

# Audit trail of progression of sites from Issues and Options Stage to Publication

April 2017

# Audit trail of progression of sites from Issues and Options Stage to Publication

## Introduction

This document consists of a table which provides a summary audit trail of the progression of sites, consulted upon during the Issues and Options consultation, their subsequent progression through the Supplementary Sites Consultation to the Preferred Options Consultation and further development through to final Sites in the Publication document.

The Issues and Options consultation in February 2014 sought comments on the suitability of the sites or areas submitted. The Supplementary Sites consultation sought comments on additional sites submitted in response to the Issues and Options consultation and on revised information submitted. A small number of additional sites were submitted following on from the Supplementary Sites consultation and these were formally published as part of the Preferred Options consultation. The Preferred Options was the first stage where the Authorities specified the proposed approach in respect of each of the sites and opinions were sought on the suitability or otherwise of a site allocation, whether the right key issues had been identified and whether the right key mitigation requirements for the site had been identified. Allocated Sites and Preferred Areas were set out in Appendix 1 of the Publication Draft and the details of those sites which had been considered and discounted were presented in the online Evidence Base in the *Discounted Sites Summary Document* and in hard copy version at the deposit locations within the Plan Area.

Note: Sites MJP18, MJP19, MJP20, MJP25, MJP36, MJP48, WJP12 and WJP14 were withdrawn by the submitters and MJP01 received planning permission prior to the preparation of the Issues and Options document in February 2014.

Site ref	Site Location	Site presented at Issues and Options	Site position at Supplementary Sites	Site status at Preferred Options Stage	Site status at Publication (pre-submission) stage	Reasons for change of Status and other changes
MJP02	Land between railway at Heck and Pollington	Yes	None, as site <b>withdrawn</b> by submitter after the closure of the Issues & Options consultation	None	None	Site withdrawn
MJP03	Scarborough Field, adjacent to Forcett Quarry, East Layton	Yes	Site listed in index	<b>Preferred site</b> as could contribute to maintaining the landbank of crushed rock (Policy M09), would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan and no overriding constraints had been identified at this stage through the site assessment process.	None, as site withdrawn by submitter following the closure of the Preferred Options consultation	Site withdrawn
MJP04	Aram Grange, Asenby	Yes	Site listed in index	<b>Preferred Area</b> within which an appropriately scaled site could be developed as could contribute to meeting the longer term requirements for the supply of sand and gravel in the southwards distribution area towards the end of the Plan period (Policy M07), and would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan, and no overriding constraints had been identified at this stage through the site assessment process.	None, as site withdrawn by submitter following the closure of the Preferred Options consultation	Site withdrawn
MJP05	Lawrence House Farm, Scotton	Yes	Site listed in index	<b>Discounted site</b> as whilst it could contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of sand and gravel in the southwards distribution area over the Plan period (Policy M07), it is considered that there would be likely to be significant adverse impacts, potentially on Percy Beck and groundwater links to the SSSI downstream, best and most versatile land, landscape, local amenity and rights of way and other options are considered more appropriate to meet the requirements.	<b>Discounted site</b> as it is considered on the basis of currently available information that there would be the potential for significant adverse impacts, taking into account the possibility of groundwater links to the Farnham Mires SSSI downstream, as well as the potential for impacts on the local landscape and local amenity in Scotton and Brearton and on users of rights of way and other options are considered more appropriate to help meet requirements in the sand and gravel southwards distribution area.	No change in status
MJP06	Langwith Hall Farm, east of Well	Yes	Site listed in index	<b>Preferred site</b> as it could contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of sand and gravel in the southwards distribution area over the Plan period (Policy M07), and would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan. No overriding constraints have been identified at this stage through the site assessment process.	<b>Allocated site</b> as it is consistent with the broad geographical approach to the supply of aggregates (Policy M01) and the provision of sand and gravel (Policies M02, M03 and M04) and could contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of sand and gravel in the southwards distribution area over the Plan period (Policy M07) as evidence, including from the current planning application NY/2011/0242/ENV, indicates that there is a suitable resource in this location. No major issues have been raised by statutory consultees in respect of local amenity, landscape, biodiversity, historic and water environments which indicate any significant conflict with other	No change in status but additional clarification provided in the justification to the allocation as to the potential role of the site in the supply of aggregates including sand and gravel.  Note: Planning permission was granted with respect to the application NY/2011/0242/ENV in December 2016.

Site ref	Site Location	Site presented at Issues and Options	Site position at Supplementary Sites	Site status at Preferred Options Stage	Site status at Publication (pre-submission) stage	Reasons for change of Status and other changes
					relevant policies in the Plan. Although there are development requirements which have been identified through the Site Assessment process which would need to form part of the development proposals for any subsequent planning application, no overriding constraints have been identified at this stage through the site assessment process that would indicate that the site could not be developed and operated in an acceptable manner.	
MJP07	Oaklands, near Well	Yes	Site listed in index	Part <b>preferred site</b> and part <b>Discounted</b> as whilst the site could contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of sand and gravel in the southwards distribution area over the Plan period (Policy M07), and would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan and no overriding constraints had been identified at that stage through the site assessment process, it was considered that development should be limited to the eastern part of the area originally submitted to help reduce impacts on the landscape and setting of Well and it was acknowledged that this would have an impact on the quantity of mineral and a provisional estimate of 1,500,000 tonnes was assumed for the eastern part of the site.	Whole of the site, as originally submitted, identified under Policy M07 as a <b>Preferred Area</b> within which an appropriately located, scaled and designed site could be developed. This is consistent with the broad geographical approach to the supply of aggregates (Policy M01) and the provision of sand and gravel (Policies M02, M03 and M04) and could contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of sand and gravel in the southwards distribution area over the Plan period (Policy M07) as geological information provided by the submitter indicates that there is a resource in this location. No major issues have been raised by statutory consultees in respect of local amenity, biodiversity and the water environment that would indicate any significant conflict with other relevant policies in the Plan although Historic England have expressed concern about the potential for impact on heritage assets. The area is subject to significant constraints regarding heritage assets and potential for impacts on the landscape and setting of Well including as a result of the cumulative changes in the landscape arising from the change from agricultural land to water and taking account of the local topography of the area. However, it is considered that, subject to more detailed project specific assessment and appropriate siting, design and mitigation, there is likely to be potential for some further minerals extraction within the overall area put forward, although this may be for a significantly reduced area. There are further development requirements which have been identified through the Site Assessment process which would also need to form part of the development proposals for any subsequent planning application.	Between Preferred Options and Publications interactions took place, including with the submitter and Historic England, regarding the nature of the representations received at Preferred Options.  By Publication there was more understanding about the nature of the resource and also regarding the nature of the historic assets via work undertaken by the submitter as part of the Langwith planning application NY/2011/0242/ENV. The MJP07 site is not yet the subject of a planning application or detailed site design. The views expressed by the submitter and Historic England indicate the importance of having a project level design in order to establish an detailed site boundary.  Therefore, at Publication the whole area within the original site boundary was included as a <i>preferred area</i> as that allows flexibility to take the relevant constraints into account in the detailed project design and specific assessment work such that appropriate siting, design and mitigation of the extraction can be developed as part of any planning application, taking account of knowledge at the time of the application. The Preferred Area status therefore reflects the current uncertainty regarding the design of the site.
MJP08	Settrington Quarry	Yes	Site listed in index	<b>Preferred site</b> under Policy M09 as it could contribute to maintaining the landbank of crushed rock (Policy M06), would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan and no overriding constraints had been identified	<b>Allocated site</b> under Policy M09 as it is consistent with the broad geographical approach to the supply of aggregates (Policy M01) and could contribute to maintaining the landbank of crushed rock (Policy M06) and a local source of	No change in status, but additional clarification provided in the justification to the allocation as to the potential role of the site in the supply of aggregates including with respect to crushed rock

Site ref	Site Location	Site presented at Issues and Options	Site position at Supplementary Sites	Site status at Preferred Options Stage	Site status at Publication (pre-submission) stage	Reasons for change of Status and other changes
				at that stage through the site assessment process.	supply of Jurassic Limestone as evidence, including from the adjacent existing quarry, indicates that there is a suitable resource in this location. No major issues have been raised by statutory consultees in respect of local amenity, landscape, biodiversity, historic and water environments which indicate any significant conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan. Although there are development requirements which have been identified through the Site Assessment process which would need to form part of the development proposals for any subsequent planning application, no overriding constraints have been identified at this stage through the site assessment process to indicate that the site could not be developed and operated in an acceptable manner.	
MJP09	Barlby Road, Selby	Yes	Site listed in index	<b>Preferred site</b> under Policy I01 as it could contribute to maintaining supply of aggregate through the continued provision of rail-linked infrastructure as well as to the sustainable transport of mineral. It would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan and no overriding constraints were identified at this stage through the site assessment process.	<b>Allocated site</b> under Policy I01 as the continued availability of the rail linked aggregates importation and handling facility at this site could contribute to maintaining supply of aggregate as well as the sustainable transport and supply of mineral and there is no submitted alternative rail linked facility. No major issues have been raised by statutory consultees in respect of local amenity, landscape, biodiversity, historic and water environments which indicate any significant conflict with other relevant policies in the Plan. The current lifespan of facility is tied by planning condition to the life of adjacent asphalt plant, but there is no specified end-date for the asphalt plant. Thus it is only if the asphalt plant use ceases that the further grant of permission would be needed to secure the continued aggregate import/handling use and the allocation is being made to safeguard against that circumstance.	No change in status, but additional clarification provided in the justification regarding the role of the continued availability of the rail linked aggregates importation and handling facility at this site and the current lifespan of the facility
MJP10	Potgate Quarry, North Stainley	Yes	Site listed in index	<b>Discounted site</b> as whilst it could contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of Magnesian limestone over the Plan period (Policy M09), and would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan, it was considered that there would be likely to be significant adverse impacts, particularly on local amenity, best and most versatile agricultural land, landscape, rights of way and local roads and other options are considered more appropriate to meet the requirements.	<b>Allocated site</b> as it is consistent with the broad geographical approach to the supply of aggregates (Policy M01) and the provision of crushed rock (Policies M05 and M06) and could contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of Magnesian limestone over the Plan period (Policy M09), as evidence, including from the recent planning application NY/2012/0319/ENV, indicates there is a suitable resource in the location, and the development would not conflict with other relevant policies in the Plan. The revised proposals and further clarification of the role of the site, provided since consultation at preferred options stage, have addressed previous areas of concern relating to	At Preferred Options representations were received both for and against the discounting of the site and the associated issues.  Following the proposed discounting of the site at Preferred Options, revised proposals were received from the submitter that reduced the size of the site, the estimated reserve and annual output. The change in the site boundary reduced the scope and significance of potential impacts on a number of issues including, amenity landscape and biodiversity.

