

Preferred Options Local Plan

January 2021

Individual Site Profiles



Explanation

The individual site profiles for each of the 412 sites assessed for the Preferred Options Local Plan sets out: the location of the site; the settlement (and tier); site size; proposed use; current land use; surrounding land uses; the 2020 site submission reference; and Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) Reference.

The profiles then follow the Site Assessment Methodology of which comprises of 3 stages:

- Stage 1: Initial Sift: Sites are considered against fundamental constraints both in physical terms and policy terms, for example flood risk and conformity with the proposed spatial strategy.
- Stage 2: Sustainability Assessment: Sites are then assessed in terms of their relative sustainability, these factors include their proximity to local services and employment, infrastructure constraints, as well as the environmental, social and economic impacts of the potential development of the site. This stage of the SAM is linked to the Sustainability Appraisal.
- Stage 3: Deliverability: Sites are assessed against factors such as ownership, availability, viability and achievability.

To understand the scoring set out in the profiles you will need to read this document in conjunction with the Site Assessment Methodology.

The site profile then sets out whether the site has been rejected or for the use it has been allocated in the Preferred Options Local Plan document, and then gives an explanation for either the sites rejection or allocation.

Should you have any queries do not hesitate to contact the Planning Policy team by:

- Email to: localplan@selby.gov.uk; or
- Phone to: 01757 292134; or
- By post to: Planning Policy Team, Selby District Council, The Civic Centre, Doncaster Road, Selby, YO8

Settlement	Appleton Roebuck	Size (Ha)	0.75	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	23	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	North Hall Farm, Chapel Green				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Predominantly agricultural, residential to South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	AROEBUCK/001	SHLAA Ref		Aroebuck-1	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 5% Grade 3 95%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 24.18%, Flood Zone 1 - 75.82%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	1.64 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
1 record for bluebell (2016) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Site appears to be improved grassland with scattered trees. Plantation woodland to W/NW. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
This site adjoins the boundary of the Appleton Roebuck Conservation Area.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The site is on the periphery of the medieval village but is outside of the core. Historic maps indicate previous agricultural buildings and a large pond that would have had a negative impact on archaeological remains should they have been present.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low-moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation measures may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Appleton Roebuck	Size (Ha)	1.71	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	44	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Villa Farm, Main Street				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Residential				
Surrounding Land Uses	Predominantly agricultural, residential to South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	AROEBUCK/003	SHLAA Ref	Aroebuck-3		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	85	2.7 % PDL	15
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.8 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
1 record for bluebell (2016) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Site comprises large gardens and paddocks with boundary and internal hedges and trees. No priority habitat within 100m. Possibility of small building on site.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low-moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(o)
Site is not within a mineral safeguarding area	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use - farm tenancy could be ended or relocated elsewhere	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. Viability assessment undertaken.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Appleton Roebuck	Size (Ha)	9.81	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	157	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land East of Colton Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural to North/East/South/West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	AROEBUCK/004	SHLAA Ref	Aroebuck-4		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	3.19 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
1 record for bluebell (2016) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a large greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low-moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(o)
Site is not within a mineral safeguarding area	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. No viability assessment undertaken	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Appleton Roebuck	Size (Ha)	17.82	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	347	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land West of Malt Kiln Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural to North/East/West. Residential to South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	AROEBUCK/005	SHLAA Ref		Aroebuck-5	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(---)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.41 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
1 record for bluebell (2016) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Large arable field with boundary hedges of unknown value. Some boundary trees of unknown age. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
This site adjoins the boundary of the Appleton Roebuck Conservation Area.					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a large greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Low-moderate sensitivity to development</p>	(+)
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	(o)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. No viability assessment undertaken</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Appleton Roebuck	Size (Ha)	5.59	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	134	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land East of Malt Kiln Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural to North/East/West. Residential to South-East/North-West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	AROEBUCK/006	SHLAA Ref	Aroebuck-6		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 2 - 0.13%, Flood Zone 1 - 99.87%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.01 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 0.28 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 6.2 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
1 record for bluebell within 1km (2016).					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a large greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Low-moderate sensitivity to development</p>	(+)
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	(o)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is not within a mineral safeguarding area</p>	(o)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. No viability assessment undertaken</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Appleton Roebuck	Size (Ha)	6.46	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	103	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Roebuck Barracks, Broad Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Former Army barracks				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural to North/East/South/West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	AROEBUCK/007	SHLAA Ref	Aroebuck-7		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(-)
Site has poor access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	75	2.7 % PDL	25
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.18 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Within 500m of an Ancient Woodland					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
1 record for bluebell (2016) and Bats (2015) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Deciduous woodland within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (This is the site of the former Roebuck Barracks. The site has been assessed and recorded previously.)</p>	(+)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.</p>	N/A
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Proposed development replaces an existing use which has a negative amenity impact</p>	(+)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is not within a mineral safeguarding area</p>	(o)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would add an open space asset identified as required in the vicinity (Site is in an area of identified need as falls outside buffer of LEAPS, NEAPS and LAPs, Amenity Greenspace, Parks and recreation, skate parks, allotment and small natural/semi natural greenspace areas.)</p>	(++)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. Detailed site investigations have taken place to identify development options and costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy</p>	<p>Rejected</p>

