Minerals and Waste Joint Plan

Initial Screening of Submitted Sites and Areas

October 2016

City of York Council
North York Moors National Park Authority
North Yorkshire County Council

Introduction

1.1 The sites and areas assessment methodology developed to support preparation of the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan indicates that sites under consideration for development would be subject to initial screening. The purpose of this initial screening was to help to identity any major matters which mean that a site or area was likely to be fundamentally unsuitable for development for the intended use/s and therefore not suitable to take forward for more detailed assessment.

1.2 To assist with this, high level screening criteria were developed. Land submitted for consideration for allocation in the Plan was considered against these criteria, leading to an initial judgement on whether it should go forward for further assessment.

1.3 The following tables set out the results of this initial screening process. In a number of cases some uncertainty about suitability was indicated. These included circumstances where the land in question was located in the North York Moors National Park or an AONB, taking into account the national policy constraints on major development in such designated areas; and where there was a lack of clarity about the presence of suitable minerals resources in the land. In practice the very high level nature of the initial screening criteria meant and the difficulty of establishing a definitive position on range of matters, taking into account availability of information at this stage in the process, resulted in no areas of land being excluded from further consideration at this stage.

Initial Screening- Mineral sites

Ref	Site	MINERALS	Tonnage proposed	Is the land / Site likely to contain a viable resource of mineral, the extraction of which could contribute to future requirements for minerals (including whether the site provides a contribution to future requirements for minerals supply in line with needs expected to be identified in the Plan[1])	Is the land/Site likely to be available[2] for the intended form of development within the relevant time period?	Are there any major infrastructure constraints (e.g. absence of potential access to the land/site) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any major human population constraints such that the development type proposed is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any overriding major environmental constraints (this will include that the site is within an area designated as an SPA, SAC or Ramsar site, within Groundwater Protection Zone 1 or an area of functional flood plain[3]) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Should the Site progress to Step 2 of the Assessment Methodology (include justification)?
MJP04	**Aram Grange**, Asenby (Blair)	Sand and gravel	Unknown at present	BGS[4] glacial sand and gravel resource - indicated[5] (Polygon 131) and a Category A[6] deposit. **Conclusion: Yes, likely viable resource**	Submitted by landowner. Start date not specified, but no current evidence to suggest unlikely to be available. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Access would be from one of two potential points on Whaites Lane (C87 @230m east of slip-road or @470m south of Poplar Hill), but no evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. Part of site crossed by high pressure gas pipeline. No other major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: Potential major constraint (gas pipeline)**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	No known major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
MJP05	**Lawrence House Farm**, Scotton (Jeffries)	Sand and gravel	2,900,000	BGS[4] glacial sand and gravel resource - indicated[5] (Polygon 119) and a Category B[7] deposit. **Conclusion: Yes, likely viable resource**	Submitted on behalf of landowner. Start date about 2016, with 5 year life. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Access onto High Moor Lane (U2792) & thence to A61, but no evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	No known major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
MJP06	**Langwith Hall Farm,** east of Well	Sand and gravel	2,000,000	BGS[4] part of site in glacial sand and gravel resource - indicated[5] (Polygon 172) and Category A[6] deposit, but Appendix 2.4[4] suggests that some of the site is outside the resource area. Submitter states proven through site investigation (details available in planning application NY/2011/0242/ENV). **Conclusion: Yes, likely viable resource**	Submitted by developer of adjoining land. Landowners support the submission. Lifespan proposed of 4-5 years. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Existing plant site. Access on to B6267. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	Includes an area of Flood Zone 3. However, sand and gravel working is defined as water-compatible development[9]. No known major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
MJP07	**Oaklands**, Well	Sand and gravel	2,528,927 (if Ings Goit not diverted) 3,602,720 (if Ings Goit diverted)	BGS[4] part of site in glacial sand and gravel resource - indicated[5] (Polygon 172) and Category A[6] deposit, but Appendix 2.4[4] suggests that some of the site is outside the resource area. Submitter states proven through site investigation (details supplied in December 2012). **Conclusion: Yes, likely viable resource**	Submitted by developer of adjoining land. Landowners support the submission. Proposed to follow MJP06 Langwith area **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be**	Existing plant site. Access on to B6267. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	Includes an area of Flood Zone 3. However, sand and gravel working is defined as water-compatible development[9]). No known major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions

Ref	Site	MINERALS	Tonnage proposed	Is the land / Site likely to contain a viable resource of mineral, the extraction of which could contribute to future requirements for minerals (including whether the site provides a contribution to future requirements for minerals supply in line with needs expected to be identified in the Plan[1])	Is the land/Site likely to be available[2] for the intended form of development within the relevant time period?	Are there any major infrastructure constraints (e.g. absence of potential access to the land/site) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any major human population constraints such that the development type proposed is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any overriding major environmental constraints (this will include that the site is within an area designated as an SPA, SAC or Ramsar site, within Groundwater Protection Zone 1 or an area of functional flood plain[3]) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Should the Site progress to Step 2 of the Assessment Methodology (include justification)?
					available in time period				
MJP14	**Ripon Quarry**, North Stainley	Sand and gravel	5,460,000	BGS[4] river terrace deposit - inferred[8] (Polygon 66) and a Category A[6] deposit. Adjacent are sub-alluvial deposits - indicated[5] (Polygon 72). **Conclusion: Yes, likely viable resource**	Submitted by developer of adjoining land. Planning application for part of site submitted (so landowner aware through application process). Lifespan 10-20 years depending on output. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Existing plant site. Access on to A6108. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. High pressure gas pipeline. No other major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: Potential major constraint (gas pipeline)**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	Includes an area of Flood Zone 3. However, sand and gravel working is defined as water-compatible development[9]). No known major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
MJP16	**Marfield Quarry**, Masham	Sand and gravel	4,000,000	BGS[4]: glacial sand and gravel resource - indicated[5] (Polygon 45) and a Category A[6] deposit. **Conclusion: Yes, likely viable resource**	Submitted by developer of neighbouring quarry. Planning application awaiting determination (so landowner aware through application process). Approximately 17 years including completion of existing reserves **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Existing plant site. Access on to A6108. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	Includes an area of Flood Zone 3. However, sand and gravel working is defined as water-compatible development[9]). No known major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
MJP17	**Land to South of Catterick**	Sand and gravel	4,200,000	BGS[4] glacial sand and gravel resource indicated[5] (Polygons 51 and 59) and Category A[6] and B[7] deposits respectively. **Conclusion: Yes, likely viable resource**	Submitted by potential developer as a replacement for closing Kiplin site. Landowners support the submission. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Access is unspecified, but no evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	Includes a small area of Flood Zone 3. However, sand and gravel working is defined as water-compatible development[9]). No known major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
MJP18	**Rushwood Hall**,East	Sand and gravel	**Not assessed**, as site submission was withdrawn prior to the commencement of the initial screening process						