Site ref	Site Location	Site presented at Issues and Options	Site position at Supplementary Sites	Site status at Preferred Options Stage	Site status at Publication (pre-submission) stage	Reasons for change of Status and other changes
					this site. No major issues have been raised by statutory consultees in respect of local amenity, landscape, biodiversity, historic and water environments which indicate any significant conflict with other relevant policies in the Plan.	The revised proposals and further clarification of the role of the site, provided since consultation at preferred options stage, have addressed previous areas of concern relating to this site.
MJP11	Gebdykes Quarry, near Masham	Yes	Site listed in index	<b>Preferred site</b> as it could contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of Magnesian limestone towards the end of the Plan period (Policy M09), and would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan. No overriding constraints have been identified at this stage through the site assessment process.	<b>Allocated site</b> as it is consistent with the broad geographical approach to the supply of aggregates (Policy M01) and the provision of crushed rock (Policies M05 and M06) and could contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of Magnesian limestone towards the end of the Plan period (Policy M09) as evidence, including from the adjacent existing quarry, indicates that there is a suitable resource in this location. No major issues have been raised by statutory consultees in respect of local amenity, landscape, biodiversity, historic and water environments which indicate any significant conflict with other relevant policies in the Plan and no overriding constraints were identified through the site assessment process.	After the Preferred Options and a review by the submitter of their operations at the existing Potgate and Gebdykes quarries an additional area for extraction on land adjoining the existing operating quarry was received from the submitter in March 2016. The proposed additional area was put forward as a means to improve the scope for access across to the original MJP11 site area and to create a wider quarry floor area to enable more light into the quarry void to assist with the low level agricultural restoration scheme and remove an awkward maintenance strip.
MJP12	Whitewall Quarry, near Malton	Yes	Site listed in index	<b>Preferred site</b> as it could contribute to maintaining the landbank of crushed rock (Policy M06), would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan and no overriding constraints had been identified at this stage through the site assessment process.	<b>Discounted site</b> as evidence supporting the Joint Plan did not indicate any overall need, in strategic terms, to release additional reserves of Jurassic Limestone for the plan period. The location of the site and its relationship to market areas in the Plan area results in a need for a substantial volume of heavy traffic to travel through an extended length of built up area in Norton-on-Derwent, in order to access the major road network, such that there is potential for significant adverse impact on local communities. The location is therefore not considered a sustainable one for longer term supply of minerals in the absence of a more specific justification that would override this concern.	The status changed because of further consideration of the site post-Preferred Options in relation to impacts on local amenity from vehicle movements, in particular through Norton-on-Derwent, and consideration of the justification for making specific provision for Jurassic Limestone. The conclusion was that it was not considered that the justification for provision of additional Jurassic Limestone reserves at the time of the Publication Draft justified the amenity impact of a longer term supply of mineral from this site.
MJP13	Whitewall Quarry near Norton (recycling)	Yes	Site listed in index	This was a <b>Preferred site</b> identified in Policy W05 and could contribute to the provision of infrastructure which could help move waste up the waste hierarchy (Policies W01, M11, W10 and W11) and subject to it being linked to the life of Whitewall Quarry it would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan. No overriding constraints have been identified at this stage through the site assessment process.	<b>Discounted site</b> as it would result in an enlarged footprint and potential increase in throughput for activity associated with importation and recycling of CD&E waste at Whitewall Quarry and whilst the principle of such activity taking place was already established through an existing permission, any increased traffic volumes could add to impacts on local communities, arising from heavy vehicle movements in combination with other traffic associated with Whitewall Quarry, and it is not considered appropriate to allocate the site on this basis.	The status changed because of further consideration of the site post-Preferred Options in relation to impacts on local amenity from vehicle movements, in particular through Norton-on-Derwent, and further consideration of the role this site could contribute to the Plan and it was not considered that this justified the amenity impact of a longer term and enlarged throughput of recycling via this site.
MJP14	Land in vicinity of Ripon Quarry	Yes	Site listed in index	<b>Preferred site</b> (comprising of Manor Farm West, Pennycroft and Thorneyfields) as it	<b>Allocated site</b> (comprising Pennycroft and Thorneyfields area) as it was consistent with the	The Manor Farm West part of site withdrawn by submitter following the

Site ref	Site Location	Site presented at Issues and Options	Site position at Supplementary Sites	Site status at Preferred Options Stage	Site status at Publication (pre-submission) stage	Reasons for change of Status and other changes
				could contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of sand and gravel in the southwards distribution area over the Plan period (Policy M07), and would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan. Whilst the site is subject to significant constraints, it was considered that these could be capable of being mitigated to an acceptable level.	broad geographical approach to the supply of aggregates (Policy M01) and the provision of sand and gravel (Policies M02, M03 and M04) and could contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of sand and gravel in the southwards distribution area over the Plan period (Policy M07) as evidence indicates that there is a suitable resource in this location. No major issues have been raised by statutory consultees in respect of local amenity, landscape, historic and water environments which indicate any significant conflict with other relevant policies in the Plan. The site is subject to significant constraints however, it was considered that the issues identified are likely to be capable of being mitigated to an acceptable level such that the site could be developed and operated in an appropriate manner.	Preferred Options in the light of the matters raised by English Heritage. However, it was considered that the remaining part of the site could continue to provide an appropriate contribution to meeting requirements for the supply of sand and gravel in the southwards distribution area over the Plan period that was consistent with the broad geographical approach to the supply of aggregates.
MJP15	Blubberhouses Quarry, west of Harrogate	Yes	Site listed in index	<b>Discounted site</b> as whilst it could contribute to the supply of silica sand over the Plan period (Policy M12), it was considered that it not clear that it was required to meet any current need for a specific manufacturing facility or market. The site was highly constrained due to its location within the AONB, and proximity to the SPA and SAC areas and it was not clear through a strategic level assessment whether the site could be developed consistent with relevant policy protection for these highly protected assets. It was considered that the planning application for the development currently awaiting determination provided the most appropriate mechanism for resolving these issues.	<b>Discounted site</b> as the site is highly constrained due to its location within the Nidderdale AONB, and proximity to the North Pennine Moors SPA and SAC areas. It is not sufficiently clear through a strategic level assessment whether the site could be developed consistent with relevant policy protection applying to these highly sensitive assets. Historic England supports the discounting of the site for the reason that the development could harm the elements which contribute to the significance of a number of heritage assets in the area including the buildings at Redshaw Hall. There is also potential for significant adverse impact on the landscape, biodiversity and tourism and recreation. Policy M12 of the Joint Plan provides support for the principle of development of the silica sand resource at Blubberhouses Quarry subject to caveats regarding the outcome of a major development test and an Appropriate Assessment under the Habitats Regulations. A planning application for the development is currently awaiting determination and, given that this determination will address the issues of the major development test and an Appropriate Assessment, it is considered that this provides the most appropriate mechanism for resolving these issues.	No change in status and the planning application NY/20111/0465/73 to extend the period of time for working the silica sand at Blubberhouses Quarry was still undetermined, but additional clarification was provided in the justification as to the reasoning for the discounting and the role that Policy M12 of the Joint Plan has in terms of support for the principle of development of the silica sand resource at Blubberhouses Quarry. The clarification also draws out the need for the completion of an Appropriate Assessment under the Habitats Regulations.
MJP16	Marfield Quarry, Masham	Yes	Site listed in index	None, as site was <b>withdrawn</b> by submitter in July 2015 after the closure of the Supplementary Sites consultation following the development receiving planning permission in June 2015.	None	Site withdrawn
MJP17	Land to South of Catterick	Yes	Site listed in index	<b>Part Preferred site</b> and <b>Part Discounted site</b> as whilst it could contribute to meeting	<b>Part Allocated site</b> as it is consistent with the broad geographical approach to the supply of	No change in status, but additional clarification provided in the justification

Site ref	Site Location	Site presented at Issues and Options	Site position at Supplementary Sites	Site status at Preferred Options Stage	Site status at Publication (pre-submission) stage	Reasons for change of Status and other changes
				longer term requirements for the supply of sand and gravel in the northwards distribution area (Policy M07), and would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan and no overriding constraints had been identified at this stage through the site assessment process; it was considered that development should exclude the south-western part of the site originally submitted to help reduce impacts on the registered Park and Garden at Hornby Castle.	aggregates (Policy M01) and the provision of sand and gravel (Policies M02, M03 and M04) and could contribute to meeting longer term requirements for the supply of sand and gravel in the northwards distribution area (Policy M07) as evidence indicates that there is a suitable resource in this location. No major issues had been raised by statutory consultees in respect of local amenity, landscape, biodiversity, historic and water environments which indicate any significant conflict with other relevant policies in the Plan. <b>Part Discounted site</b> as the NPPF requires account to be taken of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and it was considered that the south-western part of the site (as originally submitted) should be excluded from the MJP17 site to help reduce the potential for unacceptable impacts on the registered Park and Garden at Hornby Castle, or its setting, in view of the close proximity of this important asset. This is because it is considered that extraction from the south-western part of the site would be likely to have a high negative effect on the setting of this important asset.	in terms of the allocated part of the site regarding the role of the site in the supply of sand and gravel and, in terms of the part to be discounted, the need to reduce the potential for unacceptable impacts on the registered Park and Garden at Hornby Castle, or its setting in view of the close proximity of this important asset.
MJP21	Land at Killerby	Yes	Site listed in index	<b>Preferred site</b> as the site could contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of sand and gravel in the northwards distribution area over the Plan period (Policy M07), and would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan and no overriding constraints had been identified at this stage through the site assessment process.	<b>Allocated site</b> as it is consistent with the broad geographical approach to the supply of aggregates (Policy M01) and the provision of sand and gravel (Policies M02, M03 and M04) and could contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of sand and gravel in the northwards distribution area over the Plan period (Policy M07) as evidence, including from the current planning application NY/2010/0356/ENV, indicates that there is a suitable resource in this location. No major issues have been raised by statutory consultees in respect of local amenity, landscape, biodiversity, historic and water environments which indicate any significant conflict with other relevant policies in the Plan.	No change in status, but additional clarification provided in the justification in terms of the allocated part of the site regarding the role of the site in the supply of sand and gravel.
MJP22	Hensall Quarry	Yes	Site listed in index	<b>Preferred site</b> (based on original site area) as it could contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of sand over the Plan period (Policy M08), and would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan. No overriding constraints have been identified at this stage through the site assessment process.	The enlarged site was an <b>Allocated site</b> as it was consistent with the broad geographical approach to the supply of aggregates (Policy M01) and the provision of sand and gravel (Policy M02, M03 and M04) and could contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of sand over the Plan period (Policy M08) as evidence, including from the adjacent existing quarry, indicates that there is a suitable resource in this location. No major issues have been raised by statutory consultees in respect of local amenity, landscape, biodiversity, historic and water environments	The additional area was jointly submitted as an extension to the original site area as a response to the Preferred Options consultation. Following site assessment taking account of any changed issues arising from the enlargement of the site and consideration of its potential role in contributing to the provision of sand and gravel, it was considered that it was appropriate to allocate the enlarged site.



Site ref	Site Location	Site presented at Issues and Options	Site position at Supplementary Sites	Site status at Preferred Options Stage	Site status at Publication (pre-submission) stage	Reasons for change of Status and other changes
					which indicate any significant conflict with other relevant policies in the Plan.	
MJP23	Jackdaw Crag Quarry, Stutton	Yes	Revised site area included in the document comprising the original westwards extension area, a southwards area and an eastern area.	<p><b>Part Preferred site</b> (south area) and <b>part Discounted site</b> (east area) as the preferred part could contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of Magnesian limestone over the Plan period (Policy M09), and would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan and no overriding constraints have been identified at that stage through the site assessment process</p> <p>It is was considered that the east area would be likely to be significant adverse impacts, particularly in terms of the potential risk of contamination of groundwater source protection zones and the isolation of the Crag Wood SINC from surrounding habitats and other options are considered more appropriate to meet the requirements.</p>	<p><b>Part Allocated site</b> (south area) and <b>part Discounted site</b> (east area) as the south area was consistent with the broad geographical approach to the supply of aggregates (Policy M01) and the provision of crushed rock (Policies M05 and M06) and could contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of Magnesian limestone over the Plan period (Policy M09) as evidence, including from the current planning application NY/2009/0523/ENV and adjacent existing quarry, indicates that there is a suitable resource in this location. No major issues have been raised by statutory consultees in respect of local amenity, landscape, biodiversity, historic and water environments which indicate, for the south area any significant conflict with other relevant policies in the Plan</p> <p>However there would be likely to be significant adverse impacts from the east area, particularly in terms of the potential risk of contamination of groundwater source protection zones and the isolation of the Crag Wood SINC from surrounding habitats, as well as the potential for significant adverse visual impact and other options are considered more appropriate to contribute to requirements for Magnesian Limestone.</p>	<p>No change in status between Preferred and Publication, but additional clarification provided in the justification regarding the role of the site in the supply of aggregates and the provision of crushed rock.</p> <p>The additional two areas published in the Supplementary Sites consultation were received from the submitter following a request, in April 2014 after the closure of the Issues and Options Consultation, for clarification on matters relating to the original submission.</p> <p>The west area was withdrawn by the submitter prior to the Preferred Options consultation.</p>
MJP24	Darrington Quarry processing plant site and haul road	Yes	Site listed in index	<p><b>Preferred site</b> as it could contribute to maintaining supply of aggregate through the continued provision of minerals processing infrastructure (Policy M09). Although located in the Green Belt this is an established site and no overriding constraints have been identified at this stage through the site assessment process.</p>	<p><b>Allocated site</b> as it could contribute to maintaining supply of aggregate through the continued provision of minerals processing infrastructure (Policy M09) in order to serve reserves remaining within the adjacent Wakefield area. Minerals extraction at the existing quarry in Wakefield is permitted until 2028. No major issues have been raised by statutory consultees in respect of local amenity, landscape, biodiversity, historic and water environments which indicate any significant conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan. Although located in the Green Belt this is an established site and there are development requirements which have been identified through the Site Assessment process which would need to form part of the development proposals, including restoration to a use compatible with the Green Belt. No overriding constraints have been identified at this stage through the site assessment process to indicate that the site could not be developed and operated in an acceptable manner.</p>	<p>No change in status between Preferred Options and Publication stage, but additional clarification provided in the justification regarding the role of the site in the supply of aggregates and the provision of crushed rock. Clarification also provided regarding the existence of the site within the Green Belt.</p>