Settlement	Appleton Roebuck	Size (Ha)	0.17	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	5	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Therncroft Maltkiln Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Residential				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to South/East. Agriculture fields to North/West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	AROEBUCK/012	SHLAA Ref	Aroebuck-8		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land		2.7 % GF	0	2.7 % PDL	100
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
1 record for bluebell (2016) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Large domestic dwelling with mature gardens including hedges and trees. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The site contains well preserved earthworks of ridge and furrow ploughing. The ridge and furrow relates closely to the medieval layout of Appleton Roebuck and is one of the few surviving remnants in the village. There is also potential for earlier archaeological features of later prehistoric, Romano-British or the Anglo-Saxon periods beneath the ridge and furrow.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low-moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(o)
Site is not within a mineral safeguarding area	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. No viability assessment undertaken. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Appleton Roebuck	Size (Ha)	3.23	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	82	Housing Capacity Notes	Smaller part of site for 50 homes proposed for allocation		
Site Location	Land West of Northfield Avenue				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to East/South. Agriculture to West/North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	AROEUBUCK/009	SHLAA Ref	Aroebuck-9		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	2.8 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 3.48 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 7.38 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
1 record for bluebell (2016) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
A series of agricultural fields with boundary and internal hedgerows and trees. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
The site is located adjacent to Appleton Roebuck Conservation Area. The Old Vicarage and The Maltings to the south of the site along Main Street are Grade II Listed Buildings, along with All Saints Church some 180 metres to the south east. Development of this area could harm elements which contribute to the significance of these heritage assets.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(-)
The site contains or is close to known archaeological remains and presents a high level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low-moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. No viability assessment undertaken	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years

Preferred Option

Residential

Preferred Option Explanation

The site represents a logical extension to the built form of the village on its northern boundary and its development would extend the settlement in line with North Field Avenue and North Field way which lie directly to the east, without significant detriment to the form or appearance of the village.

Settlement	Appleton Roebuck	Size (Ha)	1.38	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	35	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land adjacent to Hillcrest House, Colton Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Residential				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural to North/West. Residential to South and paddocks to East				
2020 Site Submission Reference	AROEBUCK/011	SHLAA Ref	Aerobuck-15		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.9 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
1 record for bluebell (2016) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Arable field with minimal boundary features. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low-moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(o)
Site is not within a mineral safeguarding area	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. No viability assessment undertaken	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years

Preferred Option Rejected

Preferred Option Explanation

Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.

