

Slingsby Full Site Assessment

Assessment		427	428	429	430	444	464
<b>Stage 1 - Sift</b>							
all sites 0.15Ha and above	0.15 Ha or greater ++	(++) 2.03ha	(++)1.38ha	(++)1ha	(++)1.71ha	(++)3.82ha	(++)0.56ha
	Less than 0.15 Ha --						
Check for fit with Local Plan Strategy	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 significant harm to heritage assets will not be considered further	Will Not cause harm ++	(--) Substantial harm to the setting of the Church which is Grade II* and sited on the mediaeval church, with an open 'end of village' feel. It is also adjacent to the Schedule Monument Slingsby 'Castle' SM373. Which is currently on the periphery of the village. It is considered that development here would by virtue of its presence, harm the setting and context of the 'Castle' and church, by removing the peripheral context of these buildings, and their currently open setting. This open, 'edge of village' feel also contributes to the character of the adjacent Slingsby Conservation area, and would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.	(++)	(++) but no scheme has been submitted, which would allow consideration of sensitivity, and significance and impact on those attributes of the designated heritage assets on the site (Listed Buildings) and the Conservation Area, and the setting of the Scheduled Monument.	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Will cause harm --						
Sites which fall wholly within Flood Zone 3b not considered further. Where sites are partially in Flood Zone 3b, that part of the site will be not be considered further	Is not within Flood Zone 3b ++	(--) the northern most part of the site is in flood zone 3, and in the SFRA undeveloped FZ3 is to be considered FZ3B, and this includes the access.	(++)	(++)	(++)	(--) southern part of the site is in flood zone 3, and in the SFRA undeveloped FZ3 is to be considered FZ3B, and this includes the access.	(++)
	Is within Flood Zone 3b --						

Slingsby Full Site Assessment

Assessment		427	428	429	430	444	464	
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 --						
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++	(+) and flood zone 1 (FZ3 discounted)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(+)	(++)	
	Flood Zone 2 +							
	Flood zone 3a -							
Q2B What vulnerability class does the site fall	Flood Zone 1++	(+) Contains Flood Zones 1,2 (and 3 which is discounted) and is a more vulnerable use.	(++)	(++)	(++)	(+) Contains Flood Zones 1,2 (and 3 which is discounted) and is a more vulnerable use. The access to the site would be affected.	(++)	
	Flood Zone 2							Flood Zone 3a
	Less vulnerable ++							Less vulnerable+
	More vulnerable +							More vulnerable -
	Highly vulnerable -							Highly vulnerable --
Q2D Has a Flood Risk Assessment been undertaken?	yes ++	(--) SFRA. FRA required	(--) SFRA. FRA required	(--) SFRA. FRA required	(--) SFRA. FRA required	(--) SFRA. FRA required	(--) SFRA. FRA may be required to establish mitigation measures which comply with groundwater source protection	
	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 --							

Slingsby Full Site Assessment

Assessment		427	428	429	430	444	464
Q3. What are the conclusions of the Highways Authorities (NYCC) and Highways England (HE) (Where appropriate) initial highway assessment?	Site has no highway issues identified ++	(-) County Highways have advised: Access acceptable from the existing highway. Will need to be determined by a Traffic Assessment. Works will be required to improve the major road and extend existing footway/street lighting to serve the site. Will need a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan.	(-) County Highways have advised: Access could be achieved onto Railway Street, however, the width of the access would need to be widened to adoptable standards. The buildings either side of the current access road may prevent further improvements. Works will be required to improve the major road and extend existing footway/street lighting to serve the site. Will need a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan. Secondary access would need to be considered.	(-) County Highways have advised: Access acceptable onto existing highway. Minor works to extend existing footway/street lighting. Works may be required to achieve visibility. Will need a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan.	(-) County Highways have advised: Access acceptable onto the Balk. Works will be required to improve existing road , with footpaths and road widths likely to need upgrading. Will need a Traffic Assessment and Travel Plan, may require additional facilities/service provision as determined by TA or TP. Consideration needs to be given to the adjacent site 464 (which is included in site 430) , and the existing pedestrian island.	(-) County Highways have advised: The site has no direct connection/frontage to a highway maintainable at the public expense.	(-) County Highways have advised: Access acceptable onto the Balk. Works will be required to improve existing road , with footpaths and road widths likely to need upgrading. Will need a Traffic Assessment and Travel Plan, may require additional facilities/service provision as determined by TA or TP. Consideration needs to be given to the adjacent site 430 (which does include this site), and the existing pedestrian island.
	Site has some highways issues identified which can be mitigated subject to further investigation +						
	Site has multiple highways issues which can be mitigated subject to further investigation -						
	Site has multiple highway issues which may be difficult to mitigate unless further investigation demonstrates otherwise --						
Biodiversity and Geo-diversity							
Q4 Would the development affect a regional or local site of biodiversity (including SINCs, LNRs or RIGS) or affect UK, NYMNP or Ryedale Biodiversity Plan protected species	Enhancement of feature/species possible – mitigation not required ++	(+) The site is not designated, or identified as a site of biodiversity. However, were there to protected species, these would be considered under their statutory framework. The site is bounded by hedgerows and is improved grassland used as sports field.	(+) 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 includes paddocks and a camping site.	(-) 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, given that this site includes a number of barns which could be inhabited by bats/owls surveys would be 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 bounded by hedgerows and the Balk is to the west, which is a series of mature trees. The site has been assessed against the Natural England (NE) Impact Risk Zones. No automatic requirement to consult NE. However, NE has been consulted.	(+) The 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 presence of the Ancient Tree is a significant biodiversity asset.	(+) The site is not designated, or identified as a site of biodiversity. However, were there to protected species, these would be considered under their statutory framework. The site has been assessed against the Natural England (NE) Impact Risk Zones. No automatic requirement to consult NE. However, NE has been consulted.
	Neutral impact – no effect or effect can be fully mitigated +						
	Adverse impact but mitigation possible –						
	Serious impact with limited means of mitigation --						
Q5 Would the development provide opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure, including linking in with existing green infrastructure/corridors	Excellent opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors ++	(-) Existing PRoW, currently provides children's play space and sports pitches. Hedgerows mature. Accessible for villagers. However, the proposal incorporates a 'Green' and there are various stretches of trees. Its is questionable whether this is sufficient mitigation for the loss of the existing facilities. The field provides a flood storage area (along with site 444) and consultation has identified flooding issues (which aligns with the SFRA)	(-) The scheme submitted by the proposer has mature trees around the edge of the site. Fences are proposed as the boundary of each property.	(-) not currently demonstrated. This is a Brownfield site.	(+) the scheme promotes the retention of established trees. Although there would be loss of hedgerows on the eastern boundary as it is proposed that site 430 is a scheme where site 464 is also included.	(-) Existing PRoW, currently provides sports pitches. Hedgerows mature. Accessible for villagers. The presence of the Mowbray Oak is important feature for the village. Consider would be loss of GI asset. The field provides a flood storage area (along with site 427) and consultation has identified flooding issues (which aligns with the SFRA)	(+) The scheme promotes the retention of established trees. Although there would be loss of hedgerows on the western boundary as it is proposed that site 464 is part of the scheme proposed in site submission 430.
	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 --						