Site ref	Site Location	Site presented at Issues and Options	Site position at Supplementary Sites	Site status at Preferred Options Stage	Site status at Publication (pre-submission) stage	Reasons for change of Status and other changes
MJP26	Barnsdale Bar, near Kirk Smeaton (recycling)	Yes	Site listed in index	<b>Preferred site</b> as it could contribute to the provision of infrastructure which could help move waste up the waste hierarchy (Policies W01, W05, W10, W11 and M11) and subject to it being linked to the life of Barnsdale Bar Quarry and reclamation being to a use compatible with the Green Belt it would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan and no overriding constraints have been identified at this stage through the site assessment process.	<b>Allocated site</b> as it could contribute to the provision of infrastructure which could help move waste up the waste hierarchy (Policies W01, W02 and W05) and would be consistent with the overall locational principles of Policy W10, and the site identification principles of Policy W11. No major issues have been raised by statutory consultees in respect of local amenity, landscape, biodiversity, historic and water environments which indicate any significant conflict with other relevant policies in the Plan subject to it being linked to the life of Barnsdale Bar Quarry and reclamation being to a use compatible with the Green Belt.	No change in status between Preferred Options and Publication stage, but additional clarification provided in the justification regarding the role of the site in helping to move waste up the waste hierarchy and locational principles.
MJP27	Darrington Quarry (recycling)	Yes	Site listed in index	<b>Preferred site</b> as it could contribute to the provision of infrastructure which could help move waste up the waste hierarchy (Policies W01, W05, W10 and W11) and subject to it being linked to the life of the processing plant MJP24 (if allocated in the Plan) and reclamation being to a use compatible with the Green Belt it would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan. No overriding constraints have been identified at this stage through the site assessment process, but the site would only be brought forward in association with MJP24.	<b>Allocated site</b> as it could contribute to the provision of infrastructure which could help move waste up the waste hierarchy (Policies W01, W02 and W05) and would be consistent with the overall locational principles of Policy W10 and the site identification principles of Policy W11. No major issues have been raised by statutory consultees in respect of local amenity, landscape, biodiversity, historic and water environments which indicate any significant conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan, subject to it being linked to the life of the processing plant MJP24 and reclamation being to a use compatible with the Green Belt.	No change in status between Preferred Options and Publication stage, but additional clarification provided in the justification regarding the role of the site in helping to move waste up the waste hierarchy and locational principles.
MJP28	Barnsdale Bar Quarry, Kirk Smeaton	Yes	Revised site area included in the document comprising the original 'north-west' extension and an extension to the 'north'	<b>Preferred site</b> (north-west and north areas) as it could contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of Magnesian limestone over the Plan period (Policy M09), and would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan. No overriding constraints have been identified at this stage through the site assessment process.	<b>Allocated site</b> (north area) as it is consistent with the broad geographical approach to the supply of aggregates (Policy M01) and the provision of crushed rock (Policies M05 and M06) and could contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of Magnesian limestone over the Plan period (Policy M09) as evidence, including from the recently granted planning application NY/2014/0393/ENV and adjacent existing quarry, indicates that there is a suitable resource in this location. No major issues have been raised by statutory consultees in respect of local amenity, landscape, biodiversity, historic and water environments which indicate any significant conflict with other relevant policies in the Plan.	The additional 'north' area published in the Supplementary Sites consultation was received from the submitter following a request, in April 2014 after the closure of the Issues and Options Consultation, for clarification on matters relating to the original submission. The 'North' area was subsequently the subject of a planning application and that received planning permission in June 2016 and hence the submitter withdrew that area in July 2016.  No change in status of the 'north-west' area between Preferred Options and Publication stage, but additional clarification provided in the justification regarding the role of the site in the supply of aggregates and the provision of crushed rock
MJP29	Went Edge Quarry, Kirk Smeaton	Yes	Site listed in index	<b>Preferred site</b> as it could contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of Magnesian limestone over the Plan period	<b>Allocated site</b> as it is consistent with the broad geographical approach to the supply of aggregates (Policy M01) and the provision of	Since the closure of the Preferred Options planning permission has been granted for part of the original site area

Site ref	Site Location	Site presented at Issues and Options	Site position at Supplementary Sites	Site status at Preferred Options Stage	Site status at Publication (pre-submission) stage	Reasons for change of Status and other changes
				(Policy M09), and would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan. No overriding constraints had been identified at this stage through the site assessment process.	crushed rock (Policies M05 and M06) and could contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of Magnesian limestone over the Plan period (Policy M09) as evidence, including from the planning application NY/2014/0113/ENV which was granted and adjacent existing quarry, indicates that there is a suitable resource in this location. No major issues have been raised by statutory consultees in respect of local amenity, landscape, biodiversity, historic and water environments which indicate any significant conflict with other relevant policies in the Plan.	and the submitter withdrew that land which had been permitted in July 2016.  There was no change to the status of the remainder of the site between Preferred Options and Publication stage, but additional clarification provided in the justification regarding the role of the site in the supply of aggregates and the provision of crushed rock.
MJP30	West Heslerton Quarry	Yes	Site listed in index	<b>Preferred site</b> as it could contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of sand over the Plan period (Policy M08), and would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan. No overriding constraints have been identified at this stage through the site assessment process.	<b>Allocated site</b> as it is consistent with the broad geographical approach to the supply of aggregates (Policy M01) and the provision of sand and gravel (Policies M02, M03 and M04) and could contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of sand over the Plan period (Policy M08) as evidence, including from the adjacent existing quarry, indicates that there is a suitable resource in this location. No major issues have been raised by statutory consultees in respect of local amenity, landscape, biodiversity, historic and water environments which indicate any significant conflict with other relevant policies in the Plan.	No change in status, but additional clarification provided in the justification in terms of the allocated part of the site regarding the role of the site in the supply of aggregates and the provision of sand and gravel.
MJP31	Old London Road, Stutton	Yes	Site listed in index	<b>Discounted site</b> as whilst the site could contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of Magnesian limestone over the Plan period (Policy M09), and would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan, there are substantial constraints have been identified at this stage through the site assessment process including impact on the Registered Battlefield at Towton. It is considered that there would be likely to be significant adverse impacts, particularly on the elements which contribute to the significance of the registered battlefield, the local landscape, groundwater and rights of way, and other options are considered more appropriate to meet the requirements.	<b>Discounted site</b> as substantial constraints have been identified through the site assessment process including impact on the Registered Battlefield at Towton. It is considered that there would be likely to be significant adverse impacts, particularly on the elements which contribute to the significance of the registered battlefield, the local landscape, groundwater and users of rights of way including along Old London Road, and other options are considered more appropriate to contribute to requirements for Magnesian Limestone.	A minor revision to the site boundary was done prior to Preferred Options at the request of the submitter in order to clarify the boundary between this site and site WJP04. No boundary changes have been made since Preferred Options.  There has been no change in status, the potential for the site to contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of Magnesian limestone over the Plan period (Policy M09) exists but the likelihood of significant adverse impacts associated with this site means that other options are considered more appropriate to contribute to requirements for Magnesian Limestone.
MJP32	Barsneb Wood, Markington	Yes	Site listed in index	<b>Discounted site</b> as whilst the site could contribute to the supply of building stone over the Plan period (Policy M15), and would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan, substantial constraints have been identified at this stage through the site assessment process including impact on ancient woodland and the proposed access	<b>Discounted site</b> as substantial constraints have been identified through the site assessment process including potential harm to the elements that contribute to the significance of the Cistercian grange and medieval settlement at High Cayton and the group of Listed Buildings at High Cayton; the impact on ancient woodland in Barsneb Wood and potential impact on Cayton Gill Marsh SINC	No change in status, but additional clarification provided in the justification in terms of the nature of the constraints identified.

Site ref	Site Location	Site presented at Issues and Options	Site position at Supplementary Sites	Site status at Preferred Options Stage	Site status at Publication (pre-submission) stage	Reasons for change of Status and other changes
				to the site being unsuitable. It is considered that there would be likely to be significant adverse impacts such that the site is not suitable for allocation.	and protected species, and the proposed access to the site along Redgate Lane bridleway being unsuitable and not capable of adjustment to protect users of the right of way. It is considered that there would be likely to be significant adverse impacts such that the site is not suitable for allocation.	
MJP33	Home Farm, Kirkby Fleetham	Yes	Site listed in index	<b>Part Preferred site and part Discounted site</b> as the site could contribute to meeting the requirements for the supply of sand and gravel in the northwards distribution area (Policy M07), and would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan. However, it is considered that development should exclude an area to the east of Kirkby Fleetham Hall to protect the setting of the Hall. It is further considered that the potential to access the land via the MJP21 site at Killerby should be explored prior to confirming this site as a Preferred Site in order to address the potential amenity impact of quarry traffic on the B6271 and secure a more direct access to the strategic road network. Additionally the restoration proposals should, where practicable, be coordinated with the proposals for restoration of the adjacent Killerby site, if developed, in order to maximise benefits, particularly for biodiversity.	<b>Part Allocated site</b> as it is consistent with the broad geographical approach to the supply of aggregates (Policy M01) and the provision of sand and gravel (Policies M02, M03 and M04) and could contribute to meeting the requirements for the supply of sand and gravel in the northwards distribution area (Policy M07) as evidence, including geological information from the submitter, indicates that there is a suitable resource in this location. No major issues have been raised by statutory consultees in respect of local amenity, landscape, biodiversity and water environments which indicate any significant conflict with other relevant policies in the Plan.  <b>Part Discounted site</b> as the NPPF requires account to be taken of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets. It is considered that any allocation should exclude an area to the east of Kirkby Fleetham Hall to help protect the setting of the Listed Buildings at the Hall in view of the proximity of these important assets. This is because it is considered that extraction from this part of the site would be likely to have an adverse impact on the setting of Kirkby Hall and St Mary's Church. It is also considered that the area of land on the north side of the river Swale, put forward as a location for processing plant, should be excluded as it is considered that this would lead to unsatisfactory access arrangements for the site in terms of the connectivity between this part of the site and the strategic road network and that the MJP33 site as should only be allocated as identified in Appendix 1 on the basis that access is obtained via the Killerby MJP21 site and the local access road (parallel to the A1(M)) to the west.	The status of parts of the site changed between Preferred Options and Publication, as at Preferred Options it was considered that an area to the east of Kirkby Fleetham Hall should be excluded to protect the setting of the Hall. This exclusion was continued at Publication and was supported by Historic England. However, at Publication an additional area was excluded from the site (the area of land on the north side of the river Swale put forward as a location for processing plant) as the traffic issues associated with the land to the north of the river Swale were considered to be unacceptable.  Therefore, at Publication additional clarification was provided in the justification in terms of the allocated part of the site regarding the role of the site in the supply of sand and gravel and, in terms of the part to be discounted, clarification on the issues relating to the potential impacts on the heritage assets and the traffic issues associated with the land to the north of the river Swale and the opinion that the MJP33 site as should only be allocated on the basis that access was obtained via the Killerby MJP21 site and the local access road (parallel to the A1(M)) to the west.
MJP34	Land between Sandsend and Scarborough	Yes	Revised site area included in the document comprising changes to the boundary in	<b>Discounted site</b> as whilst it could contribute to the supply of potash and polyhalite over the Plan period (Policy M23), the site is highly constrained due to its location within the National Park, and the proximity of other	<b>Discounted site</b> as it is substantially similar to the area for which planning permission was granted for extraction of potash by the North York Moors National Park Authority in 2015, although the area proposed for allocation covers a larger	The revised site area was received from the submitter in May 2014 and was included in the Supplementary Sites consultation.

