <p>Development cannot accommodate higher standards than mandatory level --</p>	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that higher sustainable building standards could not be accommodated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that higher sustainable building standards could not be accommodated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that higher sustainable building standards could not be accommodated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that higher sustainable building standards could not be accommodated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that higher sustainable building standards could not be accommodated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that higher sustainable building standards could not be accommodated.
Q18 Does the development contain proposals for waste reduction in both its construction and when in operation?	<p>Proposals for waste reduction incorporated into both the construction and operation of the development++</p> <p>Proposals have investigated waste reduction, however only limited measures are achievable -</p> <p>No proposals suggested for waste reduction --</p>	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for waste reduction could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for waste reduction could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for waste reduction could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for waste reduction could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for waste reduction could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for waste reduction could not be incorporated.
Q. 19 Does the development contain individual/communal recycling facilities/ infrastructure?	<p>Yes +</p> <p>No --</p>	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for recycling facilities could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for recycling facilities could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for recycling facilities could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for recycling facilities could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for recycling facilities could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for recycling facilities could not be incorporated.
F Overall Rating for 'Sustainable Building and Waste Minimisation'	<p>Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development and developer willing ++</p> <p>Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development but developer unwilling-</p> <p>Site not capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development --</p>	No information has currently been submitted	No information has currently been submitted	No information has currently been submitted	No information has currently been submitted	No information has currently been submitted	No information has currently been submitted
Efficient Use of Land							
Q.20 Is the site or any part of the site considered previously developed land?	<p>Site is over 50% to 100% Brownfield ++</p> <p>Site is up to 50% Brownfield +</p>	0.34ha of Greenfield. But no Brownfield sites are available to meet housing need.	3.54ha of Greenfield. But no Brownfield sites are available to meet housing need.	0.56ha of Greenfield. But no Brownfield sites are available to meet housing need.	0.51ha of Greenfield. But no Brownfield sites are available to meet housing need.	0.17ha of Greenfield and some Brownfield. But no Brownfield sites are available to meet housing need.	0.80ha of Greenfield. But no Brownfield sites are available to meet housing need.
Q.21 Can the site achieve an appropriate density to achieve the most efficient use of the land?	<p>Excellent density achieved taking into account location and context ++</p> <p>Appropriate density achieved taking into account location and context +</p> <p>Lower density proposed as site faces some constraints in its development –</p> <p>Lower density necessary as site faces significant constraints in its development --</p>	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 7 dwellings.	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 74 dwellings. Planning application is for 73.	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 11 dwellings.	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 10 dwellings.	(++) The site subject to planning permission includes the land to the front, making the site larger, delivering 9 units.	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 17 dwellings.

Sherburn Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		12	71	74	77	126	251
Q.22 Would the development of the site lead to the remediation of contaminated land?	Development is located on land which is likely to be highly contaminated and will be remediated ++	No evidence of contaminated land.	No evidence of contaminated land.	No evidence of contaminated land.	No evidence of contaminated land.	No evidence of contaminated land.	No evidence of contaminated land.
	Development is located on land which may be contaminated and will be remediated +						
	Development is located on land which may be contaminated and no proposals for remediation have been put forward -						
	Development is located on land which is likely to be highly contaminated no proposals for remediation have been put forward --						
G Overall Rating for 'Efficient Use of Land'	Site represents very efficient use of land with mitigation to fully overcome concerns where necessary ++	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(++)	(+)
	Site represents efficient use of land but further mitigation required to fully overcome concerns where necessary +						
	Site does not represent efficient use of land. Further investigation of mitigation measures to overcome concerns required -						
	Site does not represent efficient use of land and mitigation is not possible --						
Natural Resources							
Q. 23 Would the development of this site involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1,2 and 3a)?	No loss of best and most versatile agricultural land ++	(-) 0.34ha of Grade 3. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as grade 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The land is not in intensive agricultural use, and is less than 5ha in size.	(-) 3.54ha of Grade 3. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as grade 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The land is not in intensive agricultural use, just grazed, and is less than 5ha in size.	(-) 0.56ha of Grade 3. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as grade 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The land is not in intensive agricultural use, and is less than 5ha in size.	(-) 0.51ha of Grade 3. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as grade 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The land is currently not in agricultural use, and is less than 5ha in size.	(-) 0.17ha of Grade 3. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as grade 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The land is currently not in agricultural use, and is less than 5ha in size.	(-) 0.80ha of Grade 3. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as grade 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The land is currently not in intensive agricultural use (grazed), and is less than 5ha in size.
	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 is within a mineral safeguarding area, but is adjacent to the built form of the settlement	(--) Site is within a mineral safeguarding area, but is adjacent to the built form of the settlement	(--) Site is within a mineral safeguarding area, but is adjacent to the built form of the settlement	(--) Site is within a mineral safeguarding area, but is adjacent to the built form of the settlement	(--) Site is within a mineral safeguarding area, but is adjacent to the built form of the settlement	(--) Site is within a mineral safeguarding area, but is adjacent to the built form of the settlement
	Site within the buffer of a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone --?						
	Site within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone --						
Q. 25 Would the development have an adverse impact on a Groundwater Source Protection Zone?	Development is not located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	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 --						

Sherburn Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		12	71	74	77	126	251
Q. 27 Is any part of the development on suspected unstable land?	<p>Land has no instability concerns ++</p> <p>Land potentially unstable but investigation has shown that mitigation is possible +</p> <p>Land potentially unstable but no investigation has been carried out –</p> <p>Land suffers from significant instability problems and either no mitigation has been proposed or instability problems are not possible to mitigate --</p>	No evidence that the land is unstable.	No evidence that the land is unstable.	No evidence that the land is unstable.	No evidence that the land is unstable.	No evidence that the land is unstable.	No evidence that the land is unstable. On sloping sites, specialist geotechnical advice should be sort detailing requirements for stabilisation and foundation design.
Q. 28 Will the site impact on major hazard sites or pipelines?	<p>HSE Standing Advice states "do not advise against development" ++</p> <p>HSE Standing Advice states "advise against development"</p>	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
H Overall Rating for 'Natural Resources'	<p>Site would not adversely affect any natural resources ++</p> <p>Site would not have any significant adverse effect on natural resources +</p> <p>Site would have an adverse effect on natural resources but mitigation is possible –</p> <p>Site would have a significant adverse effect on natural resources and limited/no mitigation is possible --</p>	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
Amenity							
Q. 29 Is the development in an area where noise, light, dust or smell is likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to generate noise, light or dust which will affect existing users?	<p>The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +</p> <p>The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible –</p> <p>The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --</p>	(+) By virtue of its location, and size of site, and adjacent uses, it is unlikely that noise, light dust or smell would cause a nuisance to both existing and prospective users.	(-) The proximity of the A64, and as the site is opposite the Wards engineering plant, will require consideration, in terms of considering the amenity of prospective occupiers.	(+) By virtue of its location, and size of site, and adjacent uses, it is unlikely that noise, light dust or smell would cause a nuisance to both existing and prospective users.	(--) The proximity of the A64, and as the site is opposite the Wards engineering plant, will require consideration, in terms of considering the amenity of prospective occupiers. This may compromise operations of Wards Kingspan engineering plant. A planning consent was refused in 2011 because of the unacceptable harm to prospective residents through levels of noise of more than 50db at sensitive times of the day, and night, and no genuine, reasonable mitigation.	(+) The proximity of the A64 will require consideration, in terms of considering the amenity of prospective occupiers. This was considered through the planning application, and evidence was submitted which demonstrated that the Council's policy standards could be complied with.	(+) By virtue of its location, and size of site, and adjacent uses, it is unlikely that noise, light dust or smell would cause a nuisance to both existing and prospective users.
Q. 30 Is the development in an area where other factors are likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to generate forms of nuisance which may affect the amenity of existing users? These may include issues such as privacy, lack of sunlight overbearing effects.	<p>The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +</p> <p>The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -</p> <p>The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --</p>	(+) it is considered that these amenity impacts could be addressed though considering the scale, massing and orientation of the properties in respect of existing dwellings, and proposed dwellings. The surrounding build form is of domestic proportions.	(+) it is considered that these amenity impacts could be addressed though considering the scale, massing and orientation of the properties in respect of proposed dwellings. There are very few residential properties proximal.	(+) it is considered that these amenity impacts could be addressed though considering the scale, massing and orientation of the properties in respect of existing dwellings, and proposed dwellings. The surrounding build form is of domestic proportions.	(+) it is considered that these amenity impacts could be addressed though considering the scale, massing and orientation of the properties in respect of existing dwellings, and proposed dwellings. The surrounding build form is of domestic proportions, but Wards of Sherburn is to the east of the site, and its visual impact will require consideration.	(+) it is considered that these amenity impacts could be addressed though considering the scale, massing and orientation of the properties in respect of existing dwellings, and proposed dwellings. The surrounding build form is of domestic proportions.	(+) it is considered that these amenity impacts could be addressed though considering the scale, massing and orientation of the properties in respect of proposed dwellings. There are very few residential properties proximal.