Ref	Site	MINERALS	Tonnage proposed	Is the land / Site likely to contain a viable resource of mineral, the extraction of which could contribute to future requirements for minerals (including whether the site provides a contribution to future requirements for minerals supply in line with needs expected to be identified in the Plan[1])	Is the land/Site likely to be available[2] for the intended form of development within the relevant time period?	Are there any major infrastructure constraints (e.g. absence of potential access to the land/site) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any major human population constraints such that the development type proposed is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any overriding major environmental constraints (this will include that the site is within an area designated as an SPA, SAC or Ramsar site, within Groundwater Protection Zone 1 or an area of functional flood plain[3]) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Should the Site progress to Step 2 of the Assessment Methodology (include justification)?
	Tanfield								
MJP19	**Chapel Hill**, Thornborough	Sand and gravel	**Not assessed**, as site submission was withdrawn prior to the commencement of the initial screening process						
MJP20	**Baldersby Park**, Topcliffe	Sand and gravel	**Not assessed**, as site submission was withdrawn prior to the commencement of the initial screening process						
MJP21	Land at **Killerby**	Sand and gravel	11,370,000	BGS[4] areas of glacial sand and gravel – indicated[5] (Polygon 59), river terrace deposits – inferred[8] (Polygon 58) and sub-alluvial deposits – indicated[5] (Polygon 60) and area includes Categories A[6] and B[7]. **Conclusion: Yes, likely viable resource**	Submitted by potential developer Planning application awaiting determination (so landowner aware through application process). Life of 16 years from commencement. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Access proposed onto existing A1. Construction work on A1(M) Leeming to Barton improvement commenced. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	Includes an area of Flood Zone 3. However, sand and gravel working is defined as water-compatible development[9]). No known major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
MJP22	**Hensall Quarry**	Sand and gravel	800,000	BGS[4] does not indicate a resource. Submitter states the evidence for the resource is based on experience of operating the current quarry immediately adjacent to this proposal (where the resource is 9 metres in depth). **Conclusion: Yes, based on existence of adjacent active site**	Submitted by developer of adjacent quarry. Landowner believed to be supportive in principle. Proposed start in 2025 and lasting 16 years. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Existing adjacent plant site and access via C Class road to A645. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	Includes an area of Flood Zone 3. However, sand and gravel working is defined as water-compatible development[9]). No known major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
MJP30	**West Heslerton Quarry**, West Heslerton	Sand and gravel	30,000	BGS[4] glacial sand and gravel resource – inferred[8] (Polygon 31) and in Category A[6]. **Conclusion: Yes, likely viable resource**	Submitted by landowner/ developer of adjacent quarry. Start in 2021 **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Existing adjacent plant site and access on to A64. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	No known major environmental constraints **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
MJP33	**Home Farm**, Kirkby Fleetham	Sand and gravel	5,000,000	BGS[4] sub-alluvial deposit resource – indicated[5] (Polygon 60) and is Category A[6]. **Conclusion: Yes, likely viable resource**	Submitted by potential developer. Landowners support the submission. Proposed to last approximately 17	Proposed access on B6271 via crossing of Swale. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage.	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major**	Includes an area of Flood Zone 3. However, sand and gravel working is defined as water-compatible development[9]). No known major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions

Ref	Site	MINERALS	Tonnage proposed	Is the land / Site likely to contain a viable resource of mineral, the extraction of which could contribute to future requirements for minerals (including whether the site provides a contribution to future requirements for minerals supply in line with needs expected to be identified in the Plan[1])	Is the land/Site likely to be available[2] for the intended form of development within the relevant time period?	Are there any major infrastructure constraints (e.g. absence of potential access to the land/site) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any major human population constraints such that the development type proposed is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any overriding major environmental constraints (this will include that the site is within an area designated as an SPA, SAC or Ramsar site, within Groundwater Protection Zone 1 or an area of functional flood plain[3]) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Should the Site progress to Step 2 of the Assessment Methodology (include justification)?
					years and no evidence to suggest unlikely to be available. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	**Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	**population constraints**		
MJP35	**Ruddings Farm**, Walshford	Sand and gravel	2,100,000	BGS[4] shows mostly outside glacial sand and gravel resource – indicated[5] (Polygon 112 in Category A[6]). No additional evidence supplied by submitter following request in 2012. **Conclusion: Doubt about resource based on BGS information and lack of alternative evidence supplied.**	Submitted on behalf of landowner. Start date not specified, but no evidence to suggest unlikely to be available. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Area split in two by A1(M), but no evidence at this stage to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	Includes an area of Flood Zone 3. However, sand and gravel working is defined as water-compatible development[9]). No known major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions but lack of resource information adds uncertainty on suitability to progress further
MJP37	**Moor Lane Farm**, Great Ouseburn	Sand and gravel	2,000,000	BGS[4] shows mostly in glacial sand and gravel resource – indicated[5] (Polygon 174) and a Category B[8] deposit. No additional evidence supplied by submitter following request in 2012. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be some viable resource based on BGS information**	Submitted on behalf of landowner. Start date not specified, but no evidence to suggest unlikely to be available. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Bridleway access to A168 or B6265. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. Site crossed by high pressure gas pipeline. No other major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: Potential major constraint (gas pipeline)**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	No known major environmental constraints **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
MJP38	**Mill Cottages Field**, Wath Road, West Tanfield	Sand and gravel	500,000	BGS[4] information shows: partly in river terrace deposits resource – inferred[8] (Polygon 66) with a small part in a glacial sand and gravel resource – indicated[5] (Polygon 172) and it is mostly in Category A[6]. No additional evidence supplied by submitter following request in 2012. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be some viable resource**	Submitted on behalf of landowner. Start date not specified, but no evidence to suggest unlikely to be available. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	C class road access to A6108, but no evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	Includes an area of Flood Zone 3. However, sand and gravel working is defined as water-compatible development[9]). No known major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
MJP39	**Quarry House**, West Tanfield	Sand and gravel	1,000,000	BGS[4] information shows: is mostly outside, but adjacent to, a river terrace resource – inferred[8] (Polygon 65) which is Category A[6]. No additional evidence supplied by submitter following request in 2012. **Conclusion: Doubt about**	Submitted on behalf of landowner. Start date not specified, but no evidence to suggest unlikely to be available. **Conclusion: Yes,**	Access onto A6108, but no evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population**	Includes an area of Flood Zone 3. However, sand and gravel working is defined as water-compatible development[9]). No known major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions but lack of resource information adds

Ref	Site	MINERALS	Tonnage proposed	Is the land / Site likely to contain a viable resource of mineral, the extraction of which could contribute to future requirements for minerals (including whether the site provides a contribution to future requirements for minerals supply in line with needs expected to be identified in the Plan[1])	Is the land/Site likely to be available[2] for the intended form of development within the relevant time period?	Are there any major infrastructure constraints (e.g. absence of potential access to the land/site) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any major human population constraints such that the development type proposed is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any overriding major environmental constraints (this will include that the site is within an area designated as an SPA, SAC or Ramsar site, within Groundwater Protection Zone 1 or an area of functional flood plain[3]) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Should the Site progress to Step 2 of the Assessment Methodology (include justification)?
				resource based on BGS information and lack of alternative evidence supplied.	**likely to be available in time period**	**constraints**	**constraints**		uncertainty on suitability to progress further
MJP40	**Lawrence House Farm**, Scotton (Middlethorpe Estates Ltd)	Sand and gravel	**Not assessed**, as site submission was withdrawn prior to the commencement of the initial screening process						
MJP41	**Scalibar Farm**, Knaresborough	Sand and gravel	2,000,000	BGS[4] information shows: sub-alluvial deposit – indicated[5] (Polygon 34) and is a Category B[7] deposit. **Conclusion: Yes, likely viable resource**	Submitted on behalf of landowner. Start date not specified, but no evidence to suggest unlikely to be available. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Access onto B6164 and no evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. Site crossed by high voltage powerline. No other major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: Potential major constraint (electricity powerline)**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	Includes an area of Flood Zone 3. However, sand and gravel working is defined as water-compatible development[9]). No known major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
MJP42	**Aram Grange**, Asenby (Middlethorpe Estates Ltd)	Sand and gravel	**Not assessed**, as site submission was withdrawn prior to the commencement of the initial screening process						
MJP43	Land to west of **Scruton**	Sand and gravel	6,500,000 to 8,000,000	BGS[4] information shows: parts have glacial sand and gravel indicated[5] (Polygons 53 & 59), sub-alluvial deposits – indicated[5] or river terrace deposits inferred[8] (Polygon 58) but other parts have no resource. The site includes both Categories A[6] and B[7] deposits. Submitter supplied borehole information (confidential). **Conclusion: Yes, likely viable resource**	Submitted on behalf of landowners. Planning application for part of site (2 year lifespan) awaiting determination. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Access is unspecified but would involve C class roads to A684 or A1. Part of site crossed by high pressure gas pipeline. No other major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: Potential major constraint (gas pipeline)**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	No known major environmental constraints **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
MJP44	Land between Great **Heck and Pollington Airfield**	Sand and gravel	900,000	BGS[4] information does not indicate a resource in that area. History of former workings in immediate vicinity as the adjacent Plasmor block works is in base of a former sand quarry (more than 5 metres deep). **Conclusion:** Doubt about resource based on BGS information, but quarry face clearly shows evidence of the resource **so yes, likely viable resource.**	Submitted on behalf of landowner/6evelop ed. Start in 5 years; 22 year lifespan. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Access via C class road to A645. Material to be used in adjacent block making plant which is also linked to railway. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	No known major environmental constraints **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions

Ref	Site	MINERALS	Tonnage proposed	Is the land / Site likely to contain a viable resource of mineral, the extraction of which could contribute to future requirements for minerals (including whether the site provides a contribution to future requirements for minerals supply in line with needs expected to be identified in the Plan[1])	Is the land/Site likely to be available[2] for the intended form of development within the relevant time period?	Are there any major infrastructure constraints (e.g. absence of potential access to the land/site) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any major human population constraints such that the development type proposed is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any overriding major environmental constraints (this will include that the site is within an area designated as an SPA, SAC or Ramsar site, within Groundwater Protection Zone 1 or an area of functional flood plain[3]) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Should the Site progress to Step 2 of the Assessment Methodology (include justification)?
MJP47	**Bridge Farm**, Catterick	Sand and gravel	**Not assessed**, as site submission was withdrawn prior to the commencement of the initial screening process						
MJP48	**Upsland**, near Kirklington	Sand and gravel	**Not assessed**, as site submission was withdrawn prior to the commencement of the initial screening process						
MJP49	**Metes Lane**, Seamer	Sand and gravel	2,000,000	BGS[4] information shows: partly in glacial sand and gravel – inferred[8] (Polygon 31) and is in a Category A[6] deposit. **Conclusion: Yes, likely some viable resource**	Submitted by landowner. Start date not specified, but no evidence to suggest unlikely to be available. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Access is via Herdborough Farm from A64. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	Includes an area of Flood Zone 3. However, sand and gravel working is defined as water-compatible development[9]). Part is in a Groundwater source protection Zone 1. **Conclusion: Potential major constraint (groundwater protection) over part of site**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
MJP50	**Sands Wood**, Sandy Lane, Wintringham	Sand and gravel	Unknown	BGS[4] information shows: glacial sand and gravel – inferred[8] (Polygon 31) and Category A[6] deposit. **Conclusion: Yes, likely viable resource**	Submitted on behalf of landowner. Start date not specified, but no evidence to suggest unlikely to be available. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Access is unspecified but potentially via C class road (Sandy Lane) on to A64. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	No known major environmental constraints on site. **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
MJP51	**Great Givendale**, Ripon	Sand and gravel	500,000	BGS[4] information shows: sub-alluvial deposit indicated[8] (Polygon 72) and is a Category A[6] deposit. **Conclusion: Yes, likely viable resource**	Submitted by landowner. Start once extraction at Ripon City Quarry ceases (about 2020) **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Access is unspecified but potentially via C class road to B6265. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	Includes an area of Flood Zone 3. However, sand and gravel working is defined as water-compatible development[9]). Part is in a Groundwater source protection Zone 1. **Conclusion: Potential major constraint (groundwater protection) over part of site**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
MJP54	**Mill Balk Quarry**, Great Heck	Sand and gravel	70,000	BGS[4] information shows: glacial sand and gravel resource – inferred[8]. BGS not assessed relative to Categories A & B. **Conclusion: Yes, likely viable resource**	Submitted on behalf of landowner. Extraction to be part of existing operation for 29 years **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Existing infrastructure and existing access via C Class roads to A19. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	Includes an area of Flood Zone 3. However, sand and gravel working is defined as water-compatible development[9]). Part is in a Groundwater source protection Zone 1. **Conclusion: Potential major constraint (groundwater protection) over part of site**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
MJP60	Land to **west of Kirkby**	Sand and gravel	5,000,000	BGS[4] information shows: parts have river terrace deposits	Submitted on behalf of	Access to be via C Class Roads to A1. No evidence to suggest	Site is not within or adjacent to a	No known major environmental constraints on site.	**Yes,** when considered

Ref	Site	MINERALS	Tonnage proposed	Is the land / Site likely to contain a viable resource of mineral, the extraction of which could contribute to future requirements for minerals (including whether the site provides a contribution to future requirements for minerals supply in line with needs expected to be identified in the Plan[1])	Is the land/Site likely to be available[2] for the intended form of development within the relevant time period?	Are there any major infrastructure constraints (e.g. absence of potential access to the land/site) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any major human population constraints such that the development type proposed is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any overriding major environmental constraints (this will include that the site is within an area designated as an SPA, SAC or Ramsar site, within Groundwater Protection Zone 1 or an area of functional flood plain[3]) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Should the Site progress to Step 2 of the Assessment Methodology (include justification)?
	Fleetham			inferred[8] (Polygon 58) or sub-alluvial deposit indicated[8] (Polygon 60) but other parts have no resource. The site includes both Categories A[6] and B[7] deposits. **Conclusion: Yes, likely viable resource**:	landowner. Start prior to 2020. Estimated life of 20 years. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	**Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	against conclusions to other questions
MJP62	Land at **Toft Hill, near Kiplin**	Sand and gravel	500,000	BGS[4] river terrace deposit - inferred[8] (Polygon 57) and is a Category A[6] deposit. **Conclusion: Yes, likely viable resource**	Submitted by potential developer. Landowners support the submission. Start 2015-16. Estimated life of 8-10 years. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Access to be onto unclassified road with options for transport of as-raised material being by road (B6271) or by conveyor or via an off-road haul route to Kiplin Haul Plant site (MJP46), or to another location with existing processing facilities. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	Includes an area of Flood Zone 3. However, sand and gravel working is defined as water-compatible development[9]). No known major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
MJP03	**Scarborough Field**, adjacent to Forcett Quarry	Carboniferous limestone	3,000,000	BGS[10] information shows: within a Carboniferous limestone resource. **Conclusion: Yes, likely viable resource**	Submitted on behalf of landowner. Estimated life of 10-20 years **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Existing access via C class road to A66. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	No known major environmental constraints **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
MJP08	**Settrington Quarry**	Jurassic limestone	3,000,000	BGS[10] information shows: within a Jurassic limestone resource. **Conclusion: Yes, likely viable resource**	Submitted on behalf of developer. Landowner supports the submission. Start date 2015; lifespan 25-30 years **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Existing access via C class roads. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	No known major environmental constraints **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
MJP12	**Whitewall Quarry**, near Norton	Jurassic limestone	3,751,922	BGS[10] information shows: within a Jurassic limestone resource. **Conclusion: Yes, likely viable resource**	Submitted on behalf of landowner / developer. Start date prior to 2023;	Access via C class roads. Existing quarry infrastructure. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population	No known major environmental constraints **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to

Ref	Site	MINERALS	Tonnage proposed	Is the land / Site likely to contain a viable resource of mineral, the extraction of which could contribute to future requirements for minerals (including whether the site provides a contribution to future requirements for minerals supply in line with needs expected to be identified in the Plan[1])	Is the land/Site likely to be available[2] for the intended form of development within the relevant time period?	Are there any major infrastructure constraints (e.g. absence of potential access to the land/site) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any major human population constraints such that the development type proposed is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any overriding major environmental constraints (this will include that the site is within an area designated as an SPA, SAC or Ramsar site, within Groundwater Protection Zone 1 or an area of functional flood plain[3]) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Should the Site progress to Step 2 of the Assessment Methodology (include justification)?
					lifespan not specified. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**		other questions
MJP59	**Spikers Quarry**, East Ayton	Jurassic limestone	2,900,000	BGS[11] information shows: within a Jurassic limestone resource. **Conclusion: Yes, likely viable resource**	Submitted on behalf of landowner / developer. Start date; lifespan of 15 years **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	C class road to A170. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	In National Park, and part in Groundwater source protection Zone 1. No other major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: Potential major constraints (National Park and groundwater protection)**	**Yes,** location within National Park and national policy presumption against major development in such areas, and against the allocation of sites, as well as policy requirement to maintain landbanks for aggregate outside such areas where practicable, may be overriding constraint but further assessment of this still required
MJP64	**Cropton Quarry**, Cropton	Jurassic limestone	1,800,000	BGS[11] information shows: within a Jurassic limestone resource. **Conclusion: Yes, likely viable resource**	Submitted on behalf of developer. Landowner supports the submission. Start date by 2020; lifespan 10 years **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Access via C class road onto A170. No evidence at initial screening to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	No known major environmental constraints **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
MJP10	**Potgate Quarry**, North Stainley	Magnesian limestone	5,200,000	BGS[10] information shows: within a Magnesian limestone resource. **Conclusion: Yes, likely viable resource**	Submitted on behalf of developer. Landowner supports the submission. Start once extraction in current Musterfield	Existing quarry infrastructure and existing access onto A6108. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major**	No known major environmental constraints **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions

Ref	Site	MINERALS	Tonnage proposed	Is the land / Site likely to contain a viable resource of mineral, the extraction of which could contribute to future requirements for minerals (including whether the site provides a contribution to future requirements for minerals supply in line with needs expected to be identified in the Plan[1])	Is the land/Site likely to be available[2] for the intended form of development within the relevant time period?	Are there any major infrastructure constraints (e.g. absence of potential access to the land/site) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any major human population constraints such that the development type proposed is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any overriding major environmental constraints (this will include that the site is within an area designated as an SPA, SAC or Ramsar site, within Groundwater Protection Zone 1 or an area of functional flood plain[3]) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Should the Site progress to Step 2 of the Assessment Methodology (include justification)?
					application completed; 17 year lifespan. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	**constraints**	**population constraints**		
MJP11	**Gebdykes Quarry**, near Masham	Magnesian limestone	2,000,000	BGS[10] information shows: within a Magnesian limestone resource. **Conclusion: Yes, likely viable resource**	Submitted on behalf of developer. Landowner supports the submission. Start date of 2025-30; lifespan not specified **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period but limited contribution likely given proposed start date**	Access on B6268 and existing quarry infrastructure. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	No known major environmental constraints **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
MJP23	**Jackdaw Crag Quarry**, Stutton	Magnesian limestone	Not yet quantified	BGS[10] information shows: within a Magnesian limestone resource. **Conclusion: Yes, likely viable resource**	Submitted on behalf of developer. Developer owns part of sites but remaining landowner position not confirmed by developer. Start date depends on determination of application for southern extension (10 year proposed life), as would follow that area and would last 10 years. **Conclusion: uncertainty about landowner support for parts of west & east extension**	C Class road to A64 and existing quarry infrastructure No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. Site adjacent to high pressure gas pipeline and crossed by high voltage powerline. No other major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: Potential major constraint (gas pipeline and powerline)**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	In Groundwater source protection Zone 1. No other major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: Potential major constraint (groundwater protection)**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
MJP25	**Lumby**, south-west of South Milford	Magnesian limestone	**Not assessed**, as site submission was withdrawn prior to the commencement of the initial screening process						
MJP28	**Barnsdale Bar**, near Kirk	Magnesian limestone	1,960,000	BGS[10] information shows: within a Magnesian limestone resource.	Submitted on behalf of developer.	Access to A1 via C class road & existing quarry infrastructure.	Site is not within or adjacent to a	No known major environmental constraints **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major**	**Yes,** when considered

Ref	Site	MINERALS	Tonnage proposed	Is the land / Site likely to contain a viable resource of mineral, the extraction of which could contribute to future requirements for minerals (including whether the site provides a contribution to future requirements for minerals supply in line with needs expected to be identified in the Plan[1])	Is the land/Site likely to be available[2] for the intended form of development within the relevant time period?	Are there any major infrastructure constraints (e.g. absence of potential access to the land/site) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any major human population constraints such that the development type proposed is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any overriding major environmental constraints (this will include that the site is within an area designated as an SPA, SAC or Ramsar site, within Groundwater Protection Zone 1 or an area of functional flood plain[3]) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Should the Site progress to Step 2 of the Assessment Methodology (include justification)?
	Smeaton			**Conclusion: Yes, likely viable resource**	Developer uncertain of north-west extension landowner position. Start date in 2015, north area 4 years, and north-west 6 years lifespan. **Conclusion: uncertainty about landowner support for northwest extension**	No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	**environmental constraints**	against conclusions to other questions
MJP29	**Went Edge Quarry**, near Kirk Smeaton	Magnesian limestone	4,300,000	BGS[10] information shows: within a Magnesian limestone resource. **Conclusion: Yes, likely viable resource**	Submitted on behalf of landowner / developer. Start in 2016; lifespan of 10 years. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Access to A1 via C class road & existing quarry infrastructure. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	No known major environmental constraints **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
MJP31	**Old London Road Quarry**, Stutton	Magnesian limestone	2,500,000	BGS[10] information shows: within a Magnesian limestone resource. **Conclusion: Yes, likely viable resource**	Submitted on behalf of landowner. Start in 2014; 20 year lifespan. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Access to C class road. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. Part of site crossed by high pressure gas pipeline. No other major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: Potential major constraint (gas pipeline)**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	No known major environmental constraints **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
MJP53	Land to north of **Old London Road Quarry**, Stutton	Magnesian limestone	5,000,000	BGS[10] information shows: within a Magnesian limestone resource. **Conclusion: Yes, likely viable resource**	Submitted on behalf of landowner. Start in 2014/15, for 20 years. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Access to C class road. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. Part of site crossed by high pressure gas pipeline. No other major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: Potential major constraint (gas pipeline)**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	In Groundwater source protection Zone 1. No other major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: Potential major constraint (groundwater protection)**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
MJP56	**Brotherton Quarry**, Burton Salmon	Magnesian limestone	600,000-700,000 (previously permitted)	BGS[10] information shows: within a Magnesian limestone resource. Land subject of previous planning permission	Submitted by developer. Landowner supports the	Existing access onto A162 and existing quarry infrastructure. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population	No known major environmental constraints **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to

Ref	Site	MINERALS	Tonnage proposed	Is the land / Site likely to contain a viable resource of mineral, the extraction of which could contribute to future requirements for minerals (including whether the site provides a contribution to future requirements for minerals supply in line with needs expected to be identified in the Plan[1])	Is the land/Site likely to be available[2] for the intended form of development within the relevant time period?	Are there any major infrastructure constraints (e.g. absence of potential access to the land/site) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any major human population constraints such that the development type proposed is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any overriding major environmental constraints (this will include that the site is within an area designated as an SPA, SAC or Ramsar site, within Groundwater Protection Zone 1 or an area of functional flood plain[3]) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Should the Site progress to Step 2 of the Assessment Methodology (include justification)?
				Conclusion: Yes, likely viable resource	submission. Start in 2014, for 6 years. **Conclusion: Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**		other questions
MJP01	**Grey Yaud Quarry**, East Witton	Sandstone	**Not assessed**, as received planning permission and site submission was withdrawn prior to the commencement of the initial screening process						
MJP32	**Barsneb Wood Quarry,** Markington	Sandstone	1,000,000	BGS[10] information shows: no Sandstone resource in the area. Submitter refers to evidence of existing face in 'quarry disused' on site and borehole information. **Conclusion: Doubt about resource based on BGS information and lack of alternative evidence supplied. Seeking clarification from submitter.**	Submitted on behalf of landowner. Start in 2014, for 16 years. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	C class road access. Evidence from pre-application discussions in 2008 of Highway Authority concern with access. No other major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: Potential major constraint (access)**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	No known major environmental constraints **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions but lack of confirmation of potential resource information adds uncertainty on suitability to progress further
MJP15	**Blubberhouses Quarry**, west of Harrogate	Silica Sand	4,050,000	BGS[10] information shows: within a Carboniferous silica sand resource. **Conclusion: Yes, likely viable resource**	Submitted by developer / landowner. Retention of permission application submitted; might re-open within next 20 years. **Conclusion: Yes, may potentially become available in time period but limited contribution given time of estimated start date**	Existing C class road access to A59. No other infrastructure currently on site. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No other major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	In Nidderdale AONB and adjacent to North Pennine Moors SPA & SAC. **Conclusion: Potential major constraints (**SPA, SAC and in AONB)	**Yes** location within AONB and national policy presumption against major development in such areas, as well as policy requirement to maintain landbanks outside such areas where practicable may be overriding constraint but further consideration of this still required taking into account national significance of silica sand resources
MJP63	**Brows Quarry**,	Building Stone	37,500	BGS[10] information shows: within a	Submitted on	Access onto B1248. No	Site is not within	No known major environmental constraints	**Yes,** when