Site ref	Site Location	Site presented at Issues and Options	Site position at Supplementary Sites	Site status at Preferred Options Stage	Site status at Publication (pre-submission) stage	Reasons for change of Status and other changes
			the vicinity of Goathland Moor	important constraints. Given the complexity and scale of this proposal it will need to be considered robustly against the criteria for major development in designated areas as set out in paragraph 116 of the NPPF. For this reason it is not considered that the proposal can be considered through a strategic level assessment and a full planning application is considered to be the most appropriate mechanism for resolving this issue.	area and includes some land outside the National Park. National policy does not support the identification of allocations in National Parks and it is not considered that the area of land outside the National Park could be identified separately from the wider area. The permission granted by the National Park Authority in 2015 established the principle of the extraction of potash in this area at the time of the planning application determination as the proposal was considered to represent exceptional circumstances. Planning policy should not, by definition, provide for "exceptional circumstances" when national policy presumes against such development within National Parks and therefore any future proposal beyond the existing timescale of the current planning permission is more appropriately addressed through an assessment of the planning merits of individual applications with regard to the major development test.	There has been no change in status, but additional clarification was provided at Publication in the justification regarding the interaction with the planning permission for a similar area that was granted for extraction of potash by the North York Moors National Park Authority in 2015 and the exceptional circumstances relating to the major development test.
MJP35	Ruddings Farm, Walshford	Yes	Site listed in index	<b>Part Preferred and Part Discounted</b> as it could contribute to meeting longer term requirements for the supply of sand and gravel in the southwards distribution area towards the end of the Plan period (Policy M07), and would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan. No overriding constraints have been identified at that stage through the site assessment process. However, it is considered that the part of the site to the east of the A1(M) is more sensitive particularly in landscape terms and should not be taken forward at this stage.	<b>Discounted site</b> as whilst at Preferred Options stage no overriding constraints had been identified through the site assessment process that would indicate that the land west of the A1 could not be developed and operated in an acceptable manner and development requirements could be identified through the Site Assessment process which would need to form part of the development proposals for any subsequent planning application, subsequently there has been no response from the landowner to confirm support for the inclusion of any part of this site as an allocation in the Joint Plan. Therefore, in the absence of this support it is considered that the site should not be allocated as there is no indication that it would be deliverable.	The site was originally put forward by an agent who retired in April 2014, however, prior to Preferred Options no confirmation had been received to state that the landowners wished to withdraw the site therefore the site was considered at that stage taking account of the issues identified through the site assessment process.  Since Preferred Options no confirmation has been received from the landowner to confirm support for the inclusion of any part of this site as an allocation in the Joint Plan. Therefore, in the absence of this support it is considered that the site should not be allocated, as there is no indication that it would be deliverable.
MJP37	Moor Lane, Great Ouseburn	Yes	Site listed in index	<b>Discounted site</b> as whilst it could contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of sand and gravel in the southwards distribution area over the Plan period (Policy M07), and would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan, and no overriding constraints have been identified at that stage through the site assessment process, it was considered that there would be likely to be significant adverse impacts, particularly on areas of ancient woodland, best and most versatile agricultural land, rights of way and the setting of Allerton Park	<b>Discounted site</b> as it is considered that there would be likely to be significant adverse impacts, particularly on areas of ancient woodland in Lylands Wood and The Dale; on water quality of areas downstream of the unnamed beck through The Dale; on historic assets or their setting, including potentially the setting of Allerton Park registered park and garden and the associated Listed Buildings, and archaeological features within or in close proximity to the site; and, on rights of way through the site. It is not considered on the basis of currently available evidence that the site could be developed and operated in an	No change in status, but additional clarification provided in the justification in terms of the nature of the constraints identified.

Site ref	Site Location	Site presented at Issues and Options	Site position at Supplementary Sites	Site status at Preferred Options Stage	Site status at Publication (pre-submission) stage	Reasons for change of Status and other changes
				registered park and garden and other options are considered more appropriate to meet the requirements.	acceptable manner and that other options are considered more appropriate to help meet the requirements in the sand and gravel southwards distribution area.	
MJP38	Mill Cottages, West Tanfield	Yes	Revised site area included in the document arising from the withdrawal of the original site area and its replacement by the field to the immediately to the west of the original site.	<b>Discounted site</b> as whilst it could contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of sand and gravel in the southwards distribution area over the Plan period (Policy M07), and would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan, the site is only capable of making a small contribution to requirements and it is considered that there would be likely to be significant adverse impacts, particularly on the historic environment south-east of West Tanfield, as well as on local amenity. Other options are considered more appropriate to meet the requirements.	<b>Discounted site</b> as it is only capable of making a small contribution to requirements for sand and gravel and it is considered that its development would be likely to give rise to significant adverse impacts, particularly on the setting of heritage assets south-east of West Tanfield (including Thornborough Henges and East Tanfield medieval village, West Tanfield Conservation Area, Listed Buildings including the Marmion Tower, West Tanfield Church of St Nicholas and Sleningford Mill), as well as on the local landscape and local amenity in the vicinity of West Tanfield village. Other options are considered more appropriate to help meet requirements in the sand and gravel southwards distribution area.	The revised site boundary was received in August 2014.  No change in status, but additional clarification provided in the justification in terms of the nature of the constraints identified.
MJP39	Quarry, House, West Tanfield	Yes	Site listed in index	<b>Discounted site</b> as whilst it could contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of sand and gravel in the southwards distribution area over the Plan period (Policy M07), and would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan and no overriding constraints were identified at this stage through the site assessment process, the site is only capable of making a small contribution to requirements and it is considered that there would be likely to be significant adverse impacts, particularly on the historic environment to the south-east of West Tanfield, local amenity as well as on users of the Ripon Rowel long distance footpath. Other options are considered more appropriate to meet the requirements.	<b>Discounted site</b> as it is only capable of making a small contribution to requirements and it is considered that there would be likely to be significant adverse impacts, particularly on the setting of heritage assets south-east of West Tanfield (including Thornborough Henges and East Tanfield medieval village, West Tanfield Conservation Area, Listed Buildings including the Marmion Tower, West Tanfield Church of St Nicholas and Sleningford Mill), as well as on the local amenity and landscape setting of West Tanfield village and on users of the Ripon Rowel Walk, which is an important public right of way. Other options are considered more appropriate to help meet requirements in the sand and gravel southwards distribution area.	No change in status, but additional clarification provided in the justification in terms of the nature of the constraints identified.
MJP40	Lawrence House Farm	Yes	None as site <b>withdrawn</b> after Issues & Options due to another submission also existing for this location (MJP05)	None	None	Site withdrawn
MJP41	Scalibar Farm, Knaresborough	Yes	Site listed in index	<b>Discounted site</b> as whilst it could contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of sand and gravel in the southwards distribution area over the Plan period (Policy M07), and would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan. No overriding constraints have been identified at this stage through the site assessment process.	<b>Discounted site</b> as it is considered that there would be likely to be significant adverse impacts, particularly on the setting of Goldsborough Hall and its associated designed landscape, Goldsborough Conservation Area and on the landscape of the river Nidd corridor and other options are considered more appropriate to help meet requirements in the sand and gravel	No change in status, but additional clarification provided in the justification in terms of the nature of the constraints identified.

Site ref	Site Location	Site presented at Issues and Options	Site position at Supplementary Sites	Site status at Preferred Options Stage	Site status at Publication (pre-submission) stage	Reasons for change of Status and other changes
				However, it is considered that there would be likely to be significant adverse impacts, particularly on best and most versatile land and the landscape and other options are considered more appropriate to meet the requirements.	southwards distribution area. There has been no response from the landowner to confirm support for the inclusion of this site as an allocation in the Joint Plan and there is therefore no indication that it would be deliverable. Therefore, taking into account the potential adverse impacts and in the absence of this support it is considered that the site should not be allocated.	
MJP42	Aram Grange	Yes	None as site withdrawn after Issues & Options due to another submission also existing for this location (MJP04)	None	None	Site withdrawn
MJP43	Land to west of Scruton	Yes	Revised site area included in the document due to the withdrawal of parts of the site area in the vicinity of Moor House Farm and Ham Hall and other part lying to the east of Carriage Rod Plantation.	<b>Part Preferred site and Part Discounted site</b> as it could contribute to meeting the longer term requirements for the supply of sand and gravel in the northwards distribution area (Policy M07), and would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan. Although no overriding constraints were identified at that stage through the site assessment process, it was considered that there would be significant landscape impacts with the potential extraction of mineral from the land to the west of Low Street due to the impact on the ridgeline parallel with the A1. The site is awkwardly configured to the east of Low Street. However, it is considered that part of the area does have some potential as a Preferred Site subject to satisfactory access being achieved via the Bedale-Aiskew-Leeming Bar Bypass.	<b>Discounted site</b> as it is considered that mineral extraction on land to the west of Low Street would be likely to give rise to adverse landscape and visual impact as a result of the change to the local topography and landscape character, and cumulatively in the context of other development in the vicinity of Leeming Bar. Revised proposals for the allocation of a reduced area of land, comprising a new 'greenfield' site to the east of Low Street, would only be able to make a small contribution to total supply requirements and, in any event, other options are considered more appropriate to meet identified requirements in this area, particularly taking into the potential for impact on local amenity and the potential for impact on historic assets and on best and most versatile agricultural land, and the potential for impacts associated with the need to achieve suitable road access to the site via Low Street.	The status changed because of further consideration of the site post-Preferred Options and discussions with the agent for the submitters about the potential for further reductions in the size of the site. However, in order to reduce the site size such that the potential for impact on local amenity, on historic assets and on best and most versatile agricultural land, and the potential for impacts associated with the need to achieve suitable road access to the site via Low Street were acceptable this would have led to an allocation that was only able to make a small contribution to total supply requirements.
MJP44	Land between Plasmor block making plant, Great Heck and Pollington	Yes	Site listed in index	<b>Preferred site</b> as it could contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of sand over the Plan period (Policy M08), and would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan. No overriding constraints were identified at this stage through the site assessment process.	<b>Allocated site</b> as it is consistent with the broad geographical approach to the supply of aggregates (Policy M01) and the provision of sand and gravel (Policies M02, M03 and M04) and could contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of sand over the Plan period (Policy M08) as evidence, including from the adjacent former quarry, indicates that there is a suitable resource in this location. No major issues have been raised by statutory consultees in respect of local amenity, landscape, biodiversity, historic and water environments which indicate any significant conflict with other relevant policies in the Plan.	No change in status, but additional clarification provided in the justification regarding the role of the site in the supply of aggregates, the provision of sand and gravel and the meeting of requirements for the supply of sand over the Plan period.
MJP45	Land to north of Hemingbrough	Yes	Site listed in index	<b>Preferred site</b> as it could contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of brick clay over the Plan period (Policy M13), and would not conflict with other strategic policies	<b>Allocated site</b> as it could contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of brick clay over the Plan period (Policy M13) as evidence, including from the adjacent existing quarry and recent	The site boundary was revised in May 2015 following a request to the agent for the site for confirmation as to whether the part of the site granted

Site ref	Site Location	Site presented at Issues and Options	Site position at Supplementary Sites	Site status at Preferred Options Stage	Site status at Publication (pre-submission) stage	Reasons for change of Status and other changes
				in the Plan. No overriding constraints have been identified at this stage through the site assessment process.	decision on an extension to the quarry NY/2015/0058/ENV, indicates that there is a suitable resource in this location. No major issues have been raised by statutory consultees in respect of local amenity, landscape, biodiversity, historic and water environments which indicate any significant conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan.	<p>planning permission in March 2016 (C8/2015/0280/CPO) was to be removed, which was confirmed.</p> <p>Prior to Publication the company advised that its preference was to extract reserves at MJP55 Escrick. However, if the clay within the MJP55 allocation is not available then the MJP45 reserve would be expected to commence within the plan period.</p> <p>No change in overall status, but additional clarification provided in the justification regarding the role of the site in the meeting of requirements for the supply of brick clay.</p>
MJP46	Kiplin plant processing sites, Kiplin	Yes	Site listed in index	<b>Discounted site</b> as whilst it could contribute to maintaining supply of aggregate through the continued provision of minerals processing infrastructure, the submitter has put this site forward primarily to provide capacity for processing mineral extracted from the Toft Hill site (MJP62). Although located open countryside this is an established site for mineral processing infrastructure and no overriding constraints have been identified at this stage through the site assessment process. However, as it is not proposed to allocate MJP62 as a Preferred Site it is considered that there is insufficient justification for the retention of this infrastructure in an open countryside location.	<b>Discounted site</b> as submitter has put this site forward primarily to provide capacity for processing mineral extracted from the Toft Hill site (MJP62) and although located in open countryside, this is an established site for mineral processing infrastructure and no overriding constraints have been identified at this stage through the site assessment process that would indicate that the site could not be developed and operated in an acceptable manner. However, as it is not proposed to allocate site MJP62 for minerals extraction, it is considered that there is insufficient justification for the retention of this infrastructure in an open countryside location.	No change in status.
MJP47	Bridge Farm, Catterick	Yes	None as site <b>withdrawn</b> after Issues & Options	None	None	Site withdrawn
MJP49	Metes Lane, Seamer	Yes	Site listed in index	<b>Discounted site</b> as whilst it could contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of sand and gravel in the southwards distribution area over the Plan period (Policy M07), and would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan. The site assessment process has identified the potential for significant adverse impacts particularly on the historic environment, groundwater, rights of way and the A64. Other options are considered more appropriate to meet the requirements.	<b>Discounted site</b> as the site assessment process has identified the potential for significant adverse impacts, including the presence of a groundwater protection zone protecting water supplies for Scarborough, as well as on the historic environment including nationally important assets associated with the Star Scheduled Monument. There is also the potential for landscape and visual impact and impact on users of rights of way in proximity to the site. Substantial reserves of sand and gravel are already permitted at an existing operational site in relatively close proximity to Scarborough and it is not considered that there is sufficient justification to release further reserves to override the potential adverse impacts identified.	No change in status, but additional clarification provided in the justification in terms of the nature of the constraints identified and the absence of sufficient justification to release further reserves to override the potential adverse impacts identified.



