

Assessment		69	72	112	177	217	434
Stage 1 - Sift							
Sites 0.15Ha and above	0.15 Ha or greater ++	(--) 0.13ha	(++) 5.44ha	(++)5.44ha	(++) 0.97ha	(++) 1.25ha	(--)0.13ha
	Less than 0.15 Ha --						
Check for conformity with Local Plan Strategy, Settlement Hierarchy SP1	Conforms to Local Plan Strategy Spatial Strategy (SP1) ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(--)
	Does not meet Local Plan Strategy (Spatial Strategy) SP1 --						
Sites which cause significant harm to national/international nature conservation sites (species or habitat) or would involve substantial harm or loss to designated heritage assets.	Will Not cause harm ++	(++)	(++) Site is proximal to River Hertford, which is a tributary into the River Derwent SAC.	(++) Site is proximal to River Hertford, which is a tributary into the 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 not be considered further for built development. Zone 3b, that part of the site will be not be considered further	Is not within Flood Zone 3b ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Is within Flood Zone 3b --						
Stage 2 - Site Assessment							
Q1A How accessible is the site to key services and facilities	Bus stop	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +					
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -					
		15 minutes walking time and over --					
	Local Shop	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(++)	(++)	(+)	(+)	
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +					
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -					
		15 minutes walking time and over --					
	Nearest Primary School	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +					
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -					
		15 minutes walking time and over --					
Nearest Development Limit	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)		
	Up to 10 minutes walking time +						
	Up to 15 minutes walking time -						
	15 minutes walking time and over --						

Staxton and Willerby Full Sites Selection Methodology

Assessment		69	72	112	177	217	434
Overall accessibility rating	Site has excellent accessibility ++		(++)	(++)	(+)	(+)	
	Site has good accessibility +						
	Site has variable accessibility –						
	Site has poor accessibility --						
Q2A What flood zone does the site fall within?	Flood Zone 1++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Flood Zone 2 +						
	Flood zone 3a –						
Q2B What vulnerability class does the site fall	Flood Zone 1++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Flood Zone 2						
	Flood Zone 3a						
	Less vulnerable ++						
	More vulnerable +						
Q2D Has a Flood Risk Assessment been undertaken?	yes ++	(--) SFRA- FRA not required due to site size	(--) SFRA. FRA due to site size., and potential flood risk	(--) SFRA. FRA due to site size., and potential flood risk	(--) SFRA. FRA due to site size., and potential flood risk	(--) SFRA. FRA due to site size., and potential flood risk	(--) SFRA- FRA not required due to site size
	No --						
A Overall Flood Risk Assessment	Site has low overall flood risk ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Site faces significant flood risk issues which can be mitigated +						
	Site faces significant flood risk issues which could potentially be mitigated –						
	Site faces significant flood risk issues and may be inappropriate for development --						
Q3. What are the conclusions of the Highways Authorities (NYCC) and Highways England (HE) (where appropriate) initial highway assessment?	Site has no highway issues identified ++	(+) Highways England have confirmed that a scheme of circa 30-50 dwellings, using the existing access (traffic-lighted) would be considered acceptable. If a number of sites are being considered then cumulative impacts would need consideration. The County Highways Officer has advised: Access acceptable: Access on to Staxton/Willerby however the close proximity to the signalised junction would need to be considered when locating an access to any residential development in this location. Accessibility criteria can be met.	(++) Highways England have confirmed that a scheme of circa 30-50 dwellings, using the existing access (traffic-lighted) would be considered acceptable. If a number of sites are being considered then cumulative impacts would need consideration. As currently submitted this site would require further investigation due to its size. The County Highways Officer has advised: Accessible onto Ings Lane or Carr Lane, However significant improvements will be required to ensure adoptable standards can be met. Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) may also be required to address the speed limit on these roads. It should be noted that any site with over 50 dwellings will require a secondary access (emergency access as a minimum). Accessibility Criteria can be met.	(++) Highways England have confirmed that a scheme of circa 30-50 dwellings, using the existing access (traffic-lighted) would be considered acceptable. If a number of sites are being considered then cumulative impacts would need consideration. As currently submitted this site would require further investigation due to its size. The County Highways Officer has advised: Accessible onto Ings Lane or Carr Lane, However significant improvements will be required to ensure adoptable standards can be met. Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) may also be required to address the speed limit on these roads. It should be noted that any site with over 50 dwellings will require a secondary access (emergency access as a minimum). Accessibility Criteria can be met.	(++) Highways England have confirmed that a scheme of circa 30-50 dwellings, using the existing access (traffic-lighted) would be considered acceptable. If a number of sites are being considered then cumulative impacts would need consideration. The County Highways Officer has advised: Accessible onto Willerby Carr Lane, however significant improvements will be required to widen access roads, to meet adoptable standards. Accessibility criteria can be met. Visibility at Willerby Carr Lane/Wains Lane junction is restricted by existing trees/hedgerow, this would need to be addressed consider this site in connection with 217.	(++) Highways England have confirmed that a scheme of circa 30-50 dwellings, using the existing access (traffic-lighted) would be considered acceptable. If a number of sites are being considered then cumulative impacts would need consideration. The County Highways Officer has advised: Accessible onto Willerby Carr Lane, however significant improvements will be required to widen access roads, to meet adoptable standards. Accessibility criteria can be met. Visibility at Willerby Carr Lane/Wains Lane junction is restricted by existing trees/hedgerow, this would need to be addressed consider this site in connection with 177.	(+) Highways England have confirmed that a scheme of circa 30-50 dwellings, using the existing access (traffic-lighted) would be considered acceptable. If a number of sites are being considered then cumulative impacts would need consideration. The County Highways Officer has advised: Access acceptable: Access on to Staxton/Willerby however the close proximity to the signalised junction would need to be considered when locating an access to any residential development in this location. Accessibility criteria can be met.
	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 --						

Staxton and Willerby Full Sites Selection Methodology

Assessment		69	72	112	177	217	434
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	<p>Enhancement of feature/species possible – mitigation not required ++</p> <p>Neutral impact – no effect or effect can be fully mitigated +</p> <p>Adverse impact but mitigation possible –</p> <p>Serious impact with limited means of mitigation --</p>	(+) There are no sites of designated importance for biodiversity or geodiversity within or proximal to the site. Were nationally protected species to be identified on the site, this would be identified through surveys required as sites progressed through the allocations process, and they would be afforded the commensurate protection within the legislation.	(+) There are no sites of designated importance for biodiversity or geodiversity within or proximal to the site. Were nationally protected species to be identified on the site, this would be identified through surveys required as sites progressed through the allocations process, and they would be afforded the commensurate protection within the legislation.	(+) There are no sites of designated importance for biodiversity or geodiversity within or proximal to the site. Were nationally protected species to be identified on the site, this would be identified through surveys required as sites progressed through the allocations process, and they would be afforded the commensurate protection within the legislation.	(+) There are no sites of designated importance for biodiversity or geodiversity within or proximal to the site. Were nationally protected species to be identified on the site, this would be identified through surveys required as sites progressed through the allocations process, and they would be afforded the commensurate protection within the legislation.	(+) There are no sites of designated importance for biodiversity or geodiversity within or proximal to the site. Were nationally protected species to be identified on the site, this would be identified through surveys required as sites progressed through the allocations process, and they would be afforded the commensurate protection within the legislation.	(+) There are no sites of designated importance for biodiversity or geodiversity within or proximal to the site. Were nationally protected species to be identified on the site, this would be identified through surveys required as sites progressed through the allocations process, and they would be afforded the commensurate protection within the legislation.
Q5 Would the development provide opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure, including linking in with existing green infrastructure/corridors	<p>Excellent opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors ++</p> <p>Some opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors +</p> <p>No opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors, however the site has the potential to accommodate these –</p> <p>No opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure corridors, however the site does not have the potential to accommodate these --</p>	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that opportunities to retain and enhance green infrastructure cannot be incorporated into the site.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that opportunities to retain and enhance green infrastructure cannot be incorporated into the site.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that opportunities to retain and enhance green infrastructure cannot be incorporated into the site.	(+) Staxton Playing Field and Sports Association have expressed their interest in purchasing this land for the extension of the sports facilities and the existing playing field, but due to the landowners hope value the site is beyond their purchasing capability. Site submitter is prepared to discuss with them. Proposes areas of open space to the west and south of the site	(+) Proposes areas of open space to the west and south of the site	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that opportunities to retain and enhance green infrastructure cannot be incorporated into the site.

Staxton and Willerby Full Sites Selection Methodology

Assessment		69	72	112	177	217	434
Q6 Would the development impact on protected and unprotected trees, hedgerows and ancient woodland?	Positive impact. Enhancement of feature possible and mitigation not required ++				(+) The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer has made the following observations. Site is a field bounded by manicured native hedges to the west and south, open boundary to the north, and residential boundaries to the west. Close to the boundaries of these gardens is a line of mature lime trees protected under a TPO. These trees are highly prominent from Wain's Lane, and through gaps in the street scene around Church Walk. There are no trees within the site. Existing property frontage boundaries along Wain's Lane are very mixed, some hedged, and some picket fenced. The following are suggested landscaping criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain western and southern boundary hedges and supplement the western boundary with new native container-grown trees of minimum 12/14cm stem girth. • Form northern boundary with new native hedge and supplement with container-grown native trees, minimum 12-14cm stem girth. • Allow sufficient separation between existing trees along eastern boundary, and new boundary trees so as not to hinder proper use of gardens and properties. • Provide a good quality landscape throughout the development. Indicative plan indicates retention of trees, hedgerows and additional planting. . 	(+) The southern boundary is formed by a post and rail fence allowing open views of the site from the A64, but viewed against a well-treed back drop to the north by the visual amalgamation of various tree canopies across the land to the north of the site. The western boundary is formed by the eastern curtilage of Willerby Grange. The northern boundary is formed by a manicured hawthorn hedge with the occasional semi-mature native tree. There are no trees or other shrubby vegetation within the site. The following is suggested as landscaping criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide native hedge and screening trees along southern of site, ensuring that layout design allows more adequate separation between trees and properties on maturity in accordance with BS 5837:2012 • Retain northern boundary hedge if appropriate in terms of visibility requirements. • Provide screen planting along western boundary. Indicative scheme shows retention of trees, hedgerows and additional planting. 	
	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 -						

Staxton and Willerby Full Sites Selection Methodology

Assessment		69	72	112	177	217	434
	Significant impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements and effects are unable to be satisfactorily mitigated --						