Settlement	Appleton Roebuck	Size (Ha)	0.37	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	7	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land adjacent to Maltkin Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Mainly Agricultural with a couple of dwellings to the West and also farm buildings.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	AROEBUCK/013	SHLAA Ref	Aroebuck-16		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
1 record for bluebell (2016) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(o)
Site is not within a mineral safeguarding area	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. No viability assessment undertaken	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Appleton Roebuck	Size (Ha)	0.74	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	22	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land adjacent to Rosemary Garth, Villa Farm Way				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Open land				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the South and west. Mainly Agricultural to the North and East				
2020 Site Submission Reference	AROEBUCK/014	SHLAA Ref	Aroebuck-17		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 5% Grade 3 95%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	95	2.7 % PDL	5
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 2 - 0.41%, Flood Zone 1 - 99.59%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	6.71 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
1 record for bluebell (2016) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Development impacts on a heritage asset and mitigation measures are necessary					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low-moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. No viability assessment undertaken. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Balne	Size (Ha)	0.05	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	1	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to the rear of Council Houses, Low Gate				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Additional garden area				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the South, railway line to the west. Agricultural to the East and North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BALNE/001	SHLAA Ref	Balne-1		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Under 0.17ha in size (residential) & Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(--)
Site has very poor access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings		Flood Zone 2 - 0.47%, Flood Zone 1 - 99.53%			
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
All protected species within 1km of site are over 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (There are no known archaeological sites in the allocation area or the near vicinity.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of railway	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. No viability assessment undertaken	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Under 0.17ha in size (residential) & Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Barlow	Size (Ha)	1.26	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	21	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land East of Mill Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Paddock				
Surrounding Land Uses	Nursery to West. Farm to South. Residential to North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BARLOW/001	SHLAA Ref	Barlow-11		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	80	2.7 % PDL	20	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 28.83%, Flood Zone 2 - 10.73%, Flood Zone 1 - 60.45%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					1.48 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 3.89 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 10.15 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2014), Various birds (2013), Common pipistrelle bat (2018) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (The site contains the former Barlow windmill in its south-western corner. This is a discrete feature and could easily be excluded from the development area if found to be well-preserved.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.</p>	N/A
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW</p>	(-)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>Multiple owners. No impact on availability from existing land use.</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation measures may add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Barlow	Size (Ha)	0.47	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	9	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Oak Tree Nursery, Mill Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural land with Oak Tree Nursery				
Surrounding Land Uses	Predominantly agriculture with residential to East/South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BARLOW/003	SHLAA Ref	Barlow-3		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	95	2.7 % PDL	5	
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					1.83 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 2.01 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 3.3 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Site within 500m of local or regional nature conservation site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2014), Pipistrelle bat roost (2018) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)</p>	<p>(+)</p>
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	<p>(+)</p>
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	<p>(--)</p>
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation measures may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	<p>0-5 years</p>
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy</p>	<p>Rejected</p>

Settlement	Barlow	Size (Ha)	2.10	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	36	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at School Farm, Mill Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Predominantly agricultural with residential to North/South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BARLOW/005	SHLAA Ref	Barlow-5		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	95	2.7 % PDL	5
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 63.37%, Flood Zone 2 - 11.47%, Flood Zone 1 - 25.16%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					0.86 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 2.86 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 6.69 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2014), various birds including marsh harrier (2013), Pipistrelle bat roost (2018) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (There are no known archaeological sites in the allocation area or the near vicinity.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation measures may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Barlow	Size (Ha)	1.81	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	31	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to rear of Morello Garth, Park Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural land surrounding on all sides.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BARLOW/006	SHLAA Ref	Barlow-12		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 99.58%, Flood Zone 2 - 0.42%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Small heath butterfly (2015), Grass snake (2018), Hare (2013), Water vole and badger (2018), Common pipistrelle bat (2018), Soprano pipistrelle bat (2013), within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.</p>	N/A
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW</p>	(-)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation measures may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Barkston Ash	Size (Ha)	1.26	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	21	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Sawyer Wells Farm, Saw Wells Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural land and farmstead				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to West. Agricultural fields to North/East/South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BARKSTON/001	SHLAA Ref	Barkston-1		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(o)
Mixed (Greenfield/ Previously Developed Land)					2.7 % GF 50 2.7 % PDL 50
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 2 - 17.54%, Flood Zone 1 - 82.46%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					1.94 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 3.67 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 11.52 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(--)
Barn owl roost (2019) within site boundary, five species of bat (2015) including Pipistrelle roost within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Grade II Barkston House and Grade II Turpin Hall Farm both to the North West of the site (80m)					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement. The area is also on the periphery of the Battle of Towton with skirmishes known to have taken place in this area before the main event.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.</p>	N/A
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	(o)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.</p>	(-)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ Limestone.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would add an open space asset identified as required in the vicinity (Site is in an area of identified need as falls outside buffer of LEAPS, NEAPS and LAPs, Amenity Greenspace, Parks and recreation, skate parks, allotment and small natural/semi natural greenspace areas.)</p>	(++)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible decontamination and flood mitigation measures may add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	<p>0-5 years</p>
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy</p>	<p>Rejected</p>