Site ref	Site Location	Site presented at Issues and Options	Site position at Supplementary Sites	Site status at Preferred Options Stage	Site status at Publication (pre-submission) stage	Reasons for change of Status and other changes
MJP50	Sands Wood, land to east of Sandy Lane, Wintringham	Yes	Site listed in index	<b>Discounted site</b> as whilst it could contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of sand over the Plan period (Policy M08), and would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan. The site assessment process has identified the potential for significant adverse impacts particularly on the biodiversity and historic assets of the area. Other options are considered more appropriate to meet the requirements.	<b>Discounted site</b> as the site assessment process has identified high potential for significant adverse impacts on: biodiversity (including at Wintringham Marsh SSSI, Sandy Lane Fields and West Knapton road verge SINCs and including rare habitat that would be difficult to recreate); and also has potential for significant adverse impact on historic assets and the landscape of the area. Other options are considered more appropriate to meet the identified requirements for building sand.	No change in status, but additional clarification provided in the justification in terms of the nature of the constraints identified and other options are considered more appropriate to meet the identified requirements for building sand
MJP51	Great Givendale, Ripon	Yes	Site listed in index	<b>Preferred site</b> as it could contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of sand and gravel in the southwards distribution area over the Plan period (Policy M07), and would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan. No overriding constraints have been identified at this stage through the site assessment process, subject to the site being worked via the processing plant and access to the highway for Ripon City Quarry.	<b>Discounted site</b> because although at Preferred Options no overriding constraints had been identified through the site assessment process, subject to the site being worked via the processing plant and access to the highway for Ripon City Quarry, the operator of that site has indicated that there may be an incompatibility in timing between the development of the MJP51 site and the expected restoration of the Ripon City Quarry and consequential removal of the Ripon City Quarry processing plant, resulting in an expectation that working of the proposed site on that basis is unlikely to be practicable.  Consideration was given to the potential for developing the MJP51 site separately in terms of stand-alone plant on the site and an access using Carriage Drive and Skelton Lane to reach the B6265. However, it is not considered that this access route is suitable for HGVs without major improvements to Carriage Lane and junction improvements on Skelton Lane and there are also issues with HGVs using the B6265 including the Hewick Bridge (Listed Building) over the river Ure to access markets to the west.	The status changed because it became evident that the suitability of the site for potential allocation had altered due to the operator of Ripon City Quarry indicating that there might be an incompatibility in timing between the development of the MJP51 site and the expected restoration of the Ripon City Quarry, and consequential removal of the Ripon City Quarry processing plant. The alternative of the potential for developing the MJP51 site separately in terms of stand-alone plant on the site and an access using Carriage Drive and Skelton Lane to reach the B6265 was explored but was not considered to be practicable due to the highway issues associated with Carriage Drive, Skelton Lane and the B6265 bridge over the river Ure.
MJP52	Field SE5356 9513, to north of Duttons Farm, Upper Poppleton	Yes	Site listed in index	<b>Preferred site</b> as it could contribute to the supply of engineering clay over the Plan period (Policy M13), and would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan. No overriding constraints have been identified at this stage through the site assessment process.	<b>Allocated site</b> as it could contribute to the supply of engineering clay over the Plan period (Policy M13) as evidence, including from the former excavation on site, indicates that there is a suitable resource in this location. No major issues have been raised by statutory consultees in respect of local amenity, landscape, biodiversity, historic and water environments which indicate any significant conflict with other relevant policies in the Plan.	No change in status.
MJP53	Land to north of Old London Road Quarry, Stutton	Yes	Site listed in index	<b>Discounted site</b> as whilst it could contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of Magnesian limestone over the Plan period (Policy M09), and would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan, substantial constraints have been identified at this stage through the site assessment	<b>Discounted site</b> as substantial constraints have been identified through the site assessment process including impact on the Registered Battlefield at Towton. It was considered that there would be likely to be significant adverse impacts, particularly on the elements which contribute to the significance of the registered battlefield, the	No change in status, but additional clarification provided in the justification in terms of the nature of the constraints identified.

Site ref	Site Location	Site presented at Issues and Options	Site position at Supplementary Sites	Site status at Preferred Options Stage	Site status at Publication (pre-submission) stage	Reasons for change of Status and other changes
				process including impact on the Registered Battlefield at Towton. It was considered that there would be likely to be significant adverse impacts on the elements which contribute to the significance of the registered battlefield, the local landscape, groundwater and rights of way and other options are considered more appropriate to meet the requirements.	local landscape, groundwater and users of rights of way including along Old London Road, and other options are considered more appropriate to contribute to requirements for Magnesian Limestone.	
MJP54	Mill Balk Quarry, Great Heck	Yes	Site listed in index	<b>Preferred site</b> as it could contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of sand over the Plan period (Policy M08), and would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan. No overriding constraints have been identified at this stage through the site assessment process.	Allocated site as it is consistent with the broad geographical approach to the supply of aggregates (Policy M01) and the provision of sand and gravel (Policies M02, M03 and M04) and could contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of sand over the Plan period (Policy M08) as evidence, including from the existing quarry, indicates that there is a suitable resource in this location. No major issues have been raised by statutory consultees in respect of local amenity, landscape, biodiversity and historic environment which indicate any significant conflict with other relevant policies in the Plan.	No change in overall status, but additional clarification provided in the justification regarding the role of the site in the supply of aggregates and provision of sand and gravel and the contribution to meeting requirements for the supply of sand.
MJP55	Land adjacent to former Escrick Brickworks	Yes	Revised site area (additional area to west of Glade Farm & revision to part of existing boundary in vicinity of Mount Farm) and details included in the document.	Site is identified as a <b>Preferred Area</b> within which an appropriately scaled site could be developed if required as it could contribute to meeting longer term requirements for the supply of brick clay for the Plasmor block works in the event that sufficient supplies cannot be obtained from the Preferred site at Hemingbrough (MJP45) towards the end of the Plan period (Policy M13). The site is large and contains resources well in excess of those likely to be required to meet the current policy requirements. The site is also subject to significant constraints. However, it is considered that subject to appropriate siting, design and mitigation there is likely to be potential to develop an appropriately scaled site within the overall area put forward.	Site is identified as a <b>Preferred Area</b> within which an appropriately scaled site could be developed if required as it could contribute to meeting longer term requirements for the supply of brick clay for existing block manufacturing capacity in the Plan area in the event that sufficient supplies cannot be obtained from the existing Hemingbrough site during the second half of the Plan period (Policy M13). Evidence, including from the adjacent former quarry, indicates that there is a suitable resource in this location. The area is large and contains resources well in excess of those likely to be required to meet the current policy requirements. The area is also subject to significant constraints regarding ecological issues, heritage assets and the Trans Pennine Trail. However, it is considered that subject to appropriate siting, design and mitigation there is likely to be potential to develop, within the overall area put forward, an appropriately scaled site to meet any additional requirements in the later part of Plan period.	<p>Site area was revised at Supplementary Sites in response to requests for clarification about the site received between June and September 2014.</p> <p>At Preferred Options MJP55 was proposed to enable a continuation of clay resource to the existing Heck facility operated by the submitter once the reserves at Hemingbrough Quarry proposed in MJP45 had been extracted but was identified as a Preferred Area rather than a Preferred Site as it was recognised that the overall area could supply more than likely requirements but that this was likely to be scaled down via development of the site design due to constraints.</p> <p>A further additional area to the west of the existing site boundary to the west of Mount Farm was submitted post-Preferred Options. This area was immediately adjacent to the area already under consideration.</p> <p>By Publication the submitter had advised that the site was proposed to enable continued supply of clay to the existing Heck block manufacturing facility operated by the submitter, once</p>

Site ref	Site Location	Site presented at Issues and Options	Site position at Supplementary Sites	Site status at Preferred Options Stage	Site status at Publication (pre-submission) stage	Reasons for change of Status and other changes
						<p>the reserves at Hemingbrough Quarry permitted via Planning Permission C8/2015/0280/CPO have been extracted. The company advised that its preference was to extract reserves at MJP55 Escrick. However, if the clay within the MJP55 allocation is not available then the MJP45 reserve would be expected to commence within the plan period.</p> <p>No overall change in status as it was recognised that the overall area could supply more than likely requirements but additional clarification provided in the justification regarding the role of the site in the meeting of requirements for the supply of brick clay and additional clarification provide via the development requirements that the site, if developed, was likely to be scaled down in the site design to address constraints.</p>
MJP56	Brotherton Quarry, Burton Salmon	Yes	None as site <b>withdrawn</b> after Issues & Options in October 2014 as permission for the extension of time of the quarry had been granted.	None	None	Site withdrawn.
MJP57	Potgate Quarry, North Stainley (recycling)	Yes	Site listed in index	None as <b>withdrawn</b> by submitter prior to Preferred Options as replacement location at Potgate Quarry proposed (see WJP23 below)	None	Site withdrawn.
MJP58	Old London Road, Stutton	Yes	Site listed in index	<b>Discounted site</b> as whilst it could contribute to the provision of infrastructure which could help move waste up the waste hierarchy over the Plan period (Policy W01), the location would not be consistent with Policy W11 relating to site identification principles as it is not located within an active quarry. Although the development could also make some contribution to supply of Magnesian limestone, the proposed total volume is very small and would not make a significant contribution to total supply. Additionally, substantial constraints have been identified at this stage through the site assessment process. It is considered that there would be likely to be significant adverse impacts, including on the setting of the Registered Battlefield at Towton and the character and	<b>Discounted site</b> as whilst it could contribute to the provision of infrastructure which could help move waste up the waste hierarchy over the Plan period (Policy W01). However, the location would not be consistent with Policy W11 relating to site identification principles as it is not located within an active quarry. Although the development could also make some contribution to supply of Magnesian limestone, the proposed total volume is very small and would not make a significant contribution to total supply. Additionally, substantial constraints have been identified at this stage through the site assessment process including in relation to access, potential impact on ground water and potential ecological impact. It is also considered that there would be likely to be significant adverse impacts on the setting of the Registered Battlefield at Towton, including on	<p>The nature of the site changed prior the Preferred Options following the receipt of clarification from the submitter's agent that the proposal was no longer just for secondary aggregate recycling but was extraction of Magnesian limestone, secondary aggregate recycling, storage of mineral fines and partial infilling with imported mineral fines material.</p> <p>No change in status, but additional clarification provided on the reasons for discounting.</p>

Site ref	Site Location	Site presented at Issues and Options	Site position at Supplementary Sites	Site status at Preferred Options Stage	Site status at Publication (pre-submission) stage	Reasons for change of Status and other changes
				amenity of the Green Belt.	elements which contribute to the significance of the Battlefield. It is acknowledged that this proposal could in the long-term achieve the reclamation of what is currently an unrestored site. However, it is not considered that the positive benefit of restoring the site outweighs the adverse impacts likely to arise from the extraction, recycling storage and need to import material to achieve the restoration.	
MJP59	Spikers Quarry, West Ayton	Yes	Site listed in index	<b>Discounted site</b> as whilst it could contribute to the supply of crushed rock over the Plan period (Policy M09), given the likely scale of this proposal it will need to be considered robustly against the criteria for major development in designated areas as set out in paragraph 116 of the NPPF. For this reason it is not considered that the proposal can be considered through a strategic level assessment and a full planning application is considered to be the most appropriate mechanism for resolving this issue. The site assessment process has identified other significant potential adverse impacts particularly on the biodiversity, landscape and water environment of the locality.	<b>Discounted site</b> as notwithstanding the potential of this site to supply building stone suitable of use in the local area including within the North York Moors National Park, given the likely scale of this proposal it will need to be considered robustly against the criteria for major development in designated areas as set out in paragraph 116 of the NPPF. For this reason it is not considered that the proposal can be considered through a strategic level assessment and a full planning application is considered to be the most appropriate mechanism for resolving this issue. It is not considered that there is sufficient justification to allocate the site in order to meet requirements for Jurassic limestone for aggregate purposes as an overall shortfall in supply of this type of crushed rock has not been identified and national planning policy does not support the working of resources of aggregate in National Parks in order to maintain landbanks. The site assessment process has identified significant potential adverse impacts particularly on biodiversity and the water environment (including potential groundwater effects) in the locality, including the potential impact of the development on biodiversity including the Forge Valley Wood National Nature Reserve, and on the landscape and enjoyment of the National Park, as well as potentially on heritage assets.	No change in status, but additional clarification provided on the reasons for discounting.
MJP60	Land to west of Kirkby Fleetham	Not applicable	Site area and details included in the document.	<b>Discounted site</b> as it could contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of sand and gravel in the northwards distribution area over the Plan period (Policy M07), and would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan. However, it is considered that there would be likely to be significant adverse impacts including on local amenity, best and most versatile agricultural land and the local landscape and other options are considered more appropriate to meet the requirements.	<b>Discounted site</b> as it is considered that there would be potential for significant adverse impact on local amenity in the villages of Kirkby Fleetham, Great and Little Fencote and on other properties in the vicinity of the site, taking into account the proximity of the site to these areas, as well as impact on the local landscape and visual impact. There is also the potential for significant adverse impact on the historic environment and on BMV agricultural land. Other options are considered more appropriate to meet the identified requirements in the sand and gravel northwards distribution area.	Site was received in April 2014.  No change in status, but additional clarification provided on the reasons for discounting.
MJP61	Land to the south	Not applicable	Site area and	None, as <b>withdrawn</b> by submitter prior to	None.	Site was received as part of

