

Stamford Bridge - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		92	394
<b>Stage 1 - Sift</b>			
all sites 0.15Ha and above	0.15 Ha or greater ++	(++) 0.89ha	(++) 2.63ha
	Less than 0.15 Ha --		
Check for conformity with Local Plan Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy SP1	Conforms to Local Plan Strategy Spatial Strategy (SP1) ++	(++) Adjacent to Stamford Bridge	(-) Tourism and Leisure use consider through planning application
	Does not meet Local Plan Strategy (Spatial Strategy) SP1 --		
Sites which cause significant harm to national/international nature conservation sites (species or habitat) or would involve substantial harm or loss to designated heritage assets will not be considered further.	Will Not cause harm ++	(++) site is not proximal to River Derwent SAC	
	Will cause harm --		
Sites which fall wholly within Flood Zone 3b not considered further for built development. Where sites are partially in Flood Zone 3b, that part of the site will be not be considered further for built development.	Is not within Flood Zone 3b ++		
	Is within Flood Zone 3b --		
<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 ++	Not applicable
		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 ++		
	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 ++		
	No --		
A Overall Flood Risk Assessment	Site has low overall flood risk ++		
	Site faces significant flood risk issues which can be mitigated +		
	Site faces significant flood risk issues which could potentially be mitigated -		
	Site faces significant flood risk issues and may be inappropriate for development --		
Q3 What are the conclusions of the Highways Authorities (North Yorkshire County Council) and Highways England (HE) (where appropriate) initial highway assessment?	Site has no highway issues identified ++		
	Site has some highways issues identified which can be mitigated subject to further investigation +		
	Site has multiple highways issues which can be mitigated subject to further investigation -		

Stamford Bridge - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		<b>92</b>	<b>394</b>
	Site has multiple highway issues which may be difficult to mitigate unless further investigation demonstrates otherwise --		
Biodiversity and Geodiversity			
Q4 Would the development affect a regional or local site of biodiversity (including SINC, LNRs or RIGS) or affect UK, NYMNP or Ryedale Biodiversity Plan protected species	Enhancement of feature/species possible – mitigation not required ++		
	Neutral impact – no effect or effect can be fully mitigated +		
	Adverse impact but mitigation possible –		
	Serious impact with limited means of mitigation --		
Q5 Would the development provide opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure, including linking in with existing green infrastructure/corridors	Excellent opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors ++		
	Some opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors +		
	No opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors, however the site has the potential to accommodate these –		
	No opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure corridors, however the site does not have the potential to accommodate these --		
Q6 Would the development impact on protected and unprotected trees, hedgerows and ancient woodland?	Positive impact. Enhancement of feature possible and mitigation not required ++		
	Neutral impact. No effect or effect can be fully mitigated +		
	Adverse impact but mitigation possible –		
	Serious impact with limited or no means of mitigation--		
B Overall rating for 'Biodiversity and Geodiversity'	Positive impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements and no mitigation required++		
	Neutral impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements however any effect can be fully mitigated +		
	Adverse impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements by effects are capable of some mitigation –		
	Significant impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements and effects are unable to be satisfactorily mitigated --		
C Special Qualities, Landscape and Setting			
Q7 What is the capacity of the landscape to accommodate the site according to the Landscape Character Assessments which cover the Ryedale Area and Special Qualities Study (including views and open spaces)?	Site has a very low landscape sensitivity to being developed or existing landscape features are retained or enhanced. Site will not detract from landscape character ++	(+) The site is within the Vale of York National Character Area.	
	Site has a low landscape sensitivity to being developed and some existing landscape features can be retained. Site is unlikely to detract from landscape character +		
	Site has medium landscape sensitivity to being developed and may affect landscape features, however mitigation is possible. Site may detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved –		
	Site has high landscape sensitivity to being developed and will affect landscape features with limited/no means of mitigation. Site will detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved --		
Q8. What impact would the site have on nationally designated landscapes- the North York Moors National Park and/or the 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 ++	(+++) Not in proximity to either of these designated landscapes.	
	Site has a low landscape sensitivity to being developed and some existing landscape features can be retained. Site is unlikely to detract from landscape character +		
	Site has medium landscape sensitivity to being developed and may affect landscape features, however mitigation is possible. Site may detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved –		
	Site has high landscape sensitivity to being developed and will affect landscape features with limited/no means of mitigation. Site will detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved --		
Q10 Is the site capable of utilising existing landscape features to minimise its	Site is capable of retaining and enhancing existing landscape features ++	(+) It is considered that scheme has some key landscape features in the hedging and that this	