Settlement	Barkston Ash	Size (Ha)	2.38	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	40	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land east of London Road and north of Back Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural Field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the North and East. Agricultural fields and farm buildings to the West. Agricultural fields to the South.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BARKSTON/002	SHLAA Ref	Barkston-2		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Barn owl roost (2019), five species of bat (2015) including Pipistrelle roost within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Grade II Laurel Farm to the immediate North East of the site					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement. The area is also on the periphery of the Battle of Towton with skirmishes known to have taken place in this area before the main event.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(++)
Development would add an open space asset identified as required in the vicinity (Site is in an area of identified need as falls outside buffer of LEAPS, NEAPS and LAPs, Amenity Greenspace, Parks and recreation, skate parks, allotment and small natural/semi natural greenspace areas.)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use. Option held by developer.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Barlby	Size (Ha)	1.45	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	37	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land North of Barlby Hall, York Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields & Poultry Buildings and Grazing Land				
Surrounding Land Uses	Barlby Hall to South. Agricultural fields to North/East/West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BARLBY/002	SHLAA Ref	Barlby-2		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?	No				
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment	(++)				
Site has excellent access services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services	N/A				
2.3 Loss of Employment Land	(o)				
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network	N/A				
2.5 Physical Point of Access	(-)				
Access can be achieved through third party land but an agreement is not in place.					
2.6 Agricultural Land	(-)				
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land	(-)				
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	90	2.7 % PDL	10	
2.8 Flood Risk	(o)				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 6.8%, Flood Zone 1 - 93.2%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.22 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints	(o)				
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)	(-)				
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)	(o)				
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site	(-)				
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species	(-)				
Barn owl (2011), Common pipistrelle bat (2011) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect	(+)				
Site comprises agricultural field with two buildings of unknown construction & age (may support bats/nesting birds). Watercourse to northern boundary of the site, broadleaved woodland to the south and SINC containing woodland and water bodies just 50m to					
2.16 Heritage Assets	(-)				
Barlby Hall immediately to the south of this site is a Grade II Listed Building					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(o)
moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(+)
Proposed development replaces an existing use which has a negative amenity impact	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use - farm tenancy could be ended or relocated elsewhere	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation measures may add to costs. Ransom strip for access will add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Access can only be achieved through third party land and an agreement is not in place.	

Settlement	Barlby	Size (Ha)	14.54	Proposed Use	Mixed Use
Housing Capacity	189	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at the Magazine				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Scrub old former industrial & farm buildings				
Surrounding Land Uses	Railway lines to the South, A19 and farm buildings to the West. To the East is an electrical substation and Agricultural to the North and East also.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BARLBY/021	SHLAA Ref	Barlby-8/27		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					
					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy					
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					
Site has good access to services and employment					(+)
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					
Site has good access to services and workforce					(+)
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					
Development would create employment					(++)
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					
Good sub-regional accessibility					(+)
2.5 Physical Point of Access					
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					(+)
2.6 Agricultural Land					
Grade 1 90% Grade 2 5% Urban 5%					(---)
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	80	2.7 % PDL	20	(-)
2.8 Flood Risk					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings Flood Zone 3a - 96.21%, Flood Zone 2 - 0.48%, Flood Zone 1 - 3.31%					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW 0.54 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 1.47 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 20.71 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water					
2.9 SFRA Level 2 Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					
No known constraints					(o)
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					(-)
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					(o)
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					(-)
2.14 Impact Protected Species					
Barn owl (2011), Common pipistrelle bat roost (2018), grass snake (2018), water vole (2018), various breeding birds (2018) within 1km					(-)
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					
No priority habitat within 100m.					(+)
2.16 Heritage Assets					
Site contains the former War Department Munitions Depot and is Grade II listed					(-)