Site ref	Site Location	Site presented at Issues and Options	Site position at Supplementary Sites	Site status at Preferred Options Stage	Site status at Publication (pre-submission) stage	Reasons for change of Status and other changes
	of Alne Brickworks		details included in the document.	Preferred Options as received planning permission in July 2015		representation during Issues and Options consultation. Site was withdrawn by submitter once planning permission was received.
MJP62	Land at Toft Hill, near Kiplin	Not applicable	Site area and details included in the document.	<b>Discounted site</b> as whilst it could contribute to meeting requirements for the supply of sand and gravel in the northwards distribution area over the Plan period (Policy M07), and would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan, the site is only capable of making a small contribution to requirements and it is considered that there would be likely to be significant adverse impacts particularly in terms of landscape, visual intrusion and local amenity. Other options are considered more appropriate to meet the requirements.	<b>Discounted site</b> as it is only capable of making a small contribution to requirements in the sand and gravel northwards distribution area and it is considered that there would be likely to be significant adverse impacts, particularly in terms of landscape, visual intrusion and local amenity in Ellerton. Other options are considered more appropriate to meet the requirements.	Site was received in July 2014.  No change in status.
MJP63	Brows Quarry, Malton	Not applicable	None, as site was submitted as part of a representation on the Supplementary Sites Consultation	<b>Preferred site</b> as it could contribute to supply of building stone over the Plan period (Policy M15), and would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan. No overriding constraints were identified at this stage through the site assessment process and the site has recently been the subject of a planning permission for building stone extraction. However, this was a preliminary conclusion, pending further assessment.	<b>Allocated site</b> as it could contribute to supply of building stone over the Plan period (Policy M15) as evidence, including from the former quarry at the site, indicates that there is a suitable resource in this location. No major issues have been raised by statutory consultees in respect of local amenity, landscape, biodiversity, historic and water environments which indicate any significant conflict with other relevant policies in the Plan.	Site was received in March 2015 in response to the Supplementary Sites Consultation.  No change in status.
MJP64	Cropton Quarry, Cropton	Not applicable	Not applicable as received separately in April 2015 after the closure of the consultation period on the Supplementary Sites Consultation.	<b>Discounted site</b> as whilst it could contribute to supply of building stone (Policy M15) and crushed rock over the Plan period (Policy M09), it was considered that there would be likely to be a significant potential risk of contamination of a groundwater source protection zone, as well as significant adverse impacts on the amenity of residents in Wrelton due to the scale and nature of traffic associated with the development. Other options are considered more appropriate to meet the requirements for crushed rock.	<b>Discounted site</b> as it was considered that there would be likely to be significant adverse impacts on the amenity of residents in Wrelton due to the scale and nature of the traffic associated with the development, the fairly narrow roads and tight turns in Wrelton and the increase in HGV traffic turning at the junction of the A170 by the village. There is also the potential for significant adverse impact on the landscape and a potential risk of contamination of a groundwater source protection zone for drinking water abstraction at Pickering. Evidence supporting the Joint Plan has not indicated any overall need, in strategic terms, to release additional reserves of Jurassic Limestone for aggregate purposes for the plan period and there is no express requirement in national policy to maintain a specific landbank for building stone.	No change in status, but additional clarification provided on the reasons for discounting.
WJP01	Hillcrest, Harmby	Yes	Revised details included in the document.	<b>Preferred site</b> as could contribute to the provision of infrastructure which could help move waste up the waste hierarchy (Policies W01 and W04) and it would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan, including Policy W11 waste site identification principles and W02 strategic role of Plan area in the management of waste. No overriding constraints have been identified at this stage	<b>Discounted site</b> as whilst this site could contribute to the provision of a small amount of increased capacity for recycling of CD & E waste, for which a capacity gap has been identified in the evidence base for the Joint Plan, this would be in substitution for the current role of the site in providing local waste management capacity for end of life vehicles, and this could substantially reduce any benefit in strategic terms resulting	The status of the site changed as it was considered that the proposed use, whilst it would provide capacity for recycling of CD & E waste for which a capacity gap had been identified in the evidence base, would be in substitution for the current role of the site. The Environment Agency permit for the site

Site ref	Site Location	Site presented at Issues and Options	Site position at Supplementary Sites	Site status at Preferred Options Stage	Site status at Publication (pre-submission) stage	Reasons for change of Status and other changes
				through the site assessment process.	from allocating the site for the proposed use. The development policies in the Plan provide flexibility and support in principle for further development within the footprint of established waste management sites and therefore provide a mechanism for consideration of specific proposals for further development at this site, should these be sought during the life of the Plan. Therefore there would be no overall net gain in waste facility provision. Development of the site for the proposed use also has the potential to give rise to increased visual impact in a relatively sensitive location.	is for end of life vehicles and, whilst the operator wishes to move away from that activity, it is local capacity for management of that type of waste. There would be no overall net gain in waste facility provision.  A significant number of representations against this site were received at Preferred Options raising a range of amenity issues and there were concerns that the proposed use also has the potential to give rise to increased visual impact in a relatively sensitive location in Wensleydale.
WJP02	Former North Selby Mine Site, Deighton	Yes	Referred to in Note 2 below Site list as being a site that had received planning permission ( <i>in April 2014</i> ). No site area plan was included.	Reference was made to the site in paragraphs 6.65-6.66 as being a committed sites which was defined in the footnote as ' <i>have planning permission for the development for which they have been put forward</i> ' and that the site was proposed for safeguarding.  The site was also referred to in <i>Note 2</i> , below the Site List at start of Appendix 1 (Preferred and Discounted Sites), as being a site that had been submitted for consideration for allocation, but which had not been considered through the site assessment as the development had received planning permission. However, to reflect that permitted status the site was identified on the Policies Map as a committed site, and was also identified as a safeguarded waste site in Appendix 2 of the Preferred Options Consultation.	<b>Allocated site</b> as it could contribute to the provision of infrastructure which could help move waste up the waste hierarchy (Policy W01) and contribute to net self-sufficiency in capacity for the management of waste (Policy W02) and provide flexibility in capacity for management of C & I waste in line with Policy W04 and would be consistent with the overall locational principles for waste capacity (Policy W10) and Policy W11 waste site identification principles. Although the site has the benefit of planning permission for the development of an anaerobic digestion facility this has not been implemented. The scale of capacity that could be provided at the site is such that it is of strategic importance and the site therefore has potential. Although, the site is located in the Green Belt permission has already been granted for development of an anaerobic digestion facility on the site which has not yet been implemented. This permission has established the principle of the suitability of the site for this form of development.  The Site was also identified as a safeguarded waste site in Appendix 2 of the Publication Draft	For consistency of approach in the Supplementary Sites Consultation, those sites which had received planning permission since the Issues and Options Consultation, including site WJP02, were not listed in the Site List; but rather these sites were referred to in notes below the list.  A similar approach was used at Preferred Options in terms of the Site List, but reference was made to the site, together with the Southmoor Energy Centre and the former ARBRE site, in paragraphs 6.65-6.66 as a committed site and that the site was proposed for safeguarding. The site boundary proposed for safeguarding at Preferred Options reflected the site boundary as proposed by the submitter when the site was submitted in 2013.  Following further consideration of the site's potential strategic significance in meeting waste management capacity requirements for commercial and industrial waste and in the light of representations received at Preferred Options, including from the submitter, the WJP02 site was proposed for allocation at the Publication Stage. At the time of drafting the Publication document the planning permission had yet to be implemented and was the subject of a time limit on that implementation. The elevation of the status of the site from safeguarded site

Site ref	Site Location	Site presented at Issues and Options	Site position at Supplementary Sites	Site status at Preferred Options Stage	Site status at Publication (pre-submission) stage	Reasons for change of Status and other changes
						<p>to an allocation was to emphasise the site's potential to play a strategically significant role in the management of waste.</p> <p>The site boundary was reduced, relative to the area published at Issues and Options, to reflect the area requested by the submitter in the representation to the Preferred Options.</p>
WJP03	Southmoor Energy Centre, former Kellingley Colliery	Yes	Revised site area (reflecting the site area proposed in planning application NY/2013/0128/ENV) included in the document as requested by the submitter in May 2014.	<p>Reference was made to the site in paragraphs 6.65-6.66 as being a committed sites which was defined in the footnote as '<i>have planning permission for the development for which they have been put forward</i>' and that the site was proposed for safeguarding.</p> <p>The site was referred to in <i>Note 2</i>, below the Site List at start of Appendix 1 (Preferred and Discounted Sites), as being a site that had been submitted for consideration for allocation, but which had not been considered through the site assessment as the development had received planning permission. However, to reflect that permitted status the site was identified on the Policies Map as a committed site, and was also identified as a safeguarded waste site in Appendix 2 of the Preferred Options Consultation.</p>	<b>Allocated site</b> as it could contribute to the provision of infrastructure which could help move waste up the waste hierarchy (Policy W01) and contribute to net self-sufficiency in capacity for the management of waste (Policy W02) and provide flexibility in capacity for management of C & I waste in line with Policy W04, overall locational principles for waste capacity (Policy W10) and Policy W11 waste site identification principles. Although the site has the benefit of planning permission for the development of a waste to energy recovery facility this has not been implemented. The scale of capacity that could be provided at the site is such that it is of strategic importance and the site is therefore allocated to help retain this potential for the future.	<p>Revised details and plan, as received from the submitter in 2014, were published in the Supplementary Sites Consultation (January 2015).</p> <p>At Preferred Options those sites which had received planning permission since the Supplementary Sites Consultation, including site WJP03, were not listed in the Site List, but rather such sites were referred to in notes below the list. Reference was also made to the site, together with the North Selby Mine site and the former ARBRE site, in paragraphs 6.65-6.66 as a committed site and that the site was proposed for safeguarding. The site boundary proposed for safeguarding at Preferred Options reflected the site boundary as proposed by the submitter in 2014.</p> <p>Following further consideration of the site's potential role in the meeting waste management capacity requirements for commercial and industrial waste and in the light of representations received at Preferred Options, including from the submitter, the WJP03 site was proposed for allocation at the Publication Stage and the site boundary was changed to reflect the area requested by the submitter in the representation to the Preferred Options.</p>
WJP04	Old London Road Quarry, Stutton	Yes	Site listed in index, but no further details presented, as site had not been revised.	<b>Discounted site</b> as which the recycling element of this site could contribute to the provision of infrastructure which could help move waste up the waste hierarchy over the Plan period (Policy W01), the recycling is proposed in association with landfill and the landfilling of the site is not required as part of a current agreed reclamation scheme (Policy	<b>Discounted site</b> as whilst the recycling element of this site could contribute to the provision of infrastructure which could help move waste up the waste hierarchy over the Plan period (Policy W01), the recycling is proposed in association with landfill and the landfilling of the site is not required as part of a current agreed reclamation scheme (Policy W01). Although the development	The site was originally proposed for landfill and recycling of waste at Issues and Options, but, prior to Preferred Options although there was no change to the site boundary the submitter changed the proposal to include, as well as the original elements, the extraction of Magnesian limestone if