Staxton and Willerby Full Sites Selection Methodology

Assessment		69	72	112	177	217	434
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>(-) Site straddles the Vale of Pickering and Yorkshire Wolds Landscape Character Areas. The site is a small corner plot, on the entrance to Staxton. It is a visually prominent site which is currently screened by the presence of a mature hedge. The land sweeps gently upwards up the Wolds Escarpment. The site is just below the allocation threshold. It is considered that whilst not harming 'landscape features', the site does offer an attractive entrance to the entrance of the village.</p>	<p>(+) This is the largest site submission in Staxton, and is to the north of twentieth century development. The land is very gently sloping, though there are particular undulations to the south eastern corner of the site. The site extends well out beyond the settlement's linear form, following a field boundary. The site is within the Vale of Pickering Landscape Character Type, and the Local landscape character type is 'Wolds Footslope', which recognises that the land in this area forms part of the Wolds Footslope and is gently sloping. It is considered that there is some capacity to accommodate further development, but not to its fullest extent.</p>	<p>(+) This is the largest site submission in Staxton, and is to the north of twentieth century development. The land is very gently sloping, though there are particular undulations to the south eastern corner of the site. The site extends well out beyond the settlement's linear form, following a field boundary. The site is within the Vale of Pickering Landscape Character Type, and the Local landscape character type is 'Wolds Footslope', which recognises that the land in this area forms part of the Wolds Footslope and is gently sloping. It is considered that there is some capacity to accommodate further development, but not to its fullest extent.</p>	<p>(-) This site is on the western edge of Willerby, on land to the north of the lane. It is within the Vale of Pickering National Character Area, and within the Local Landscape Character Type of the Wolds Footslope. The site is current open, grazing land. The topography is gently sloping towards the north, and rural in character. The land is open in both northwards and southwards aspect. It is considered that the landscape has limited capacity to accommodate development.</p>	<p>(-) This site is on the western edge of Willerby, on land to the south of the lane. It is within the Vale of Pickering National Character Area, and within the Local Landscape Character Type of the Wolds Footslope. The site is current open, grazing land. The topography is gently sloping towards the north, and rural in character. The land is open in both northwards and southwards aspect. It is considered that the landscape has limited capacity to accommodate development.</p>	<p>(-) Site straddles the Vale of Pickering and Yorkshire Wolds Landscape Character Areas. The site is a small corner plot, on the entrance to Staxton. It is a visually prominent site which is currently screened by the presence of a mature hedge. The land sweeps gently upwards up the Wolds Escarpment. The site is just below the allocation threshold. It is considered that whilst not harming 'landscape features', does offer an attractive entrance to the entrance of the village.</p>
Q8. What impact would the site have on the 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>(++) By virtue of the sites location and topography there would be no impact on designated landscapes.</p>	<p>(++) By virtue of the sites location and topography there would be no impact on designated landscapes.</p>	<p>(++) By virtue of the sites location and topography there would be no impact on designated landscapes.</p>	<p>(++) By virtue of the sites location and topography there would be no impact on designated landscapes.</p>	<p>(++) By virtue of the sites location and topography there would be no impact on designated landscapes.</p>	<p>(++) By virtue of the sites location and topography there would be no impact on designated landscapes.</p>
Q10 Is the site capable of utilising existing landscape features to minimise its impact or provide adequate landscape mitigation measures?	<p>Site is capable of retaining and enhancing existing landscape features ++</p> <p>Site is capable of retaining some existing landscape features and limited or no landscape mitigation is required +</p> <p>Site will not retain most existing landscape features, however landscape mitigation is possible –</p> <p>Site will not retain any existing landscape features and limited or no landscape mitigation is possible/proposed –</p>	<p>(--) This site is prominent within the village context, and is screened by the presence of a mature hedge. It provides an attractive setting to the entrance to the village, which would be eroded if the site were to be developed.</p>	<p>(+) Built out in its entirety it would be at a disproportionate scale to the settlement. Given the topography and setting it is considered the site is capable of keeping landscape character features, providing the scale of the site (i.e. the extent to which it extends out into the Vale) is appropriate.</p>	<p>(+) Built out in its entirety it would be at a disproportionate scale to the settlement. Given the topography and setting it is considered the site is capable of keeping landscape character features, providing the scale of the site (i.e. the extent to which it extends out into the Vale) is appropriate.</p>	<p>(-) The site is current open and affords the ability to read the slope of the Wolds (in conjunction with site 217) and provides uninterrupted views into the Vale of Pickering and would perpetuate the linear form of the village, and it is the more distanced of the from the land which rises up to the A64.</p>	<p>(-) The site is adjacent to modern cul-de-sac style development, but is open and rural in character. It is more sloping than the neighbouring site of 177, and considered to be more visually sensitive. This site allows the view of the sweeping of the Wolds, and provides and with site 177 provides the ability to read the slope of the Wolds in conjunction with the Vale of Pickering</p>	<p>(--) This site is prominent within the village context, and is screened by the presence of a mature hedge. It provides an attractive setting to the entrance to the village, which would be eroded if the site were to be developed.</p>

Staxton and Willerby Full Sites Selection Methodology

Assessment		69	72	112	177	217	434
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 ++	(+) Willerby and Staxton are almost fully merged. Willerby is the smaller, hamlet settlement, to the west of Staxton, and only two fields either side of Wains Lane separate the two settlements. Although the parish is Willerby, and it has the Church. This site would not in itself perpetuate coalescence.	(+) Willerby and Staxton are almost fully merged. Willerby is the smaller, hamlet settlement, to the west of Staxton, and only two fields either side of Wains Lane separate the two settlements. Although the parish is Willerby, and it has the Church. This site would not in itself perpetuate coalescence because this site is to the north of Staxton.	(+) Willerby and Staxton are almost fully merged. Willerby is the smaller, hamlet settlement, to the west of Staxton, and only two fields either side of Wains Lane separate the two settlements. Although the parish is Willerby, and it has the Church. This site would not in itself perpetuate coalescence because this site is to the north of Staxton.	(-) Willerby and Staxton are almost fully merged. Willerby is the smaller, hamlet settlement, to the west of Staxton, and only two fields either side of Wains Lane separate the two settlements. This the northern most of those fields, and it is considered that development on either side of the lane would fully erode the established, historic separation of these to villages, which would be contrary to the objectives of the Local Plan Strategy concerning the protection of individual settlement character. Mitigation may be achievable with a reduced site area, which was adjacent to Staxton. Site submissions have shown an area to be retained as open space.	(-) Willerby and Staxton are almost fully merged. Willerby is the smaller, hamlet settlement, to the west of Staxton, and only two fields either side of Wains Lane separate the two settlements. This the southern most of those fields, and it is considered that development on either side of the lane would fully erode the established, historic separation of these to villages, which would be contrary to the objectives of the Local Plan Strategy concerning the protection of individual settlement character. Site submissions have shown an area to be retained as open space.	(+) Willerby and Staxton are almost fully merged. Willerby is the smaller, hamlet settlement, to the west of Staxton, and only two fields either side of Wains Lane separate the two settlements. Although the parish is Willerby, and it has the Church. This site would not in itself perpetuate 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 --						
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 --						

Staxton and Willerby Full Sites Selection Methodology

Assessment		69	72	112	177	217	434
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 ++	(+) Site is within the buffer zone of SM 558 the site of the Hospital Of St. Mary, but not proximal to the site.	(+) Site is within the buffer zone of SM 558 the site of the Hospital Of St. Mary, but not proximal to the site.	(+) The site is within the buffer zone of SM 558 the site of the Hospital Of St. Mary, but is not proximal to the site.	(--) Site is within the buffer zone of SM 558 the site of the Hospital Of St. Mary, but not proximal to the site. The site (and the full site 217) would be enclosing land which affords the setting of the Grade II* Church of St. Peter on the North side of Wains Lane the ability to help identify the Church and ensure that it remains distinct. Residential development would be viewable from the site (as is existing development) but at much closer proximity. It is considered that the full site would harm the setting of the Church. Historic England have advised that as a Grade II* Listed building, as designated assets of the highest significance, and that were the site proposed as an allocation there would need to be an assessment of what contribution this undeveloped area makes to those elements which contribute to the significance of the Church and what effect the loss of this site and its subsequent development might have upon its significance. Information has been submitted which provides an open space buffer to the site, and creates an open verge /Vista. There is no full examination of the significance of the church.	(--) Site is within the buffer zone of SM 558 the site of the Hospital Of St. Mary, but not proximal to the site. The site (and the full site 177) would be enclosing land which affords the setting of the Grade II* Church of St. Peter on the North side of Wains Lane the ability to help identify the Church and ensure that it remains distinct. Residential development would be viewable from the site (as is existing development) but at much closer proximity. It is considered that the full site would harm the setting of the Church. Historic England have advised that as a Grade II* Listed building, as designated assets of the highest significance, and that were the site proposed as an allocation there would need to be an assessment of what contribution this undeveloped area makes to those elements which contribute to the significance of the Church and what effect the loss of this site and its subsequent development might have upon its significance. Information has been submitted which provides an open space buffer to the site, and creates an open verge /Vista. There is no full examination of the significance of the church.	(+) Site is within the buffer zone of SM 558 the site of the Hospital Of St. Mary, but not proximal to the site.
	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 --						