Slingsby Full Site Assessment

Assessment		427	428	429	430	444	464
Q6 Would the development impact on protected and unprotected trees, hedgerows and ancient woodland?	Positive impact. Enhancement of feature possible and mitigation not required ++	(-) Existing hedgerows would be removed (in part)	(+)Existing hedgerows would need to be protected.	(+) Brownfield site, currently has large, rural farm buildings. Planting within the site should be in scale with and sympathetic to the sensitive nature of the site.	(+)Key features: Line of veteran sycamores along western boundary; Boundary native hedges; Large mature sycamore in central hedge. These trees are subject to a Tree Preservation Order. Their retention and protection is considered to be important to the character of this part of Slingsby Village. Tree Officer recommends the following: Ensure that layout allows for the retention of the veteran trees along the eastern boundary of the site within a separate 'green' strip. Retain all outer hedged boundaries treat and supplement in accordance with good practise. Supplement hedged boundaries with native tree planting. Ensure a high quality landscape throughout the development. Proposals show 430/464 combined- which would mean the loss of some hedging. but proposals show retention of the mature tree. This is considered to be important, for biodiversity, and wider amenity value. Scheme submitted shows retention of mature trees on western boundary.	(-)There is the Mowbray Oak in this site. An Ancient Tree c. 500 years old. The site submitter has provided no details of the scheme so mitigation cannot be demonstrated.	(-) impact on hedgerows is a potential impact, where possible hedgerows should be retained. Proposals show 430/464 combined- which would mean the loss of some hedging. But proposals show retention of the mature tree. This is considered to be important, for biodiversity, and wider amenity value.
	Neutral impact. No effect or effect can be fully mitigated +						
	Adverse impact but mitigation possible --						
	Serious impact with limited or no means of mitigation--						
B Overall rating for 'Biodiversity and Geodiversity'	Positive impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements and no mitigation required++	(-)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(-)	(+)
	Neutral impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements however any effect can be fully mitigated +						
	Adverse impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements by effects are capable of some mitigation -						
	Significant impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements and effects are unable to be satisfactorily mitigated --						

Slingsby Full Site Assessment

Assessment		427	428	429	430	444	464
C Special Qualities, Landscape and Setting							
Q7 What is the capacity of the landscape to accommodate the site according to the Landscape Character Assessments which cover the Ryedale Area and Special Qualities Study (including views and open spaces)?	<p>Site has a very low landscape sensitivity to being developed or existing landscape features are retained or enhanced. Site will not detract from landscape character ++</p> <p>Site has a low landscape sensitivity to being developed and some existing landscape features can be retained. Site is unlikely to detract from landscape character +</p> <p>Site has medium landscape sensitivity to being developed and may affect landscape features, however mitigation is possible. Site may detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved –</p> <p>Site has high landscape sensitivity to being developed and will affect landscape features with limited/no means of mitigation. Site will detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved --</p>	<p>(--) Slingsby is within the Howardian Hills Footslope of the Landscape Character Assessment. This characterises the land as 'open sloping terrain'. Strongly rural and pastoral. This site is open and expansive, and is on the side of Slingsby that has remained rural in character. Its nature and scale mean that development of this nature would be a challenge to assimilate within the landscape.</p>	<p>(-) The landform at this part of Slingsby is where the land flattens out, and long distance views become challenged. The land is paddocks to the rear of properties. The prevailing development character in this area is single, linear development with long paddocks, open in character, with lots of screening so the site cannot be read within the village. Scheme of considerable depth, relative to existing development.</p>	<p>(-) this area is a collection of farms and agricultural farm buildings, it has a surprisingly rural feel this edge of the village, in combination with the setting of the 'Castle' this area is very rural in character. The sensitive conversion would reinforce this reality, but a re-development scheme.</p>	<p>(-) This area is open in character, with a gentle sweeping rise of land in a southerly direction to the road (B1257). The site has the distinctive tree lined avenue, proposals incorporate site 464. It is considered that the scheme of landscaping will be important to ensure that this development is a sensitive expansion of the village.</p>	<p>(--) this site is very open in character, the landscape is flatter at this part of the village, and affords wider views as the hedgerows are lower and less dense. The site is disproportionately large, projecting well out into the open countryside. It is considered that the landscape has high sensitivity to accommodating development of this scale, and in this location development would adversely affect the setting of Slingsby.</p>	<p>(-) This area is open in character, with a gentle sweeping rise of land in a southerly direction to the road (B1257). The site proposals show that the site is part of site submission 430. It is considered that the scheme of landscaping will be important to ensure that this development is a sensitive expansion of the village. It is considered that as a single site submission this would create a scheme which poorly related to the form of the village.</p>
Q8 What impact would the site have on the nationally designated landscapes of the North York Moors National Park and Howardian Hills AONB?	<p>Site has a very low landscape sensitivity to being developed or existing landscape features are retained or enhanced. Site will not detract from landscape character ++</p> <p>Site has a low landscape sensitivity to being developed and some existing landscape features can be retained. Site is unlikely to detract from landscape character +</p> <p>Site has medium landscape sensitivity to being developed and may affect landscape features, however mitigation is possible. Site may detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved –</p> <p>Site has high landscape sensitivity to being developed and will affect landscape features with limited/no means of mitigation. Site will detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved --</p>	<p>(-) The site is within the AONB Buffer Zone, the site is on the relatively undeveloped western side, which is has a number of farms, and has a strongly rural character. Development of this site has the potential to harm the setting of the AONB.</p>	<p>(-) north eastern edge of the settlement. Scheme extends relatively deep with the site, and up to the historic curtilage/paddock blocks of the existing houses. Dense grain of development with 'square' and lanes proposed, which is not the prevailing character and form of the settlement.</p>	<p>(-) This site is a collection of farm buildings and no scheme has been submitted which demonstrates the layout. Strong rural/agricultural edge</p>	<p>(+) This site would be adjacent to the boundary of the Howardian Hills AONB. It is currently open and undeveloped, but the topography is sloping to the north. The site has hedging to the south and a strong linear belt of attractive mature trees, submitted design scheme shows their retention. It is considered that within the context of the falling land, the build character of the surrounding area, this site, subject to appropriate landscaping has the capability to be accommodated in manner which would not harm the special qualities of the AONB.</p>	<p>(--) The land is open, low lying in character. This site is not proximal to the boundary of the AONB, but the site is relatively substantial in scale, and it projects out significantly from the western edge of the village, indeed the site extends out to the parish boundary with Fryton. It is considered that development has the potential to adversely affect the setting of the settlement and its relationship with the AONB.</p>	<p>(+) Site is linked to 430. This site would be adjacent to the boundary of the Howardian Hills AONB. It is currently open and undeveloped, but the topography is sloping to the north. It is considered that within the context of the falling land, the build character of the surrounding area, this site, subject to appropriate landscaping has the capability to be accommodated in manner which would not harm the special qualities of the AONB.</p>



Slingsby Full Site Assessment

Assessment		427	428	429	430	444	464
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 sites is open in character with limited screening. It is considered that development will have a significant impact, and the nature and form of the landscape and features will not allow the comfortable assimilation of development into this area	(-) The site is open in character with limited screening. It is considered that the nature and form of the development will require consideration., if development is to be acceptably accommodated.	(+)This site is a collection of farm buildings and no scheme has been submitted which demonstrates the layout. Strong rural/agricultural edge, the nature of the proposal will need to reflect this.	(+)It is currently open and undeveloped, but the topography is sloping to the north. The site has hedging to the south and a strong linear belt of attractive mature trees, submitted design scheme shows their retention.	(--) This land is open, undeveloped, and strongly rural in character and is not proximal to the built-up edge of the settlement. The site is on flat topography and is open, and the hedgerows provide limited screening. It is considered that these features render the site incapable of accommodating development without detriment to the character of this area, the setting of Slingsby.	(+)It is currently open and undeveloped, but the topography is sloping to the north.
	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 ++	(+) This settlement is not affected by coalescence.	(+) This settlement is not affected by coalescence.	(+) This settlement is not affected by coalescence.	(+) This settlement is not affected by coalescence.	(--) This settlement is not affected by coalescence, but this site, by virtue of its substantial extent and north western situation, would extend up to the parish boundary with Fryton. Whilst this in itself would not lead to settlement coalescence in absolute terms, it would bring the small hamlet of Fryton to one field's separation from Slingsby. This would be of concern to the local community, contrary to the Local Plan Strategy, and is identified within the Landscape Character Assessment as a general concern with the 'Street Villages'.	(+) This settlement is not affected by coalescence.
	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 --						