Site ref	Site Location	Site presented at Issues and Options	Site position at Supplementary Sites	Site status at Preferred Options Stage	Site status at Publication (pre-submission) stage	Reasons for change of Status and other changes
				W01). Although the development could make some contribution to supply of Magnesian limestone, the proposed total volume is small and would not make a significant contribution to total supply. Additionally, substantial constraints had been identified at this stage through the site assessment process. It was considered that there would be likely to be significant adverse impacts including on the setting of the Registered Battlefield at Towton and on the character and amenity of the Green Belt.	could make some contribution to supply of Magnesian limestone, the proposed total volume is small and would not make a significant contribution to total supply requirements. Additionally, substantial constraints had been identified at this stage through the site assessment process. It was considered that there would be likely to be significant adverse impacts including on the setting of the Registered Battlefield at Towton and the elements which contribute to its significance, and the potential for adverse visual impact and impact on the users of public rights of way. It is acknowledged that this proposal could in the long-term achieve the reclamation of the land to the west of Old London Road which is currently an unrestored site. However, it is not considered that the positive benefit of restoring the site outweighs the adverse impacts likely to arise from the extraction, recycling storage and need to import material to achieve the restoration.	MJP31 were developed, temporary storage of mineral fines arising if MJP31 and MJP53 were developed.  No change in status has occurred, as the site assessment process took into account the information available at the time of preparation of the Preferred Options and subsequently the information available at the time of preparation of the Publication stage, including representations and information received on behalf of the submitter. The additional information also informed the consideration of the site's potential to move waste up the waste hierarchy over the Plan period (Policy W01) and in terms of the other waste requirements of the Plan.
WJP05	Field to north of Duttons Farm, Upper Poppleton	Yes	Site listed in index but no further details presented, as site had not been revised.	<b>Preferred site</b> as it is proposed as the means to enable the restoration of the MJP52 site, and as such, would not conflict with the strategic policies in the Plan (Policies W01, WJP02 and W11). The site would need to be restored to a use compatible with the location in the Green Belt. No overriding constraints have been identified at this stage through the site assessment process. The site would only be taken forward in association with MJP52.	<b>Allocated site</b> as it is proposed as the means to enable the restoration of the MJP52 clay extraction site, and as such, would not conflict with the strategic policies in the Plan (Policies W01, W02, W10 and W11) and would contribute to meeting capacity requirements for C, D & E waste (Policy W05). Recycling of waste would assist in moving management of waste up the hierarchy and the site would provide capacity for inert landfill to help meet any future requirements. The site would only be taken forward in association with MJP52.	Following a request for clarification on matters relating to the original submission after the closure of the Supplementary Sites Consultation in March 2015, the submitter changed the nature of the submission to include recycling as well as the original landfill proposal.  No change in status, but additional clarification provided in the justification in terms of the potential role of the site in contributing to meeting capacity requirements for C, D & E waste and moving management of waste up the hierarchy
WJP06	Land adjacent to former Escrick Brickworks	Yes.	Revised site area and details included in the document as requested by the submitter in May 2014.	Site identified as a <b>Preferred Area</b> which would only be taken forward in conjunction with the development of MJP55. Preferred site may have some potential for inert landfill in order to achieve the reclamation of the site to agriculture in association with any future working of clay as part of site MJP55 and in these circumstances could be consistent with Policies W01, W02 and W11. The site is also subject to significant constraints. However, it is considered that these are likely to be capable of mitigation.	Site identified as a <b>Preferred Area</b> which would only be taken forward in conjunction with the development of MJP55. The area may have some potential for inert landfill in order to achieve the reclamation of the site to agriculture in association with any future working of clay as part of preferred area MJP55 and in order to meet any longer term needs for landfill of inert waste and in these circumstances could be consistent with Policies W01, W02 and W11 and it would also contribute to meeting capacity requirements for C, D & E waste (Policy W05). The area is also subject to significant constraints regarding ecological issues, heritage assets and the Trans Pennine Trail. However, it is considered that	The site area was revised at Supplementary Sites in response to requests for clarification about the site received between June and September 2014.  At Preferred Options the identification of the WJP06 site as a Preferred Area was a consequential change arising from the changes to the MJP55 clay extraction proposal.  A further additional area to the west of the existing site boundary to the west of Mount Farm was submitted post-



Site ref	Site Location	Site presented at Issues and Options	Site position at Supplementary Sites	Site status at Preferred Options Stage	Site status at Publication (pre-submission) stage	Reasons for change of Status and other changes
					these are likely to be capable of mitigation.	<p>Preferred Options. This area was immediately adjacent to the area already under consideration.</p> <p>The changes to the site area at Publication and associated identification as a Preferred Area were again consequential changes arising from changes to the MJP55 clay extraction proposal.</p> <p>No change in status, but additional clarification provided in the justification in terms of the potential role as a landfill for inert water and contribution to meeting capacity requirements for C, D &amp; E waste. However, a flood risk exclusion area was designated arising from the work on flood risk as part of the work on the sustainability appraisal of the site in 2016.</p>
WJP07	Land on former Pollington airfield	Yes.	Site listed in index but no further details presented, as site had not been revised.	Site <b>withdrawn</b> prior to Preferred Options and superseded by site submission WJP22.	None, as site already withdrawn.	Site withdrawn
WJP08	Allerton Park, near Knaresborough	Yes,	Site listed in index but no further details presented, as site had not been revised.	<b>Preferred site</b> as it already contributes to the waste management capacity within the Plan area and the adjacent Allerton Waste Recovery Park which is under construction will add to the range of facilities in this locality. Support for the retention of existing uses and development of appropriate further uses could further contribute to the provision of infrastructure which could help move waste up the waste hierarchy (Policy W01) and facilitate net self-sufficiency in capacity (Policies W02 and W03). The continuation of the landfill would enable the reclamation of the former quarry void and would maintain increasingly scarce capacity for non-inert, non-hazardous waste. No overriding constraints have been identified at this stage through the site assessment process.	<b>Allocated site</b> as it already contributes to waste management capacity within the Plan area and the adjacent Allerton Waste Recovery Park, which is under construction, will add to the range of facilities in this locality, which represents a strategically significant location for the management of waste arising in the Plan area. Provision of support for the retention of existing uses and development of appropriate further uses could further contribute to the provision of infrastructure which could help move waste up the waste hierarchy (Policy W01) and facilitate net self-sufficiency in capacity (Policy W02) and the meeting of capacity requirements for LACW and C& I waste (Policies W03 and W04). The continuation of the landfill would enable the reclamation of the former quarry void and would maintain increasingly scarce capacity for non-inert, non-hazardous waste. The site is also compatible with Policies W10 overall locational principles for waste capacity and W11 waste site identification principles.	<p>The original submission was for landfill, landfill gas utilisation, energy/biomass crop growth, energy from waste, composting, transfer station, materials recycling facility and recycling for secondary aggregates. Clarification was received from the submitter in April 2015 that EFW no longer part of the WJP08 submission so that was removed from the proposal at Preferred Options.</p> <p>No change in status, but additional clarification provided in the justification regarding the retention of existing uses and development of appropriate further uses contribution to the provision of infrastructure which could help move waste up the waste hierarchy, facilitation of net self-sufficiency in capacity and the meeting of capacity requirements for LACW and C&amp; I waste.</p>
WJP09	Whitewall Quarry materials recycling facility,	Yes	Site listed in index but no further details presented,	<b>Discounted site</b> as, whilst it could contribute to the further provision of infrastructure which could help move waste up the waste	<b>Discounted Site</b> as the Waste Disposal Authority had not indicated any requirement for a facility in this location to deal with household waste and the	No change in status, as evidence from the Waste Disposal Authority does not indicate there is a requirement for such

Site ref	Site Location	Site presented at Issues and Options	Site position at Supplementary Sites	Site status at Preferred Options Stage	Site status at Publication (pre-submission) stage	Reasons for change of Status and other changes
	near Norton		as site had not been revised.	hierarchy (Policy W01), the Waste Disposal Authority had not indicated any requirement for a facility in this location to deal with household waste and the County Council was already developing a waste transfer station for household waste at Kirby Misperton. The development could add significantly to traffic movements on local roads in combination with existing and proposed development in this location. It was not considered that there was sufficient justification for this form of development in this location.	County Council was developing a waste transfer station for household waste at Kirby Misperton. The development could add significantly to existing HGV traffic movements on local roads, including on Welham Hill Road and in Norton, in combination with other traffic associated with Whitewall Quarry, leading to additional impacts on local communities. It was not considered that there was sufficient justification for this form of development in this location to override this concern.	a facility in this location to deal with household waste arising in the area, and, therefore there was insufficient justification for this form of development in this location to override the traffic concern.
WJP10	Went Edge Quarry recycling, near Kirk Smeaton	Yes	Site listed in index but no further details presented, as site had not been revised.	<b>Preferred site</b> as it could contribute to the provision of infrastructure which could help move waste up the waste hierarchy (Policies W01 and W11 waste site identification principles and W02 strategic role of Plan area in the management of waste) and subject to it being linked to the life of Went Edge Quarry it would not conflict with the policy on Green Belt D05. No overriding constraints had been identified at this stage through the site assessment process.	<b>Allocated site</b> as it could contribute to the provision of infrastructure which could help move waste up the waste hierarchy (Policies W01 and W11 waste site identification principles and W02 strategic role of Plan area in the management of waste) and would contribute to meeting capacity requirements for CD & E waste (Policy W05).	No change in status
WJP11	Harewood Whin, Rufforth	Yes	Revised site area and details included in the document as requested by the submitter in May 2014.	<b>Preferred site</b> as it already contributes to waste management capacity within the Plan area. Provision of support for the retention of existing uses and development of appropriate additional uses could further contribute to the provision of infrastructure which could help move waste up the waste hierarchy (Policy W01) and facilitate net self-sufficiency in capacity (Policy W03). The continuation of the landfill would maintain increasingly scarce capacity for non-inert, non-hazardous waste. The location of the site within the Green Belt is a significant constraint which may limit the scale and nature of waste development that may be appropriate.  However, as further clarification was being sought from the submitter in relation to future development intentions for this site, the conclusion on this site was preliminary only.	<b>Allocated site</b> as it already contributes to waste management capacity within the Plan area. Provision of support for the retention of existing uses and development of appropriate additional uses could further contribute to the provision of infrastructure which could help move waste up the waste hierarchy (Policy W01) and facilitate net self-sufficiency in capacity (Policy W02) and the meeting of capacity requirements for LACW and C& I waste (Policies W03 and W04). The site is also compatible with Policies W10 overall locational principles for waste capacity and W11 waste site identification principles. The continuation of the landfill would maintain increasingly scarce capacity for non-inert, non-hazardous waste. Although this is a well-established site with a range of existing waste uses, its location within the Green Belt is a significant constraint which may limit the scale and nature of waste development that may be appropriate.	The original proposal was for landfill, open windrow composting, recycling including bulking & transfer and liquid waste treatment. An additional site area and proposed new materials recycling facility and waste transfer facility were received from the submitter in May 2014, but that additional site area was removed together with land in the south-west corner of the site, the proposed materials recycling facility and the composting proposal prior to Publication as the site areas removed and the MRF were no longer proposed and the composting area had been granted in May 2016.  No change in status, but additional clarification provided in the justification regarding the contribution to the provision of infrastructure that could help move waste up the waste hierarchy, the facilitating of net self-sufficiency in capacity, the meeting of capacity requirements for LACW and C& I waste and the compatibility with overall locational principles for waste capacity and waste site identification

Site ref	Site Location	Site presented at Issues and Options	Site position at Supplementary Sites	Site status at Preferred Options Stage	Site status at Publication (pre-submission) stage	Reasons for change of Status and other changes
						principles. However, a flood risk exclusion area was designated arising from the work on flood risk as part of the work on the sustainability appraisal of the site in 2016.
WJP13	Halton East, near Skipton	Yes	Site listed in index but no further details presented, as site had not been revised.	<b>Preferred Site</b> as it could contribute to the provision of infrastructure which could help move waste up the waste hierarchy (Policy W01) and facilitate net self-sufficiency in the management of waste (Policy W02) and it would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan, including Policy W11 waste site identification principles. No overriding constraints have been identified at this stage through the site assessment process.	<b>Allocated site</b> as it could contribute to the retention of infrastructure which could help move waste up the waste hierarchy (Policy W01) and facilitate net self-sufficiency in the management of waste (Policy W02). No major issues have been raised by statutory consultees in respect of local amenity, landscape, biodiversity, historic and water environment which indicate any significant conflict with other relevant policies in the Plan, including Policies W03 meeting capacity requirements for LACW, W04 meeting capacity requirements for C & I waste, W10 overall locational principles for waste capacity and W11 waste site identification principles.	No change in status, but additional clarification provided in the justification regarding the retention helping move waste up the waste hierarchy, facilitating of net self-sufficiency in capacity, the meeting of capacity requirements for LACW and C& I waste and the compatibility with overall locational principles for waste capacity and waste site identification principles.
WJP15	Seamer Carr, Eastfield, Scarborough	Yes	Site listed in index but no further details presented, as site had not been revised.	<b>Preferred site</b> as it could contribute to the provision of infrastructure which could help move waste up the waste hierarchy (Policy W01) and facilitate net self-sufficiency in the management of waste (Policy W02) and would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan including Policy W11 waste site identification principles. No overriding constraints were identified at that stage through the site assessment process.	<b>Allocated site</b> as it could contribute to the provision of infrastructure which could help move waste up the waste hierarchy (Policy W01) and facilitate net self-sufficiency in the management of waste (Policy W02), meeting capacity requirements for LACW (Policy W03) and meeting capacity requirements for C & I waste (Policy W04). No major issues have been raised by statutory consultees in respect of local amenity, landscape, biodiversity, historic and water environment which indicate any significant conflict with other relevant policies in the Plan including W10 meeting overall requirements for the provision of waste capacity and Policy W11 waste site identification principles.	The original submission was for landfill, recycling (including treatment, building & transfer, open windrow composting & Energy from waste (biomass & landfill gas utilisation). The submission was altered in discussion with the submitter prior to Preferred Options by the removal of the landfill element (as that was no longer permitted by the Environment Agency) and the inclusion of a new inert waste screening facility.  No change in status, but additional clarification provided in the justification regarding the provision of infrastructure that could help move waste up the waste hierarchy, facilitate net self-sufficiency in capacity, meet capacity requirements for LACW and C& I waste and the compatibility with overall locational principles for waste capacity and waste site identification principles. However, a flood risk exclusion area was designated arising from the work on flood risk as part of the work on the sustainability appraisal of the site in 2016.
WJP16	Common Lane, Burn	Yes	Site listed in index but no further details presented, as site had not been revised.	<b>Preferred site</b> as it could contribute to the provision of infrastructure which could help move waste up the waste hierarchy (Policy W01) and facilitate net self-sufficiency in capacity for management of waste (Policies W03 and W04), and it would not conflict with	<b>Allocated site</b> as it could contribute to the provision of infrastructure which could help move waste up the waste hierarchy (Policy W01) and facilitate net self-sufficiency in capacity for management of waste (Policies W03 and W04), and it would not conflict with Policy W10 overall	No change in status, but additional clarification provided in the justification regarding the provision of infrastructure that could help move waste up the waste hierarchy, facilitate net self-sufficiency in capacity, meet capacity