Staxton and Willerby Full Sites Selection Methodology

Assessment		69	72	112	177	217	434
<p>Q13 Will the site affect a non-designated heritage asset which the Council identifies as having a degree of significance that is worthy of consideration?</p>	<p>Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++</p>	<p>(-) Staxton is a broadly linear settlement, which has been much extended over the 20th Century, in the form of a series of cul-de-sacs, with harsh edges. It is on gently sloping land, following the Vale of Pickering contours as the land eventually rises into the Wolds. The A64 is a modern, strongly defining feature. The historic centre of the village is centrally positioned in a dense pattern of frontage development. This site is a small parcel of land which is to the entrance of the village (off the A64 junction) it is a prominent site, and offers a</p>	<p>(-) Staxton is a broadly linear settlement, which has been much extended over the 20th Century, in the form of a series of cul-de-sacs, with harsh edges. It is on gently sloping land, following the Vale of Pickering contours as the land eventually rises into the Wolds. The A64 is a modern, strongly defining feature. The historic centre of the village is centrally positioned in a dense pattern of frontage development. The site is a very substantial site projecting to the north of the settlement. In totality, the site would significantly extend the</p>	<p>(-) Staxton is a broadly linear settlement, which has been much extended over the 20th Century, in the form of a series of cul-de-sacs, with harsh edges. It is on gently sloping land, following the Vale of Pickering contours as the land eventually rises into the Wolds. The A64 is a modern, strongly defining feature. The historic centre of the village is centrally positioned in a dense pattern of frontage development. The site is a very substantial site projecting to the north of the settlement. In totality, the site would significantly extend the</p>	<p>(-) Staxton is a broadly linear settlement, which has been much extended over the 20th Century, in the form of a series of cul-de-sacs, with harsh edges. This form of development has extended into the Parish of Willerby. This site is on one of only two fields (the other being site submission 217) which straddle either side of the lane, and provide a physical buffer between the two settlements. Development of the site in its entirety would significantly erode the individual identity of Willerby. However, part of the site may offer a specific opportunity to improve the physical edge of this part of Staxton. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. NYCC Heritage Unit advises: Site lies in an area of extremely high potential for presence of prehistoric and later burials and associated settlement/activity. Remains of the medieval pottery industry. Would advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching. The Council has been provided with a geophysical survey. This has concluded that there is 'significant archaeological activity' with a series of 'enclosures', sub-enclosures, and features with several clear alignments of anomalies and several different forms and shapes. The complexity and strength and breadth of responses has complicated the interpretation of the data. Would require trial trenching, which has</p>	<p>(-) Staxton is a broadly linear settlement, which has been much extended over the 20th Century, in the form of a series of cul-de-sacs, with harsh edges. This form of development has extended into the Parish of Willerby. This site is on one of only two fields (the other being site submission 177) which straddle either side of the lane, and provide a physical buffer between the two settlements. Development of the site in its entirety would completely erode the individual identity of Willerby, as it is the only field left between the settlements. However, part of the site may offer a specific opportunity to improve the physical edge of this part of Staxton, although the site would be marginally more prominent than 177 due to the modestly raised elevation. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. NYCC Heritage Unit advises: Site lies in an area of extremely high potential for presence of prehistoric and later burials and associated settlement/activity. Would advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching. The Council has been provided with a geophysical survey. This has concluded that there is 'significant archaeological activity' with a series of 'enclosures', sub-enclosures, and features with several clear alignments of anomalies and several different forms and shapes. The complexity and strength and breadth of responses has complicated the interpretation of the data. Would require trial trenching, which has</p>	<p>(-) Staxton is a broadly linear settlement, which has been much extended over the 20th Century, in the form of a series of cul-de-sacs, with harsh edges. It is on gently sloping land, following the Vale of Pickering contours as the land eventually rises into the Wolds. The A64 is a modern, strongly defining feature. The historic centre of the village is centrally positioned in a dense pattern of frontage development. This site is a small parcel of land which is to the entrance of the village (off the A64 junction) it is a prominent site, and offers a visually and physical buffer to development. It provides a backdrop to the War Memorial. It's development would be viewed within the context of existing development. This is an archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. The villages (like many villages along the Foothslopes of the Wolds have existed for multiple centuries and there is a immense archaeological record showing settlement chronology dating back millennia. All sites would need to undertake geophysical surveying in the first instance to establish the archaeological features within this area.</p>
	<p>Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +</p>	<p>visually and physical buffer to development. It provides a backdrop to the War Memorial. It's development would be viewed within the context of existing development. This is an archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. The villages (like many villages along the Foothslopes of the Wolds have existed for multiple centuries and there is a immense archaeological record showing settlement chronology dating back millennia. All sites would need to undertake geophysical surveying in the first instance to establish the archaeological features within this area.</p>	<p>manner. However, the existing northern edge of Staxton is post-world war housing in small cul-de-sacs. The southernmost extent of the site has the capability to be incorporated into the settlement, and read within the context of existing development (subject to landscaping). This is an archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities. NYCC Heritage Unit advises: Site lies in an area of extremely high potential for presence of prehistoric and later burials and associated settlement/activity. Remains of the medieval pottery industry. Would advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching</p>	<p>manner. However, the existing northern edge of Staxton is post-world war housing in small cul-de-sacs. The southernmost extent of the site has the capability to be incorporated into the settlement, and read within the context of existing development (subject to landscaping). This is an archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities. NYCC Heritage Unit advises: Site lies in an area of extremely high potential for presence of prehistoric and later burials and associated settlement/activity. Remains of the medieval pottery industry. Would advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching</p>	<p>prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. NYCC Heritage Unit advises: Site lies in an area of extremely high potential for presence of prehistoric and later burials and associated settlement/activity. Remains of the medieval pottery industry. Would advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching. The Council has been provided with a geophysical survey. This has concluded that there is 'significant archaeological activity' with a series of 'enclosures', sub-enclosures, and features with several clear alignments of anomalies and several different forms and shapes. The complexity and strength and breadth of responses has complicated the interpretation of the data. Would require trial trenching, which has</p>	<p>prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. NYCC Heritage Unit advises: Site lies in an area of extremely high potential for presence of prehistoric and later burials and associated settlement/activity. Would advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching. The Council has been provided with a geophysical survey. This has concluded that there is 'significant archaeological activity' with a series of 'enclosures', sub-enclosures, and features with several clear alignments of anomalies and several different forms and shapes. The complexity and strength and breadth of responses has complicated the interpretation of the data. Would require trial trenching, which has</p>	<p>visually and physical buffer to development. It provides a backdrop to the War Memorial. It's development would be viewed within the context of existing development. This is an archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. The villages (like many villages along the Foothslopes of the Wolds have existed for multiple centuries and there is a immense archaeological record showing settlement chronology dating back millennia. All sites would need to undertake geophysical surveying in the first instance to establish the archaeological features within this area.</p>
	<p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –</p>	<p>visually and physical buffer to development. It provides a backdrop to the War Memorial. It's development would be viewed within the context of existing development. This is an archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. The villages (like many villages along the Foothslopes of the Wolds have existed for multiple centuries and there is a immense archaeological record showing settlement chronology dating back millennia. All sites would need to undertake geophysical surveying in the first instance to establish the archaeological features within this area.</p>	<p>manner. However, the existing northern edge of Staxton is post-world war housing in small cul-de-sacs. The southernmost extent of the site has the capability to be incorporated into the settlement, and read within the context of existing development (subject to landscaping). This is an archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities. NYCC Heritage Unit advises: Site lies in an area of extremely high potential for presence of prehistoric and later burials and associated settlement/activity. Remains of the medieval pottery industry. Would advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching</p>	<p>manner. However, the existing northern edge of Staxton is post-world war housing in small cul-de-sacs. The southernmost extent of the site has the capability to be incorporated into the settlement, and read within the context of existing development (subject to landscaping). This is an archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities. NYCC Heritage Unit advises: Site lies in an area of extremely high potential for presence of prehistoric and later burials and associated settlement/activity. Remains of the medieval pottery industry. Would advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching</p>	<p>prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. NYCC Heritage Unit advises: Site lies in an area of extremely high potential for presence of prehistoric and later burials and associated settlement/activity. Remains of the medieval pottery industry. Would advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching. The Council has been provided with a geophysical survey. This has concluded that there is 'significant archaeological activity' with a series of 'enclosures', sub-enclosures, and features with several clear alignments of anomalies and several different forms and shapes. The complexity and strength and breadth of responses has complicated the interpretation of the data. Would require trial trenching, which has</p>	<p>prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. NYCC Heritage Unit advises: Site lies in an area of extremely high potential for presence of prehistoric and later burials and associated settlement/activity. Would advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching. The Council has been provided with a geophysical survey. This has concluded that there is 'significant archaeological activity' with a series of 'enclosures', sub-enclosures, and features with several clear alignments of anomalies and several different forms and shapes. The complexity and strength and breadth of responses has complicated the interpretation of the data. Would require trial trenching, which has</p>	<p>visually and physical buffer to development. It provides a backdrop to the War Memorial. It's development would be viewed within the context of existing development. This is an archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. The villages (like many villages along the Foothslopes of the Wolds have existed for multiple centuries and there is a immense archaeological record showing settlement chronology dating back millennia. All sites would need to undertake geophysical surveying in the first instance to establish the archaeological features within this area.</p>

Staxton and Willerby Full Sites Selection Methodology

Assessment		69	72	112	177	217	434
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not 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	(-) Significant Archaeology found without evaluation	(-) Significant Archaeology found without evaluation	(-) Subject to archaeological investigation
	Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +						
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible -						
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --						
Low Carbon Development and Renewable Energy							
Q14 Is the site adopting the Energy Hierarchy of the Local Plan Strategy?	Site capable and developer willing ++	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that opportunities to adopt parts, if not all elements, of the Energy Hierarchy of the Local Plan Strategy cannot be incorporated into the site.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that opportunities to adopt parts, if not all elements, of the Energy Hierarchy of the Local Plan Strategy cannot be incorporated into the site.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that opportunities to adopt parts, if not all elements, of the Energy Hierarchy of the Local Plan Strategy cannot be incorporated into the site.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that opportunities to adopt parts, if not all elements, of the Energy Hierarchy of the Local Plan Strategy cannot be incorporated into the site.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that opportunities to adopt parts, if not all elements, of the Energy Hierarchy of the Local Plan Strategy cannot be incorporated into the site.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that opportunities to adopt parts, if not all elements, of the Energy Hierarchy of the Local Plan Strategy cannot be incorporated into the site.
	Site capable but developer unwilling -						
	Site not capable --						
Q15 Is the site capable of linking in or supporting off site renewable energy schemes?	Site capable linking in with off site renewable energy scheme and developer willing to take it forward ++	No such sites have been currently identified.	No such sites have been currently identified.	No such sites have been currently identified.	No such sites have been currently identified.	No such sites have been currently identified.	No such sites have been currently identified.
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 sites have been currently identified.	No such sites have been currently identified.	No such sites have been currently identified.	No such sites have been currently identified.	No such sites have been currently identified.	No such sites have been currently identified.
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

Staxton and Willerby Full Sites Selection Methodology

Assessment		69	72	112	177	217	434
	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 provided, although there is no reason to assume that that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that that this would not be possible.
	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 provided, although there is no reason to assume that that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that that this would not be possible.
	Proposals have investigated waste reduction, however, only limited measures are achievable-						
	No proposals suggested for waste reduction --						

Staxton and Willerby Full Sites Selection Methodology

Assessment		69	72	112	177	217	434
Q. 19 Does the development contain individual/communal recycling facilities/ infrastructure?	Yes + No --	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that that this would not be possible.
F Overall Rating for 'Sustainable Building and Waste Minimisation'	Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development and developer willing ++ Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development but developer unwilling- Site not capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development --	No information 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
Efficient Use of Land							
Q.20 Is the site or any part of the site considered previously developed land?	Site is over 50% to 100% Brownfield ++ Site is up to 50% Brownfield +	0.13ha greenfield. But the there are no sites available in the village to meet housing need.	5.44ha greenfield. But the there are no sites available in the village to meet housing need.	5.44ha greenfield. But the there are no sites available in the village to meet housing need.	0.97ha greenfield. But the there are no sites available in the village to meet housing need.	1.25ha greenfield. But the there are no sites available in the village to meet housing need.	0.13ha greenfield. But the there are no sites available in the village to meet housing need.
Q.21 Can the site achieve an appropriate density to achieve the most efficient use of the land?	Excellent density achieved taking into account location and context ++ Appropriate density achieved taking into account location and context + Lower density proposed as site faces some constraints in its development - Lower density necessary as site faces significant constraints in its development --	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c.2 dwellings.	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c.114 dwellings.	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c.114 dwellings.	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c.20 dwellings.	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c.26 dwellings.	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c.2 dwellings.
Q.22 Would the development of the site lead to the remediation of contaminated land?	Development is located on land which is likely to be highly contaminated and will be remediated ++ Development is located on land which may be contaminated and will be remediated + Development is located on land which may be contaminated and no proposals for remediation have been put forward - Development is located on land which is likely to be highly contaminated no proposals for remediation have been put forward --	No evidence of contamination.	The site is adjacent to a former sewage works, 501640 479451. There is also unknown filled ground (pond, marsh, river, stream) at 501704 479457 and 501669 479325.	The site is adjacent to a former sewage works, 501640 479451. There is also unknown filled ground (pond, marsh, river, stream) at 501704 479457 and 501669 479325.	Within 50-60 metres of the former quarry which is adjacent to site 217.	Site is adjacent to a former quarry, that is now described as an unknown in filled land at 501156 479029. There is an unknown filled ground (pond/marsh/stream) nearby at 500905 479174.	No contaminated land.
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 --	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)