Slingsby Full Site Assessment

Assessment		427	428	429	430	444	464
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 ++	(--) Substantial harm to the setting of the Church which is Grade II* and sited on the mediaeval church, with an open 'end of village' feel. It is also adjacent to the Schedule Monument Slingsby 'Castle' SM373. Which is currently on the periphery of the village. It is considered that development here would by virtue of its presence, harm the setting and context of the 'Castle' and church, by removing the peripheral context of these buildings, and their currently open setting. This open, 'edge of village' feel also contributes to the character of this adjacent Slingsby Conservation area, and would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.	(--) The site is currently open, and is paddocks. The adjacent land which is of a similar character is within the Slingsby Conservation Area. As such, were this site to be developed, it would extend far back, away from the single depth character of development which is typical in this part of Slingsby. As such it is considered that such development would not preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area. The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of numbers 373 and 1200, but is not in a discernible distance to the SMs. There are a small number of listed buildings proximal, but development of this site would not harm the preservation of the setting or its significance.	(--) Being within Slingsby Conservation Area, the site contains two listed farm houses, Castle Farmhouse and Heights Farmhouse. The former is a late eighteenth century property, the latter 18-19th century. In the first instance the preservation of these farmhouse buildings will be important, but their setting will be influenced significantly by the farm buildings which serve the farm complex and will form part of the curtilage listing. Any form of re-development will harm the features of special architectural and historic context. Sensitive conversion could be appropriate, but no such scheme is presented. The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of numbers 373 and 1200. The site is close to the SM Slingsby Castle, and as such has the potential to impact on the	(+) The most westerly part of this site is within the Slingsby Conservation Area, Historic England have advised that an assessment needs to be undertaken of the contribution that the field makes to the significance of the Conservation Area. The Conservation Area is built up with modern development, but includes trees which are a very distinctive feature of this part of the Slingsby Conservation Area. Their retention would need to be ensured. Given the proximity of modern residential development, it is considered that the principle of development would not be in conflict with the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, but the landscaping approach will be particularly important, as will scale, layout and massing. Historic England	(--) Substantial harm to the setting of the Church which is Grade II* and sited on the mediaeval church, with an open 'end of village' feel. It is also proximal to the Schedule Monument Slingsby 'Castle' SM373. Which is currently on the periphery of the village. It is considered that development here would by virtue of its presence and depth projecting out from the village, would harm the setting and context of the 'Castle' and church, by removing the peripheral context of these buildings, and their currently open setting. This open, 'edge of village' feel also contributes to the character of this adjacent Slingsby Conservation area, and would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.	(--)Historic England have raise concerns about ensuring that the character of the Conservation Area is preserved, and in terms of the setting of the SM Barrow there is adverse impact. The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of numbers 373 and 1200, but is not in a discernible distance to the SM 373, but is proximal to 1200 which is an Iron Age Barrow Cemetery. Preliminary archaeological investigations have identified a series of trenches, which have a functional/physical relationship to the Iron Age Barrow. The significance of this is being assessed through trial trenching. Currently, the most westerly part of this site is within the Slingsby Conservation Area, and includes the previously referred to trees which are a very distinctive
	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 –						

Slingsby Full Site Assessment

Assessment		427	428	429	430	444	464
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --			Castle's setting by reducing the rural character of this area, but is not in a discernible distance to the SM 1200. Historic England have also reiterated the number of designated historic assets and the potential for impact on the setting of Slingsby Castle SM. Until further assessment is undertaken to establish the impacts on the significant of these designated assets, the LPA cannot establish no harm.	sought to ensure preservation of the setting of the SM 1200 Barrow. The site is also within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of numbers 373 but is not in a discernible distance. Preliminary archaeological investigations identified a series of trenches, which have a functional/physical relationship to the Iron Age Barrow SM1200. The trial trenching has confirmed the Iron Age ditch system and includes at least one adjacent feature of possible human cremation. The remainder of the site was free of archaeological features and the ditches that were identified were at c. 700mm beneath the present ground surface. Demonstrated that archaeological features are relatively localised, fairly dispersed and have a decent depth of cover beneath the existing ground surface. Demonstrate preservation in situ (i.e. through design) or by record prior to development will be acceptable.		feature of this part of the Slingsby Conservation Area. Their retention would need to be ensured. Given the proximity of modern residential development, it is considered that the principle of development would not be in conflict with the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, but the landscaping approach will be particularly important. Historic England have advised that an assessment needs to be undertaken of the contribution that the field makes to the significance of the Conservation Area and the setting of the Scheduled Monument, and what impact the development of this site would have upon their significance. This site is not currently included in the archaeological evaluation.



Slingsby Full Site Assessment

Assessment		427	428	429	430	444	464
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 ++	(-) The Conservation Area of Slingsby covers much of the built part of the village, and surrounding land. NYCC Heritage Unit advise: Lies adjacent to SM of Slingsby Castle in an area of former earthworks presumed to be associated with a second moated enclosure or a series of fishponds associated with the castle. High potential for medieval remains likely to be of national significance if associated with the castle, but not known to what extent remains survive the later use as a sports ground and bowling green. Would advise DBA map regression, geophysical survey and trial trenching to follow.	(-) This site is out with but adjacent to the Conservation Area, and the concerns around development of this site, and its impact on the Conservation Area are outlined above. NYCC Heritage Unit advise: At northern end of historic core of village in an area of former tofts and crofts as seen on 1st edition OS map. Would advise desk based assessment, map regression, followed by geophysical survey and trial trenching.	(-) NYCC Heritage Unit advises: South of SM of Slingsby Castle, within historic core of the village. It is not known to what extent the use of the site as a farm has affected the survival of archaeological remains. Would advise Desk Base Assessment and trial trenching to assess.	(+) Preliminary archaeological investigations identified a series of trenches, which have a functional/physical relationship to the Iron Age Barrow SM1200. The trial trenching has confirmed the Iron Age ditch system and includes at least one adjacent feature of possible human cremation. The remainder of the site was free of archaeological features and the ditches that were identified were at c. 700mm beneath the present ground surface. Demonstrated that archaeological features are relatively localised, fairly dispersed and have a decent depth of cover beneath the existing ground surface. Demonstrate preservation in situ (i.e. through design) or by record prior to development will be acceptable.	(--Development of the site would harm the wider character and setting of Slingsby, and its relationship to Fryton	(--) In terms of the form and character of the Slingsby, it is considered that as a single site submission this site would link from Aspen Way, and have a poor physical relationship which the existing settlement, which is concentrated around the roads. It is considered that this site (as incorporated into a larger scheme (430) would have a better integration. NYCC Heritage Unit advises: Site lies immediately west of SM of Iron Age square barrow cemetery & associated track way. A geophysical survey being commissioned for the site. NYCC advised trial trenching to clarify the nature and significance of the archaeological anomalies identified by the survey. This Trial Trenching does not yet appear to have been undertaken.
	Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +						
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –						
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --						
D Overall Rating for 'Culture and Heritage'	Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++	(--Subject to archaeological investigation	(--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 ++	As it forms part of the Local Plan Strategy there is a policy presumption for the application of the hierarchy where feasible and viable.	As it forms part of the Local Plan Strategy there is a policy presumption for the application of the hierarchy where feasible and viable.	As it forms part of the Local Plan Strategy there is a policy presumption for the application of the hierarchy where feasible and viable.	As it forms part of the Local Plan Strategy there is a policy presumption for the application of the hierarchy where feasible and viable.	As it forms part of the Local Plan Strategy there is a policy presumption for the application of the hierarchy where feasible and viable.	As it forms part of the Local Plan Strategy there is a policy presumption for the application of the hierarchy where feasible and viable.
	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 ++	Not in the locality	Not in the locality	Not in the locality	Not in the locality	Not in the locality	Not in the locality
Q16 Can the site link in to existing heat or power sources available in the District?	Site capable of linking in with existing heat or power source and developer willing to take it forward ++	No such schemes are in the locality.	No such schemes are in the locality.	No such schemes are in the locality.	No such schemes are in the locality.	No such schemes are in the locality.	No such schemes are in the locality.