Sherburn Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		12	71	74	77	126	251
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 --	(--)Yes- within zone of potential of groundwater and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A). Reported event of groundwater flooding in the village but not proximal to the site.	(--)Yes- within zone of potential of groundwater and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A). Reported event of groundwater flooding at this site. FRA required.	(--)Yes- within zone of potential of groundwater and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A). Reported event of groundwater flooding in the village but not proximal to the site	(--)Yes- within zone of potential of groundwater and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A). Reported event of groundwater flooding in close proximity to this site. FRA required	(--)Yes- within zone of potential of groundwater and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A). Reported event of groundwater flooding in close proximity to this site. FRA required.	(--)Yes- within zone of potential of groundwater and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A). Reported event of groundwater flooding in close proximity to this site. FRA 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 --	(--) Not a critical drainage area - but within zone of potential of groundwater and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A). Environment Agency expect no increase in surface runoff from the site.	(--) Not a critical drainage area - but within zone of potential of groundwater and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A). Environment Agency expect no increase in surface runoff from the site. FRA required	(--) Not a critical drainage area - but within zone of potential of groundwater and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A). Environment Agency expect no increase in surface runoff from the site.	(--) Not a critical drainage area - but within zone of potential of groundwater and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A). Environment Agency expect no increase in surface runoff from the site. FRA required.	(--) Not a critical drainage area - but within zone of potential of groundwater and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A). Environment Agency expect no increase in surface runoff from the site. FRA required.	(--) Not a critical drainage area - but within zone of potential of groundwater and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A). Environment Agency expect no increase in surface runoff from the site. FRA 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 details have been submitted concerning the scheme, and any Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used. The site is close to East Beck. The Environment Agency would either approve combined water discharge, or, where discharge to the water course is the only option, treatment and attenuation will be required. Consideration should be given to the use of SDSs.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme, and any Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme, and any Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used. The site is close to East Beck. The Environment Agency would either approve combined water discharge, or, where discharge to the water course is the only option, treatment and attenuation will be required. Consideration should be given to the use of SDSs.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme, and any Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme, and any Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented, through the planning process, and information submitted at the planning application has been satisfactory.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme, and any Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.

Sherburn Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		12	71	74	77	126	251
Q. 35 What other measures* have been considered which ensure the development is resilient to climate change? *variable to site	<p>Multiple additional measures proposed which build in resilience to climate change ++</p> <p>Single additional measure proposed to build in resilience to climate change +</p> <p>No information provided on measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change -</p> <p>No measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change --</p>	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme and other resilience measures to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme and other resilience measures to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme and other resilience measures to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme and other resilience measures to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme and other resilience measures to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme and other resilience measures to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.
J Overall Rating for 'Flood Risk'	<p>No flood risk associated with the site ++</p> <p>Limited flood risk associated with the site which can be fully mitigated +</p> <p>Site affected by a number of flood risk issues, however mitigation possible-</p> <p>Site affected by significant flood risk issues and limited mitigation possible --</p>	(+)	(--) due to ground water flooding incident.	(+)	(-)	(-)	(-)
People							
Q. 36 Would the development of the site lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of the settlement?	<p>Development incorporates existing use(s), as part of the overall scheme ++</p> <p>Development proposes relocation of use to suitable alternative location +</p> <p>Development will result in the loss of a valued facility/use and no justification or alternative provided --</p>	Development of the site would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of Sherburn.	Development of the site would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of Sherburn.	Development of the site would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of Sherburn.	Development of the site would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of Sherburn.	Development of the site would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of Sherburn.	Development of the site would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of Sherburn.
Q. 37 Will the site incorporate the principles of Secured By Design, reducing the potential for crime and discouraging anti-social behaviour?	<p>Yes – SBD principles taken into account or will be taken into account following liaison with North Yorkshire police +</p> <p>No – SBD principles not taken into account -</p>	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that secured by design principles could not be taken into account. Some specifics may not be appropriate within the village context of Sherburn- but this is a site specific consideration.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that secured by design principles could not be taken into account. Some specifics may not be appropriate within the village context of Sherburn- but this is a site specific consideration.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that secured by design principles could not be taken into account. Some specifics may not be appropriate within the village context of Sherburn- but this is a site specific consideration.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that secured by design principles could not be taken into account. Some specifics may not be appropriate within the village context of Sherburn- but this is a site specific consideration.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that secured by design principles could not be taken into account. Some specifics may not be appropriate within the village context of Sherburn- but this is a site specific consideration.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that secured by design principles could not be taken into account. Some specifics may not be appropriate within the village context of Sherburn- but this is a site specific consideration.
Q. 38 Does the design of the development encourage people to walk and cycle rather than travel by car?	<p>Cycleway and footpaths effectively integrated into the development encouraging walking and cycling ++</p> <p>Some cycleway and/or footpaths shown encouraging walking and cycling +</p> <p>No cycleway and footpaths indicated as part of this development --</p>	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that measures to increase walking and cycling could not be taken into account.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that measures to increase walking and cycling could not be taken into account.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that measures to increase walking and cycling could not be taken into account.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that measures to increase walking and cycling could not be taken into account.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that measures to increase walking and cycling could not be taken into account.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that measures to increase walking and cycling could not be taken into account.
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>	Not required	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a travel plan could not be produced.	Not required	Not required	Not required	Not required

Sherburn Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		12	71	74	77	126	251
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 ++	No details have been submitted as to the type of housing proposed. Although there is no reason to suggest that development of the site would not support the ability to attract a more balanced population, and reducing inequality.	No details have been submitted as to the type of housing proposed. Although there is no reason to suggest that development of the site would not support the ability to attract a more balanced population, and reducing inequality.	No details have been submitted as to the type of housing proposed. Although there is no reason to suggest that development of the site would not support the ability to attract a more balanced population, and reducing inequality.	No details have been submitted as to the type of housing proposed. Although there is no reason to suggest that development of the site would not support the ability to attract a more balanced population, and reducing inequality.	No details have been submitted as to the type of housing proposed. Although there is no reason to suggest that development of the site would not support the ability to attract a more balanced population, and reducing inequality.	No details have been submitted as to the type of housing proposed. Although there is no reason to suggest that development of the site would not support the ability to attract a more balanced population, and reducing inequality.
	Development takes into account the need to attract a balanced and/or working community +						
	Development takes no account of the need to attract a balanced living and/or working community -						
K Overall Rating for 'People'	Development actively planned to encourage the development of sustainable communities ++	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
	Development has taken into account the need to develop sustainable communities +						
	Development has little regard to the need to develop sustainable communities -						
	Development has no regard for the need to develop sustainable communities --						
Meeting needs							
Q.41 Does the type and mix of development proposed meet the needs identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), Employment Land Review Update 2010 (ELR), Ryedale Retail Capacity Studies (RRCS) and Malton Town Centre Strategy?	Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)
	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 ++	(-) There are no details provided concerning the amount of affordable housing. Based on a theoretical yield of 7 dwellings the site would be expected to provide a commuted sum for affordable housing in accordance with SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy.	There are no details provided concerning the amount of affordable housing as part of the site submission. Satisfactory affordable housing provision provided as part of the application (minded to approve)	(-) There are no details provided concerning the amount of affordable housing. Based on a theoretical yield of 11 dwellings the site would be expected to provide on-site affordable dwellings in accordance with SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy. The contribution will be limited.	(-) There are no details provided concerning the amount of affordable housing. Based on a theoretical yield of 7 dwellings the site would be expected to provide a commuted sum for affordable housing in accordance with SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy.	(+) The originally site extent did not off any form of contribution towards affordable housing. However, since the site was expanded, a commuted sum of 35% has been identified as being viable.	There are no details provided concerning the amount of affordable housing. Based on a theoretical yield of 17 dwellings the site would be expected to provide on-site affordable dwellings in accordance with SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy.
	Development offers some affordable housing which meets some of the need as set out in the SHMA +						
	Development does not offer the appropriate level and type of affordable housing or does not meet the need for affordable housing as set out in the SHMA -						
	The development makes no provision for affordable housing --						
Q. 43 What provision has been made for Ryedale's elderly population?	Development addresses and meets the needs of Ryedale's elderly population ++	No details have been provided, although as a service village there is no presumption for extra-care facilities. There is no expectation that bungalows will be required, but the Plan supports the delivery of lifetime homes. This will be considered as a site-specific matter.	No details have been provided, although as a service village there is no presumption for extra-care facilities. There is no expectation that bungalows will be required, but the Plan supports the delivery of lifetime homes. This will be considered as a site-specific matter.	No details have been provided, although as a service village there is no presumption for extra-care facilities. There is no expectation that bungalows will be required, but the Plan supports the delivery of lifetime homes. This will be considered as a site-specific matter.	No details have been provided, although as a service village there is no presumption for extra-care facilities. There is no expectation that bungalows will be required, but the Plan supports the delivery of lifetime homes. This will be considered as a site-specific matter.	No details have been provided, although as a service village there is no presumption for extra-care facilities. There is no expectation that bungalows will be required, but the Plan supports the delivery of lifetime homes. This will be considered as a site-specific matter.	No details have been provided, although as a service village there is no presumption for extra-care facilities. There is no expectation that bungalows will be required, but the Plan supports the delivery of lifetime homes. This will be considered as a site-specific matter.
	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 --						