Staxton and Willerby Full Sites Selection Methodology

Assessment		69	72	112	177	217	434
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>	(-) 0.13ha of grade 3 land. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as grade 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The site has not been used for the purposes of agriculture, and is less than 5ha in size.	(-) 5.44ha of grade 3 land. The site is classified as grade 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The site is used for grazing, and is over 5ha, but there is no reason to suggest part of the site may be inappropriate.	(-) 5.44ha of grade 3 land. The site is classified as grade 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The site is used for grazing, and is over 5ha, but there is no reason to suggest part of the site may be inappropriate.	(-) 0.97ha of grade 3 land. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as grade 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The site is used for grazing land, and is less than 5ha in size.	(-) 1.25ha of grade 3 land. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as grade 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The site is used for grazing land, and is less than 5ha in size.	(-) 0.13ha of grade 3 land. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as grade 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The site has not been used for the purposes of agriculture, and is less than 5ha in size.
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>	(-) Site within a mineral safeguarding area, but site is adjacent to built form of the settlement	(-) Site within a mineral safeguarding area, but site is adjacent to built form of the settlement	(-) Site within a mineral safeguarding area, but site is adjacent to built form of the settlement	(-) Site within a mineral safeguarding area, but site is adjacent to built form of the settlement	(-) Site within a mineral safeguarding area, but site is adjacent to built form of the settlement	(-) Site within a mineral safeguarding area, but site is adjacent to built form of 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>	(++)The site is not within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone.	(++)The site is not within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone.	(++)The site is not within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone.	(++)The site is not within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone.	(++)The site is not within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone.	(++)The site is not within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone.
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.	(-)Unknown filled ground (pond, marsh, river, stream) at 501704 479457 and 501669 479325. On sloping sites, specialist geotechnical advice should be sort detailing requirements for stabilisation and foundation design.	(-)Unknown filled ground (pond, marsh, river, stream) at 501704 479457 and 501669 479325. On sloping sites, specialist geotechnical advice should be sort detailing requirements for stabilisation and foundation design.	No evidence that the land is unstable.	(-)Site is adjacent to a former quarry, that is now described as an unknown in filled land at 501156 479029. There is an unknown filled ground (pond/marsh/stream) nearby at 500905 479174. On sloping sites, specialist geotechnical advice should be sort detailing requirements for stabilisation and foundation design.	No evidence that the land is unstable.
Q. 28 Will the site impact on major hazard sites or pipelines?	<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>	(+)	(-)	(-)	(+)	(+)	(-)

Staxton and Willerby Full Sites Selection Methodology

Assessment		69	72	112	177	217	434
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>	<p>(-) The proposed use is unlikely to generate levels of nuisance which would adversely affect existing residents, or there are uses (excepting the A64) which would generate noise which had the potential to harm residential amenity for the new residents. Consideration of this could be considered through noise mitigation measures.</p>	<p>(+) The site is not adjacent to uses which would cause nuisance concerning noise, light, dust and smell.</p>	<p>(+) The site is not adjacent to uses which would cause nuisance concerning noise, light, dust and smell.</p>	<p>(-) The site is not adjacent to uses which would cause nuisance concerning noise, light, dust and smell. The site is adjacent to the cricket pitch, and some form of boundary screening would require consideration. Site submitter proposes screening.</p>	<p>(-) The site is not adjacent to uses which would cause nuisance concerning light, dust and smell. The site is proximal to the A64 and this would need consideration through noise mitigation measures. Site submitter proposes screening.</p>	<p>(-) Retail use, providing a community facility which has the potential to affect residential amenity through noise.</p>
Q. 30 Is the development in an area where other factors are likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to generate forms of nuisance which may affect the amenity of existing users? These may include issues such as privacy, lack of sunlight overbearing effects.	<p>The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +</p> <p>The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -</p> <p>The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --</p>	<p>(+) These types of residential amenity issues can be considered through siting, orientation and window treatments. The surrounding properties are residential in nature.</p>	<p>(+) These types of residential amenity issues can be considered through siting, orientation and window treatments. The surrounding properties are residential in nature.</p>	<p>(+) These types of residential amenity issues can be considered through siting, orientation and window treatments. The surrounding properties are residential in nature.</p>	<p>(+) These types of residential amenity issues can be considered through siting, orientation and window treatments. The surrounding properties are residential in nature.</p>	<p>(+) These types of residential amenity issues can be considered through siting, orientation and window treatments. The surrounding properties are residential in nature.</p>	<p>(-) This is for a retail proposal, therefore the siting will need to consider the amenity of the existing residents.</p>
I Overall Rating for 'Amenity'	<p>The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +</p> <p>The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -</p> <p>The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of this site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --</p>	(-)	(+)	(+)	(-)	(-)	(-)
Flood Risk							
Q. 31 Is the site potentially affected by groundwater flooding?	<p>No ++</p> <p>Yes further investigation required --</p>	<p>(--) Lies within the Zone A of potential groundwater and surface runoff flood risk</p>	<p>(--) Lies within the Zone A of potential groundwater and surface runoff flood risk</p>	<p>(--) Lies within the Zone A of potential groundwater and surface runoff flood risk</p>	<p>(--) Lies within the Zone A of potential groundwater and surface runoff flood risk</p>	<p>(--) Lies within the Zone A of potential groundwater and surface runoff flood risk</p>	<p>(--) Lies within the Zone A of potential groundwater and surface runoff flood risk</p>
Q. 32 Is the site potentially affected by surface water flooding and is this site considered to be within a critical drainage area?	<p>No ++</p> <p>Yes further investigation required --</p>	<p>(--) Lies within the Zone A of potential groundwater and surface runoff flood risk, but not within a critical drainage area. The Environment Agency require that surface water runoff rates are not increased from the site.</p>	<p>(--) Lies within the Zone A of potential groundwater and surface runoff flood risk, but not within a critical drainage area. The Environment Agency require that surface water runoff rates are not increased from the site.</p>	<p>(--) Lies within the Zone A of potential groundwater and surface runoff flood risk, but not within a critical drainage area. The Environment Agency require that surface water runoff rates are not increased from the site.</p>	<p>(--) Lies within the Zone A of potential groundwater and surface runoff flood risk, but not within a critical drainage area. The Environment Agency require that surface water runoff rates are not increased from the site.</p>	<p>(--) Lies within the Zone A of potential groundwater and surface runoff flood risk, but not within a critical drainage area. The Environment Agency require that surface water runoff rates are not increased from the site.</p>	<p>(--) Lies within the Zone A of potential groundwater and surface runoff flood risk, but not within a critical drainage area. The Environment Agency require that surface water runoff rates are not increased from the site.</p>

Staxton and Willerby Full Sites Selection Methodology

Assessment		69	72	112	177	217	434
Q. 33 Is the site potentially affected by sewer flooding?	No ++ Yes further investigation required --	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
Q. 34 Have Sustainable Drainage Systems (SDS) been proposed as part of the development?	Site capable of accommodating SDS and have been proposed as part of the development ++ Site capable of accommodating SDS though no information on whether SDS proposed as part of the development + Site capable of accommodating SDS however SDS not being proposed on site – Site not suitable for accommodating SDS –	No information has been submitted concerning the use of SDS, but no information is submitted which demonstrates that they are not suitable to be used.	No information has been submitted concerning the use of SDS, but no information is submitted which demonstrates that they are not suitable to be used. Environment Agency advises that combined water discharge would be appropriate, and if this is not possible-treatment and attenuation would be required before discharge into a water course. The use of SDSs is advocated.	No information has been submitted concerning the use of SDS, but no information is submitted which demonstrates that they are not suitable to be used. Environment Agency advises that combined water discharge would be appropriate, and if this is not possible-treatment and attenuation would be required before discharge into a water course. The use of SDSs is advocated.	(+) Site submitter indicates the use of SUDs to manage surface water	(+) Site submitter indicates the use of SUDs to manage surface water	No information has been submitted concerning the use of SDS, but no information is submitted which demonstrates that they are not suitable to be used.
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 submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures cannot be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures cannot be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures cannot be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures cannot be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures cannot be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures cannot be implemented.
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 --	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+) Site submitter aware of the need for a FRA	(+) Site submitter aware of the need for a FRA	(+)
People							
Q. 36 Would the development of the site lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of the settlement?	Development incorporates existing use(s), as part of the overall scheme ++ Development proposes relocation of use to suitable alternative location + Development will result in the loss of a valued facility/use and no justification or alternative provided --	(--) The site is not in public use, but the small field, bounded by hedging offers an attractive setting to the village, and a sensitive setting for the war memorial, which is to the immediate north east of the site. Were the site to be developed, the character of this area, and its community value.	The development of this site would not cause the loss of any element of social character or distinctiveness.	The development of this site would not cause the loss of any element of social character or distinctiveness.	(-) Staxton Playing Field and Sports Association have expressed their interest in purchasing this land for the extension of the sports facilities and the existing playing field, but due to the landowners hope value the site is beyond their purchasing capability. Site Submitter is willing to enter into discussion with them	The development of this site would not cause the loss of any element of social character or distinctiveness.	(--) The site is not in public use, but the small field, bounded by hedging offers an attractive setting to the village, and a sensitive setting for the war memorial, which is to the immediate north east of the site. Were the site to be developed, the character of this area, and its community value.
Q. 37 Will the site incorporate the principles of Secured By Design, reducing the potential for crime and discouraging anti-social behaviour?	Yes – SBD principles taken into account or will be taken into account following liaison with North Yorkshire police + No – SBD principles not taken into account -	No information has been 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?	Cycleways and footpaths effectively integrated into the development encouraging walking and cycling ++ Some cycleways and/or footpaths shown encouraging walking and cycling +	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.