Slingsby Full Site Assessment

Assessment		427	428	429	430	444	464
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 at this stage	No information at this stage	No information at this stage	No information at this stage	No information at this stage	No information at this stage
	Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer unwilling -						
	Site not capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology --						
Sustainable Building and Waste Reduction							
Q17 Can the site accommodate higher sustainable building standards than currently required?	Site can accommodate 2 levels higher than mandatory limit ++	No information has been submitted concerning this. As sites progress, developers will be asked to provide information.	No information has been submitted concerning this. As sites progress, developers will be asked to provide information.	No information has been submitted concerning this. As sites progress, developers will be asked to provide information.	No information has been submitted concerning this. As sites progress, developers will be asked to provide information.	No information has been submitted concerning this. As sites progress, developers will be asked to provide information.	No information has been submitted concerning this. As sites progress, developers will be asked to provide information.
	Site can accommodate 1 level higher than mandatory limit -						
	Development cannot accommodate higher standards than mandatory level --						
Q18 Does the development contain proposals for waste reduction in both its construction and when in operation?	Proposals for waste reduction incorporated into both the construction and operation of the development++	No information has been submitted concerning this. As sites progress, developers will be asked to provide information.	No information has been submitted concerning this. As sites progress, developers will be asked to provide information.	No information has been submitted concerning this. As sites progress, developers will be asked to provide information.	No information has been submitted concerning this. As sites progress, developers will be asked to provide information.	No information has been submitted concerning this. As sites progress, developers will be asked to provide information.	No information has been submitted concerning this. As sites progress, developers will be asked to provide information.
	Proposals have investigated waste reduction, however only limited measures are achievable -						
	No proposals suggested for waste reduction --						
Q. 19 Does the development contain individual/communal recycling facilities/ infrastructure?	Yes +	No information has been submitted concerning this. As sites progress, developers will be asked to provide information.	No information has been submitted concerning this. As sites progress, developers will be asked to provide information.	No information has been submitted concerning this. As sites progress, developers will be asked to provide information.	No information has been submitted concerning this. As sites progress, developers will be asked to provide information.	No information has been submitted concerning this. As sites progress, developers will be asked to provide information.	No information has been submitted concerning this. As sites progress, developers will be asked to provide information.
	No --						
F Overall Rating for 'Sustainable Building and Waste Minimisation'	Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development and developer willing ++	No information has been provided at this stage	No information has been provided at this stage	No information has been provided at this stage	No information has been provided at this stage	No information has been provided at this stage	No information has been provided at this stage
	Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development but developer unwilling -						
	Site not capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development --						
Efficient Use of Land							
Q.20 Is the site or any part of the site considered previously developed land?	Site is over 50% to 100% Brownfield ++	Greenfield Site, but no Brownfield sites are available (i.e. deliverable and developable) in the village to meet housing need.	Greenfield Site, but no Brownfield sites are available (i.e. deliverable and developable) in the village to meet housing need.	(++)	Greenfield Site, but no Brownfield sites are available (i.e. deliverable and developable) in the village to meet housing need.	Greenfield Site, but no Brownfield sites are available (i.e. deliverable and developable) in the village to meet housing need.	Greenfield Site, but no Brownfield sites are available (i.e. deliverable and developable) in the village to meet housing need.
	Site is up to 50% Brownfield +						
Q.21 Can the site achieve an appropriate density to achieve the most efficient use of the land?	Excellent density achieved taking into account location and context ++	Indicative layout demonstrates at c.25 dwellings per hectare. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c.43 dwellings. There are, however, flood risk issues will mean the northern portion of the site is not capable of being developed, reducing the developable area.	Indicative layout of the scheme demonstrates at 32 dwellings per hectare.	No density of development provided, but the Listed buildings will have a significant influence on the density of development capable on the site. It is likely that it will be a conversion scheme.	Indicative layout of the scheme demonstrates at 32 dwellings per hectare. On a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c.38 dwellings.	Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c.80 dwellings. There are, however, flood risk issues will mean the southern portion of the site (about a third of the site) is not capable of being developed, reducing the developable area.	Indicative layout of the scheme demonstrates at 32 dwellings per hectare. On a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c.24 dwellings.
	Appropriate density achieved taking into account location and context +						
	Lower density proposed as site faces some constraints in its development -						
	Lower density necessary as site faces significant constraints in its development --						

Slingsby Full Site Assessment

Assessment		427	428	429	430	444	464
Q.22 Would the development of the site lead to the remediation of contaminated land?	<p>Development is located on land which is likely to be highly contaminated and will be remediated ++</p> <p>Development is located on land which may be contaminated and will be remediated +</p> <p>Development is located on land which may be contaminated and no proposals for remediation have been put forward -</p> <p>Development is located on land which is likely to be highly contaminated no proposals for remediation have been put forward --</p>	Land is not contaminated	Land is not contaminated	Land is not contaminated	Land is not contaminated	Land is not contaminated	Land is not contaminated
G Overall Rating for 'Efficient Use of Land'	<p>Site represents very efficient use of land with mitigation to fully overcome concerns where necessary ++</p> <p>Site represents efficient use of land but further mitigation required to fully overcome concerns where necessary +</p> <p>Site does not represent efficient use of land. Further investigation of mitigation measures to overcome concerns required -</p> <p>Site does not represent efficient use of land and mitigation is not possible --</p>	(+)	(+)	(++)	(+)	(-)	(+)
Natural Resources							
Q. 23 Would the development of this site involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1,2 and 3a)?	<p>No loss of best and most versatile agricultural land ++</p> <p>Up to 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost -</p> <p>More than 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost --</p>	(-) 2.03ha of Grade 3 agricultural land. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. Therefore it is possible that the land is best and most versatile, but less than 5ha is proposed.	(-) 1.38ha of Grade 3 agricultural land. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. Therefore it is possible that the land is best and most versatile, but less than 5ha is proposed.	(++)	(-) 1.71ha of grades 2 and 3. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. Therefore it is possible that the land is best and most versatile, but less than 5ha is proposed.	(-) 3.82ha of grade 3. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. Therefore it is possible that the land is best and most versatile, but less than 5ha is proposed.	(-) 0.56ha of grades 2 and 3. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. Therefore it is possible that the land is best and most versatile, but less than 5ha is proposed.
Q. 24 Would the development lead to the sterilisation of mineral resources?	<p>Site not within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search, or Mineral Consultation Zone ++?</p> <p>Site within the buffer of a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone -?</p> <p>Site within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone --</p>	(--) within a mineral consultation zone, but adjacent to the settlement	(--) within a mineral consultation zone, but adjacent to the settlement	(--) within a mineral consultation zone, but adjacent to the settlement	(--) within a mineral consultation zone, but adjacent to the settlement	(--) within a mineral consultation zone, but adjacent to the settlement	(--) within a mineral consultation zone, but adjacent to the settlement
Q. 25 Would the development have an adverse impact on a Groundwater Source Protection Zone?	<p>Development is not located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone ++</p> <p>Development is located in a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but mitigation is possible to reduce the risk of groundwater pollution risk +</p> <p>Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but no risk assessment has been undertaken -</p> <p>Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone and mitigation of the risk of groundwater pollution is not possible --</p>	No response requested from the Environment Agency,	No response requested from the Environment Agency,	No response requested from the Environment Agency,	(+) The site is underlain by the Coralline Oolite Formation, a member of the Corallian Group principal aquifer. The solid geology on the northern part of the site is overlain by superficial drift deposits of sand & gravel. There are no drift deposits over the southern part of the site. There are a number of groundwater abstractions within 1.5km of the site although these are for agricultural or industrial purposes rather than potable use. Whilst the aquifer is vulnerable to pollution at this location, the absence of potable abstractions make the risk to groundwater relatively low. Principal Aquifer, not in a Groundwater Source Protection Zone	No response requested from the Environment Agency.	(+) The site is underlain by the Coralline Oolite Formation, a member of the Corallian Group principal aquifer. The solid geology on the northern part of the site is overlain by superficial drift deposits of sand & gravel. There are no drift deposits over the southern part of the site. There are a number of groundwater abstractions within 1.5km of the site although these are for agricultural or industrial purposes rather than potable use. Whilst the aquifer is vulnerable to pollution at this location, the absence of potable abstractions make the risk to groundwater relatively low. Principal Aquifer, not in a Groundwater Source Protection Zone

Slingsby Full Site Assessment

Assessment		427	428	429	430	444	464
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. On sloping sites, specialist geotechnical advice should be sort detailing requirements for stabilisation and foundation design. An engineering report has been undertaken.	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>	(+) within mineral safeguarding but adjacent to built form of settlement.	(+) within mineral safeguarding but adjacent to built form of settlement.	(++) within mineral safeguarding but with listed buildings.	(+) Subject to Hydrogeological Risk Assessment within mineral safeguarding but adjacent to built form of settlement.	(+) within mineral safeguarding but adjacent to built form of settlement.	(+) Subject to Hydrogeological Risk Assessment. Within mineral safeguarding but adjacent to built form of settlement.
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>	(+) For residential development, access could generate noise for proximal residents to east of the site.	(--)The site is within 400m of the Sewerage Plant, which have specific environmental health and amenity considerations. It depends on the nature of the access and whether this harms the residential amenity of existing properties.	(+) this already contains residential development. The proposal is for residential development which would not create these amenity concerns.	(+) Residential development is proximal. The proposal is for residential development which would not create these amenity concerns.	(+)	(+)Residential development is proximal. The proposal is for residential development which would not create these amenity concerns.
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 depends on the nature of the access and whether this harms the residential amenity of existing properties. Could be considered through the layout stage.	(-) this already contains residential development, and any scheme would need to consider the impact on existing and new residences	(-) need to consider residences on northern boundary, but amenity issues could be mitigated at the layout design stage.	(+)	(-) need to consider residences on western boundary and the impact of the access, but site is being considered with 430, and access could be achieved through 430.