Sherburn Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		12	71	74	77	126	251
L Overall Rating for 'Meeting Needs'	Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(+)	(-)
	Proposal identifies what the needs are and how some needs will be met by the development +						
	Proposal either does not identify what the needs are or how any needs are or how any needs will be met by the development -						
	No assessment is undertaken of what the needs are and whether any needs --						
Community Facilities, utilities and Infrastructure							
Q45 On sites greater than 1ha: Has a Transport Assessment been undertaken	Yes ++ No- transport assessment required --	Not required	(--) No assessment has currently been undertaken.	Not required	Not required	Not required	Not required
Q. 46 Is highway mitigation required as part of the development and what is the impact of the development on the highway network following mitigation?	No mitigation required or no impact on the highway following mitigation ++	This particular site submission has no identified access, but a later submission does. It utilises the East Beck Close hammerhead. (264)	The site can access the A64 off one of the site roads, thus utilising the signalised junction.	This particular site submission has no identified access, but a later submission does. It utilises the East Beck Close hammerhead. (264)	There are concerns of the deliverability of the access, which forms part of a tourist accommodation scheme.	(+) Highways matters are now satisfied in respect of conditions required as part of the planning permission.	No details have been submitted concerning the siting of an access, although it is considered that there is no reason in principle why an access could not be achieved.
	Mitigation required but no unacceptable impact following mitigation +						
	Mitigation required and development would have a significant impact though not unacceptable impact after mitigation -						
	Mitigation required and development would still have an unacceptable impact following mitigation --						
Q. 47 Can the site accommodate adequate parking and servicing facilities?	Site meets highway guidelines for parking and servicing ++	No details have been submitted concerning this matter, no evidence to suggest that such facilities cannot be achieved.	No details have been submitted concerning this matter, no evidence to suggest that such facilities cannot be achieved.	No details have been submitted concerning this matter, no evidence to suggest that such facilities cannot be achieved.	There are no details provided concerning the parking and servicing. There are concerns of the deliverability of the access.	(+) Highways matters are now satisfied in respect of conditions required as part of the planning permission.	No details have been submitted concerning this matter, no evidence to suggest that such facilities cannot be achieved.
	Site does not currently meet parking and/or servicing requirements. However these issues can potentially be overcome or mitigated -						
	Site does not meet highway requirements for parking and/or servicing and the issues identified are difficult/not practically possible to overcome --						
Q. 48 Will the proposal provide, enable or improve access to public rights of way (PROW)?	Proposal will create new PROW or integrate existing PROW into the development ++	(+) The will not affect a PROW, although no details have been submitted concerning improving access to PROW.	(+) The will not affect a PROW, although no details have been submitted concerning improving access to PROW.	(+) The will not affect a PROW, although no details have been submitted concerning improving access to PROW.	(+) The will not affect a PROW, although no details have been submitted concerning improving access to PROW.	(+) The will not affect a PROW, although no details have been submitted concerning improving access to PROW.	(+) The will not affect a PROW, although no details have been submitted concerning improving access to PROW.
	Proposal will not affect a PROW +						
	Proposal would involve the diversion or loss of a PROW --						
Q. 49 Does the proposal involve new public realm or enhancements to the existing public realm as part of its development?	Proposal will create high quality new public realm or significantly enhance existing public realm as part of its development ++	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.
	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 --						

Sherburn Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		12	71	74	77	126	251
Q.50 What is the capacity of existing utilities and infrastructure to cope with impact of the development?	Site has limited or no adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be fully mitigated ++	Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: additional capacity required at school. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water. Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer. Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.	Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: additional capacity required at school. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water. Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer. Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.	Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: additional capacity required at school. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water. Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer. Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.	Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: additional capacity required at school. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water. Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer. Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.	Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: additional capacity required at school. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water. Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer. Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.	Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: additional capacity required at school. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water. Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer. Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.
	Site has limited to medium adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be satisfactorily mitigated +						
	Site has medium to high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation –						
	Site has high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation --						
Q. 51 What is the impact on Waste Water Treatment Works?	Further than 400m from the boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact undertaken and Yorkshire Water No Objection +						
	Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact not undertaken –						
	Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact undertaken Yorkshire Water consulted and likely to object --						

Sherburn Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		12	71	74	77	126	251
Q. 52 Would the development on its own, have an impact on an existing community facility and has mitigation of this impact been proposed as part of the development?	<p>Site has no adverse impact on community facilities or where there is an adverse impact this is fully mitigated through the provision of new, expanded or alternative facilities ++</p> <p>Site does not have a significant adverse impact on community facilities or where there is a significant adverse impact this is mitigated through the provision of new, expanded or alternative facilities +</p> <p>Site has an adverse impact on community facilities and limited mitigation is indicated -</p> <p>Site has a significant adverse impact on community facilities and no mitigation is indicated --</p>	(++) Development of the site would not have a direct impact on the an existing community facility.	(++) Development of the site would not have a direct impact on the an existing community facility.	(++) Development of the site would not have a direct impact on the an existing community facility.	(++) Development of the site would not have a direct impact on the an existing community facility.	(++) Development of the site would not have a direct impact on the an existing community facility.	(++) Development of the site would not have a direct impact on the an existing community facility.
M Overall Rating for 'Community facilities, Utilities and Infrastructure'	<p>Site has limited or no adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has a adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be fully mitigated ++</p> <p>Site has limited to medium adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be satisfactorily mitigated +</p> <p>Site has medium to high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation -</p> <p>Site has high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation --</p>	(+)	(-)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)
Strong Economy							
Q53. (Town centre uses) Will the site promote the viability and vitality of the Principal Town or Local Service Centre?	<p>Proposal will support and enhance the vitality and viability of the town centre, encouraging new investment ++</p> <p>Proposal will support the vitality and viability of the town centre in retaining key services and facilities +</p> <p>Proposal could adversely harm the viability and vitality of the town centre leading to decline --</p>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Q. 54 (Employment uses) Will the mix of uses proposed by the development assist in diversifying the economy as set out in the ELR?	<p>Mix of uses proposed will diversify the economy as set out in the ELR ++</p> <p>Mix of uses proposed will not diversify the economy but will support existing employment sectors in Ryedale +</p>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Q. 55 (Employment/retail uses) Does the proposal involve the creation of net additional or net loss of jobs in Ryedale?	<p>Up to 250 net jobs created ++</p> <p>Up to 50 net jobs created +</p> <p>Up to 50 net jobs lost -</p> <p>Up to 250 net jobs lost --</p>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Assessment		12	71	74	77	126	251	
N Overall rating for 'Strong Economy'	Proposal will have a significant positive impact on the economy ++	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
	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 ++	(++) Category 1 site within the 2009 SHLAA	(++) Category 1 site within the 2009 SHLAA	(++) Category 1 site within the 2009 SHLAA	(++) Category 1 site within the 2009 SHLAA	Not considered in the 2009 SHLAA	(++) Category 1 site within the 2009 SHLAA
	Housing: Category 2 (Developable) +	Employment: Category II +						
	Housing: Category 3 (Not Currently Developable) --	Employment: Category III -						
Q57. Are there any other legal or physical constraints which may affect the ability of the site to come forward?	No constraints identified ++	Subject to archaeological assessment	Subject to archaeological assessment.	Subject to archaeological assessment	Subject to archaeological assessment	Subject to archaeological assessment	Subject to archaeological assessment	
	Constraint(s) identified but resolution possible +							
	Constraint(s) identified but resolution is uncertain --							
Developer Contributions								
Q58 Will the development be capable of meeting the usual range of site-specific s106 requirements?	Normal range of contributions can be achieved ++	Unknown	(++) The site is now subject to a planning consent which has covered the usual range of contributions.	Unknown	Unknown	(++) proven policy compliant level of contributions sought through the s.106 of the planning permission.	Unknown	
	Some contributions can be achieved +							
	Limited contributions can be achieved -							
	No contributions can be achieved --							
Q. 59 Can the development support the requirements of the CIL charging schedule?	Yes ++	Unknown	Consent granted in advance of CIL adoption	Unknown	Unknown	(++) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	Unknown	
	No --							
O Overall Deliverability / Developability Rating	Site is able to come forward without impairment and is able to provide a normal range of contributions ++	No response received	(++) Planning permission has recently been granted.	No response received	No response received	(++)	No response received	
	Site has some constraints and / or may not be able to support the full range of developer contributions +							
	Site faces significant constraints and may not be able to support any developer contributions --							

Assessment		253	258	264	283	348	605
Stage 1 - Sift					planning consent granted but permission has lapsed.		
all sites 0.15Ha and above	0.15 Ha or greater ++	(++)0.3ha	(++) 1.77ha	(++) 0.41ha	(++) 0.16ha	(++) 4.8ha	(++) 1.08ha
	Less than 0.15 Ha --						
Check for conformity with Local Plan Strategy, Settlement Hierarchy SP1	Conforms to Local Plan Strategy Spatial Strategy (SP1) ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(-) tourist and leisure use proposed	(++)
	Does not meet Local Plan Strategy (Spatial Strategy) SP1 --						
Sites which cause significant harm to national/international nature conservation sites (species or habitat) or would involve substantial harm or loss to designated heritage assets will not be considered further.	Will Not cause harm ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Will cause harm --						
Sites which fall wholly within Flood Zone 3b not considered further for built development. Where sites are partially in Flood Zone 3b, that part of the site will be not be considered further for built development.	Is not within Flood Zone 3b ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Is within Flood Zone 3b --						
Stage 2 - Site Assessment							
Q1A How accessible is the site to key services and facilities	Bus stop	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(++)	(++)	(+)	(++)	(++)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +					
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -					
		15 minutes walking time and over --					
	Local Shop	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(++)	(++)	(+)	(++)	(++)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +					
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -					
		15 minutes walking time and over --					
	Nearest Primary School	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(++)	(++)	(+)	(++)	(+)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +					
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -					
		15 minutes walking time and over --					
	Nearest Development Limit	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)WITHIN	(++)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +					
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -					
		15 minutes walking time and over --					