Ref	Site	MINERALS	Tonnage proposed	Is the land / Site likely to contain a viable resource of mineral, the extraction of which could contribute to future requirements for minerals (including whether the site provides a contribution to future requirements for minerals supply in line with needs expected to be identified in the Plan[1])	Is the land/Site likely to be available[2] for the intended form of development within the relevant time period?	Are there any major infrastructure constraints (e.g. absence of potential access to the land/site) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any major human population constraints such that the development type proposed is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any overriding major environmental constraints (this will include that the site is within an area designated as an SPA, SAC or Ramsar site, within Groundwater Protection Zone 1 or an area of functional flood plain[3]) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Should the Site progress to Step 2 of the Assessment Methodology (include justification)?
	Malton			Building stone resource. **Conclusion: Yes, likely viable resource**	behalf of landowner. Start date 2015. Lifespan of 25 years **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No other major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: Site located in close proximity to Malton but, no apparent major population constraints identified at initial screening**	**Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	considered against conclusions to other questions
MJP45	Land to north of **Hemingbrough**	Clay	1,800,000	BGS[10] information shows: within a Brick Clay resource. **Conclusion: Yes, likely viable resource**	Submitted on behalf of developer. Landowner supports the submission. Start when current reserves exhausted (4-5 years), lifespan 9-12 years. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Direct access to A63 and existing quarry infrastructure. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No other major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	No known major environmental constraints **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
MJP52	Field to north of **Duttons Farm, Upper Poppleton**	Clay	200,000	BGS[12] information shows: within a Brick Clay resource proposed for safeguarding. **Conclusion: Yes, likely viable resource**	Submitted on behalf of landowner. Lifespan of 5-10 years. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	C Class road to A59. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No other major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	In Flood Zone 3. No other known major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: Potential major constraint (flooding)**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
MJP55	Land adjacent to former **Escrick** brickworks	Clay	5,000,000	BGS[10] information shows: within a Brick Clay resource. **Conclusion: Yes, likely viable resource**	Submitted on behalf of landowner / developer. Start when Hemingbrough reserves exhausted (see MJP45), 25 years additional life **Conclusion: Yes, may potentially become available in time period but**	Direct access to A19. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No other major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	No known major environmental constraints **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions

Ref	Site	MINERALS	Tonnage proposed	Is the land / Site likely to contain a viable resource of mineral, the extraction of which could contribute to future requirements for minerals (including whether the site provides a contribution to future requirements for minerals supply in line with needs expected to be identified in the Plan[1])	Is the land/Site likely to be available[2] for the intended form of development within the relevant time period?	Are there any major infrastructure constraints (e.g. absence of potential access to the land/site) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any major human population constraints such that the development type proposed is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any overriding major environmental constraints (this will include that the site is within an area designated as an SPA, SAC or Ramsar site, within Groundwater Protection Zone 1 or an area of functional flood plain[3]) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Should the Site progress to Step 2 of the Assessment Methodology (include justification)?
					limited contribution given likely start date				
MJP61	Land to south of **Alne Brickworks**	Clay	700,000	BGS[10] information shows: within a Brick Clay resource. **Conclusion: Yes, likely viable resource**	Submitted on behalf of developer. Landowner supports the submission. Start in about 2017. Lifespan of 23 years. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Direct access to existing brickworks. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No other major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	No known major environmental constraints **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
MJP34	Land between **Sandsend** and **Scarborough**	Potash	250,000,000	BGS[10 and 11] information confirm the presence of an underground potash resource. **Conclusion: Yes, likely viable resource.** However, the Issues and Options document states that it is not appropriate to consider allocating land for potash extraction. If this stance is maintained at Preferred Options stage there should be no need to assess the submission further.	Submitted by developer. Start date 2014-2016, for in excess of 50 years. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Mine entrance proposed in North York Moors National Park (possibly in vicinity of Sneaton Low Moor) with an underground conveyor link to a processing plant in Teesside. No other major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Underground working and no evidence of major human population constraints such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	Part of land in North York Moors National Park, partly in North York Moors SAC and SPA sites. No other known major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: Potential major constraints (National Park, SAC, SPA)**	**Yes** location within National Park and national policy presumption against major development in such areas, as well as national policy position which does not support identification of allocations in National Parks may be over-riding constraint but further consideration of this still required taking into account national significance of potash resources
MJP02	Land between East Coast Main line at **Heck and Pollington**	Coal	10,500,000	BGS[10] information confirms the presence of an underground coal resource. **Conclusion: Yes, likely viable resource**	Submitted by developer. Current workings in adjacent area due to expire in 2018. Lifespan 5 years **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time**	Existing colliery facility and access onto A645. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No other major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure**	Underground working and no evidence of major human population constraints such that the development is unlikely to be	Part of site in Flood Zone 3. No other known major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: Potential major constraint (flooding) across part of site**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions

Ref	Site	MINERALS	Tonnage proposed	Is the land / Site likely to contain a viable resource of mineral, the extraction of which could contribute to future requirements for minerals (including whether the site provides a contribution to future requirements for minerals supply in line with needs expected to be identified in the Plan[1])	Is the land/Site likely to be available[2] for the intended form of development within the relevant time period?	Are there any major infrastructure constraints (e.g. absence of potential access to the land/site) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any major human population constraints such that the development type proposed is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any overriding major environmental constraints (this will include that the site is within an area designated as an SPA, SAC or Ramsar site, within Groundwater Protection Zone 1 or an area of functional flood plain[3]) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Should the Site progress to Step 2 of the Assessment Methodology (include justification)?
					period	**constraints**	deliverable **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**		

Footnotes
[1] As part of the Joint Plan preparation process evidence has been gathered on the minerals resources within the plan area via a series of topic papers. These are published at [www.northyorks.gov.uk/mwevidence]. The Plan will identify those minerals for which it will be necessary / appropriate to allocate sites.
[2] As a minimum there needs to be general landowner support for the development and there are no known physical or other reasons why the site could not be brought forward for development for the intended purpose within the relevant time period.
[3] For non-sand and gravel sites
[4] North Yorkshire Sand and Gravel Assessment CR/11/133 (British Geological Survey 2011)
[5] **Indicated Mineral resource**: tonnage, densities, shape, physical characteristics, grade & mineral content can be estimated with a reasonable level of confidence
[6] **Category A Sand & Gravel deposit**: 1:1 overburden to mineral ratio, less than 20% fines, at least 2m thickness of resource, within 5m of surface
[7] **Category B Sand & Gravel deposit**: 2:1 overburden to mineral ratio, less than 40% fines, at least 2m thickness of resource, within 10m of surface
[8] **Inferred Mineral resource**: tonnage, grade & mineral content can be estimated with a low level of confidence
[9] **Water Compatible Development**: Source: http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/flood-risk-and-coastal-change/flood-zone-and-flood-risk-tables/table-2-flood-risk-vulnerability-classification/
[10] Mineral Safeguarding Areas for North Yorkshire County Council CR/11/132 (British Geological Survey 2011)
[11] Mineral Safeguarding Areas for North York Moors National Park Authority CR/13/073 (British Geological Survey 2013)
[12] Mineral Safeguarding Areas for City of York CR/13/072 (British Geological Survey 2013)