Slingsby Full Site Assessment

Assessment		427	428	429	430	444	464
I Overall Rating for 'Amenity'	The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +	(+)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(+)	(-)
	The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -						
	The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of this site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --						
Flood Risk							
Q. 31 Is the site potentially affected by groundwater flooding?	No ++ Yes further investigation required --	(++)The SFRA does not identify ground water flooding. Flooding is from Wath Beck	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)The SFRA does not identify ground water flooding. Flooding is from Wath Beck	(++)
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 --	(--) SFRA identifies capability to be susceptible to surface water flooding, but the site is not within a critical drainage area. FRA required due to site size and flood risk. Environment Agency expect no increase in surface runoff rates from the site.	(--) SFRA identifies capability to be susceptible to surface water flooding, but the site is not within a critical drainage area. FRA required due to site size. Environment Agency expect no increase in surface runoff rates from the site.	(--) SFRA identifies capability to be susceptible to surface water flooding, but the site is not within a critical drainage area. FRA required due to site size. Environment Agency expect no increase in surface runoff rates from the site.	SFRA identifies capability to be susceptible to surface water flooding, but the site is not within a critical drainage area. FRA required due to site size. Environment Agency expect no increase in surface runoff rates from the site. The LLFA advise: no historic record of reports of flooding being made to the County Council, associated with the site. EA plans demonstrate no specific risk of surface water flooding within the site area indicated.	(--) SFRA identifies capability to be susceptible to surface water flooding, but the site is not within a critical drainage area. FRA required due to site size and flood risk. Environment Agency expect no increase in surface runoff rates from the site.	(--) SFRA identifies capability to be susceptible to surface water flooding, but the site is not within a critical drainage area. FRA may be required. Environment Agency expect no increase in surface runoff rates from the site.
Q. 33 Is the site potentially affected by sewer flooding?	No ++ Yes further investigation required --	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
Q. 34 Have Sustainable Drainage Systems (SDS) been proposed as part of the development?	Site capable of accommodating SDS and have been proposed as part of the development ++ Site capable of accommodating SDS though no information on whether SDS proposed as part of the development + Site capable of accommodating SDS however SDS not being proposed on site - Site not suitable for accommodating SDS --	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.
Q. 35 What other measures* have been considered which ensure the development is resilient to climate change? * variable	Multiple additional measures proposed which build in resilience to climate change ++ Single additional measure proposed to build in resilience to climate change + No information provided on measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change - No measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change --	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.
J Overall Rating for 'Flood Risk'	No flood risk associated with the site ++ Limited flood risk associated with the site which can be fully mitigated + Site affected by a number of flood risk issues, however mitigation possible- Site affected by significant flood risk issues and limited mitigation possible --	(-) discount part of site in Flood Zones 2 and 3	(++)	(++)	(++)	(-) discount part of site in Flood Zones 2 and 3	(++)



Slingsby Full Site Assessment

Assessment		427	428	429	430	444	464
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>	(--) this is the sports field and children's play area. It is accessible to the local community. Relocation is suggested, but no firm scheme. Also scheme proposes a small 'Green', which is unlikely to provide an accessible alternative to the recreational offer that is currently available	No public usage	No public usage	No public usage	(--) Presence of the Mowbray Oak, and field used as overflow for sporting activities	No public usage
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 provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.
Q. 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 cycleway or footpaths are displayed on the plan submitted.	(--) No cycleway or footpaths are displayed on the plan submitted.	No details submitted.	(--) No cycleway or footpaths are displayed on the plan submitted.	No details submitted	(--) No cycleway or footpaths are displayed on the plan submitted.
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>	Travel Plan not provided.	Travel Plan not provided.	Travel Plan not provided.	Travel Plan not provided.	Travel Plan not provided.	Travel Plan not required.
Q. 40 Will the proposed development attract a balanced living and/or working population, reducing inequality of opportunity?	<p>Development proposed is clearly designed to attract a balanced living and/or working community ++</p> <p>Development takes into account the need to attract a balanced and/or working community +</p> <p>Development takes no account of the need to attract a balanced living and/or working community -</p>	The scheme submitted proposes a mix of dwellings, 2-5 bedroom, with three flats and a studio flat.	The scheme submitted proposes a mix of dwellings, 2-5 bedrooms.	No scheme submitted.	The scheme submitted proposes a mix of dwellings, 2-5 bedrooms. Two one bedroom flats over garages too.	No scheme submitted.	The scheme submitted proposes a mix of dwellings, 2-5 bedrooms. Two one bedroom flats over garages too.
K Overall Rating for 'People'	<p>Development actively planned to encourage the development of sustainable communities ++</p> <p>Development has taken into account the need to develop sustainable communities +</p> <p>Development has little regard to the need to develop sustainable communities –</p> <p>Development has no regard for the need to develop sustainable communities --</p>	(-)	(-)	(--)	(-)	(--)	(-)

Slingsby Full Site Assessment

Assessment		427	428	429	430	444	464
Meeting needs							
Q.41 Does the type and mix of development proposed meet the needs identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), Employment Land Review Update 2010 (ELR), Ryedale Retail Capacity Studies (RRCS) and Malton Town Centre Strategy?	<p>Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++</p> <p>Proposal identifies what the needs are and how some needs will be met by the development +</p> <p>Proposal either does not identify what the needs are or how any needs will be met by the development –</p> <p>No assessment is undertaken of what the needs are and whether any needs will be met --</p>	Some 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 'Ampleforth etc.' of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 76 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 26. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 38 dwellings.	Some 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 'Ampleforth etc.' of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 76 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 26. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 38 dwellings.	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Ampleforth etc.' of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 76 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 26. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 38 dwellings.	Some 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 'Ampleforth etc.' of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 76 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 26. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 38 dwellings.	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Ampleforth etc.' of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 76 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 26. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 38 dwellings.	Some 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 'Ampleforth etc.' of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 76 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 26. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 38 dwellings.
Q. 42 What level and type of affordable housing is proposed?	<p>Development offers appropriate level and type of affordable housing which meets the needs as set out in the SHMA ++</p> <p>Development offers some affordable housing which meets some of the need as set out in the SHMA +</p> <p>Development does not offer the appropriate level and type of affordable housing or does not meet the need for affordable housing as set out in the SHMA –</p> <p>The development makes no provision for affordable housing --</p>	No information has been provided concerning affordable housing provision. Part of site in flood zone 3, which would need to be discounted. Approximately 43 units could be delivered- not taking account of the flood risk. On-site affordable housing provision, as per SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy would be expected.	No information has been provided. The indicative yield of 30 dwellings would be expected to have an on-site affordable housing contribution as per SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy	(--) <b>No information has been provided. This is potentially a conversion scheme, the nature of which has not been established. This would influence the ability of the scheme to deliver affordable housing.</b>	No information has been provided. The indicative yield of 36 dwellings would be expected to have an on-site affordable housing contribution as per SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy.	No information has been provided. The indicative yield of 80 dwellings would be expected to have an on-site affordable housing contribution as per SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy	No information has been provided. The indicative yield of 24 dwellings would be expected to have an on-site affordable housing contribution as per SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy
Q. 43 What provision has been made for Ryedale's elderly population?	<p>Development addresses and meets the needs of Ryedale's elderly population ++</p> <p>Development takes into account and meets some of the needs of Ryedale's elderly population +</p> <p>Development does not address the needs of Ryedale's elderly population –</p> <p>The development makes no provision for the needs of Ryedale's elderly population --</p>	No details have been provided. No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible. Although the size of the site would not necessitate the requirement for 5% bungalow provision. The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.	No details have been provided. No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible. Although the size of the site would not necessitate the requirement for 5% bungalow provision. The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.	No details have been provided. No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible. Although the size of the site would not necessitate the requirement for 5% bungalow provision. The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.	No details have been provided. No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible. Although the size of the site would not necessitate the requirement for 5% bungalow provision. The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.	No details have been provided. No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible. Although the size of the site could necessitate the requirement for 5% bungalow provision. The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.	No details have been provided. No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible. Although the size of the site would not necessitate the requirement for 5% bungalow provision. The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.
L Overall Rating for 'Meeting Needs'	<p>Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++</p> <p>Proposal identifies what the needs are and how some needs will be met by the development +</p> <p>Proposal either does not identify what the needs are or how any needs are or how any needs will be met by the development –</p> <p>No assessment is undertaken of what the needs are and whether any needs --</p>	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
Community Facilities, utilities and Infrastructure							
Q45 On sites greater than 1ha: Has a Transport Assessment been undertaken	<p>Yes ++</p> <p>No- transport assessment required --</p>	(--)	(--)	(--)	(--)	(--)	Not required