Sherburn Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		253	258	264	283	348	605
Overall accessibility rating	Site has excellent accessibility ++	(++)	(++)	(+)	(++)		(++)
	Site has good accessibility +						
	Site has variable accessibility –						
	Site has poor accessibility --						
Q2A What flood zone does the site fall within?	Flood Zone 1++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Flood Zone 2 +						
	Flood zone 3a –						
Q2B What vulnerability class does the site fall	Flood Zone 1++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Flood Zone 2						
	Flood Zone 3a						
	Less vulnerable ++						
	More vulnerable +						
Highly vulnerable -							
Q2D Has a Flood Risk Assessment been	yes ++	(++) SFRA. FRA not required due to site size.	(-) SFRA. FRA required.	(++) SFRA. FRA not required due to site size.	(++) SFRA. FRA not required due to site size.	(-) SFRA. FRA required.	(-) SFRA. FRA required.
	No --						
A Overall Flood Risk Assessment	Site has low overall flood risk ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Site faces significant flood risk issues which can be mitigated +						
	Site faces significant flood risk issues which could potentially be mitigated –						
	Site faces significant flood risk issues and may be inappropriate for development --						
Q3. What are the conclusions of the Highways Authorities (NYCC) and Highways Agency (HA) (where appropriate) initial highway assessment?	Site has no highway issues identified ++	(+) Highways England would be supportive of a scheme which linked onto St. Hilda's Street which is served by the traffic-lighted junction, through the modern development of 'The Pastures'. The County Council Highways Officer has advised: Acceptable access onto the Pastures and the High Street (subject to HA approval). Consideration should be given to residential parking on the Pastures. Consideration should be given to the cumulative impact of sites accessing the High Street. Junction spacing should be considered carefully, adhering to NYCC's residential design guide.	(-) The site access would be directly onto the A64, and it is not possible to physically link onto St. Hilda's Street which is served by the traffic-lighted junction. Highways England would have significant concerns about the creation of new access points onto the A64. The County Council Highways Officer has advised: The site does not include sufficient frontage to enable an access of acceptable standards to be formed on the public highway. The existing access would require significant improvement and need widening to meet adoptable standards. Improvements are restricted due to existing infrastructure. Junction spacing should be considered carefully, adhering to NYCC's residential design guide.	(++) Highways England have confirmed that by virtue of size and ability of the site to access the traffic-lighted junction this would be acceptable. The County Council Highways Officer has advised: access from existing highway acceptable onto Eastbeck Court; Accessibility criteria has been met. Junction spacing should be considered carefully, adhering to NYCC's residential design guide.	(++) Highways England have confirmed that by virtue of size and ability of the site to access the traffic-lighted junction this would be acceptable. The County Council Highways Officer has advised: Accessible onto Vicarage Lane. Accessibility criteria met. Junction spacing should be considered carefully, adhering to NYCC's residential design guide.	(-) Highways England consider that this site will have a significant impact on the Strategic Road Network (SRN) which will require mitigation. Improvements to the SRN are only considered as a last resort. Instead sustainable travel choices need to be developed through use of travel plans. The County Council Highways Officer has advised: access acceptable onto High Street A64 (Subject to HA approval). Accessibility Criteria can be met. Sites with over 50 dwellings will require a secondary (emergency as a minimum). Consideration should be given to the cumulative impact of sites accessing the High Street. Junction spacing should be considered carefully, adhering to NYCC's residential design guide.	(-) Highways England The site access would be directly onto the A64, and it is not possible to physically link onto St. Hilda's Street which is served by the traffic-lighted junction. For the number of houses capable of being delivered, it is not able to support an application with a new access onto the A64. The County Council Highways Officer has advised: Access can be achieved off the high street. Accessibility criteria can be met. Consideration should be given to the cumulative impact of sites accessing the High Street. Junction spacing should be considered carefully, adhering to NYCC's residential design guide.
	Site has some highways issues identified which can be mitigated subject to further investigation +						
	Site has multiple highways issues which can be mitigated subject to further investigation -						
	Site has multiple highway issues which may be difficult to mitigate unless further investigation demonstrates otherwise --						

Sherburn Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		253	258	264	283	348	605
Biodiversity and Geo-diversity							
Q4 Would the development affect a regional or local site of biodiversity (including SINC, LNRs or RIGS) or affect UK, NYMNP or Ryedale Biodiversity Plan protected species	Enhancement of feature/species possible – mitigation not required ++	(+). The site is not designated, or identified as a site of biodiversity. However, were there to protected species, these would be considered under their statutory framework.	(+). The site is not designated, or identified as a site of biodiversity. However, were there to protected species, these would be considered under their statutory framework.	(+). The site is not designated, or identified as a site of biodiversity. However, were there to protected species, these would be considered under their statutory framework.	(+). The site is not designated, or identified as a site of biodiversity. However, were there to protected species, these would be considered under their statutory framework.	(+). The site is not designated, or identified as a site of biodiversity. However, were there to protected species, these would be considered under their statutory framework.	(+). The site is not designated, or identified as a site of biodiversity. However, were there to protected species, these would be considered under their statutory framework.
	Neutral impact – no effect or effect can be fully mitigated +						
	Adverse impact but mitigation possible –						
	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 ++	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible. The site has a water course in close proximity to the site. There would be a need to ensure the retention of hedgerows.	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.
	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		253	258	264	283	348	605
<p>Q6 Would the development impact on protected and unprotected trees, hedgerows and ancient woodland?</p>	<p>Positive impact. Enhancement of feature possible and mitigation not required ++</p>			<p>(+) Similar site extent to 12, but includes access to Eastbeck Close. The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer advises:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain existing mature trees on northern and eastern boundaries as a priority (subject to a health and safety assessment) and ensure that layouts respect the recommendations in BS 5837:2012 – Trees in relation to demolition design and construction – Recommendations • Retain selected mature trees within the site where layout design allows (subject to a health and safety assessment) and ensure that layouts respect the recommendations in BS 5837:2012 – Trees in relation to demolition design and construction - Recommendations • Ensure that layout design considers the retention of existing native hedges along boundaries. • Ensure that the development is generally well treed utilising a mixture of native and non-native species appropriate to the available space to provide a greened environment in harmony with existing local residential areas, and in the interests of views into the site from gaps in the street from the west and south 			<p>(+) A roughly rectangular site immediately to the east of Springfield Terrace and south of the A-64. Bordered by a strong woodland belt to the south and a rural hedge along the A-64 with some trees and gaps. The eastern boundary is formed by a farm complex. Apart from glimpses on passing the site along the A-64, there are no immediate open views of the site. The land is currently open paddock with a few scattered trees along the southern boundary. Although the land rises steeply to the south, public views from the southern approaches are screened by roadside hedges and the wide woodland strip along the southern end of the site. There are no other wider landscape views of the site</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>						

Sherburn Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		253	258	264	283	348	605
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 --						
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 ++	(-) This site is within the Vale of Pickering National Character Area. The land is gently rising, and is considered to be in the "Sand and Gravel Vale Fringe" in the North Yorkshire Landscape Character Assessment, which recognises this as a transition zone between the Vale of Pickering and the Wolds. It recognises the strong intervisibility between these areas, and that the rising land of the Wolds creates a prominent backdrop. This is a paddock area, and the land provides intermittent views of the Wolds. It is also south of the A64, an area which has seen only limited residential development in the latter half of the twentieth century. It is considered that the site has medium landscape sensitivity, but by virtue of size and relative positioning to other residential development, the landscape could accommodate some development in this location.	(-- This site is within the Vale of Pickering National Character Area. The Local Landscape Character type is Wooded Open Vale, reflecting the flat, low lying terrain, which affords long views, which are punctuated by woodland blocks. The site is to the rear of a small, sporadic collection of properties, which have organically developed. These properties have a limited visual and physical relationship to Sherburn, with the majority of Sherburn's development following the road which links into the Vale of Pickering. This site is accessed from the A64 and is offset to the west of the village proper. The site is relatively large, and currently affords the open views. It is considered that this site, in terms of its scale, the topography and, in particular, its lack of physical association with the village-proper, means that the site would be incongruous, and that the landscape is not capable of accommodating this form of development.	(+) This site is within the Vale of Pickering National Character Area. The Local Landscape Character type is Wooded Open Vale, reflecting the flat, low lying terrain which is punctuated by woodland blocks. The site is adjacent the existing built form of the village. The adjacent properties are large, low density builds, and the scheme would extend from the existing cul-de-sac development. The site is surrounded by mature trees, and bounded on the east by the Beck. It is considered that in landscape terms the site could be accommodated in the landscape.	(++ Within the built form of the settlement	(-- The site is currently open fields (grazed), out with the village-proper. This site is within the Vale of Pickering National Character Area. It is considered to be in the "Sand and Gravel Vale Fringe" in the North Yorkshire Landscape Character Assessment, which recognises this as a transition zone between the Vale of Pickering and the Wolds. It is to the immediate south of the A64, and the site contains a farmstead, which set back from the road and accessed by a track. It is considered that this site is open, expansive, and that the land, albeit extremely gently at this site, rises up to the Wolds, and this offers an open view of the Fringe of the Moors. The site is the within the Wolds Area of High Landscape Value designation. Limited development has occurred to the south of the A64, the settlement has grown northwards, into the flatter, Vale land. It is noted that the proposal for this site is leisure/tourism, and this includes tourist accommodation. It is considered that the topography and its open character mean that this site is visually prominent, and its development would have a significant impact on the setting and character of Sherburn, and that the landscape and topography are not capable of affording a landscape impact which is mitigatable.	(-) This site straddles both the Yorkshire Wolds and the Vale of Pickering National Character Area. The land is gently rising, and is considered to be in the "Sand and Gravel Vale Fringe" in the North Yorkshire Landscape Character Assessment, which recognises this as a transition zone between the Vale of Pickering and the Wolds. It recognises the strong intervisibility between these areas, and that the rising land of the Wolds creates a prominent backdrop. This is open field, which is positioned between the mid-twentieth century cul-de-sac, and the Forge. The land provides intermittent views of the Wolds. It thus contributes the character of Sherburn by affording a visual relationship with the Wolds, and providing a continuation of the development pattern to the south of the A64 being limited and intermittent. It is considered therefore that the landscape development at this site would detract from the existing open qualities.
	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 --						