Stamford Bridge - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		<b>92</b>	<b>394</b>
features to minimise its impact or provide adequate landscape mitigation measures?	Site is capable of retaining some existing landscape features and limited or no landscape mitigation is required +	in the hedging, and that this would need to be preserved and increased to ensure mitigation from the uses to the east of the site. The site is on gently sloping land, which rises to the north.	
	Site will not retain most existing landscape features, however landscape mitigation is possible –		
	Site will not retain any existing landscape features and limited or no landscape mitigation is possible/proposed --		
Q11 Will the site lead to the coalescence of settlements which will impact on their character and setting?	Development within the built form of the settlement ++	(+)	
	Development is on the edge of a settlement which is not affected by coalescence with another settlement +		
	Development is on the edge of the settlement and will lead to coalescence with another settlement however mitigation possible –		
	Development is on the edge of the settlement and will lead to significant coalescence with another settlement and limited/no mitigation possible --		
C Overall Rating for 'Special Qualities, Landscape and Setting'	Positive impact – the proposal will retain and enhance the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement ++		
	Neutral impact – the proposal will not have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement +		
	Negative impact – the proposal will have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement, however mitigation is possible –		
	Significant impact – the proposal will have a significant adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement and limited or no mitigation is possible --		
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 buffer zone of the Battle site of Stamford Bridge in 1066, but by virtue of no views achievable into and out of the fields of this site it would not harm the setting of this heritage asset.
	Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +		
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –		
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --		
Q13 Will the site affect a non-designated heritage asset which the Council identifies as having a degree of significance that is worthy of consideration?	Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++	(+)	It is considered that by virtue of its close physical association with the built up environment of Stamford Bridge that development of this field would not harm the form and character of Stamford Bridge
	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 ++	No details have been submitted but there is no reason to suggest that such proposals cannot be delivered.	
	Site capable but developer unwilling -		
	Site not capable --		
Q15 Is the site capable of linking in or supporting off site renewable energy schemes?	Site capable linking in with off site renewable energy scheme and developer willing to take it forward ++	No details have been submitted but there is no reason to suggest that such proposals cannot be delivered.	
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 details have been submitted .	

Stamford Bridge - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		<b>92</b>	<b>394</b>
E Overall rating for 'Low Carbon Development and Renewable Energy'	Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer willing ++		
	Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer unwilling -		
	Site not capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology --		
Sustainable Building and Waste Reduction			
Q17 Can the site accommodate higher sustainable building standards than currently required?	Site can accommodate 2 levels higher than mandatory limit ++	No details have been submitted but there is no reason to suggest that higher standards cannot be achieved.	
	Site can accommodate 1 level higher than mandatory limit -		
	Development cannot accommodate higher standards than mandatory level --		
Q18 Does the development contain proposals for waste reduction in both its construction and when in operation?	Proposals for waste reduction incorporated into both the construction and operation of the development++	No details have been submitted but there is no reason to suggest that such proposals cannot be delivered.	
	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/	Yes +	No details have been submitted but there is no reason to suggest that such proposals cannot be delivered.	
	No --		
F Overall Rating for 'Sustainable Building and Waste Minimisation'	Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development and developer willing ++		
	Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development but developer unwilling-		
	Site not capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development --		
Efficient Use of Land			
Q.20 Is the site or any part of the site considered previously developed land?	Site is over 50% to 100% Brownfield ++	0.89ha of greenfield land.	
	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 ++	No details have been submitted concerning density. At 30 dwellings per hectare density the site is theoretically capable of 27 dwellings, but this does not take account of landscaping that has been identified as being important.	
	Appropriate density achieved taking into account location and context +		
	Lower density proposed as site faces some constraints in its development -		
	Lower density necessary as site faces significant constraints in its development --		
Q.22 Would the development of the site lead to the remediation of contaminated land?	Development is located on land which is likely to be highly contaminated and will be remediated ++		
	Development is located on land which may be contaminated and will be remediated +		
	Development is located on land which may be contaminated and no proposals for remediation have been put forward -		
	Development is located on land which is likely to be highly contaminated no proposals for remediation have been put forward --		
G Overall Rating for 'Efficient Use of Land'	Site represents very efficient use of land with mitigation to fully overcome concerns where necessary ++		
	Site represents efficient use of land but further mitigation required to fully overcome concerns where necessary +		
	Site does not represent efficient use of land. Further investigation of mitigation measures to overcome concerns required -		
	Site does not represent efficient use of land and mitigation is not possible --		
Natural Resources			
Q. 23 Would the development of this site involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1,2 and 3a)?	No loss of best and most versatile agricultural land ++		
	Up to 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost -		
	More than 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost --		
Q. 24 Would the development lead to the sterilisation of mineral resources?	Site not within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search, or Mineral Consultation Zone ++?		
	Site within the buffer of a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone -?		
	Site within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone --		
Q. 25 Would the development have an adverse impact on a	Development is not located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone ++		