Staxton and Willerby Full Sites Selection Methodology

Assessment		69	72	112	177	217	434
	No cycleways and footpaths indicated as part of this development --						

Staxton and Willerby Full Sites Selection Methodology

Assessment		69	72	112	177	217	434
Q. 39 For sites over 1ha or over 80 houses- Has a Travel Plan been produced which assesses alternative options and initiatives?	<p>Travel Plan undertaken and clear implementable initiatives for promoting modal shift set out ++</p> <p>Travel Plan undertaken and some initiatives identified for promoting modal shift +</p> <p>Travel Plan undertaken which identifies limited opportunities for modal shift or Travel Plan not undertaken --</p>	Not required	No information has been 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.	Not required	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.	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 site submitter has said that the site would be for affordable dwellings. Suggesting 4-5 starter homes.	No details have been submitted. But there is no reason to suggest that this would not be achieved on this development within the context of Staxton/Willerby.	No details have been submitted. But there is no reason to suggest that this would not be achieved on this development within the context of Staxton/Willerby.	No details have been submitted. But there is no reason to suggest that this would not be achieved on this development within the context of Staxton/Willerby.	No details have been submitted. But there is no reason to suggest that this would not be achieved on this development within the context of Staxton/Willerby.	The site submitter proposes the site as retail. The precise nature has not been established. Such a proposal would need to be considered through a planning application as it would be allocated (in the service villages).
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>		(-) limited information	(-) limited information	(-) limited information	(-) limited information	
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>	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)	Retail Capacity Study identifies capacity in market towns. If a village shop was proposed this would be considered through a planning application, as no retail allocations proposed.
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>	The site submitter has said that the site would be for affordable dwellings. Suggesting 4-5 starter homes	No information has been provided. Based on a theoretical yield of 114 dwellings, the site would be expected to comply with Policy SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy.	No information has been provided. Based on a theoretical yield of 114 dwellings, the site would be expected to comply with Policy SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy.	(+)No specific information has been provided. Based on a theoretical yield of 20 dwellings, the site would be expected to comply with Policy SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy. Site submitter proposed compliance with SP3.	(+) No specific information has been provided. Based on a theoretical yield of 26 dwellings, the site would be expected to comply with Policy SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy. Site submitter proposed compliance with SP3.	This scheme proposes retail.

Staxton and Willerby Full Sites Selection Methodology

Assessment		69	72	112	177	217	434
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 extra-care units are proposed within the Service Villages, in line with the County Council's delivery strategy for meeting the needs of the Elderly. The site is below the threshold for the delivery of bungalows on site (as per SP4 of the LPS). The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.	No extra-care units are proposed within the Service Villages, in line with the County Council's delivery strategy for meeting the needs of the Elderly. The site is above the threshold for the delivery of bungalows on site (as per SP4 of the LPS). The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.	No extra-care units are proposed within the Service Villages, in line with the County Council's delivery strategy for meeting the needs of the Elderly. The site is above the threshold for the delivery of bungalows on site (as per SP4 of the LPS). The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.	No extra-care units are proposed within the Service Villages, in line with the County Council's delivery strategy for meeting the needs of the Elderly. The site is below the threshold for the delivery of bungalows on site (as per SP4 of the LPS). The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.	No extra-care units are proposed within the Service Villages, in line with the County Council's delivery strategy for meeting the needs of the Elderly. The site is below the threshold for the delivery of bungalows on site (as per SP4 of the LPS). The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.	Retail development
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>	(-) limited information	(-) limited information	(-) limited information	(-) limited information	(-) limited information	(-) retail development
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	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.	Not required	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.	Not required
Q. 46 Is highway mitigation required as part of the development and what is the impact of the development on the highway network following mitigation?	<p>No mitigation required or no impact on the highway following mitigation ++</p> <p>Mitigation required but no unacceptable impact following mitigation +</p> <p>Mitigation required and development would have a significant impact though not unacceptable impact after mitigation –</p> <p>Mitigation required and development would still have an unacceptable impact following mitigation --</p>	Access to site is constrained, and would be likely to involve (as suggested by the site submitter either demolition of a property in their ownership- or a one-way system with the Pub).	(++) The Highways England have confirmed that a scheme of circa 30-50 dwellings, using the existing access (traffic-lighted) would be considered acceptable. If a number of sites are being considered then cumulative impacts would need consideration. As currently submitted this site would require further investigation due to its size.	(++) The Highways England have confirmed that a scheme of circa 30-50 dwellings, using the existing access (traffic-lighted) would be considered acceptable. If a number of sites are being considered then cumulative impacts would need consideration. As currently submitted this site would require further investigation due to its size.	(++) The Highways England have confirmed that a scheme of circa 30-50 dwellings, using the existing access (traffic-lighted) would be considered acceptable. If a number of sites are being considered then cumulative impacts would need consideration. The County Highways Officer has advised: Acceptable onto Willerby Carr Lane, however significant improvements will be required to widen access roads, to meet adoptable standards.	(++) The Highways England have confirmed that a scheme of circa 30-50 dwellings, using the existing access (traffic-lighted) would be considered acceptable. If a number of sites are being considered then cumulative impacts would need consideration. The County Highways Officer has advised: Acceptable onto Willerby Carr Lane, however significant improvements will be required to widen access roads, to meet adoptable standards.	Site has access issues. See 69.
Q. 47 Can the site accommodate adequate parking and servicing facilities?	<p>Site meets highway guidelines for parking and servicing ++</p> <p>Site does not currently meet parking and/or servicing requirements. However these issues can potentially be overcome or mitigated –</p> <p>Site does not meet highway requirements for parking and/or servicing and the issues identified are difficult/not practically possible to overcome --</p>		No information has been provided, but there is no reason that adequate standards could not be achieved.	No information has been provided, but there is no reason that adequate standards could not be achieved.	No information has been provided, but there is no reason that adequate standards could not be achieved.	No information has been provided, but there is no reason that adequate standards could not be achieved.	
Q. 48 Will the proposal provide, enable or improve access to public rights of way (PROW)?	<p>Proposal will create new PROW or integrate existing PROW into the development ++</p> <p>Proposal will not affect a PROW +</p> <p>Proposal would involve the diversion or loss of a PROW --</p>	(+) The site is not proximal to a PROW, although there is a paved public footpath.	(--) The site has a public footpath running through the southern boundary, and across to the western boundary. No details have been submitted as to how the PROW would be treated.	(--) The site has a public footpath running through the southern boundary, and across to the western boundary. No details have been submitted as to how the PROW would be treated.	(+) The site is not adjacent to an PROW	(+) The site is not adjacent to an PROW	(+) The site is not proximal to a PROW, although there is a paved public footpath.

Staxton and Willerby Full Sites Selection Methodology

Assessment		69	72	112	177	217	434
Q. 49 Does the proposal involve new public realm or enhancements to the existing public realm as part of its development?	<p>Proposal will create high quality new public realm or significantly enhance existing public realm as part of its development ++</p> <p>Proposal will create some new public realm or partially enhance existing public realm as part of its development+</p> <p>Though capable of incorporating new or enhancing existing public realm, the proposal makes no provision for it --</p>	No details have been submitted. The site is adjacent to established public realm with the war memorial.	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.	Staxton Playing Field and Sports Association have expressed their interest in purchasing this land for the extension of the sports facilities and the existing playing field, but due to the landowners hope value the site is beyond their purchasing capability.	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.	No details have been submitted. The site is adjacent to established public realm with the war memorial.
Q. 50 What is the capacity of existing utilities and infrastructure to cope with impact of the development?	<p>Site has limited or no adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be fully mitigated ++</p> <p>Site has limited to medium adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be satisfactorily mitigated +</p> <p>Site has medium to high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation –</p> <p>Site has high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation --</p>	<p>Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. No capacity issue concerning water supply. Upgrading of sewerage capacity is required, no capacity. Primary education: additional capacity required. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. Folkton (Serves Staxton/Willerby) waste water treatment works is on its flow consent limit. However, it is due for a full site rebuilding our next Asset Management Plan (known as AMP 6). 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.</p>	<p>Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. No capacity issue concerning water supply. Upgrading of sewerage capacity is required, no capacity. Primary education: additional capacity required. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. Folkton (Serves Staxton/Willerby) waste water treatment works is on its flow consent limit. However, it is due for a full site rebuilding our next Asset Management Plan (known as AMP 6). 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.</p>	<p>Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. No capacity issue concerning water supply. Upgrading of sewerage capacity is required, no capacity. Primary education: additional capacity required. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. Folkton (Serves Staxton/Willerby) waste water treatment works is on its flow consent limit. However, it is due for a full site rebuilding our next Asset Management Plan (known as AMP 6). 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.</p>	<p>Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. No capacity issue concerning water supply. Upgrading of sewerage capacity is required, no capacity. Primary education: additional capacity required. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. Folkton (Serves Staxton/Willerby) waste water treatment works is on its flow consent limit. However, it is due for a full site rebuilding our next Asset Management Plan (known as AMP 6). 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.</p>	<p>Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. No capacity issue concerning water supply. Upgrading of sewerage capacity is required, no capacity. Primary education: additional capacity required. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. Folkton (Serves Staxton/Willerby) waste water treatment works is on its flow consent limit. However, it is due for a full site rebuilding our next Asset Management Plan (known as AMP 6). 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.</p>	<p>Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. No capacity issue concerning water supply. Upgrading of sewerage capacity is required, no capacity. Primary education: additional capacity required. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. Folkton (Serves Staxton/Willerby) waste water treatment works is on its flow consent limit. However, it is due for a full site rebuilding our next Asset Management Plan (known as AMP 6). 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.</p>

Staxton and Willerby Full Sites Selection Methodology

Assessment		69	72	112	177	217	434
Q. 51 What is the impact on Waste Water Treatment Works?	Further than 400m from the boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works ++	(++)	(-) within 250m	(-) within 250m	(++)	(++)	(++)
	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 ++	(++) It is considered that development of this site would not harm an existing community facility.	(++) It is considered that development of this site would not harm an existing community facility.	(++) It is considered that development of this site would not harm an existing community facility.	(-) Staxton Playing Field and Sports Association have expressed their interest in purchasing this land for the extension of the sports facilities and the existing playing field, but due to the landowners hope value the site is beyond their purchasing capability. The site submitter is willing to discuss with the association.	(++) It is considered that development of this site would not harm an existing community facility.	(++) It is considered that development of this site would not harm an existing community facility.
	Site does not have a significant adverse impact on community facilities or where there is a significant adverse impact this is mitigated through the provision of new, expanded or alternative facilities +						
	Site has an adverse impact on community facilities and limited mitigation is indicated -						
	Site has a significant adverse impact on community facilities and no mitigation is indicated --						
M Overall Rating for 'Community facilities, Utilities and Infrastructure'	Site has limited or no adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has a adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be fully mitigated ++	(+) (+)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(+) (+)	(+) (+)
	Site has limited to medium adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be satisfactorily mitigated +						
	Site has medium to high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation -						
	Site has high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation --						
Strong Economy							
Q53. (Town centre uses only) Will the site promote the viability and vitality of the Principal Town or Local Service Centre?	Proposal will support and enhance the vitality and viability of the town centre, encouraging new investment ++	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	The site is below the allocation threshold, a proposal would be considered within the context of providing retail facilities commensurate with a village.
	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 --						