Sherburn Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		253	258	264	283	348	605
Q8. What impact would the site have on the nationally designated landscapes of the North York Moors National Park 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 ++	(++) The site's situation means that there would be no impact on the designated landscapes of the Howardian Hills AONB or the North York Moors NP.	(++) The site's situation means that there would be no impact on the designated landscapes of the Howardian Hills AONB or the North York Moors NP.	(++) The site's situation means that there would be no impact on the designated landscapes of the Howardian Hills AONB or the North York Moors NP.	(++) The site's situation means that there would be no impact on the designated landscapes of the Howardian Hills AONB or the North York Moors NP.	(++) The site's situation means that there would be no impact on the designated landscapes of the Howardian Hills AONB or the North York Moors NP.	(++) The site's situation means that there would be no impact on the designated landscapes of the Howardian Hills AONB or the North York Moors NP.
	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 --						
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 ++	(--). Designated a Visually Important Undeveloped Area in LP 2002. This area is a small paddock which provides intermittent open views of the Wolds, and provide a physical break between residential development and the Forge. It is considered that the development of this site would harm that intermittent intervisibility.	(--). The site is open, unscreened, and has a limited association with the village, it is considered that the site is not capable of utilising the existing landscape features to minimise the impact of the development.	(++). The most notable landscape features relate to the presence of the mature trees which would provide some form of natural, intermediate screening. The land is flat, and this is not a feature which could, or indeed should be mitigated.	(++). Within the built form of the settlement	(--). The open sweeping nature of this site, in relation to the absence of development (other than the farm) mean that the landscape features make the ability for development to be assimilated into the landscape difficult, despite it being a non- residential scheme.	(--). This area is a which provides intermittent open views of the Wolds, and provide a physical break between residential development and the Forge. It contributes to the character of the area, alongside site 253 which provides these intermittent open views of the Wolds. The "council housing" scheme is a harsh edge. But is a product of its time.
	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 ++	(+). Sherburn is a village which is not affected by coalescence with another settlement.	(+). Sherburn is a village which is not affected by coalescence with another settlement.	(+). Sherburn is a village which is not affected by coalescence with another 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 --						

Sherburn Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		253	258	264	283	348	605
C Overall Rating for 'Special Qualities, Landscape and Setting'	Positive impact – the proposal will retain and enhance the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement ++	(-)	(--)	(+)	(++)	(--)	(-)
	Neutral impact – the proposal will not have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement +						
	Negative impact – the proposal will have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement, however mitigation is possible –						
	Significant impact – the proposal will have a significant adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement and limited or no mitigation is possible --						
Culture and Heritage							
Q12 Will the site affect a designated heritage asset, either directly or indirectly through its setting?	Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++	(-) Within the buffer zone (but at the edge of SM 812 a round barrow. It not considered that development in itself would harm the setting of the Scheduled Monument by virtue of distance. It is within the buffer zone of the Listed Former Pigeon Pie, which was converted back to dwellings, but it is not adjacent, and is offset, on the opposite side of the road, and so will have limited contextual relationship. The site is adjacent to the Brewery House, a grade II listed former farmhouse. The Listed Building is offered only limited screened from the site by existing out buildings, which run the depth of the site.	(+) Within the Listed Building Buffers for the Milestone on the A64, and the Pigeon Pie Listed Building, but not physically proximal to the site, and not considered to adversely affect the setting.	(+) Within the Listed Building Buffer, not adjacent to the St. Hilda's church and so development is unlikely to affect the setting of the Church.	(+) Within the Listed Building Buffer, not adjacent to the St. Hilda's church and so development is unlikely to affect the setting of the Church.	(-) Within the Listed Building Buffers for the Corner House Farm and its associated outbuildings, and of Pasture House Farm House. It is considered that development of this field could harm the context of these farm houses, because they have historically operated in a isolated, semi-independent manner.	(-) Within the buffer zone (but at the edge) of SM 812 a round barrow. It not considered that development in itself would harm the setting of the Scheduled Monument. It is within the buffer zone of the Listed Milepost, but it is not considered that the site has the capability to affect the setting of the Milepost. The site is adjacent to the Brewery site, which has the Listed Brewery House. Currently, this complex of buildings stands within its own complex, and this complex being read as such. It is considered that through mitigation any impact on context could be mitigated through siting.
	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 --						

Sherburn Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		253	258	264	283	348	605
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 ++	<p>(--) The village of Sherburn, is broadly concentrated to the North of the A64, and historically development to the south of the A64 has been limited, reflecting and protecting the open sweeping, gently rising land. It is considered that development to the south will require very careful consideration to ensure that the character, approach to, and form of Sherburn is not altered to its detriment. This area is designated a Visually Important Undeveloped Area for it affords the ability to read the sweeping rise of the land to the Wolds. It also helps to break-up the development to the south of the A64, retaining some of the relatively undeveloped land between sporadic development. Development of this site would create a solid line of development along the A64, to the detriment of the settlement's form and character. This is an Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance accordingly. NYCC Heritage Unit advises: Part of this area has already been subject to geophysical survey carried out by the Landscape Research Centre. However, not aware that follow-on investigation has been done. Therefore, trial trenching is advised to clarify the nature and significance of any archaeological remains.</p>	<p>(--) This is a site which is to the rear of, and wraps around a small collection of properties which are separated from the village (indeed they have their own Development Limits), the site is also set back from the road. It is considered that development of this site would create a scheme of dwellings which has a very limited relationship to the existing form of the village, and change the morphology of the settlement. It is considered that other sites have a better integration with the form and character of the Settlement. This is an Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. NYCC Heritage Unit advises: Sherburn village has significant archaeological interest, previous archaeological work in the area having located remains from prehistoric to medieval and later date. Previous planning applications for this site in 2002 and 2008 (08/00475/OUT). NYCC consultation response advised evaluation, and geophysical survey was carried out by the Landscape Research Centre in 2008. NYCC subsequently advised trial trenching as the geo survey identified numerous anomalies of potential archaeological significance. However, we have no record of this trial trenching having yet been undertaken, so trial trenching pre-determination is advised again.</p>	<p>(-) Situated to the north eastern area of Sherburn, the landscape form, and the presence of existing development mean that the site is relatively enclosed, and its development would not be read as a projection. This is in part due to the relatively recent development due south of the site. This is an Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. NYCC Heritage Unit advises: Sherburn village has significant archaeological interest, previous archaeological work in the area having located remains from prehistoric to medieval and later date. Previous planning applications for this site in 2002 and 2008 (08/00475/OUT). NYCC consultation response advised evaluation, and geophysical survey was carried out by the Landscape Research Centre in 2008. NYCC subsequently advised trial trenching as the geo survey identified numerous anomalies of potential archaeological significance. However, we have no record of this trial trenching having yet been undertaken, so trial trenching pre-determination is advised again.</p>	<p>(+)The site is situated within the built form of the settlement. Site is subject to a planning permission granted. 11/00166/FULL NYCC advises: This area is one of high archaeological potential for remains of prehistoric through to medieval and later date, with known archaeological remains to the east and west revealed by geophysical survey. Therefore, subject to suitable ground conditions, geophysical survey is advised, followed by trial trenching to clarify the nature and significance of any archaeological remains.</p>	<p>(--)The village of Sherburn, is broadly concentrated to the North of the A64, and historically development to the south of the A64 has been limited, reflecting and protecting the open sweeping, gently rising land. It is considered that development to the south will require very careful consideration to ensure that the character, approach to, and form of Sherburn is not altered to its detriment. This is an open, distanced site from the village, and although the submission was to consider tourism uses, it was considered important to outline the sensitivities of the site to more substantial, and permanent forms of development. This is an Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. The village (like many villages along the foot slope of the Wolds have existed for multiple centuries and there is a immense archaeological record showing settlement chronology dating back millennia. All sites would need to undertake geophysical surveying in the first instance to establish the archaeological features within this area.</p>	<p>(--) The village of Sherburn, is broadly concentrated to the North of the A64, and historically development to the south of the A64 has been limited, reflecting and protecting the open sweeping, gently rising land. It is considered that development to the south will require very careful consideration to ensure that the character, approach to, and form of Sherburn is not altered to its detriment. This site affords the ability to read the sweeping rise of the land to the Wolds, and development would detract from that ability. This is an Archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. NYCC Heritage Unit advises: This site has already been subject to geophysical survey carried out by the Landscape Research Centre. However, no trial trenching has, to our knowledge, been undertaken to assess the anomalies identified by the survey. Therefore, trial trenching is advised to clarify the nature and significance of any archaeological remains.</p>
	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 --						