Stamford Bridge - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		<b>92</b>	<b>394</b>
Groundwater Source Protection Zone?	Development is located in a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but mitigation is possible to reduce the risk of groundwater pollution risk +		
	Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but no risk assessment has been undertaken -		
	Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone and mitigation of the risk of groundwater pollution is not possible --		
Q. 27 Is any part of the development on suspected unstable land?	Land has no instability concerns ++	No evidence of land instability. On sloping sites, specialist geotechnical advice should be sort detailing requirements for stabilisation and foundation design.	
	Land potentially unstable but investigation has shown that mitigation is possible +		
	Land potentially unstable but no investigation has been carried out -		
	Land suffers from significant instability problems and either no mitigation has been proposed or instability problems are not possible to mitigate --		
Q. 28 Will the site impact on major hazard sites or pipelines?	HSE Standing Advice states "do not advise against development" ++		
	HSE Standing Advice states "advise against development"		
H Overall Rating for 'Natural Resources'	Site would not adversely affect any natural resources ++		
	Site would not have any significant adverse effect on natural resources +		
	Site would have an adverse effect on natural resources but mitigation is possible -		
	Site would have a significant adverse effect on natural resources and limited/no mitigation is possible --		
Amenity			
Q. 29 Is the development in an area where noise, light, dust or smell is likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to generate noise, light or dust which will affect existing users?	The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +	(-) The site is proximal to an established industrial site. As a consequence, it is considered that there will need to be appropriate noise mitigation through the use of a landscaping belt to the north east of the site, to improve noise levels, provide visual screening and amelioration of any dust. This can then be retained in perpetuity.	
	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 +	(+) Such matters can be considered through the landscaping, layout, design scale and massing of the buildings and their relationship to existing development to the west and east (dwellings and industrial buildings).	
	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 --		
I Overall Rating for 'Amenity'	The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +		
	The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -		
	The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of this site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --		
Flood Risk			
Q. 31 Is the site potentially affected by groundwater flooding?	No ++		
	Yes further investigation required --		
Q. 32 Is the site potentially affected by surface water flooding and is this site considered to be within a critical drainage area?	No ++		
	Yes further investigation required --		
Q. 33 Is the site potentially affected by sewer	No ++		