Slingsby Full Site Assessment

Assessment		427	428	429	430	444	464
Q. 46 Is highway mitigation required as part of the development and what is the impact of the development on the highway network following mitigation?	No mitigation required or no impact on the highway following mitigation ++						
	Mitigation required but no unacceptable impact following mitigation +						
	Mitigation required and development would have a significant impact though not unacceptable impact after mitigation –						
	Mitigation required and development would still have an unacceptable impact following mitigation --						
Q. 47 Can the site accommodate adequate parking and servicing facilities?	Site meets highway guidelines for parking and servicing ++						
	Site does not currently meet parking and/or servicing requirements. However these issues can potentially be overcome or mitigated –						
	Site does not meet highway requirements for parking and/or servicing and the issues identified are difficult/not practically possible to overcome --						
Q. 48 Will the proposal provide, enable or improve access to public rights of way (PROW)?	Proposal will create new PROW or integrate existing PROW into the development ++	(-- ) The submitted scheme does not incorporate the PROW which runs from the entrance of the site in a south western direction to the site of the Slingsby Castle.	(+ ) The site is not proximal to a PROW.	(+ ) The site contains two PROWs, which run in a westward direction along the northern and southern boundaries of the site. They then traverse a series of fields to the B1257. No details have been submitted concerning their situation. But being the edge of the sites, their incorporation is possible in principle.	(+ ) The site is not proximal to a PROW.	(+ ) the site is adjacent to a section of a PROW. No details have been submitted, but it is unlikely that a proposal would impact on this section of PROW.	(+ ) The site is not proximal to a 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 ++	(-- )The proposal seeks to retain some areas of public open space: 'The Green' and some of the recreational provision currently on offer. This is not considered to be an enhancement of the existing facilities	(-- ) There is no public realm provision.	No proposals have been submitted. This site has listed buildings on it, and this will significantly influence any development scheme.	(-- ) the scheme proposed has two 'Squares', but they appear in plan form to be a parking area with trees.	No details submitted	(-- ) the scheme proposed has two 'Squares', but they appear in plan form to be a parking area with trees.
	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 --						





Assessment		427	428	429	430	444	464
Q. 52 Would the development on its own, have an impact on an existing community facility and has mitigation of this impact been proposed as part of the development?	Site has no adverse impact on community facilities or where there is an adverse impact this is fully mitigated through the provision of new, expanded or alternative facilities ++	(-) The site is the recreational area, and includes a play area and sports pitches. A scheme submitted retains some recreational provision, but it is not quantifiably and qualitatively.	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Site does not have a significant adverse impact on community facilities or where there is a significant adverse impact this is mitigated through the provision of new, expanded or alternative facilities +						
	Site has an adverse impact on community facilities and limited mitigation is indicated -						
	Site has a significant adverse impact on community facilities and no mitigation is indicated --						
M Overall Rating for 'Community facilities, Utilities and Infrastructure'	Site has limited or no adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has a adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be fully mitigated ++	(--)	(-)	(+)	(-)	(+)	(-)
	Site has limited to medium adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be satisfactorily mitigated +						
	Site has medium to high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation –						
	Site has high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation –						
Strong Economy							
Q53. (Town centre uses) Will the site promote the viability and vitality of the Principal Town or Local Service Centre?	Proposal will support and enhance the vitality and viability of the town centre, encouraging new investment ++	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Proposal will support the vitality and viability of the town centre in retaining key services and facilities +						
	Proposal could adversely harm the viability and vitality of the town centre leading to decline --						
Q. 54 (Employment uses) Will the mix of uses proposed by the development assist in diversifying the economy as set out in the ELR?	Mix of uses proposed will diversify the economy as set out in the ELR ++	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Mix of uses proposed will not diversify the economy but will support existing employment sectors in Ryedale +						
Q. 55 (Employment/Retail) Does the proposal involve the creation of net additional or net loss of jobs in Ryedale?	Up to 250 net jobs created ++	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Up to 50 net jobs created +						
	Up to 50 net jobs lost -						
	Up to 250 net jobs lost --						



Slingsby Full Site Assessment

Assessment		427	428	429	430	444	464
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 --						
<b>Stage 3 - Deliverability / Developability</b>							
Q56. How does the site perform against the SHLAA Update (housing), ELR Update (employment) and RRCS (retail) in terms of its ability to come forward and its suitability for development?	Housing: Category 1 (Deliverable) ++	Employment: Category I ++	Within Slingsby there is one site which is not submitted for consideration. It is a Category 1 site. This site was not considered through the 2009 SHLAA	Within Slingsby there is one site which is not submitted for consideration. It is a Category 1 site. This site was not considered through the 2009 SHLAA	Within Slingsby there is one site which is not submitted for consideration. It is a Category 1 site. This site was not considered through the 2009 SHLAA	Within Slingsby there is one site which is not submitted for consideration. It is a Category 1 site. This site was not considered through the 2009 SHLAA	Within Slingsby there is one site which is not submitted for consideration. It is a Category 1 site. This site was not considered through the 2009 SHLAA
	Housing: Category 2 (Developable) +	Employment: Category II +					
	Housing: Category 3 (Not Currently Developable) --	Employment: Category III -					
Q57. Are there any other legal or physical constraints which may affect the ability of the site to come forward?	No constraints identified ++	Subject to archaeological investigation	Subject to archaeological investigation	(--) Subject to archaeological investigation. Treatment of the various designated heritage assets.	(+)	Subject to archaeological investigation	Subject to archaeological investigation
	Constraint(s) identified but resolution possible +						
	Constraint(s) identified but resolution is uncertain --						
Developer Contributions							
Q58 Will the development be capable of meeting the usual range of site-specific s106 requirements?	Normal range of contributions can be achieved ++	Castle Howard Estate fully considers that the above sites are deliverable and developable and will assist in the delivery of local objectives in Slingsby.	Castle Howard Estate fully considers that the above sites are deliverable and developable and will assist in the delivery of local objectives in Slingsby.	Castle Howard Estate fully considers that the above sites are deliverable and developable and will assist in the delivery of local objectives in Slingsby.	Castle Howard Estate fully considers that the above sites are deliverable and developable and will assist in the delivery of local objectives in Slingsby.	(--) Site submitter no longer wishes to have the site considered at this time	(++) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.
	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 ++	(++) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	(++) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	(++) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	(++) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	(--) Site submitter no longer wishes to have the site considered at this time	(++) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.
	No --						
O Overall Deliverability / Developability Rating	Site is able to come forward without impairment and is able to provide a normal range of contributions ++	(++)	(++)	(--) Uncertainty due to inability to establish significance, and impact of proposals, and assessment of impacts on designated heritage assets.	(++)	(--)	(++)
	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		532
<b>Stage 1 - Sift</b>		
all sites 0.15Ha and above	0.15 Ha or greater ++	(--).0.13ha
	Less than 0.15 Ha --	
Check for fit with Local Plan Strategy	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 significant harm to 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. Where sites are partially in Flood Zone 3b, that part of the site will be not be considered further	Is not within Flood Zone 3b ++	(++)
	Is within Flood Zone 3b --	