Initial Screening- Waste Sites

Ref	Site	WASTE Management TYPE(S)	Tonnage proposed	Is the land / Site likely to provide a viable[1] contribution to future requirements for waste management infrastructure needs (including whether the site provides a contribution to future requirements for waste management in line with needs expected to be identified in the Plan)	Is the land/Site likely to be available[1] for the intended form of development within the relevant time period?	Are there any major infrastructure constraints (e.g. absence of potential access to the land/site) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any major human population constraints such that the development type proposed is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any overriding major environmental constraints (this will include that the site is within an area designated as an SPA, SAC or Ramsar site, within Groundwater Protection Zone 1 or an area of functional flood plain[2]) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Should the Site progress to Step 2 of the Assessment Methodology (include justification)?
WJP01	**Hillcrest**, Harmby	Recycling and Waste transfer	Unknown	Could contribute to moving material to or meeting the identified[4] capacity gap for recycling of C&D and/or C&I waste. There is no identified[4] capacity gap for composting **Conclusion: Yes, likely to contribute to requirements but need to meet to understand proposal**	Submitted on behalf of landowner / developer. Start date not specified, but no evidence to suggest unlikely to be available. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Existing access onto A684. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	No known major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
WJP02	**Former North Selby Mine** site, Deighton	Anaerobic digestion	60,000	Could contribute to moving waste up the waste hierarchy by providing additional waste recovery capacity for C&I and municipal waste (particularly if the AWRP facility is not developed) **Conclusion: Yes, likely to contribute to requirements**	Submitted by developer and landowner is the other shareholder. Planning Permission has been granted. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Existing access to A19. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	Part of site in Flood Zone 3. However, waste treatment is defined as 'less vulnerable' in terms of water compatible development[3]. Located within Green Belt. No other known major environmental constraints **Conclusion: Potential major constraint (flooding) across part of site**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
WJP03	**Southmoor Energy Centre**, Kellingley Colliery	Energy from waste	280,000	Although any capacity gap for EFW is likely to be small subject to delivery of the AWRP facility[4], the facility could contribute to moving waste up the waste hierarchy by providing additional waste recovery capacity for C&I and municipal waste (particularly if the AWRP facility is not developed). **Conclusion: Yes, likely to contribute to requirements**	Submitted by developer and landowner is the other shareholder. Application currently awaiting determination. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Access to A645. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. High voltage powerline crosses part of site. No other major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: Potential major infrastructure constraint (powerline)**	Significant population centre lies in close proximity to site but no evidence at this stage to suggest development not deliverable for this reason **Conclusion: no apparent major population constraints**	No known major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
WJP04	**Old London Road**, Stutton	Landfill and recycling	90,000	Could contribute to meeting the capacity gap for recycling of C&D waste and the identified[4] capacity gap for landfill of C&D waste **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be a viable contribution**	Submitted on behalf of landowner. Proposed start 2014; lifespan of 6-9 years. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Access to C class road. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. High pressure gas pipeline adjacent to site. No other major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: Potential major infrastructure constraint (gas**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	Part of site in Flood Zone 3. However, landfill is defined as 'more vulnerable' and waste treatment is defined as 'less vulnerable' in terms of water compatible development[3]. Located within Green Belt. No other known major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: Potential major constraint (flooding) across part of**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions

[1] For the purposes of this initial appraisal this has been interpreted as whether the site would enable delivery of infrastructure that could help move management of waste up the waste hierarchy

Ref	Site	WASTE Management TYPE(S)	Tonnage proposed	Is the land / Site likely to provide a viable[1] contribution to future requirements for waste management infrastructure needs (including whether the site provides a contribution to future requirements for waste management in line with needs expected to be identified in the Plan)	Is the land/Site likely to be available[1] for the intended form of development within the relevant time period?	Are there any major infrastructure constraints (e.g. absence of potential access to the land/site) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any major human population constraints such that the development type proposed is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any overriding major environmental constraints (this will include that the site is within an area designated as an SPA, SAC or Ramsar site, within Groundwater Protection Zone 1 or an area of functional flood plain[2]) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Should the Site progress to Step 2 of the Assessment Methodology (include justification)?
						pipeline)		**site**	
WJP05	Field to North of **Duttons Farm, Upper Poppleton**	Landfill	40,000	Could contribute to meeting the identified[4] capacity gap for landfill of C&D waste, (subject to the prior development on MJP52) **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be a viable contribution**	Submitted on behalf of landowner. Start date not specified, but no evidence to suggest unlikely to be available. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	C Class road to A59. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	Part of site in Flood Zone 3. Landfill is defined as 'more vulnerable' in terms of water compatible development[3]. Located within Green Belt. No other known major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: Potential major constraint (flooding) across part of site**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
WJP06	Land adjacent to former **Escrick** brickworks	Landfill	200,000	Could contribute to meeting the identified[4] capacity gap for landfill of C&D waste, (subject to the prior development on MJP52) **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be a viable contribution**	Submitted on behalf of landowner / developer. Life of site 20 years based on commencing 2 years after start of MJP55 extraction. **Conclusion: Yes, may potentially become available in time period but limited contribution given time of start date linked to completion of MJP45**	Direct access to A19. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	No known major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
WJP07	Land on former **Pollington** airfield	Processing	150,000	Could contribute to moving waste up the waste hierarchy by providing additional waste recycling capacity for C&I waste **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be a viable contribution**	Submitted on behalf of landowner / developer. Existing processing facility. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Access via C class roads to A645. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	Part of site in Flood Zone 3. However, waste treatment is defined as 'less vulnerable' in terms of water compatible development[3]. No other known major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: Potential major constraint (flooding) across part of site**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
WJP08	**Allerton Park**, near Knaresborough	Landfill, Recycling, Transfer, Composting and EFW	60,000	Could contribute to maintaining capacity requirements for landfill of C&I and municipal waste and could contribute to moving waste up the waste hierarchy by providing additional waste recycling capacity for C&I and municipal waste: There is no identified[4] capacity	Submitted by developer. Landowner supports proposal. Proposes to extend existing landfill facility beyond current 2018 limit and add additional	Direct access to A168. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	No known major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions

Ref	Site	WASTE Management TYPE(S)	Tonnage proposed	Is the land / Site likely to provide a viable[1] contribution to future requirements for waste management infrastructure needs (including whether the site provides a contribution to future requirements for waste management in line with needs expected to be identified in the Plan)	Is the land/Site likely to be available[1] for the intended form of development within the relevant time period?	Are there any major infrastructure constraints (e.g. absence of potential access to the land/site) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any major human population constraints such that the development type proposed is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any overriding major environmental constraints (this will include that the site is within an area designated as an SPA, SAC or Ramsar site, within Groundwater Protection Zone 1 or an area of functional flood plain[2]) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Should the Site progress to Step 2 of the Assessment Methodology (include justification)?
				gap for the provision of new composting capacity. Although any capacity gap for EFW is likely to be small subject to delivery of the AWRP facility[4], the facility could contribute to moving waste up the waste hierarchy by providing additional waste recovery capacity for C&I and municipal waste (particularly if the AWRP facility is not developed). **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be a viable contribution**	facilities. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**				
WJP09	**Whitewall** Materials Recycling Facility, near Norton	Materials recycling facility	25,000	Could contribute to moving waste up the waste hierarchy by providing additional waste recycling capacity for municipal waste **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be a viable contribution**	Submitted on behalf of developer/ landowner. Proposed lifespan linked to life of quarry (until 2023). **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Access via C class roads, existing quarry and recycling infrastructure. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	No known major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
WJP10	**Went Edge** recycling, near Kirk Smeaton	Waste recycling facility	150,000	Could contribute to meeting the identified[4] capacity gap for recycling of C&D waste **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be a viable contribution**	Submitted on behalf of landowner/ developer. Proposed throughout plan period. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Access to A1 via C class road & existing quarry infrastructure. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	Located within Green Belt. No known other major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
WJP11	**Harewood Whin**, Rufforth	Landfill, Recycling, Transfer, Composting, Treatment and EFW	30,000 150,000 60,000 60,000 25,000 Unknown	Could contribute to maintaining capacity requirements for landfill of C&I and municipal waste and could contribute to moving waste up the waste hierarchy by providing additional waste recycling capacity for C&I and municipal waste: There is no identified[4] capacity gap for the provision of new composting capacity. Although any capacity gap for EFW is likely to be small subject	Submitted on behalf of developer. Landowner position supports the submission. Planning application awaiting determination. Proposed throughout plan period. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be**	Access to B1224 & some existing waste infrastructure. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage.. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	Part of site in Flood Zone 3. However, landfill is defined as 'more vulnerable' and waste treatment is defined as 'less vulnerable' in terms of water compatible development[3]. Located in Green Belt. No other known major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: Potential major constraint (flooding) across part of site**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions

Ref	Site	WASTE Management TYPE(S)	Tonnage proposed	Is the land / Site likely to provide a viable[1] contribution to future requirements for waste management infrastructure needs (including whether the site provides a contribution to future requirements for waste management in line with needs expected to be identified in the Plan)	Is the land/Site likely to be available[1] for the intended form of development within the relevant time period?	Are there any major infrastructure constraints (e.g. absence of potential access to the land/site) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any major human population constraints such that the development type proposed is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any overriding major environmental constraints (this will include that the site is within an area designated as an SPA, SAC or Ramsar site, within Groundwater Protection Zone 1 or an area of functional flood plain[2]) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Should the Site progress to Step 2 of the Assessment Methodology (include justification)?
				to delivery of the AWRP facility[4], the facility could contribute to moving waste up the waste hierarchy by providing additional waste recovery capacity for C&I and municipal waste (particularly if the AWRP facility is not developed). **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be a viable contribution**	**available in time period**				
WJP12	**Caulklands,** Thornton le Dale	Transfer	**Not assessed**, as site submission was withdrawn prior to the commencement of the initial screening process						
WJP13	**Halton East**, near Skipton	Transfer	40,000	Could contribute to moving material to appropriate sites to enable waste to be managed further up the waste hierarchy **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be a viable contribution**	Submitted on behalf of developer. Landowner position supports the submission. Proposed throughout plan period. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Existing access to A59 via C Class road & existing waste infrastructure on site. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	No known major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
WJP14	**Claro Road**, Harrogate	Transfer	**Not assessed**, as site submission was withdrawn prior to the commencement of the initial screening process						
WJP15	**Seamer Carr**, Eastfield, Scarborough	Recycling, Transfer, Composting and EFW	47,000 75,000 25,000 Unknown	Could contribute to maintaining capacity requirements for landfill of C&I and municipal waste and could contribute to moving waste up the waste hierarchy by providing additional waste recycling capacity for C&I and municipal waste: There is no identified[4] capacity gap for the provision of new composting capacity. Although any capacity gap for EFW is likely to be small subject to delivery of the AWRP facility[4], the facility could contribute to moving waste up the waste	Submitted on behalf of developer. Landowner position supports the submission. Proposed throughout plan period. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Existing access to A64 via C Class road and existing waste infrastructure on site. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	Part of site in Flood Zone 3 and part of site in Groundwater source protection Zone 1. However, waste treatment is defined as 'less vulnerable' in terms of water compatible development[3]. No other known major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: Potential major constraint (groundwater protection and flooding) across part of site**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
WJP16	**Common Lane**, Burn	Transfer	65,000	Could contribute to moving material to appropriate sites to enable waste to be managed further up the waste hierarchy **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be a viable contribution**	Submitted on behalf of developer. Landowner supports the submission. Proposed	Access via C class road to A19. Existing waste infrastructure adjacent to site. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major**	No known major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions

Ref	Site	WASTE Management TYPE(S)	Tonnage proposed	Is the land / Site likely to provide a viable[1] contribution to future requirements for waste management infrastructure needs (including whether the site provides a contribution to future requirements for waste management in line with needs expected to be identified in the Plan)	Is the land/Site likely to be available[1] for the intended form of development within the relevant time period?	Are there any major infrastructure constraints (e.g. absence of potential access to the land/site) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any major human population constraints such that the development type proposed is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any overriding major environmental constraints (this will include that the site is within an area designated as an SPA, SAC or Ramsar site, within Groundwater Protection Zone 1 or an area of functional flood plain[2]) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Should the Site progress to Step 2 of the Assessment Methodology (include justification)?
					throughout plan period. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	**population constraints**		
WJP17	**Skibeden**, near Skipton	HWRC	5,000	Retention of the facility could contribute to moving waste up the waste hierarchy by providing waste recycling capacity for municipal waste **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be a viable contribution**	Submitted on behalf of developer. Landowner supports the submission. Proposed throughout plan period. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Access direct onto A59 & existing waste infrastructure. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	No known major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
WJP18	**Tancred**, near Scorton	Landfill, Recycling & Transfer, & Composting	150,000 100,999 26,999	Could contribute to maintaining capacity requirements for landfill of C&I and municipal waste and could contribute to moving waste up the waste hierarchy by providing additional waste recycling capacity for C&I and municipal waste: There is no identified[4] capacity gap for the provision of new composting capacity. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be a viable contribution**	Submitted on behalf of developer. Landowner supports the submission. Proposed life of 15-20 years. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Access onto B6271 and existing infrastructure. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	Part of site in Flood Zone 3. However, landfill is defined as 'more vulnerable' and waste treatment is defined as 'less vulnerable' in terms of water compatible development[3]. No other known major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: Potential major constraint (flooding) across part of site**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
WJP19	**Fairfield Road**, Whitby	Recycling & Transfer	46,700	Could contribute to moving waste up the waste hierarchy by providing additional waste recycling capacity for C&I and municipal waste **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be a viable contribution**	Submitted on behalf of landowner / developer. Life of site unspecified, but no evidence to suggest unlikely to be available. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Access via industrial estate road to A171 and existing waste infrastructure. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	It lies inside an urban area but on an existing industrial estate. **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	In North York Moors National Park However, part of site already in industrial estate. No other major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: Potential major constraint (National Park)**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
WJP20	**Allerton Waste Recovery Park**, near Knaresborough	Integrated Waste Management Facility	**Not assessed**, planning permission granted and implemented prior to completion of the initial screening process						
WJP21	**Brotherton Quarry**, Burton	Import of inert waste for	250,000	Could contribute to meeting the identified[4] capacity gap for landfill	Site submitted by developer.	Existing access onto A162 and existing quarry infrastructure.	Site is not within or adjacent to a major	No known major environmental constraints	**Yes,** when considered

Ref	Site	WASTE Management TYPE(S)	Tonnage proposed	Is the land / Site likely to provide a viable[1] contribution to future requirements for waste management infrastructure needs (including whether the site provides a contribution to future requirements for waste management in line with needs expected to be identified in the Plan)	Is the land/Site likely to be available[1] for the intended form of development within the relevant time period?	Are there any major infrastructure constraints (e.g. absence of potential access to the land/site) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any major human population constraints such that the development type proposed is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any overriding major environmental constraints (this will include that the site is within an area designated as an SPA, SAC or Ramsar site, within Groundwater Protection Zone 1 or an area of functional flood plain[2]) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Should the Site progress to Step 2 of the Assessment Methodology (include justification)?
	Salmon	restoration purposes		of C&D waste **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be a viable contribution**	Landowner supports the submission. Lifespan linked to life of quarry (until 2020). **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	**Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	against conclusions to other questions
WJP22	Land on former **Pollington** airfield	Processing	260,000	Could contribute to moving waste up the waste hierarchy by providing additional waste recycling capacity for C&I waste **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be a viable contribution**	Submitted on behalf of developer. Landowner supports the submission. Existing processing facility. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Access via C class roads to A645. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	Part of site in Flood Zone 3. However, waste treatment is defined as 'less vulnerable' in terms of water compatible development[3]. No other known major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: Potential major constraint (flooding) across part of site**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
WJP23	**Potgate** (former piggery), North Stainley	Recycling	30,000	Could contribute to meeting the identified[4] capacity gap for recycling of C&D waste **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be a viable contribution**	Submitted on behalf of developer. Landowner supports the submission. Proposed throughout plan period. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Access is onto A6108 and existing quarry infrastructure but no existing waste facility. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	No known major environmental constraints **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
WJP24	**Potgate** (former plant site), North Stainley	Recycling	30,000	Could contribute to meeting the identified[4] capacity gap for recycling of C&D waste **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be a viable contribution**	Submitted on behalf of developer. Landowner supports the submission. Proposed throughout plan period. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Access is onto A6108 and existing quarry infrastructure but no existing waste facility. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	No known major environmental constraints **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
WJP25	**Former ARBRE Power Station**, Eggborough	Energy recovery	200,000	Could contribute to moving waste up the waste hierarchy by providing additional waste recovery capacity for C&I and	Submitted on behalf of developer. Landowner supports the	Existing access A19 via a short distance of C Class road. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint	No known major environmental constraints **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to