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>moderate sensitivity to development</p>	(o)
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 100m of railway and within 100m of A road</p>	(-)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.</p>	(-)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, 400m of LAP, and 1200m of Allotments)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>Multiple landownership. 1 year for existing land use to cease.</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation and ground decontamination may add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Barlby	Size (Ha)	6.56	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	105	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Turnhead Farm				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural Field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Farm Buildings to the North/South. Agricultural fields to East/West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BARLBY/016	SHLAA Ref	Barlby-12		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes		Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy & Site partially within flood Zone 3b			
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 1 5% Grade 2 95%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings		Flood Zone 3b - 0.62%, Flood Zone 2 - 0.1%, Flood Zone 1 - 99.28%			
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW		4.25 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water			
2.9 SFRA Level 2					(o)
Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(-)
Major constraints exist - multiple powerlines run through the site					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Barn owl (2019) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Site comprises arable farmland with some boundary features including well maintained hedges and limited trees. Site is within 90m of the River Ouse. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(-)
The site contains or is close to known archaeological remains and presents a high level of risk (This is a greenfield site with cropmarks suggesting later prehistoric, Romano-British and/or Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(o)
moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW and within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible decontamination and flood mitigation measures may add to costs. .	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy & Site partially within flood Zone 3b	

Settlement	Barlby	Size (Ha)	0.96	Proposed Use	Employment
Housing Capacity	Housing Capacity Notes				
Site Location	Land south of Market Weighton Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural Field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Highway to the East/North. South/West agricultural				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BARLBY/017	SHLAA Ref	N/A		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					N/A
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(++)
Development would create employment					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(+)
Good sub-regional accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Barn owl (2019) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Site comprises arable farmland with well-maintained hedge to the west and north. Site is within 250m of the River Ouse. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(-)
The site contains or is close to known archaeological remains and presents a high level of risk (This is a greenfield site with cropmarks suggesting later prehistoric, Romano-British and/or Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(o)
moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Expressions of interest received from developers but no formal option exists and the site has not been marketed. No viability assessment undertaken.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Barlby	Size (Ha)	0.58	Proposed Use	Employment
Housing Capacity	Housing Capacity Notes				
Site Location	Land north of Market Weighton Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural Field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural to North/East. Highway to West/South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BARLBY/018	SHLAA Ref	N/A		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					N/A
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(++)
Development would create employment					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(+)
Good sub-regional accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Barn owl (2019) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Site comprises arable farmland with hedges to the west and south. Site is within 250m of the River Ouse. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(-)
The site contains or is close to known archaeological remains and presents a high level of risk (This is a greenfield site with cropmarks suggesting later prehistoric, Romano-British and/or Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low-moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW and within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Expressions of interest received from developers but no formal option exists and the site has not been marketed. No viability assessment undertaken.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Barlby	Size (Ha)	1.02	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	26	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Turnhead Farm				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural Field/ Residential				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural to North/East. River Ouse West. Residential South.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BARLBY/019	SHLAA Ref	Barlby-13		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Site partially within flood Zone 3b
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 1 15% Grade 2 85%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(o)
Mixed (Greenfield/ Previously Developed Land)					2.7 % GF 50 2.7 % PDL 50
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3b - 0.23%, Flood Zone 2 - 4.87%, Flood Zone 1 - 94.9%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					2.04 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 9.85 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Barn owl (2019) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Site comprises of a farmstead with a range of buildings on site that could support bats and various nesting birds. Also on site are scattered trees and rough grassland. The site is directly adjacent to the River Ouse. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (There may be archaeological deposits beneath Turnhead Farm but these would be of low potential given the likelihood of disturbance from the current buildings.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(o)
moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(-)
Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on a Public Right of Way (PRoW) (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace. PRoW runs through the site)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Expressions of interest received from developers but no formal option exists and the site has not been marketed. No viability assessment undertaken. Possible flood mitigation may add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years