Assessment		532	
<b>Stage 2 - Site Assessment</b>			
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 --		
Overall accessibility rating	Site has excellent accessibility ++		
	Site has good accessibility +		
	Site has variable accessibility -		
	Site has poor accessibility --		
Q2A What flood zone does the site fall within?	Flood Zone 1++		(++)
	Flood Zone 2 +		
	Flood zone 3a -		
Q2B What vulnerability class does the site fall	Flood Zone 1++		(++)
	Flood Zone 2	Flood Zone 3a	
	Less vulnerable ++	Less vulnerable +	
	More vulnerable +	More vulnerable -	
	Highly vulnerable -	Highly vulnerable --	
Q2D Has a Flood Risk Assessment been undertaken?	yes ++		(--) SFRA FRA not 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 --		

Assessment		532
Q3. What are the conclusions of the Highways Authorities (NYCC) and Highways England (HE) (Where appropriate) initial highway assessment?	Site has no highway issues identified ++	(-) County Highways have advised: The site has no direct connection/frontage to a highway maintainable at the public expense.
	Site has some highways issues identified which can be mitigated subject to further investigation +	
	Site has multiple highways issues which can be mitigated subject to further investigation -	
	Site has multiple highway issues which may be difficult to mitigate unless further investigation demonstrates otherwise --	
Biodiversity and Geo-diversity		
Q4 Would the development affect a regional or local site of biodiversity (including SINCs, LNRs or RIGS) or affect UK, NYMNP or Ryedale Biodiversity Plan protected species	Enhancement of feature/species possible – mitigation not required ++	(+) The site is a small paddock to the rear of the garage. Its development would have a limited biodiversity impact.
	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 ++	(+) development would be expected to retain the hedgerows
	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		532
Q6 Would the development impact on protected and unprotected trees, hedgerows and ancient woodland?	Positive impact. Enhancement of feature possible and mitigation not required ++	(+)
	Neutral impact. No effect or effect can be fully mitigated +	
	Adverse impact but mitigation possible –	
	Serious impact with limited or no means of mitigation--	
B Overall rating for 'Biodiversity and Geo-diversity'	Positive impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements and no mitigation required++	(+)
	Neutral impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements however any effect can be fully mitigated +	
	Adverse impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements by effects are capable of some mitigation –	
	Significant impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements and effects are unable to be satisfactorily mitigated --	



Assessment		532
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 modest, enclosed unlikely to detract from the landscape character.
	Site has a low landscape sensitivity to being developed and some existing landscape features can be retained. Site is unlikely to detract from landscape character +	
	Site has medium landscape sensitivity to being developed and may affect landscape features, however mitigation is possible. Site may detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved –	
	Site has high landscape sensitivity to being developed and will affect landscape features with limited/no means of mitigation. Site will detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved --	
Q8 What impact would the site have on 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 ++	(++) This site is relatively small in scale, contiguous with existing development, and on that basis is not considered to have any impact on the character of the AONB, or its setting.
	Site has a low landscape sensitivity to being developed and some existing landscape features can be retained. Site is unlikely to detract from landscape character +	
	Site has medium landscape sensitivity to being developed and may affect landscape features, however mitigation is possible. Site may detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved –	
	Site has high landscape sensitivity to being developed and will affect landscape features with limited/no means of mitigation. Site will detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved --	

Assessment		532
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 ++	(+). This site is contiguous with development on the existing eastern boundary. Residential development is already in proximity, including that which is set back from the street frontage. It is considered that this site demonstrates capacity for development without adversely harming the character of Slingsby.
	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 ++	(+). This settlement is not affected by coalescence.
	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 --	

Assessment		532
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 ++	(+) The site is within the Scheduled Monument Buffer of numbers 373 and 1200, but is not in a discernible distance to the SMs. It is by virtue of its scale and location, development in principle would not adversely impact on the setting of the Listed Buildings of Wyville Hall and Wyville Cottage to the south of the site, and of the Wheatlands Farmhouse which is to the west of the site, close to the established access.
	Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +	
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –	

Assessment		532
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --	

Assessment		532
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 ++	(+).The Conservation Area of Slingsby covers much of the built part of the village, and surrounding land.
	Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +	
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –	
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --	
D Overall Rating for 'Culture and Heritage'	Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++	(+)
	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++	As it forms part of the Local Plan Strategy there is a policy presumption for the application of the hierarchy where feasible and viable.
	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 ++	Not in the locality
Q16 Can the site link in to existing heat or power sources available in the District?	Site capable of linking in with existing heat or power source and developer willing to take it forward ++	No such schemes are in the locality.



Assessment		532
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 at this stage
	Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer unwilling -	
	Site not capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology --	
Sustainable Building and Waste Reduction		
Q17 Can the site accommodate higher sustainable building standards than currently required?	Site can accommodate 2 levels higher than mandatory limit ++	Site below site allocation threshold.
	Site can accommodate 1 level higher than mandatory limit -	
	Development cannot accommodate higher standards than mandatory level --	
Q18 Does the development contain proposals for waste reduction in both its construction and when in operation?	Proposals for waste reduction incorporated into both the construction and operation of the development++	Site below site allocation threshold.
	Proposals have investigated waste reduction, however only limited measures are achievable -	
	No proposals suggested for waste reduction --	
Q. 19 Does the development contain individual/communal recycling facilities/ infrastructure?	Yes +	Site below site allocation threshold.
	No --	
F Overall Rating for 'Sustainable Building and Waste Minimisation'	Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development and developer willing ++	Site below site allocation threshold.
	Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development but developer unwilling -	
	Site not capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development --	
Efficient Use of Land		
Q.20 Is the site or any part of the site considered previously developed land?	Site is over 50% to 100% Brownfield ++	Greenfield Site, but no Brownfield sites are available (i.e. deliverable and developable) in the village to meet housing need.
	Site is up to 50% Brownfield +	
Q.21 Can the site achieve an appropriate density to achieve the most efficient use of the land?	Excellent density achieved taking into account location and context ++	Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c.2 dwellings.
	Appropriate density achieved taking into account location and context +	
	Lower density proposed as site faces some constraints in its development -	
	Lower density necessary as site faces significant constraints in its development --	

Assessment		532
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 ++	Land is not contaminated
	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 ++	(-) 0.13ha of grade 3. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. Therefore it is possible that the land is best and most versatile, but less than 5ha is proposed. This is a small paddock.
	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 ++?	(--) within a mineral consultation zone, but adjacent to 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 ++	No response requested from the Environment Agency
	Development is located in a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but mitigation is possible to reduce the risk of groundwater pollution risk +	
	Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but no risk assessment has been undertaken -	
	Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone and mitigation of the risk of groundwater pollution is not possible --	

Assessment		532
Q. 27 Is any part of the development on suspected unstable land?	Land has no instability concerns ++	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 ++	(++ within mineral safeguarding but adjacent to built form of settlement.
	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 +	(+) residential development is proximal. The proposal is for residential development which would not create these amenity concerns.
	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 +	(-) need to consider residences on western boundary and the impact of the access on existing properties.
	The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -	
	The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --	

Assessment		532
I Overall Rating for 'Amenity'	The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +	(-)
	The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -	
	The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of this site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --	
Flood Risk		
Q. 31 Is the site potentially affected by groundwater flooding?	No ++	(++)
	Yes further investigation required --	
Q. 32 Is the site potentially affected by surface water flooding and is this site considered to be within a critical drainage area?	No ++	(--). SFRA identifies capability to be susceptible to surface water flooding, but the site is not within a critical drainage area. FRA may be required. Environment Agency expect no increase in surface runoff rates from the site.
	Yes further investigation required --	
Q. 33 Is the site potentially affected by sewer flooding?	No ++	(++)
	Yes further investigation required --	
Q. 34 Have Sustainable Drainage Systems (SDS) been proposed as part of the development?	Site capable of accommodating SDS and have been proposed as part of the development ++	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.
	Site capable of accommodating SDS though no information on whether SDS proposed as part of the development +	
	Site capable of accommodating SDS however SDS not being proposed on site -	
	Site not suitable for accommodating SDS --	
Q. 35 What other measures* have been considered which ensure the development is resilient to climate change? * variable	Multiple additional measures proposed which build in resilience to climate change ++	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.
	Single additional measure proposed to build in resilience to climate change +	
	No information provided on measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change -	
	No measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change --	
J Overall Rating for 'Flood Risk'	No flood risk associated with the site ++	(++)
	Limited flood risk associated with the site which can be fully mitigated +	
	Site affected by a number of flood risk issues, however mitigation possible-	
	Site affected by significant flood risk issues and limited mitigation possible --	