Staxton and Willerby Full Sites Selection Methodology

Assessment		69	72	112	177	217	434
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 uses) 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	No details have been submitted.
	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 ++	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
	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 ++	Subject to archaeological investigation	(++) Category 1 Site in the 2009 SHLAA	(++) Category 1 Site in the 2009 SHLAA	(++) Category 1 Site in the 2009 SHLAA	(++) Category 1 Site in the 2009 SHLAA
	Housing: Category 2 (Developable) +	Employment: Category II +					
	Housing: Category 3 (Not Currently Developable) --	Employment: Category III -					
Q57. Are there any other legal or physical constraints which may affect the ability of the site to come forward?	No constraints identified ++	Subject to archaeological investigation	(-- Land ownership is complex, and agreement cannot be made between all parties	(-- Land ownership is complex, and agreement cannot be made between all parties	(-- Archaeological investigation raised significant archaeology which without further evaluation cannot be ascertained acceptable for development.	(-- Archaeological investigation raised significant archaeology which without further evaluation cannot be ascertained acceptable for development.	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 ++	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	(+ Site submitter indicates that they propose to meet policy SP3	(+ Site submitter indicates that they propose to meet policy SP3	
	Some contributions can be achieved +						
	Limited contributions can be achieved -						
	No contributions can be achieved --						
Q. 59 Can the development support the requirements of the CIL charging schedule?	Yes ++	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	No specific reference is made to the implications of CIL being factored in	No specific reference is made to the implications of CIL being factored in	
	No --						
O Overall Deliverability / Developability Rating	Site is able to come forward without impairment and is able to provide a normal range of contributions ++	No response provided	(-- Land ownership constraint/complexity	(-- Land ownership constraint/complexity	(-- Significant Archaeology found without evaluation	(-- Significant Archaeology found without evaluation	(-- Site submitter has moved away
	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		480	557	591	
Stage 1 - Sift					
Sites 0.15Ha and above	0.15 Ha or greater ++ Less than 0.15 Ha --	(++) 1.31ha	(++) 5.52 ha	(++) 1.05ha	
Check for conformity with Local Plan Strategy, Settlement Hierarchy SP1	Conforms to Local Plan Strategy Spatial Strategy (SP1) ++ Does not meet Local Plan Strategy (Spatial Strategy) SP1 --	(++)	(++)	(++)	
Sites which cause significant harm to national/international nature conservation sites (species or habitat) or would involve substantial harm or loss to designated heritage assets.	Will Not cause harm ++ Will cause harm --	(++) but adjacent to SM	(++) Site is proximal to River Hertford, which is a tributary into the River Derwent SAC.	(++)	
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 not be considered further for built development. Zone 3b, that part of the site will be not be considered further	Is not within Flood Zone 3b ++ Is within Flood Zone 3b --	(++)	(++)	(++)	
Stage 2 - Site Assessment					
Q1A How accessible is the site to key services and facilities	Bus stop	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(+)	(+)	(+)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +			
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -			
		15 minutes walking time and over --			
	Local Shop	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(+)	(++)	(++)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +			
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -			
		15 minutes walking time and over --			
	Nearest Primary School	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(+)	(++)	(++)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +			
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -			
		15 minutes walking time and over --			
Nearest Development Limit	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	
	Up to 10 minutes walking time +				
	Up to 15 minutes walking time -				
	15 minutes walking time and over --				

Assessment		480	557	591
Overall accessibility rating	Site has excellent accessibility ++	(+)	(++)	(++)
	Site has good accessibility +			
	Site has variable accessibility –			
	Site has poor accessibility --			
Q2A What flood zone does the site fall within?	Flood Zone 1++	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Flood Zone 2 +			
	Flood zone 3a –			
Q2B What vulnerability class does the site fall	Flood Zone 1++	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Flood Zone 2			
	Flood Zone 3a			
	Less vulnerable ++			
	More vulnerable +			
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 (NYCC) and Highways England (HE) (where appropriate) initial highway assessment?	Site has no highway issues identified ++	(--)	(++)	(++)
	Site has some highways issues identified which can be mitigated subject to further investigation +			
	Site has multiple highways issues which can be mitigated subject to further investigation -			
	Site has multiple highway issues which may be difficult to mitigate unless further investigation demonstrates otherwise --			

Assessment		480	557	591
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 ++	(+) There are no sites of designated importance for biodiversity or geodiversity within or proximal to the site. Were nationally protected species to be identified on the site, this would be identified through surveys required as sites progressed through the allocations process, and they would be afforded the commensurate protection within the legislation.	(+) There are no sites of designated importance for biodiversity or geodiversity within or proximal to the site. Were nationally protected species to be identified on the site, this would be identified through surveys required as sites progressed through the allocations process, and they would be afforded the commensurate protection within the legislation.	(+) There are no sites of designated importance for biodiversity or geodiversity within or proximal to the site. Were nationally protected species to be identified on the site, this would be identified through surveys required as sites progressed through the allocations process, and they would be afforded the commensurate protection within the legislation.
	Neutral impact – no effect or effect can be fully mitigated +			
	Adverse impact but mitigation possible –			
	Serious impact with limited means of mitigation --			
Q5 Would the development provide opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure, including linking in with existing green infrastructure/corridors	Excellent opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors ++	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that opportunities to retain and enhance green infrastructure cannot be incorporated into the site.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that opportunities to retain and enhance green infrastructure cannot be incorporated into the site.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that opportunities to retain and enhance green infrastructure cannot be incorporated into the site.
	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		480	557	591
Q6 Would the development impact on protected and unprotected trees, hedgerows and ancient woodland?	Positive impact. Enhancement of feature possible and mitigation not required ++	The Council's Tree Officer has made the following observations: The site is formed by two flat rectangular grazing fields directly to the north of Mayfield Villas bounded on three sides by heavily depleted hedges, the southern boundary being formed by the mixed residential garden boundaries of residential properties. The following landscaping criteria were suggested: Retain existing hedged boundaries and instigate management techniques to ensure their enhancement with additional planting and new trees. Retain existing two sycamores within site and include within any new open space area and protect as necessary throughout the development phase. Ensure a good quality of landscaping throughout the development. Retain or divert (within site) the existing section of open space which transverses the south-western corner of the site.		
	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 –			

Assessment		480	557	591
	Significant impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements and effects are unable to be satisfactorily mitigated --			

Assessment		480	557	591
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>	(-) This site is in the Vale of Pickering National Landscape Character Area. It is within the Wolds Foothills local landscape character type. The land is open and flat, and it is considered that, given the curving nature of the A64 that further development of Staxton at this site would be viewed as a 'limb' and not be well related to the physical form of the village, and this would be exacerbated further by the nature and form of the submission.	(+) This is the largest site submission in Staxton, and is to the north of twentieth century development. The land is very gently sloping, though there are particular undulations to the south eastern corner of the site. The site extends well out beyond the settlement's linear form, following a field boundary. The site is within the Vale of Pickering Landscape Character Type, and the Local landscape character type is 'Wolds Foothills', which recognises that the land in this area forms part of the Wolds Foothills and is gently sloping. It is considered that there is some capacity to accommodate further development, but not to its fullest extent.	(-) This site is within the Vale of Pickering National Character Area, and the Local Landscape Character area is 'Wolds Foothills'. The site is on gently sloping land and is sited between a small collection of larger properties with commensurate curtilages and the A64. The site is visually prominent, and will increase the visual presence of Willerby and Staxton when viewed from the south, this presence has been incrementally increasing over time, with many historic properties which face into the Vale, and have their backs to the Wolds.
Q8. What impact would the site have on the 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>	(++) By virtue of the sites location and topography there would be no impact on designated landscapes.	(++) By virtue of the sites location and topography there would be no impact on designated landscapes.	(++) By virtue of the sites location and topography there would be no impact on designated landscapes.
Q10 Is the site capable of utilising existing landscape features to minimise its impact or provide adequate landscape mitigation measures?	<p>Site is capable of retaining and enhancing existing landscape features ++</p> <p>Site is capable of retaining some existing landscape features and limited or no landscape mitigation is required +</p> <p>Site will not retain most existing landscape features, however landscape mitigation is possible –</p> <p>Site will not retain any existing landscape features and limited or no landscape mitigation is possible/proposed –</p>	(-) The land here is flatter, with the land falling sharply away from the road side. It is part of a large open field, it is considered that development on this site would be visually prominent, particularly in its current extent.	(+) Built out in its entirety it would be at a disproportionate scale to the settlement. Given the topography and setting it is considered the site is capable of keeping landscape character features, providing the scale of the site (i.e. the extent to which it extends out into the Vale) is appropriate.	(--) Visually prominent site, to the rear of a collection of substantial properties with commensurate curtilages. Development would be visually prominent, in that the land rises to the A64. This would bring about development in depth in this part of Staxton, which is not concurrent with the established form and character in this part of the village.

Assessment		480	557	591
<p>Q11 Will the site lead to the coalescence of settlements which will impact on their character and setting?</p>	<p>Development within the built form of the settlement ++</p>	<p>(+) Willerby and Staxton are almost fully merged. Willerby is the smaller, hamlet settlement, to the west of Staxton, and only two fields either side of Wains Lane separate the two settlements. Although the parish is Willerby, and it has the Church. This site would not in itself perpetuate coalescence because it is to the eastern extent of Staxton.</p>	<p>(+) Willerby and Staxton are almost fully merged. Willerby is the smaller, hamlet settlement, to the west of Staxton, and only two fields either side of Wains Lane separate the two settlements. Although the parish is Willerby, and it has the Church. This site would not in itself perpetuate coalescence because this site is to the north of Staxton.</p>	<p>(-) Willerby and Staxton are almost fully merged. Willerby is the smaller, hamlet settlement, to the west of Staxton, and only two fields either side of Wains Lane separate the two settlements. Although the parish is Willerby, and it has the Church. This site would not in itself perpetuate coalescence because this site is to the south of Staxton, but it would create a concentration of development to the south-west of the village, and be visually prominent</p>
	<p>Development is on the edge of a settlement which is not affected by coalescence with another settlement +</p>			
	<p>Development is on the edge of the settlement and will lead to coalescence with another settlement however mitigation possible –</p>			
	<p>Development is on the edge of the settlement and will lead to significant coalescence with another settlement and limited/no mitigation possible --</p>			
<p>C Overall Rating for 'Special Qualities, Landscape and Setting'</p>	<p>Positive impact – the proposal will retain and enhance the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement ++</p>	<p>(-)</p>	<p>(+)</p>	<p>(--)</p>
	<p>Neutral impact – the proposal will not have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement +</p>			
	<p>Negative impact – the proposal will have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement, however mitigation is possible –</p>			
	<p>Significant impact – the proposal will have a significant adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement and limited or no mitigation is possible --</p>			