Sherburn Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		253	258	264	283	348	605
D Overall Rating for 'Culture and Heritage'	Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++	(--) Subject to archaeological investigation	(--) Subject to archaeological investigation	(-) Subject to archaeological investigation	(+) Subject to archaeological investigation	(--)	(--)
	Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +						
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –						
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --						
Low Carbon Development and Renewable Energy							
Q14 Is the site adopting the Energy Hierarchy of the Local Plan Strategy?	Site capable and developer willing ++	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	No information provided, although there is no reason to assume that this would not be possible.	Site is subject to a planning permission granted. 11/00166/FULL	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 would serve Sherburn.	No such schemes would serve Sherburn.	No such schemes would serve Sherburn.	Site is subject to a planning permission granted. 11/00166/FULL	No such schemes would serve Sherburn.	No such schemes would serve Sherburn.
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 currently serve Sherburn.	No such schemes currently serve Sherburn.	No such schemes currently serve Sherburn.	Site is subject to a planning permission granted. 11/00166/FULL	No such schemes currently serve Sherburn.	No such schemes currently serve Sherburn.
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 currently submitted	No information currently submitted	No information currently submitted	No information currently submitted	No information currently submitted	No information currently submitted
	Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer unwilling -						
	Site not capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology --						

Sherburn Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		253	258	264	283	348	605
Sustainable Building and Waste Reduction							
Q17 Can the site accommodate higher sustainable building standards than currently required?	<p>Site can accommodate 2 levels higher than mandatory limit ++</p> <p>Site can accommodate 1 level higher than mandatory limit –</p> <p>Development cannot accommodate higher standards than mandatory level --</p>	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that higher sustainable building standards could not be accommodated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that higher sustainable building standards could not be accommodated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that higher sustainable building standards could not be accommodated.	Site is subject to a planning permission granted. 11/00166/FULL	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that higher sustainable building standards could not be accommodated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that higher sustainable building standards could not be accommodated.
Q18 Does the development contain proposals for waste reduction in both its construction and when in operation?	<p>Proposals for waste reduction incorporated into both the construction and operation of the development++</p> <p>Proposals have investigated waste reduction, however only limited measures are achievable -</p> <p>No proposals suggested for waste reduction --</p>	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for waste reduction could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for waste reduction could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for waste reduction could not be incorporated.	Site is subject to a planning permission granted. 11/00166/FULL	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for waste reduction could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for waste reduction could not be incorporated.
Q. 19 Does the development contain individual/communal recycling facilities/ infrastructure?	<p>Yes +</p> <p>No --</p>	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for recycling facilities could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for recycling facilities could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for recycling facilities could not be incorporated.	Site is subject to a planning permission granted. 11/00166/FULL	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for recycling facilities could not be incorporated.	No details have been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that proposals for recycling facilities could not be incorporated.
F Overall Rating for 'Sustainable Building and Waste Minimisation'	<p>Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development and developer willing ++</p> <p>Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development but developer unwilling-</p> <p>Site not capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development --</p>	No information has currently been submitted	No information has currently been submitted	No information has currently been submitted	Details submitted as part of the planning permission	No information has currently been submitted	No information has currently been submitted
Efficient Use of Land							
Q.20 Is the site or any part of the site considered previously developed land?	<p>Site is over 50% to 100% Brownfield ++</p> <p>Site is up to 50% Brownfield +</p>	0.3ha of Greenfield. But no Brownfield sites are available to meet housing need.	1.77ha of Greenfield. But no Brownfield sites are available to meet housing need.	0.41ha of Greenfield. But no Brownfield sites are available to meet housing need.	0.16ha of Greenfield. But no Brownfield sites are available to meet housing need.	4.8ha of Greenfield. But no Brownfield sites are available to meet housing need.	1.08ha of Greenfield. But no Brownfield sites are available to meet housing need.
Q.21 Can the site achieve an appropriate density to achieve the most efficient use of the land?	<p>Excellent density achieved taking into account location and context ++</p> <p>Appropriate density achieved taking into account location and context +</p> <p>Lower density proposed as site faces some constraints in its development –</p> <p>Lower density necessary as site faces significant constraints in its development --</p>	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 6 dwellings.	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 37 dwellings.	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 8 dwellings.	Site is subject to a planning permission granted. 11/00166/FULL. The scheme was for 4 units.	This site was submitted as a tourism and leisure use. Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 101 dwellings.	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 22 dwellings.

Sherburn Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		253	258	264	283	348	605
Q.22 Would the development of the site lead to the remediation of contaminated land?	Development is located on land which is likely to be highly contaminated and will be remediated ++	No evidence of contaminated land.	No evidence of contaminated land.	No evidence of contaminated land.	No evidence of contaminated land.	No evidence of contaminated land.	(-) Records show that the site overlaps with a former Brewery site which was in operation from 1854 to 1950.
	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 ++	(+)	(+)	(+)	(++)	(+)	(+) (Green)
	Site represents efficient use of land but further mitigation required to fully overcome concerns where necessary +						
	Site does not represent efficient use of land. Further investigation of mitigation measures to overcome concerns required -						
	Site does not represent efficient use of land and mitigation is not possible --						
Natural Resources							
Q. 23 Would the development of this site involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1,2 and 3a)?	No loss of best and most versatile agricultural land ++	(-) 0.3ha of Grade 3. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as grade 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The land is currently not in intensive agricultural use, being grazed, and is less than 5ha in size.	(-) 1.77ha of Grade 3. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as grade 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The land is currently in agricultural use, for the grazing of sheep, and is less than 5ha in size.	(-) 0.41ha of Grade 3. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as grade 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The land is not in intensive agricultural use, and is less than 5ha in size.	(-) The site has a planning consent. 0.16ha of Grade 3. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as grade 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The land is not in intensive agricultural use, but is grazed, and is less than 5ha in size.	(-) 4.8ha of Grade 3. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as grade 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The land is not in intensive agricultural use, but is grazed, and is just less than 5ha in size.	(-) 1.08ha of Grade 3. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as grade 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The land is not in intensive agricultural use, but is grazed, and is less than 5ha in size.
	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 is within a mineral safeguarding area, but is adjacent to the built form of the settlement	(-- Site is within a mineral safeguarding area, but is adjacent to the built form of the settlement	(-- Site is within a mineral safeguarding area, but is adjacent to the built form of the settlement	(-- Site is within a mineral safeguarding area, but is adjacent to the built form of the settlement	(-- Site is within a mineral safeguarding area, but is adjacent to the built form of the settlement	(-- Site is within a mineral safeguarding area, but is adjacent to the built form of the settlement
	Site within the buffer of a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone --?						
	Site within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone --						
Q. 25 Would the development have an adverse impact on a Groundwater Source Protection Zone?	Development is not located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	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 --						

Sherburn Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		253	258	264	283	348	605
Q. 27 Is any part of the development on suspected unstable land?	Land has no instability concerns ++	No evidence that the land is unstable.	No evidence that the land is unstable.	No evidence that the land is unstable.	No evidence that the land is unstable.	No evidence that the land is unstable.	No evidence that the land is unstable.
	Land potentially unstable but investigation has shown that mitigation is possible +						
	Land potentially unstable but no investigation has been carried out –						
	Land suffers from significant instability problems and either no mitigation has been proposed or instability problems are not possible to mitigate --						
Q. 28 Will the site impact on major hazard sites or pipelines?	HSE Standing Advice states "do not advise against development" ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	HSE Standing Advice states "advise against development"						
H Overall Rating for 'Natural Resources'	Site would not adversely affect any natural resources ++	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
	Site would not have any significant adverse effect on natural resources +						
	Site would have an adverse effect on natural resources but mitigation is possible –						
	Site would have a significant adverse effect on natural resources and limited/no mitigation is possible --						
Amenity							
Q. 29 Is the development in an area where noise, light, dust or smell is likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to generate noise, light or dust which will affect existing users?	The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +	(-) The proximity of the A64 will require consideration, in terms of considering the amenity of prospective occupants.	(-) By virtue of its location, and size of site, and adjacent uses, it is likely that noise could be an issue for existing users, but light dust or smell would not cause a nuisance to both existing and prospective users.	(+) By virtue of its location, and size of site, and adjacent uses, it is unlikely that noise, light dust or smell would cause a nuisance to both existing and prospective users.	(+) By virtue of its location, and size of site, and adjacent uses, it is unlikely that noise, light dust or smell would cause a nuisance to both existing and prospective users.	(-) The proximity of the A64, and as the site is opposite the Wards engineering plant, will require consideration, in terms of considering the amenity of prospective occupants. This may also influence the ability of the site to be used for tourism/leisure. The impact of increased vehicular movements etc. may affect the amenity of existing residents.	(-) The proximity of the A64 will require consideration, in terms of considering the amenity of prospective occupants.
	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 +	(+) it is considered that these amenity impacts could be addressed though considering the scale, massing and orientation of the properties in respect of existing dwellings, and proposed dwellings. The surrounding build form is of domestic proportions.	(+) it is considered that these amenity impacts could be addressed though considering the scale, massing and orientation of the properties in respect of existing dwellings, and proposed dwellings. The surrounding build form is of domestic proportions.	(+) it is considered that these amenity impacts could be addressed though considering the scale, massing and orientation of the properties in respect of existing dwellings, and proposed dwellings. The surrounding build form is of domestic proportions.	(+) ascertained through planning application that amenity is acceptable.	(+) the site is being proposed as a leisure use, this is unlikely to create these specific amenity impacts for new users, and there are no residential properties (save the farm itself) in the vicinity.	(+) it is considered that these amenity impacts could be addressed though considering the scale, massing and orientation of the properties in respect of existing dwellings, and proposed dwellings. The surrounding build form is of domestic proportions, but the forge is a substantial building.
	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 --						