Assessment		532
People		
Q. 36 Would the development of the site lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of the settlement?	Development incorporates existing use(s), as part of the overall scheme ++	No public usage
	Development proposes relocation of use to suitable alternative location +	
	Development will result in the loss of a valued facility/use and no justification or alternative provided --	
Q. 37 Will the site incorporate the principles of Secured By Design, reducing the potential for crime and discouraging anti-social behaviour?	Yes – SBD principles taken into account or will be taken into account following liaison with North Yorkshire police +	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.
	No – SBD principles not taken into account -	
Q. 38 Does the design of the development encourage people to walk and cycle rather than travel by car?	Cycleway and footpaths effectively integrated into the development encouraging walking and cycling ++	No details submitted
	Some cycleway and/or footpaths shown encouraging walking and cycling +	
	No cycleway and footpaths indicated as part of this development --	
Q. 39 For sites over 1ha or over 80 houses- Has a Travel Plan been produced which assesses alternative options and initiatives?	Travel Plan undertaken and clear implementable initiatives for promoting modal shift set out ++	Travel Plan not required.
	Travel Plan undertaken and some initiatives identified for promoting modal shift +	
	Travel Plan undertaken which identifies limited opportunities for modal shift or Travel Plan not undertaken --	
Q. 40 Will the proposed development attract a balanced living and/or working population, reducing inequality of opportunity?	Development proposed is clearly designed to attract a balanced living and/or working community ++	No scheme submitted
	Development takes into account the need to attract a balanced and/or working community +	
	Development takes no account of the need to attract a balanced living and/or working community -	
K Overall Rating for 'People'	Development actively planned to encourage the development of sustainable communities ++	(--)
	Development has taken into account the need to develop sustainable communities +	
	Development has little regard to the need to develop sustainable communities -	
	Development has no regard for the need to develop sustainable communities --	

Assessment		532
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 'Ampleforth etc.' of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 76 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 26. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 38 dwellings.
	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 ++	(-) No affordable housing provision is achievable.
	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. No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible. Although the size of the site would not necessitate the requirement for 5% bungalow provision. The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.
	Development takes into account and meets some of the needs of Ryedale's elderly population +	
	Development does not address the needs of Ryedale's elderly population –	
	The development makes no provision for the needs of Ryedale's elderly population --	
L Overall Rating for 'Meeting Needs'	Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++	(-)
	Proposal identifies what the needs are and how some needs will be met by the development +	
	Proposal either does not identify what the needs are or how any needs are or how any needs will be met by the development –	
	No assessment is undertaken of what the needs are and whether any needs --	
Community Facilities, utilities and Infrastructure		
Q45 On sites greater than 1ha: Has a Transport Assessment been undertaken	Yes ++	Not required
	No- transport assessment required --	

Assessment		532
Q. 46 Is highway mitigation required as part of the development and what is the impact of the development on the highway network following mitigation?	No mitigation required or no impact on the highway following mitigation ++	
	Mitigation required but no unacceptable impact following mitigation +	
	Mitigation required and development would have a significant impact though not unacceptable impact after mitigation –	
	Mitigation required and development would still have an unacceptable impact following mitigation --	
Q. 47 Can the site accommodate adequate parking and servicing facilities?	Site meets highway guidelines for parking and servicing ++	
	Site does not currently meet parking and/or servicing requirements. However these issues can potentially be overcome or mitigated –	
	Site does not meet highway requirements for parking and/or servicing and the issues identified are difficult/not practically possible to overcome --	
Q. 48 Will the proposal provide, enable or improve access to public rights of way (PROW)?	Proposal will create new PROW or integrate existing PROW into the development ++	(+). The site is not proximal to a PROW.
	Proposal will not affect a PROW +	
	Proposal would involve the diversion or loss of a PROW --	
Q. 49 Does the proposal involve new public realm or enhancements to the existing public realm as part of its development?	Proposal will create high quality new public realm or significantly enhance existing public realm as part of its development ++	No details submitted
	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 --	



Assessment		532
Q. 50 What is the capacity of existing utilities and infrastructure to cope with impact of the development?	Site has limited or no adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be fully mitigated ++	Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: no additional capacity required. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: no additional capacity required. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water. Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer. Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.
	Site has limited to medium adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be satisfactorily mitigated +	
	Site has medium to high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation –	
	Site has high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation --	
Q. 51 What is the impact on Waste Water Treatment Works?	Further than 400m from the boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works ++	(++)
	Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact undertaken and Yorkshire Water No Objection +	
	Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact not undertaken –	
	Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact undertaken Yorkshire Water consulted and likely to object --	

Assessment		532
Q. 52 Would the development on its own, have an impact on an existing community facility and has mitigation of this impact been proposed as part of the development?	Site has no adverse impact on community facilities or where there is an adverse impact this is fully mitigated through the provision of new, expanded or alternative facilities ++	(++)
	Site does not have a significant adverse impact on community facilities or where there is a significant adverse impact this is mitigated through the provision of new, expanded or alternative facilities +	
	Site has an adverse impact on community facilities and limited mitigation is indicated -	
	Site has a significant adverse impact on community facilities and no mitigation is indicated --	
M Overall Rating for 'Community facilities, Utilities and Infrastructure'	Site has limited or no adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has a adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be fully mitigated ++	(+)
	Site has limited to medium adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be satisfactorily mitigated +	
	Site has medium to high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation –	
	Site has high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation –	
<b>Strong Economy</b>		
Q53. (Town centre uses) Will the site promote the viability and vitality of the Principal Town or Local Service Centre?	Proposal will support and enhance the vitality and viability of the town centre, encouraging new investment ++	NA
	Proposal will support the vitality and viability of the town centre in retaining key services and facilities +	
	Proposal could adversely harm the viability and vitality of the town centre leading to decline --	
Q. 54 (Employment uses) Will the mix of uses proposed by the development assist in diversifying the economy as set out in the ELR?	Mix of uses proposed will diversify the economy as set out in the ELR ++	NA
	Mix of uses proposed will not diversify the economy but will support existing employment sectors in Ryedale +	
Q. 55 (Employment/Retail) Does the proposal involve the creation of net additional or net loss of jobs in Ryedale?	Up to 250 net jobs created ++	NA
	Up to 50 net jobs created +	
	Up to 50 net jobs lost -	
	Up to 250 net jobs lost --	

Assessment		532	
N Overall rating for 'Strong Economy'	Proposal will have a significant positive impact on the economy ++	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 --		
<b>Stage 3 - Deliverability / Developability</b>			
Q56. How does the site perform against the SHLAA Update (housing), ELR Update (employment) and RRCS (retail) in terms of its ability to come forward and its suitability for development?	Housing: Category 1 (Deliverable)++	Employment: Category I ++	Within Slingsby there is one site which is not submitted for consideration. It is a Category 1 site. This site was not considered through the 2009 SHLAA
	Housing: Category 2 (Developable) +	Employment: Category II +	
	Housing: Category 3 (Not Currently Developable) --	Employment: Category III -	
Q57. Are there any other legal or physical constraints which may affect the ability of the site to come forward?	No constraints identified ++	Subject to archaeological investigation	
	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 ++	Castle Howard Estate fully considers that the above sites are deliverable and developable and will assist in the delivery of local objectives in Slingsby.	
	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 ++	(++). Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	
	No --		
O Overall Deliverability / Developability Rating	Site is able to come forward without impairment and is able to provide a normal range of contributions ++	(++)	
	Site has some constraints and / or may not be able to support the full range of developer contributions +		
	Site faces significant constraints and may not be able to support any developer contributions --		