Assessment		480	557	591
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 ++	(-) Site is immediately adjacent to the SM 558 the site of the Hospital Of St. Mary. The setting, and archaeological context of this site will require further consideration. Site lies in an area of extremely high potential for presence of prehistoric and later burials and associated settlement/activity as the wider area along the southern edge of the Vale of Pickering is known for a corridor of almost continuous settlement and activity from early prehistory through to the medieval period between the 25-45m contour zone. This village is also known for remains of the medieval pottery industry having been found here, including pottery kilns. Would advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching to clarify the nature and significance of any archaeological remains.	(+ Site is within the buffer zone of SM 558 the site of the Hospital Of St. Mary, but not proximal to the site.	(+ Site is within the buffer zone of SM 558 the site of the Hospital Of St. Mary, but not proximal to the site.
	Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +			
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –			
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --			

Assessment		480	557	591
<p>Q13 Will the site affect a non-designated heritage asset which the Council identifies as having a degree of significance that is worthy of consideration?</p>	<p>Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++</p>	<p>(--) Staxton is a broadly linear settlement, which has been much extended over the 20th Century, in the form of a series of cul-de-sacs, with harsh edges. It is on gently sloping land, following the Vale of Pickering contours as the land eventually rises into the Wolds. The A64 is a modern, strongly defining feature. The historic centre of the village is centrally positioned in a dense pattern of frontage development. This site is to the far eastern end of the settlement, which would be a continuation of established form. However, the site has considerable depth, and would be extending well beyond the existing built form of the settlement as a discordant limb. This is an archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. The villages (like many villages along the Foothills of the Wolds have existed for multiple centuries and there is a immense archaeological record showing settlement chronology dating back millennia. All sites would need to undertake geophysical surveying in the first instance to establish the archaeological features within this area.</p>	<p>(-) Staxton is a broadly linear settlement, which has been much extended over the 20th Century, in the form of a series of cul-de-sacs, with harsh edges. It is on gently sloping land, following the Vale of Pickering contours as the land eventually rises into the Wolds. The A64 is a modern, strongly defining feature. The historic centre of the village is centrally positioned in a dense pattern of frontage development. The site is a very substantial site projecting to the north of the settlement. In totality, the site would significantly extend the village in a disproportionate manner. However, the existing northern edge of Staxton is post-world war housing in small cul-de-sacs. The southernmost extent of the site has the capability to be incorporated into the settlement, and read within the context of existing development (subject to landscaping). This is an archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities. NYCC Heritage Unit advises: Site lies in an area of extremely high potential for presence of prehistoric and later burials and associated settlement/activity. Remains of the medieval pottery industry. Would advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching</p>	<p>(--) Staxton is a broadly linear settlement, which has been much extended over the 20th Century, in the form of a series of cul-de-sacs, with harsh edges. It is on gently sloping land, following the Vale of Pickering contours as the land eventually rises into the Wolds. The A64 is a modern, strongly defining feature. The historic centre of the village is centrally positioned in a dense pattern of frontage development. Other historic development is to the south west, in the form of a small collection of buildings of status (the Vicarage amongst others), with commensurate curtilages. They are offset from the A64, by a parcel of gently rising land which includes this site submission, which would extend the village, in and behind these properties, right up to the boundary with the A64. It is considered that this development would detract from the character of this part of Staxton, and harming the wider views achieved of the Wolds from the settlement. This is an archaeologically Sensitive Area. Historic England have prepared a Statement of Significance to demonstrate the unique qualities of the Vale of Pickering, particularly in terms of its rich archaeological heritage. NYCC Heritage Unit advise: Site lies in an area of extremely high potential for presence of prehistoric and later burials and associated settlement/activity as the wider area along the southern edge of the Vale of Pickering is known for a corridor of almost continuous settlement and activity from early prehistory through to the medieval period between the 25-45m contour zone. This village is also known for remains of the medieval pottery industry having been found here, including pottery</p>
	<p>Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +</p>			
	<p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –</p>			

Assessment		480	557	591
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --			Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible -- kilns. Would advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching to clarify the nature and significance of any archaeological remains.
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
	Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +			
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible -			
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --			
Low Carbon Development and Renewable Energy				
Q14 Is the site adopting the Energy Hierarchy of the Local Plan Strategy?	Site capable and developer willing ++	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that opportunities to adopt parts, if not all elements, of the Energy Hierarchy of the Local Plan Strategy cannot be incorporated into the site.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that opportunities to adopt parts, if not all elements, of the Energy Hierarchy of the Local Plan Strategy cannot be incorporated into the site.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that opportunities to adopt parts, if not all elements, of the Energy Hierarchy of the Local Plan Strategy cannot be incorporated into the site.
	Site capable but developer unwilling -			
	Site not capable --			
Q15 Is the site capable of linking in or supporting off site renewable energy schemes?	Site capable linking in with off site renewable energy scheme and developer willing to take it forward ++	No such sites have been currently identified.	No such sites have been currently identified.	No such sites have been currently identified.
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 sites have been currently identified.	No such sites have been currently identified.	No such sites have been currently identified.
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

Assessment		480	557	591
	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 provided, although there is no reason to assume that that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that that this would not be possible.
	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 provided, although there is no reason to assume that that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that that this would not be possible.
	Proposals have investigated waste reduction, however, only limited measures are achievable-			
	No proposals suggested for waste reduction --			

Assessment		480	557	591
Q. 19 Does the development contain individual/communal recycling facilities/ infrastructure?	Yes + No --	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that that this would not be possible.	No information has been provided, although there is no reason to assume that that this would not be possible.
F Overall Rating for 'Sustainable Building and Waste Minimisation'	Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development and developer willing ++ Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development but developer unwilling - Site not capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development --	No information at this stage	No information at this stage	No information at this stage
Efficient Use of Land				
Q.20 Is the site or any part of the site considered previously developed land?	Site is over 50% to 100% Brownfield ++ Site is up to 50% Brownfield +	1.31ha greenfield. But the there are no sites available in the village to meet housing need.	5.52ha greenfield. But the there are no sites available in the village to meet housing need.	1.05ha greenfield. But the there are no sites available in the village to meet housing need.
Q.21 Can the site achieve an appropriate density to achieve the most efficient use of the land?	Excellent density achieved taking into account location and context ++ Appropriate density achieved taking into account location and context + Lower density proposed as site faces some constraints in its development - Lower density necessary as site faces significant constraints in its development --	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c.27 dwellings.	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c.114 dwellings.	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c.22 dwellings.
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 --	Land is not contaminated. The site is 100m of a licensed sand quarry, which has an Environment Agency Permit.	The site is adjacent to a former sewage works, 501640 479451. There is also unknown filled ground (pond, marsh, river, stream) at 501704 479457 and 501669 479325.	Within 50-60 metres of the former quarry which is adjacent to site 217.
G Overall Rating for 'Efficient Use of Land'	Site represents very efficient use of land with mitigation to fully overcome concerns where necessary ++ Site represents efficient use of land but further mitigation required to fully overcome concerns where necessary + Site does not represent efficient use of land. Further investigation of mitigation measures to overcome concerns required - Site does not represent efficient use of land and mitigation is not possible --	(+)	(+)	(+)

Assessment		480	557	591
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 ++	(-) 1.31ha of grade 3 land. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as grade 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The site is used for grazing land, and is less than 5ha in size.	(-) 5.52ha of grade 3 land. The site is classified as grade 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The site is used for grazing, and is over 5ha, but there is no reason to suggest part of the site may be inappropriate.	(-) 1.05ha of grade 3 land. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as grade 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The site is used for grazing land, and is less than 5ha in size.
	Up to 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost -			
	More than 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost --			
Q. 24 Would the development lead to the sterilisation of mineral resources?	Site not within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search, or Mineral Consultation Zone ++?	(-) Site within a mineral safeguarding area, but site is adjacent to built form of the settlement	(-) Site within a mineral safeguarding area, but site is adjacent to built form of the settlement	(-) Site within a mineral safeguarding area, but site is adjacent to built form of the settlement
	Site within the buffer of a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone -?			
	Site within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone --			
Q. 25 Would the development have an adverse impact on a Groundwater Source Protection Zone?	Development is not located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone ++	(++)The site is not within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone.	(++)The site is not within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone.	(++)The site is not within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone.
	Development is located in a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but mitigation is possible to reduce the risk of groundwater pollution risk +			
	Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but no risk assessment has been undertaken -			
	Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone and mitigation of the risk of groundwater pollution is not possible --			
Q. 27 Is any part of the development on suspected unstable land?	Land has no instability concerns ++	No evidence that the land is unstable. Site is within 100m of a quarry. On sloping sites, specialist geotechnical advice should be sort detailing requirements for stabilisation and foundation design.	(-) Unknown filled ground (pond, marsh, river, stream) at 501704 479457 and 501669 479325. On sloping sites, specialist geotechnical advice should be sort detailing requirements for stabilisation and foundation design.	(-) Within 50-60 metres of the former quarry which is adjacent to site 217. 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 --			

Assessment		480	557	591
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>	<p>(-) The site is not adjacent to uses which would cause nuisance concerning light, dust and smell. The A64 will require consideration concerning noise. The A64 is adjacent to the site, and although it is single carriageway cars of this intensity will make significant noise (and the means to mitigate will significantly reduce the developable area).</p>	<p>(+) The site is not adjacent to uses which would cause nuisance concerning noise, light, dust and smell.</p>	<p>(--) The site is not adjacent to uses which would cause nuisance concerning light, dust and smell. The A64 is adjacent to the site, and although it is single carriageway cars of this intensity will make significant noise (and the means to mitigate will significantly reduce the developable area).</p>
Q. 30 Is the development in an area where other factors are likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to generate forms of nuisance which may affect the amenity of existing users? These may include issues such as privacy, lack of sunlight overbearing effects.	<p>The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +</p> <p>The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -</p> <p>The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --</p>	<p>(+) These types of residential amenity issues can be considered through siting, orientation and window treatments. The surrounding properties are residential in nature.</p>	<p>(+) These types of residential amenity issues can be considered through siting, orientation and window treatments. The surrounding properties are residential in nature.</p>	<p>(+) These types of residential amenity issues can be considered through siting, orientation and window treatments. The surrounding properties are residential in nature.</p>
I Overall Rating for 'Amenity'	<p>The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +</p> <p>The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -</p> <p>The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of this site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --</p>	(--)	(+)	(--)
Flood Risk				
Q. 31 Is the site potentially affected by groundwater flooding?	<p>No ++</p> <p>Yes further investigation required --</p>	<p>(--) Lies within the Zone A of potential groundwater and surface runoff flood risk</p>	<p>(--) Lies within the Zone A of potential groundwater and surface runoff flood risk</p>	<p>(--) Lies within the Zone A of potential groundwater and surface runoff flood risk</p>
Q. 32 Is the site potentially affected by surface water flooding and is this site considered to be within a critical drainage area?	<p>No ++</p> <p>Yes further investigation required --</p>	<p>(--) Lies within the Zone A of potential groundwater and surface runoff flood risk, but not within a critical drainage area. The Environment Agency require that surface water runoff rates are not increased from the site.</p>	<p>(--) Lies within the Zone A of potential groundwater and surface runoff flood risk, but not within a critical drainage area. The Environment Agency require that surface water runoff rates are not increased from the site.</p>	<p>(--) Lies within the Zone A of potential groundwater and surface runoff flood risk, but not within a critical drainage area. The Environment Agency require that surface water runoff rates are not increased from the site.</p>