Sherburn Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		253	258	264	283	348	605
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 --	(--) Yes- within zone of potential of groundwater and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A). Reported event of groundwater flooding in close proximity to this site. FRA required.	(--) Yes- within zone of potential of groundwater and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A). Reported event of groundwater flooding in the village but not proximal to the site. FRA required.	(--) Yes- within zone of potential of groundwater and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A). Reported event of groundwater flooding in the village but not proximal to the site.	(--) Yes- within zone of potential of groundwater and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A). Reported event of groundwater flooding in the village but not proximal to the site.	(--) Yes- within zone of potential of groundwater and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A). Reported event of groundwater flooding in close proximity to this site. FRA required.	(--) Yes- within zone of potential of groundwater and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A). Reported event of groundwater flooding in close proximity to this site. far 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 --	(--) Not a critical drainage area - but within zone of potential of groundwater and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A). Environment Agency expect no increase in surface runoff from the site. FRA required.	(--) Not a critical drainage area - but within zone of potential of groundwater and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A). Environment Agency expect no increase in surface runoff from the site. FRA required.	(--) Not a critical drainage area - but within zone of potential of groundwater and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A). Environment Agency expect no increase in surface runoff from the site.	(--) Not a critical drainage area - but within zone of potential of groundwater and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A). Environment Agency expect no increase in surface runoff from the site.	(--) Not a critical drainage area - but within zone of potential of groundwater and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A). Environment Agency expect no increase in surface runoff from the site. FRA required.	(--) Not a critical drainage area - but within zone of potential of groundwater and surface runoff flood risk (Zone A). Environment Agency expect no increase in surface runoff from the site. FRA 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 details have been submitted concerning the scheme, and any Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme, and any Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme, and any Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used. The site is close to East Beck. The Environment Agency would either approve combined water discharge, or, where discharge to the water course is the only option, treatment and attenuation will be required. Consideration should be given to the use of SDSs.	(+) considered as part of the planning permission	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme, and any Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme, and any Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.

Sherburn Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		253	258	264	283	348	605
Q. 35 What other measures* have been considered which ensure the development is resilient to climate change? *variable to site	<p>Multiple additional measures proposed which build in resilience to climate change ++</p> <p>Single additional measure proposed to build in resilience to climate change +</p> <p>No information provided on measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change -</p> <p>No measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change --</p>	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme and other resilience measures to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme and other resilience measures to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme and other resilience measures to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme and other resilience measures to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme and other resilience measures to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.	No details have been submitted concerning the scheme and other resilience measures to be implemented, although there is no reason to suggest that such a mechanism cannot be used.
J Overall Rating for 'Flood Risk'	<p>No flood risk associated with the site ++</p> <p>Limited flood risk associated with the site which can be fully mitigated +</p> <p>Site affected by a number of flood risk issues, however mitigation possible-</p> <p>Site affected by significant flood risk issues and limited mitigation possible --</p>	(-)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(-)	(-)
People							
Q. 36 Would the development of the site lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of the settlement?	<p>Development incorporates existing use(s), as part of the overall scheme ++</p> <p>Development proposes relocation of use to suitable alternative location +</p> <p>Development will result in the loss of a valued facility/use and no justification or alternative provided --</p>	Development of the site would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of Sherburn.	Development of the site would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of Sherburn.	Development of the site would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of Sherburn.	Development of the site would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of Sherburn.	Development of the site would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of Sherburn.	Development of the site would not lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of Sherburn.
Q. 37 Will the site incorporate the principles of Secured By Design, reducing the potential for crime and discouraging anti-social behaviour?	<p>Yes – SBD principles taken into account or will be taken into account following liaison with North Yorkshire police +</p> <p>No – SBD principles not taken into account -</p>	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that secured by design principles could not be taken into account. Some specifics may not be appropriate within the village context of Sherburn- but this is a site specific consideration.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that secured by design principles could not be taken into account. Some specifics may not be appropriate within the village context of Sherburn- but this is a site specific consideration.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that secured by design principles could not be taken into account. Some specifics may not be appropriate within the village context of Sherburn- but this is a site specific consideration.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that secured by design principles could not be taken into account. Some specifics may not be appropriate within the village context of Sherburn- but this is a site specific consideration.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that secured by design principles could not be taken into account. Some specifics may not be appropriate within the village context of Sherburn- but this is a site specific consideration.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that secured by design principles could not be taken into account. Some specifics may not be appropriate within the village context of Sherburn- but this is a site specific consideration.
Q. 38 Does the design of the development encourage people to walk and cycle rather than travel by car?	<p>Cycleway and footpaths effectively integrated into the development encouraging walking and cycling ++</p> <p>Some cycleway and/or footpaths shown encouraging walking and cycling +</p> <p>No cycleway and footpaths indicated as part of this development --</p>	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that measures to increase walking and cycling could not be taken into account.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that measures to increase walking and cycling could not be taken into account.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that measures to increase walking and cycling could not be taken into account.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that measures to increase walking and cycling could not be taken into account.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that measures to increase walking and cycling could not be taken into account.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that measures to increase walking and cycling could not be taken into account.
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>	Not required	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a travel plan could not be produced.	Not required	Not required. Site is subject to a planning permission granted. 11/00166/FULL	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a travel plan could not be produced.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a travel plan could not be produced.

Sherburn Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		253	258	264	283	348	605
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 ++	No details have been submitted as to the type of housing proposed. Although there is no reason to suggest that development of the site would not support the ability to attract a more balanced population, and reducing inequality.	No details have been submitted as to the type of housing proposed. Although there is no reason to suggest that development of the site would not support the ability to attract a more balanced population, and reducing inequality.	No details have been submitted as to the type of housing proposed. Although there is no reason to suggest that development of the site would not support the ability to attract a more balanced population, and reducing inequality.	(++) scheme was for a terrace of two bedroom properties	No details have been submitted as to the type of housing proposed. Although there is no reason to suggest that development of the site would not support the ability to attract a more balanced population, and reducing inequality.	No details have been submitted as to the type of housing proposed. Although there is no reason to suggest that development of the site would not support the ability to attract a more balanced population, and reducing inequality.
	Development takes into account the need to attract a balanced and/or working community +						
	Development takes no account of the need to attract a balanced living and/or working community -						
K Overall Rating for 'People'	Development actively planned to encourage the development of sustainable communities ++	(-)	(-)	(-)	(+)	(-)	(-)
	Development has taken into account the need to develop sustainable communities +						
	Development has little regard to the need to develop sustainable communities -						
	Development has no regard for the need to develop sustainable communities --						
Meeting needs							
Q.41 Does the type and mix of development proposed meet the needs identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), Employment Land Review Update 2010 (ELR), Ryedale Retail Capacity Studies (RRCS) and Malton Town Centre Strategy?	Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)	Considered to when application was considered.	The site is being proposed for leisure tourism. The ELR (2006) and update (2010) confirmed that Employment Land requirements were, for the most part, to be concentrated in the Market Towns, and that policies should be used to support the diversification of Ryedale's economic base, and the support in principle the expansion of existing established businesses. This use is not covered in the ELR, and is subject to other plan policies.	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)
	Proposal identifies what the needs are and how some needs will be met by the development +						
	Proposal either does not identify what the needs are or how any needs will be met by the development -						
	No assessment is undertaken of what the needs are and whether any needs will be met --						
Q. 42 What level and type of affordable housing is proposed?	Development offers appropriate level and type of affordable housing which meets the needs as set out in the SHMA ++	(-) There are no details provided concerning the amount of affordable housing. Based on a theoretical yield of 7 dwellings the site would be expected to provide a commuted sum for affordable housing in accordance with SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy.	There are no details provided concerning the amount of affordable housing. Based on a theoretical yield of 37 dwellings the site would be expected to provide on-site affordable dwellings in accordance with SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy.	(-) There are no details provided concerning the amount of affordable housing. Based on a theoretical yield of 7 dwellings the site would be expected to provide a commuted sum for affordable housing in accordance with SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy.	Site below on site affordable housing threshold, but providing 4 smaller properties. Limited provision. Commuted sum.	There are no details provided concerning the amount of affordable housing. Although there is no reason to suggest that an appropriate level of housing could not be negotiated.	There are no details provided concerning the amount of affordable housing. Based on a theoretical yield of 22 dwellings the site would be expected to provide on-site affordable dwellings in accordance with SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy.
	Development offers some affordable housing which meets some of the need as set out in the SHMA +						
	Development does not offer the appropriate level and type of affordable housing or does not meet the need for affordable housing as set out in the SHMA -						
	The development makes no provision for affordable housing --						
Q. 43 What provision has been made for Ryedale's elderly population?	Development addresses and meets the needs of Ryedale's elderly population ++	No details have been provided, although as a service village there is no presumption for extra-care facilities. There is no expectation that bungalows will be required, but the Plan supports the delivery of lifetime homes. This will be considered as a site-specific matter.	No details have been provided, although as a service village there is no presumption for extra-care facilities. There is no expectation that bungalows will be required on site, but the Plan supports the delivery of lifetime homes. This will be considered as a site-specific matter.	No details have been provided, although as a service village there is no presumption for extra-care facilities. There is no expectation that bungalows will be required, but the Plan supports the delivery of lifetime homes. This will be considered as a site-specific matter.	No details have been provided, although as a service village there is no presumption for extra-care facilities. There is no expectation that bungalows will be required, but the Plan supports the delivery of lifetime homes. This will be considered as a site-specific matter.	Not applicable, as a tourism/leisure use is proposed.	No details have been provided, although as a service village there is no presumption for extra-care facilities. There is no expectation that bungalows will be required, but the Plan supports the delivery of lifetime homes. This will be considered as a site-specific matter.
	Development takes into account and meets some of the needs of Ryedale's elderly population +						
	Development does not address the needs of Ryedale's elderly population -						
	The development makes no provision for the needs of Ryedale's elderly population --						