Stamford Bridge - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		<b>92</b>	<b>394</b>
flooding?	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 details have been supplied.	
	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?	Multiple additional measures proposed which build in resilience to climate change ++	No details have been supplied.	
	Single additional measure proposed to build in resilience to climate change +		
	No information provided on measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change -		
	No measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change --		
J Overall Rating for 'Flood Risk'	No flood risk associated with the site ++		
	Limited flood risk associated with the site which can be fully mitigated +		
	Site affected by a number of flood risk issues, however mitigation possible-		
	Site affected by significant flood risk issues and limited mitigation possible --		
People			
Q. 36 Would the development of the site lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of the settlement?	Development incorporates existing use(s), as part of the overall scheme ++	No loss.	
	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 supplied at this stage, but there is no reason to suggest it would not be undertaken.	
	No – SBD principles not taken into account -		
Q. 38 Does the design of the development encourage people to walk and cycle rather than travel by car?	Cycleways and footpaths effectively integrated into the development encouraging walking and cycling ++	No information supplied at this stage, but there is no reason to suggest it would not be undertaken, and this site is well within walking distance of the village.	
	Some cycleways and/or footpaths shown encouraging walking and cycling +		
	No cycleways and footpaths indicated as part of this development --		
Q.39 For sites over 1ha or over 80 houses- Has a Travel Plan been produced which assesses alternative options and initiatives?	Travel Plan undertaken and clear implementable initiatives for promoting modal shift set out ++	Not applicable	
	Travel Plan undertaken and some initiatives identified for promoting modal shift +		
	Travel Plan undertaken which identifies limited opportunities for modal shift or Travel Plan not undertaken --		
Q. 40 Will the proposed development attract a balanced living and/or working population, reducing inequality of opportunity?	Development proposed is clearly designed to attract a balanced living and/or working community ++		
	Development takes into account the need to attract a balanced and/or working community +		
	Development takes no account of the need to attract a balanced living and/or working community -		
K Overall Rating for 'People'	Development actively planned to encourage the development of sustainable communities ++		
	Development has taken into account the need to develop sustainable communities +		
	Development has little regard to the need to develop sustainable communities -		
	Development has no regard for the need to develop sustainable communities --		
Meeting needs			
Q.41 Does the type and mix of development proposed meet the needs identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), Employment Land Review Update 2010 (ELR), Ryedale Retail Capacity Studies (RRCS) and Malton Town Centre Strategy?	Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++		
	Proposal identifies what the needs are and how some needs will be met by the development +		
	Proposal either does not identify what the needs are or how any needs will be met by the development -		
	No assessment is undertaken of what the needs are and whether any needs will be met --		
Q.42 What level and type of affordable housing is proposed?	Development offers appropriate level and type of affordable housing which meets the needs as set out in the SHMA ++	No details have been provided, although there is no reason to suggest that appropriate	

Stamford Bridge - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		<b>92</b>	<b>394</b>
	Development offers some affordable housing which meets some of the need as set out in the SHMA +	affordable housing will not be provided.	
	Development does not offer the appropriate level and type of affordable housing or does not meet the need for affordable housing as set out in the SHMA -		
	The development makes no provision for affordable housing --		
Q. 43 What provision has been made for Ryedale's elderly population?	Development addresses and meets the needs of Ryedale's elderly population ++	No details have been provided, although there is no presumption for extra-care facilities. There is no expectation that bungalows will be required, but the Plan supports the delivery of lifetime homes. This will be considered as a site-specific matter.	
	Development takes into account and meets some of the needs of Ryedale's elderly population +		
	Development does not address the needs of Ryedale's elderly population -		
	The development makes no provision for the needs of Ryedale's elderly population --		
L Overall Rating for 'Meeting Needs'	Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++		
	Proposal identifies what the needs are and how some needs will be met by the development +		
	Proposal either does not identify what the needs are or how any needs are or how any needs will be met by the development -		
	No assessment is undertaken of what the needs are and whether any needs --		
Community Facilities, utilities and Infrastructure			
Q45 On sites greater than 1ha: Has a Transport Assessment been undertaken	Yes ++	No TA but not required.	
	No- transport assessment required --		
Q. 46 Is highway mitigation required as part of the development and what is the impact of the development on the highway network following mitigation?	No mitigation required or no impact on the highway following mitigation ++		
	Mitigation required but no unacceptable impact following mitigation +		
	Mitigation required and development would have a significant impact though not unacceptable impact after mitigation -		
	Mitigation required and development would still have an unacceptable impact following mitigation --		
Q. 47 Can the site accommodate adequate parking and servicing facilities?	Site meets highway guidelines for parking and servicing ++		
	Site does not currently meet parking and/or servicing requirements. However these issues can potentially be overcome or mitigated -		
	Site does not meet highway requirements for parking and/or servicing and the issues identified are difficult/not practically possible to overcome --		
Q. 48 Will the proposal provide, enable or improve access to public rights of way (PROW)?	Proposal will create new PROW or integrate existing PROW into the development ++	(+ there are no PROWs in proximity. The site is adjacent to the public footpath. This does not extend	
	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 have been submitted, but there will be an expectation for landscaping.	
	Proposal will create some new public realm or partially enhance existing public realm as part of its development +		
	Though capable of incorporating new or enhancing existing public realm, the proposal makes no provision for it --		
Q. 50 What is the capacity of existing utilities and infrastructure to cope with impact of the development?	Site has limited or no adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be fully mitigated ++		
	Site has limited to medium adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be satisfactorily mitigated +		
	Site has medium to high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation -		
	Site has high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation --		