Ref	Site	WASTE Management TYPE(S)	Tonnage proposed	Is the land / Site likely to provide a viable[1] contribution to future requirements for waste management infrastructure needs (including whether the site provides a contribution to future requirements for waste management in line with needs expected to be identified in the Plan)	Is the land/Site likely to be available[1] for the intended form of development within the relevant time period?	Are there any major infrastructure constraints (e.g. absence of potential access to the land/site) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any major human population constraints such that the development type proposed is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any overriding major environmental constraints (this will include that the site is within an area designated as an SPA, SAC or Ramsar site, within Groundwater Protection Zone 1 or an area of functional flood plain[2]) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Should the Site progress to Step 2 of the Assessment Methodology (include justification)?
				municipal waste **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be a viable contribution**	submission. Start date 2018; lifespan of initially 25 years **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	**Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	**constraints**	other questions
MJP13	**Whitewall Quarry**, Norton	Recycling	20,000	Facility would contribute to meeting the identified[4] capacity gap for recycling of C&D waste **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be a viable contribution**	Submitted on behalf of developer / landowner. Lifespan linked to life of quarry (until 2023). **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Access via C class roads. Existing waste infrastructure. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	No known major environmental constraints **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
MJP26	**Barnsdale Bar**, Kirk Smeaton	Recycling	100,000	Could contribute to meeting the identified[4] capacity gap for recycling of C&D waste **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be a viable contribution**	Submitted on behalf of developer. Landowner supports the submission. Proposed throughout plan period. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Access to A1 via C class road. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	Located in Green Belt. No known other major environmental constraints **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
MJP27	**Darrington**	Recycling	Unknown	Could contribute to meeting the identified[4] capacity gap for recycling of C&D waste **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be a viable contribution**	Site submitted by developer / landowner. Proposed until at least 2028. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Existing access to C Class road (Stubbs Lane) leading to A1. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	Part of site in Groundwater source protection Zone 1. Located in GreenBelt. No other known major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: Potential major constraint (groundwater protection) across part of site**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
MJP57	**Potgate**, North Stainley	Recycling	30,000	Could contribute to meeting the identified[4] capacity gap for recycling of C&D waste **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be a viable contribution**	Submitted on behalf of developer. Landowner supports the submission. Proposed throughout plan period. **Conclusion: Yes,**	Access is onto A6108 and existing quarry infrastructure but no existing waste facility. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	No known major environmental constraints **Conclusion: No apparent overriding major environmental constraints**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions

Ref	Site	WASTE Management TYPE(S)	Tonnage proposed	Is the land / Site likely to provide a viable[1] contribution to future requirements for waste management infrastructure needs (including whether the site provides a contribution to future requirements for waste management in line with needs expected to be identified in the Plan)	Is the land/Site likely to be available[1] for the intended form of development within the relevant time period?	Are there any major infrastructure constraints (e.g. absence of potential access to the land/site) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any major human population constraints such that the development type proposed is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any overriding major environmental constraints (this will include that the site is within an area designated as an SPA, SAC or Ramsar site, within Groundwater Protection Zone 1 or an area of functional flood plain[2]) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Should the Site progress to Step 2 of the Assessment Methodology (include justification)?
					likely to be available in time period	**major infrastructure constraints**			
MJP58	**Old London Road**, Stutton	Recycling	Unknown	Could contribute to meeting the identified[4] capacity gap for recycling of C&D waste **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be a viable contribution**	Submitted on behalf of landowner. Proposed until 2021. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Access to C class road. No evidence to suggest appropriate infrastructure including access is not feasible. No major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Site is not within or adjacent to a major human population constraint **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	Part of site in Flood Zone 3. However, waste treatment is defined as 'less vulnerable' in terms of water compatible development[3]. Located inGreen Belt. No other known major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: Potential major constraint (flooding) across part of site**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions

Foot notes:

[1] As a minimum there needs to be general landowner support for the development and there are no known physical or other reasons why the site could not be brought forward for development for the intended purpose within the relevant time period

[2] For non-sand and gravel sites

[3] **Water Compatible Development**: Source: http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/flood-risk-and-coastal-change/flood-zone-and-flood-risk-tables/table-2-flood-risk-vulnerability-classification/

Initial Screening- Infrastructure Sites

Based on conclusions in Urban Vision (2013) 'North Yorkshire Sub Region Waste Arisings and Capacity Evidence – Waste Arisings and Capacity Requirements – Final Report

Ref	Site	Infrastructure Type	Tonnage proposed	Is the site necessary to help ensure the supply of minerals or mineral products in accordance with Plan objectives?	Is the Site likely to be available[1] for the intended form of development within the relevant time period?	Are there any major infrastructure constraints (e.g. absence of potential access to the Site) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any major human population constraints such that the development type proposed is unlikely to be deliverable?	Are there any overriding major environmental constraints (this will include that the Site is within an area designated as an SPA, SAC or Ramsar site, within Groundwater Protection Zone 1 or an area of functional flood plain[2]) such that the development is unlikely to be deliverable?	Should the Site progress to Step 2 of the Assessment Methodology (include justification)?
MJP09	**Barlby Road**, Selby	Aggregates rail depot	Through-put unknown	Existing site for the transport of minerals by rail. **Conclusion: Yes, facilitates minerals movement and supply**	Site submitted by landowner / developer. Use is currently linked to operation of the adjacent asphalt plant only. Already operating. Operator seeks to continue with no set end-date. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Existing access via former flour mill; scope to link to Selby bypass. No other major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	Existing facility in Selby. Land to west is proposed for development including housing and a school as part of Olympia Park development (developer of that scheme is aware of the facility). **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	Site is partly in Flood Zone 3. No other known major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: Potential major constraint (flooding) across part of site**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions
MJP24	**Darrington Quarry**	Processing plant and haul road	10,000,000 permitted	Existing site to process stone extracted within Wakefield (permitted until 2028).	Site submitted by developer/ landowner.	Existing access and plant site. No other major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this	Site is not within or adjacent to major human population constraints	Part of site in Groundwater source protection Zone 1. Located in Green Belt. No other known major	**Yes,** when considered against

			in 2011 by Wakefield	**Conclusion: Yes, facilitates minerals supply obviating need for a new plant site in the Wakefield authority area**	Already operating and stone supply permitted until 2028. Application to retain plant site awaiting determination. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	stage. **Conclusion: No apparent major infrastructure constraints**	**Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	environmental constraints. **Conclusion: Potential major constraint (groundwater protection) across part of site**	conclusions to other questions
MJP46	**Kiplin**	Processing plant	est. 250,000 pa	Existing minerals processing plant site. Processes mineral from adjacent Ellerton site (permitted for extraction until 2030 with more than a quarter of the site remaining to be worked). Potential, subject to provision of river crossing mechanism, for use to process minerals extracted from land to south of River Swale **Conclusion: yes facilitates minerals supply and may obviate need for a plant site to be located in new extraction sites south of the River Swale**	Submitted on behalf of landowner. Proposed throughout plan period subject to extension of time for retention beyond 2017. **Conclusion: Yes, likely to be available in time period**	Existing plant site and access permitted currently until 2017 to allow for resolution of future extraction in the area. No other major infrastructure constraints known to exist at this stage. **Conclusion: No constraints in terms of infrastructure**	Site is not within or adjacent to major human population constraints **Conclusion: No apparent major population constraints**	Site is partly in Flood Zone 3. No other known major environmental constraints. **Conclusion: Potential major constraint (flooding) across part of site**	**Yes,** when considered against conclusions to other questions

[1] As a minimum there needs to be general landowner support for the development and there are no known physical or other reasons why the site could not be brought forward for development for the intended purpose within the relevant time period
[2] For non-sand and gravel sites

Contact us

Minerals and Waste Joint Plan Team Planning Services, North Yorkshire County Council, County Hall, Northallerton, North Yorkshire, DL7 8AH

Tel: **01609 780780** Email: **mwjointplan@northyorks.gov.uk**