Assessment		480	557	591
Q. 33 Is the site potentially affected by sewer flooding?	No ++ Yes further investigation required --	(++)	(++)	(++)
Q. 34 Have Sustainable Drainage Systems (SDS) been proposed as part of the development?	Site capable of accommodating SDS and have been proposed as part of the development ++ Site capable of accommodating SDS though no information on whether SDS proposed as part of the development + Site capable of accommodating SDS however SDS not being proposed on site – Site not suitable for accommodating SDS –	No information has been submitted concerning the use of SDS, but no information is submitted which demonstrates that they are not suitable to be used.	No information has been submitted concerning the use of SDS, but no information is submitted which demonstrates that they are not suitable to be used. Environment Agency advises that combined water discharge would be appropriate, and if this is not possible-treatment and attenuation would be required before discharge into a water course. The use of SDSs is advocated.	No information has been submitted concerning the use of SDS, but no information is submitted which demonstrates that they are not suitable to be used.
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 submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures cannot be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures cannot be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures cannot be implemented.
J Overall Rating for 'Flood Risk'	No flood risk associated with the site ++ Limited flood risk associated with the site which can be fully mitigated + Site affected by a number of flood risk issues, however mitigation possible- Site affected by significant flood risk issues and limited mitigation possible --	(+)	(+)	(+)
People				
Q. 36 Would the development of the site lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of the settlement?	Development incorporates existing use(s), as part of the overall scheme ++ Development proposes relocation of use to suitable alternative location + Development will result in the loss of a valued facility/use and no justification or alternative provided --	The development of this site would not cause the loss of any element of social character or distinctiveness.	The development of this site would not cause the loss of any element of social character or distinctiveness.	The development of this site would not cause the loss of any element of social character or distinctiveness.
Q. 37 Will the site incorporate the principles of Secured By Design, reducing the potential for crime and discouraging anti-social behaviour?	Yes – SBD principles taken into account or will be taken into account following liaison with North Yorkshire police + No – SBD principles not taken into account -	No information has been 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?	Cycleways and footpaths effectively integrated into the development encouraging walking and cycling ++ Some cycleways and/or footpaths shown encouraging walking and cycling +	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.

Assessment		480	557	591
	No cycleways and footpaths indicated as part of this development --			

Assessment		480	557	591
Q. 39 For sites over 1ha or over 80 houses- Has a Travel Plan been produced which assesses alternative options and initiatives?	Travel Plan undertaken and clear implementable initiatives for promoting modal shift set out ++	No 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.
	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 precise details have been submitted. The site submitter has suggested a mixed scheme. But there is no reason to suggest that this would not be achieved on this development within the context of Staxton/Willerby.	No details have been submitted. But there is no reason to suggest that this would not be achieved on this development within the context of Staxton/Willerby.	Site submitter refers to residential including affordable housing. No precise details have been submitted. But there is no reason to suggest that this would not be achieved on this development within the context of Staxton/Willerby.
	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 ++	(-) limited information	(-) limited information	(-) limited information
	Development has taken into account the need to develop sustainable communities +			
	Development has little regard to the need to develop sustainable communities -			
	Development has no regard for the need to develop sustainable communities --			
Meeting needs				
Q.41 Does the type and mix of development proposed meet the needs identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), Employment Land Review Update 2010 (ELR), Ryedale Retail Capacity Studies (RRCS) and Malton Town Centre Strategy?	Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Wolds Rillington and Sherburn' area of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 34 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 5. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 0 dwellings. (12 dwellings were completed)
	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 ++	Site submitter refers to mixed housing. Based on a theoretical yield of 27 dwellings, the site would be expected to comply with Policy SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy.	No information has been provided. Based on a theoretical yield of 114 dwellings, the site would be expected to comply with Policy SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy.	Site submitter refers to residential including affordable housing. Based on a theoretical yield of 22 dwellings, the site would be expected to comply with Policy SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy.
	Development offers some affordable housing which meets some of the need as set out in the SHMA +			
	Development does not offer the appropriate level and type of affordable housing or does not meet the need for affordable housing as set out in the SHMA -			
	The development makes no provision for affordable housing --			

Assessment		480	557	591
Q. 43 What provision has been made for Ryedale's elderly population?	Development addresses and meets the needs of Ryedale's elderly population ++	No extra-care units are proposed within the Service Villages, in line with the County Council's delivery strategy for meeting the needs of the Elderly. The site is below the threshold for the delivery of bungalows on site (as per SP4 of the LPS). The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.	No extra-care units are proposed within the Service Villages, in line with the County Council's delivery strategy for meeting the needs of the Elderly. The site is above the threshold for the delivery of bungalows on site (as per SP4 of the LPS). The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.	No extra-care units are proposed within the Service Villages, in line with the County Council's delivery strategy for meeting the needs of the Elderly. The site is below the threshold for the delivery of bungalows on site (as per SP4 of the LPS). 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 ++	(-) limited information	(-) limited information	(-) limited information
	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 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- 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 ++	(-- The Highways England have confirmed that a scheme of circa 30-50 dwellings, using the existing access (traffic-lighted) would be considered acceptable. If a number of sites are being considered then cumulative impacts would need consideration. The County Highways Officer has advised: this site has no direct connection/frontage to a highway maintainable at the public expense.	(++) The Highways England have confirmed that a scheme of circa 30-50 dwellings, using the existing access (traffic-lighted) would be considered acceptable. If a number of sites are being considered then cumulative impacts would need consideration. As currently submitted this site would require further investigation due to its size.	(++) The Highways England have confirmed that a scheme of circa 30-50 dwellings, using the existing access (traffic-lighted) would be considered acceptable. If a number of sites are being considered then cumulative impacts would need consideration. As currently submitted this site would require further investigation due to its size.
	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 ++	(-- unlikely given the access concerns identified	No information has been provided, but there is no reason that adequate standards could not be achieved.	No information has been provided, but there is no reason that adequate standards could not be achieved.
	Site does not currently meet parking and/or servicing requirements. However these issues can potentially be overcome or mitigated -			
	Site does not meet highway requirements for parking and/or servicing and the issues identified are difficult/not practically possible to overcome --			
Q. 48 Will the proposal provide, enable or improve access to public rights of way (PROW)?	Proposal will create new PROW or integrate existing PROW into the development ++	(+) The site is not adjacent to an PROW	(-- The site has a public footpath running through the southern boundary, and across to the western boundary. No details have been submitted as to how the PROW would be treated.	(+) The site is not adjacent to an PROW
	Proposal will not affect a PROW +			
	Proposal would involve the diversion or loss of a PROW --			

Assessment		480	557	591
Q. 49 Does the proposal involve new public realm or enhancements to the existing public realm as part of its development?	<p>Proposal will create high quality new public realm or significantly enhance existing public realm as part of its development ++</p> <p>Proposal will create some new public realm or partially enhance existing public realm as part of its development+</p> <p>Though capable of incorporating new or enhancing existing public realm, the proposal makes no provision for it --</p>	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.	No information has been provided although there is no reason to assume that it would not be possible.
Q. 50 What is the capacity of existing utilities and infrastructure to cope with impact of the development?	<p>Site has limited or no adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be fully mitigated ++</p> <p>Site has limited to medium adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be satisfactorily mitigated +</p> <p>Site has medium to high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation –</p> <p>Site has high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation --</p>	<p>Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. No capacity issue concerning water supply. Upgrading of sewerage capacity is required, no capacity. Primary education: additional capacity required. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. Folkton (Serves Staxton/Willerby) waste water treatment works is on its flow consent limit. However, it is due for a full site rebuilding our next Asset Management Plan (known as AMP 6). 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.</p>	<p>Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. No capacity issue concerning water supply. Upgrading of sewerage capacity is required, no capacity. Primary education: additional capacity required. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. Folkton (Serves Staxton/Willerby) waste water treatment works is on its flow consent limit. However, it is due for a full site rebuilding our next Asset Management Plan (known as AMP 6). 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.</p>	<p>Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. No capacity issue concerning water supply. Upgrading of sewerage capacity is required, no capacity. Primary education: additional capacity required. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. Folkton (Serves Staxton/Willerby) waste water treatment works is on its flow consent limit. However, it is due for a full site rebuilding our next Asset Management Plan (known as AMP 6). 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.</p>

Assessment		480	557	591
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	(-) within 250m	(++)
	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 ++	(++) It is considered that development of this site would not harm an existing community facility.	(++) It is considered that development of this site would not harm an existing community facility.	(++) It is considered that development of this site would not harm an existing community facility.
	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 ++	(--) due to access concerns	(-)	(+)
	Site has limited to medium adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be satisfactorily mitigated +			
	Site has medium to high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation -			
	Site has high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation --			
Strong Economy				
Q53. (Town centre uses only) Will the site promote the viability and vitality of the Principal Town or Local Service Centre?	Proposal will support and enhance the vitality and viability of the town centre, encouraging new investment ++	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 --			

Assessment		480	557	591
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
	Mix of uses proposed will not diversify the economy but will support existing employment sectors in Ryedale +			
Q. 55 (Employment retail uses) Does the proposal involve the creation of net additional or net loss of jobs in Ryedale?	Up to 250 net jobs created ++	NA	NA	NA
	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 ++	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
	Proposal will have a positive impact on the economy +			
	Proposal will have a negative impact on the economy -			
	Proposal will have a significant negative impact on the economy --			

Stage 3 - Deliverability / Developability

Q56. How does the site perform against the SHLAA Update (housing), ELR Update (employment) and RRCS (retail) in terms of its ability to come forward and its suitability for development?	Housing: Category 1 (Deliverable)++	Employment: Category I ++	Not considered in the 2009 SHLAA	(++) Category 1 Site in the 2009 SHLAA	Not considered in the 2009 SHLAA
	Housing: Category 2 (Developable) +	Employment: Category II +			
	Housing: Category 3 (Not Currently Developable) --	Employment: Category III -			
Q57. Are there any other legal or physical constraints which may affect the ability of the site to come forward?	No constraints identified ++		(--) Despite the landowner's desire to have the site developed there are unresolved issues concerning a safe access which is capable of being achieved based on the road configuration and land ownership uncertainties.	(--) Land ownership is complex, and agreement cannot be made between all parties	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 ++		(+) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	Unknown	(+) 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.	Unknown	(++) 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 ++		(--) Highly unlikely that a safe access can be achieved.	(--) Land ownership constraint/complexity	(+)
	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 --				