Stamford Bridge - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		<b>92</b>	<b>394</b>
Q. 51 What is the impact on Waste Water Treatment Works?	Further than 400m from the boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works ++	(+) The site is c.275 metres from the WWTW. This is a distance from which it unlikely that amenity issues will be present.	
	Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact undertaken and Yorkshire Water No Objection +		
	Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact not undertaken -		
	Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact undertaken Yorkshire Water consulted and likely to object --		
Q. 52 Would the development on its own, have an impact on an existing community facility and has mitigation of this impact been proposed as part of the development?	Site has no adverse impact on community facilities or where there is an adverse impact this is fully mitigated through the provision of new, expanded or alternative facilities ++	(++ no adverse impact on community facilities. The public house which is adjacent will need some form mitigation concerning noise.	
	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>			
Q.53 Will the site promote the viability and vitality of the Principal Town or Local Service Centre?	Proposal will support and enhance the vitality and viability of the town centre, encouraging new investment ++	(++)	
	Proposal will support the vitality and viability of the town centre in retaining key services and facilities +		
	Proposal could adversely harm the viability and vitality of the town centre leading to decline --		
Q. 54 (Employment) Will the mix of uses proposed by the development assist in diversifying the economy as set out in the ELR?	Mix of uses proposed will diversify the economy as set out in the ELR ++	Not applicable	
	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 ++	Not applicable	
	Up to 50 net jobs created +		
	Up to 50 net jobs lost -		
	Up to 250 net jobs lost --		
N Overall rating for 'Strong Economy'	Proposal will have a significant positive impact on the economy ++		
	Proposal will have a positive impact on the economy +		
	Proposal will have a negative impact on the economy -		
	Proposal will have a significant negative impact on the economy --		

**Stage 3 - Deliverability / Developability**

Q56. How does the site perform against the SHLAA Update (housing), ELR Update (employment) and RRCS (retail) in terms of its ability to come forward and its suitability for development?	Housing: Category 1 (Deliverable) ++	Employment: Category I ++	
	Housing: Category 2 (Developable) +	Employment: Category II +	
	Housing: Category 3 (Not Currently Developable) --	Employment: Category III -	
Q57. Are there any other legal or physical constraints which may	No constraints identified ++	(-- East Riding of Yorkshire are not supportive of this site coming forward when they have	
	Constraint(s) identified but resolution possible +		



Stamford Bridge - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		92	394
affect the ability of the site to come forward?	Constraint(s) identified but resolution is uncertain --	discounted more sustainable sites than this.	
Developer Contributions			
Q58 Will the development be capable of meeting the usual range of site-specific s106 requirements?	Normal range of contributions can be achieved ++		
	Some contributions can be achieved +		
	Limited contributions can be achieved -		
	No contributions can be achieved --		
Q. 59 Can the development support the requirements of the CIL charging schedule?	Yes ++		
	No --		
O Overall Deliverability / Developability Rating	Site is able to come forward without impairment and is able to provide a normal range of contributions ++	(-- East Riding of Yorkshire are not supportive of this site coming forward when they have discounted more sustainable sites than this.	
	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 --		