Sherburn Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		253	258	264	283	348	605
L Overall Rating for 'Meeting Needs'	Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++	(-)	(-)	(-)	(+) (Green)	(-)	(-)
	Proposal identifies what the needs are and how some needs will be met by the development +						
	Proposal either does not identify what the needs are or how any needs are or how any needs will be met by the development -						
	No assessment is undertaken of what the needs are and whether any needs --						
Community Facilities, utilities and Infrastructure							
Q45 On sites greater than 1ha: Has a Transport Assessment been undertaken	Yes ++ No- transport assessment required --	Not required	(--) No assessment has currently been undertaken.	Not required	Not required. Site is subject to a planning permission granted. 11/00166/FULL	(--) No assessment has currently been undertaken.	(--) No assessment has currently been undertaken.
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 ++	No details have been submitted concerning the access, but it is expected that access would be provided by linking into the existing Pastures development, which negates the need for a new access onto the A64 (which would be objected to)	Would need to form a new access.	This particular site submission utilises the East Beck Close hammerhead.	(++) Planning application considered appropriate provision of an access.	Site is outside the speed limit reduction.	A new access would be required, and this could be objected to as a new access or a conflict with existing access points.
	Mitigation required but no unacceptable impact following mitigation +						
	Mitigation required and development would have a significant impact though not unacceptable impact after mitigation -						
	Mitigation required and development would still have an unacceptable impact following mitigation --						
Q. 47 Can the site accommodate adequate parking and servicing facilities?	Site meets highway guidelines for parking and servicing ++	No details have been submitted concerning this matter, no evidence to suggest that such facilities cannot be achieved.	No details have been submitted concerning this matter, no evidence to suggest that such facilities cannot be achieved.	No details have been submitted concerning this matter, no evidence to suggest that such facilities cannot be achieved.	(++) Site is subject to a planning permission granted. 11/00166/FULL satisfactory arrangements	No details have been submitted concerning this matter, no evidence to suggest that such facilities cannot be achieved.	No details have been submitted concerning this matter, no evidence to suggest that such facilities cannot be achieved.
	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 ++	(++) PROW is present on the site, running down the eastern boundary. No details have been submitted, but likely that capable of being integrated.	(+) The will not affect a PROW, although no details have been submitted concerning improving access to PROW.	(+) The will not affect a PROW, although no details have been submitted concerning improving access to PROW.	(+) The will not affect a PROW, although no details have been submitted concerning improving access to PROW.	(+) A PROW is present on the site. No details are submitted as to the retention of this. It currently provides access to the farm/house however, so it is unlikely to be altered.	(+) The will not affect a PROW, although no details have been submitted concerning improving access to PROW.
	Proposal will not affect a PROW +						
	Proposal would involve the diversion or loss of a PROW --						
Q. 49 Does the proposal involve new public realm or enhancements to the existing public realm as part of its development?	Proposal will create high quality new public realm or significantly enhance existing public realm as part of its development ++	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.	Site is modest and so public realm is not possible to achieve	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.
	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 --						

Sherburn Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		253	258	264	283	348	605
Q.50 What is the capacity of existing utilities and infrastructure to cope with impact of the development?	Site has limited or no adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be fully mitigated ++	Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: additional capacity required at school. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. A sewer, retention tank and overflow sewer are present. They require either diversion, or for the site layout to reflect infrastructure. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water. Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer.	Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: additional capacity required at school. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. Access onto the A64 has been identified as a constraint. A 225mm sewer is present. It would require either diversion, or for the site layout to reflect infrastructure. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water. Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer.	Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: additional capacity required at school. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water. Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer. Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.	Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: additional capacity required at school. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water. Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer. Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.	Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. No capacity issue concerning water supply. Upgrading of sewerage capacity is required, no current capacity. Primary education: additional capacity required at school. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. Access onto the A64 has been identified as a constraint. Highways England have concerns about the scale of this site, and its impact on the Strategic Road Network. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water. Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer. Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.	Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: additional capacity required at school. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water. Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer. Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.
	Site has limited to medium adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be satisfactorily mitigated +	Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.	Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.				
	Site has medium to high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation –						
	Site has high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation --						
Q. 51 What is the impact on Waste Water Treatment Works?	Further than 400m from the boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact undertaken and Yorkshire Water No Objection +						
	Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact not undertaken –						
	Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact undertaken Yorkshire Water consulted and likely to object --						

Sherburn Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		253	258	264	283	348	605
Q. 52 Would the development on its own, have an impact on an existing community facility and has mitigation of this impact been proposed as part of the development?	<p>Site has no adverse impact on community facilities or where there is an adverse impact this is fully mitigated through the provision of new, expanded or alternative facilities ++</p> <p>Site does not have a significant adverse impact on community facilities or where there is a significant adverse impact this is mitigated through the provision of new, expanded or alternative facilities +</p> <p>Site has an adverse impact on community facilities and limited mitigation is indicated -</p> <p>Site has a significant adverse impact on community facilities and no mitigation is indicated --</p>	(++) Development of the site would not have a direct impact on the an existing community facility.	(++) Development of the site would not have a direct impact on the an existing community facility.	(++) Development of the site would not have a direct impact on the an existing community facility.	(++) Development of the site would not have a direct impact on the an existing community facility.	(++) Development of the site would not have a direct impact on the an existing community facility.	(++) Development of the site would not have a direct impact on the an existing community facility.
M Overall Rating for 'Community facilities, Utilities and Infrastructure'	<p>Site has limited or no adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has a adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be fully mitigated ++</p> <p>Site has limited to medium adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be satisfactorily mitigated +</p> <p>Site has medium to high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation -</p> <p>Site has high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation --</p>	(+)	(-)	(+)	(++)	(-)	(-)
Strong Economy							
Q53. (Town centre uses) Will the site promote the viability and vitality of the Principal Town or Local Service Centre?	<p>Proposal will support and enhance the vitality and viability of the town centre, encouraging new investment ++</p> <p>Proposal will support the vitality and viability of the town centre in retaining key services and facilities +</p> <p>Proposal could adversely harm the viability and vitality of the town centre leading to decline --</p>	NA	NA	NA	N/A	NA	NA
Q. 54 (Employment uses) Will the mix of uses proposed by the development assist in diversifying the economy as set out in the ELR?	<p>Mix of uses proposed will diversify the economy as set out in the ELR ++</p> <p>Mix of uses proposed will not diversify the economy but will support existing employment sectors in Ryedale +</p>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Q. 55 (Employment/retail uses) Does the proposal involve the creation of net additional or net loss of jobs in Ryedale?	<p>Up to 250 net jobs created ++</p> <p>Up to 50 net jobs created +</p> <p>Up to 50 net jobs lost -</p> <p>Up to 250 net jobs lost --</p>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Assessment		253	258	264	283	348	605
N Overall rating for 'Strong Economy'	Proposal will have a significant positive impact on the economy ++	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Proposal will have a positive impact on the economy +						
	Proposal will have a negative impact on the economy -						
	Proposal will have a significant negative impact on the economy --						
Stage 3 - Deliverability / Developability							
Q56. How does the site perform against the SHLAA Update (housing), ELR Update (employment) and RRCS (retail) in terms of its ability to come forward and its suitability for development?	Housing: Category 1 (Deliverable) ++	Employment: Category I ++	Not considered in the 2009 SHLAA	(++) Category 1 site within the 2009 SHLAA	(++) Category 1 site within the 2009 SHLAA	Not considered in the 2009 SHLAA	Not considered in the 2009 SHLAA
	Housing: Category 2 (Developable) +	Employment: Category II +					
	Housing: Category 3 (Not Currently Developable) --	Employment: Category III -					
Q57. Are there any other legal or physical constraints which may affect the ability of the site to come forward?	No constraints identified ++	Subject to archaeological assessment	Subject to archaeological assessment	Subject to archaeological assessment	(+) Site is subject to a planning permission granted. 11/00166/FULL this has now lapsed.	Subject to archaeological assessment	Subject to archaeological assessment
	Constraint(s) identified but resolution possible +						
	Constraint(s) identified but resolution is uncertain --						
Developer Contributions							
Q58 Will the development be capable of meeting the usual range of site-specific s106 requirements?	Normal range of contributions can be achieved ++	Unknown	(+) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	(+) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	No response received		Unknown
	Some contributions can be achieved +						
	Limited contributions can be achieved -						
	No contributions can be achieved --						
Q. 59 Can the development support the requirements of the CIL charging schedule?	Yes ++	Unknown	(++) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	(++) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	No response received		Unknown
	No --						
O Overall Deliverability / Developability Rating	Site is able to come forward without impairment and is able to provide a normal range of contributions ++	No response received	(+)	(+)	(+) Site is subject to a planning permission granted. 11/00166/FULL The permission has now lapsed, but site is small and within development limits	(-) Site submitter only wants to consider the site for Leisure Tourism, and is aware not making allocations for this land use	No response received
	Site has some constraints and / or may not be able to support the full range of developer contributions +						
	Site faces significant constraints and may not be able to support any developer contributions --						