Site ref	Site Location	Site presented at Issues and Options	Site position at Supplementary Sites	Site status at Preferred Options Stage	Site status at Publication (pre-submission) stage	Reasons for change of Status and other changes
				Policy W11 waste site identification principles. No overriding constraints were identified at this stage through the site assessment process.	locational principles for waste capacity and Policy W11 waste site identification principles.	requirements for LACW and C& I waste and the compatibility with overall locational principles for waste capacity and waste site identification principles.
WJP17	Skibeden, near Skipton	Yes	Site listed in index but no further details presented, as site had not been revised.	<b>Preferred site</b> as it could contribute to the provision of infrastructure which could help move waste up the waste hierarchy (Policy W01) and facilitate net self-sufficiency in the management of waste (Policy W02) and it would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan, including Policy W11 waste site identification principles. No overriding constraints were identified at this stage through the site assessment process.	<b>Allocated site</b> as it could contribute to the retention of infrastructure which could help move waste up the waste hierarchy (Policy W01) and facilitate net self-sufficiency in the management of waste (Policy W02). No major issues were raised by statutory consultees in respect of local amenity, landscape, biodiversity, historic and water environments which indicate any significant conflict with other relevant policies in the Plan, including Policies W03 meeting capacity requirements for LACW, W04 meeting capacity requirements for C & I waste, W10 overall locational principles for waste capacity and W11 waste site identification principles.	No change in status, but additional clarification provided in the justification regarding the retention of infrastructure that could help move waste up the waste hierarchy, facilitate net self-sufficiency in capacity, meet capacity requirements for LACW and C& I waste and the compatibility with overall locational principles for waste capacity and waste site identification principles.
WJP18	Tancred, near Scorton	Yes	Site listed in index but no further details presented, as site had not been revised.	<b>Preferred site</b> as it could contribute to the provision of infrastructure which could help move waste up the waste hierarchy (Policy W01) and facilitate net self-sufficiency in the management of waste (Policy W02) and would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan including Policy W11 waste site identification principles. No overriding constraints were identified at this stage through the site assessment process.	<b>Allocated site</b> as it could contribute to the retention of infrastructure which could help move waste up the waste hierarchy (Policy W01) and facilitate net self-sufficiency in the management of waste (Policy W02), meeting capacity requirements for LACW (Policy W03) and meeting capacity requirements for C & I waste (Policy W04). No major issues have been raised by statutory consultees in respect of local amenity, landscape, biodiversity, historic and water environment which indicate any significant conflict with other relevant policies in the Plan including Policy W10 meeting overall requirements for the provision of waste capacity and Policy W11 waste site identification principles.	The area allocated at Publication was smaller than previously proposed as the landfill site at the east end of the site had been completed and so was withdrawn in August 2016.  No change in status, but additional clarification provided in the justification regarding the retention of infrastructure that could help move waste up the waste hierarchy, facilitate net self-sufficiency in capacity, meet capacity requirements for LACW and C& I waste and the compatibility with overall locational principles for waste capacity and waste site identification principles.
WJP19	Fairfield Road, Whitby	Yes	An extension to the site area and changes to the existing were included in the document as requested by the submitter in July 2014.	<b>Preferred site</b> as although located in the National Park this is an extension to an established site (also within the Park) and is within a proposed extension to the business park identified in local planning policy. The site could contribute to the provision of infrastructure which could help move waste up the waste hierarchy (Policy W01) and facilitate net self-sufficiency in the management of waste (Policy W02). No overriding constraints were identified at this stage through the site assessment process.	<b>Allocated site</b> as although located in the National Park this is an extension to an established site (also within the Park) and is within a proposed extension to the business park identified in local planning policy. The site could contribute to the provision of infrastructure which could help move waste up the waste hierarchy (Policy W01) and facilitate net self-sufficiency in the management of waste (Policy W02). It would also provide flexibility in capacity for management of C & I waste in line with Policy W04 and would be consistent with the overall locational principles for waste capacity (Policy W10) and Policy W11 waste site identification principles.	No change in status, but additional clarification provided in the justification regarding the contribution to the provision of infrastructure that could help move waste up the waste hierarchy, facilitate net self-sufficiency in capacity, provide flexibility in capacity for the management of C& I waste and to be compatible with overall locational principles for waste capacity and waste site identification principles.
WJP20	Allerton Waste Recovery Park	Not applicable	Consideration through site assessment did not commence as	The site was referred to in Policy W04, but was not listed as a preferred site as the development proposed had secured planning permission and development had	The site was referred to in Policy W04, but was not listed as a preferred site as the development proposed had secured planning permission and development had commenced.	No change in status.

Site ref	Site Location	Site presented at Issues and Options	Site position at Supplementary Sites	Site status at Preferred Options Stage	Site status at Publication (pre-submission) stage	Reasons for change of Status and other changes
			development had received planning permission in February 2013 and development was commencing.	commenced.		
WJP21	Brotherton Quarry, Burton Salmon	Not applicable	Site and area and details (import of inert waste for restoration purposes) included in the document as requested by the submitter in April 2014.	<b>Preferred site</b> as the importation of material to eastern part of the site has been granted planning permission and the importation of material would enable the reclamation of the former quarry void which has previously been the subject of permission for landfill and therefore would not conflict with Policies W01 and W11. The site would need to be restored to a use compatible with its location in the Green Belt. No overriding constraints have been identified at this stage through the site assessment process.	<b>Allocated site</b> as the importation of material for restoration of the eastern part of the site has been granted planning permission. The importation of further material would enable the completion of reclamation of the quarry, which has previously been the subject of permission for landfill. The development would not conflict with Policies W01, W02 and W11 and would provide additional capacity for the landfill of inert CD & E waste (Policy W05).	Site details submitted in April 2014 as part of clarification of situation on site MJP56.  No change in status as the importation of further material would enable the completion of reclamation of the quarry, which has previously been the subject of permission for landfill and would provide additional capacity for the landfill of inert CD & E waste.
WJP22	Land on former Pollington airfield	Not applicable	Site and area and details (wood pellet production, modification of permitted biomass plant and additional infrastructure associated with wood processing) included in the document as requested by the submitter in October 2014.	<b>Preferred site</b> as the site is based on an existing operation with an adjacent consent for the construction of a biomass energy plant. The allocation of this site could contribute to the further provision of infrastructure which could help move waste up the waste hierarchy (Policy W01) and it would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan, including Policy W02 facilitating net self-sufficiency in the management of waste. No overriding constraints have been identified at this stage through the site assessment process.	The <b>Allocated site</b> is based on an existing operation with an adjacent consent for the construction of a biomass energy plant. It could contribute to the further provision of a range of infrastructure which could help move waste up the waste hierarchy (Policy W01) and it would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan, including Policy W02 facilitating net self-sufficiency in the management of waste and would be consistent with the overall locational principles for waste capacity (Policy W10) and Policy W11 waste site identification principles.	The original site area and proposal included development proposals for land within the East Riding of Yorkshire. At Publication the land within the East Riding of Yorkshire was not included in the allocation so that the site solely related to matters within the jurisdiction of the Joint Plan (import of waste wood for wood pellet production and additional infrastructure associated with wood processing).  No change in overall status, but additional clarification provided in the justification regarding the contribution the site could make to the provision of infrastructure that could help move waste up the waste hierarchy, the facilitating of net self-sufficiency in the management of waste and the compatibility with overall locational principles for waste capacity and waste site identification principles.
WJP23	Potgate Quarry (former piggery) North Stainley	Not applicable	Not applicable as received separately direct from the submitter just prior to the closure of the consultation period on the Supplementary Sites Consultation	<b>Preferred site</b> as the site is located on previously developed land which had recently been the subject of a planning permission for a block making plant and was immediately adjacent to an active quarry. The site could contribute to the provision of infrastructure which could help move waste up the waste hierarchy (Policy W01) and facilitate net self-sufficiency in the management of waste (Policy W02). Subject to it being linked to the life of Potgate Quarry it would not conflict with	Not applicable as the site was <b>withdrawn</b> by submitter in February 2016 and a new location within the existing Potgate Quarry was proposed (see WJP24). This took place prior to Publication so the WJP23 site received no further consideration. However, the withdrawal was listed in the Appendix 2 (Withdrawn Sites) in the <i>Discounted Sites Summary Document</i> as part of the Evidence Base	This site for recycling inert C&D waste for secondary aggregates was submitted in March 2015 as a replacement for MJP57 proposal in response to request for clarification as to whether the submitter still wished to proceed with site MJP57. The location was adjacent to the existing Potgate Quarry void within which MJP57 was original proposed, and at the same time MJP57 was withdrawn.

Site ref	Site Location	Site presented at Issues and Options	Site position at Supplementary Sites	Site status at Preferred Options Stage	Site status at Publication (pre-submission) stage	Reasons for change of Status and other changes
				Policy W11 waste site identification principles. No overriding constraints have been identified at this stage through the site assessment process.		Subsequently the site was withdrawn and WJP24 submitted on land within the existing Potgate Quarry void.
WJP24	Potgate (former plant site), North Stainley	Not applicable	Not applicable	None, as submitted post-Preferred options in replacement for proposed location WJP23	<b>Allocated site</b> as it is located within the existing Potgate Quarry operational area and is immediately adjacent to the active quarry. The site could contribute to the provision of infrastructure which could help move waste up the waste hierarchy (Policy W01), facilitate net self-sufficiency in the management of waste (Policy W02) and to meeting capacity requirements for CD & E waste (Policy W05). Subject to it being linked to the life of Potgate Quarry it would not conflict with Policy W11 waste site identification principles. No major issues have been raised by statutory consultees in respect of local amenity, landscape, biodiversity, historic and water environments which indicate any significant conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan. under Policy W05	No change in Status as the Publication stage was the first time that this site was published.  The boundary of the area proposed by the submitter for allocation was revised following Preferred Options stage in the light of a review by the submitter of their operations at the Quarry, the WJP24 Allocated Site remains within the overall footprint of the existing operational quarry (as was the case with the original submission MJP57) and it was a replacement in very close proximity at Potgate Quarry to the Preferred Site (WJP23) identified in the Preferred Options Consultation.
WJP25	Former ARBRE Power Station, Eggborough	Not applicable	Not application	The site was referred to in Policy W04, but was not listed as a preferred site as the development proposed had secured planning permission.	<b>Allocated site</b> as it could contribute to the provision of infrastructure which could help move waste up the waste hierarchy (Policy W01) and contribute to net self-sufficiency in capacity for the management of waste (Policy W02) and provide flexibility in capacity for management of C & I waste in line with Policy W04, overall locational principles for waste capacity (Policy W10) and Policy W11 waste site identification principles. Although the site has the benefit of planning permission for the development of a waste to energy recovery facility this has not been implemented. The scale of capacity that could be provided at the site is such that it is of strategic importance and the site is therefore allocated to help retain this potential for the future.	The site was allocated at Publication as, whilst it has the benefit of planning permission, this has yet to be implemented and the scale of capacity that could be provided at the site is such that it is of strategic importance and the site is therefore allocated to help retain this potential for the future.

## 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](mailto:mwjointplan@northyorks.gov.uk)**