Preferred Option Residential

Preferred Option Explanation

The site marks a logical northern extension to Barlby with existing residential properties adjacent on its southern boundary. The site is also located primarily in Flood Zone 1 with only a small proportion falling in Flood Zone 3b (0.23%) and Flood Zone 2 (4.87%). The site is situated in close proximity to the A19, providing easy access to both Selby and York.

Settlement	Barlby	Size (Ha)	2.79	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	71	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land off York Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural Field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural field and farm buildings West. Highway East. Agricultural land North/South.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BARLBY/020	SHLAA Ref	Barlby-23		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					0.95 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 1.55 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 3.66 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Barn owl (2019) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Site comprises arable farmland with some boundary features including well maintained hedges and limited trees. Site is within 100m of the River Ouse. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(-)
The site contains or is close to known archaeological remains and presents a high level of risk (This is a greenfield site with cropmarks suggesting later prehistoric, Romano-British and/or Anglo-Saxon settlement. The cropmarks appear particularly complex in this allocation area.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(o)
moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW and within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Expressions of interest received from developers but no formal option exists and the site has not been marketed. No viability assessment undertaken.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Barlby	Size (Ha)	1.18	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	20	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Sand Lane, York Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural Field				
Surrounding Land Uses	A19 to the East/ Farm buildings to the North. A minor road to the west of the site with agricultural surrounding the rest of the site. Residential dwelling adjacent to the South east corner of the site.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BARLBY/022	SHLAA Ref	Barlby-28		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					
					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes	Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					
Site has good access to services and employment					(+)
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					
					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					
Development does not impact on employment land					(o)
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					
					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					(+)
2.6 Agricultural Land					
Grade 2 100%					(-)
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	(-)
2.8 Flood Risk					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.97 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 3.21 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 12.49 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					
Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					
No known constraints					(o)
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					(-)
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					(o)
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					(+)
2.14 Impact Protected Species					
Barn owl (2019) within 1km					(-)
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					
No priority habitat within 100m.					(+)
2.16 Heritage Assets					
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					(o)

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(-)
The site contains or is close to known archaeological remains and presents a high level of risk (This is a greenfield site with cropmarks suggesting later prehistoric, Romano-British and/or Anglo-Saxon settlement. The cropmarks appear particularly complex in this allocation area.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(o)
moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW and within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landownership. 1 year for existing land use to cease.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Barlby	Size (Ha)	0.04	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	1	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land off Turnhead Crescent				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Garage site				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential mainly surrounding with tree coverage and the A19 to the East.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BARLBY/023	SHLAA Ref	Barlby-29		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Under 0.17ha in size (residential)
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land		2.7 % GF	0	2.7 % PDL	100
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings		Flood Zone 1 - 100%			
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Barn owl (2011), Tansy beetle (2012) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (There are no known archaeological sites in the allocation area or the near vicinity.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Site within the built form of the settlement	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible ground decontamination may add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Under 0.17ha in size (residential)	

Settlement	Barlby	Size (Ha)	23.70	Proposed Use	Employment
Housing Capacity	Housing Capacity Notes				
Site Location	Land to the south of Riccall Airfield employment site				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	Predominantly agricultural surrounding however there is a road to South and employment land to the North.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BARLBY/024	SHLAA Ref	Barlby-31		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(-)
Site has poor access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(++)
Development would create employment					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(+)
Good sub-regional accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(--)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings Flood Zone 1 - 100%					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW 2.73 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 5.42 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 12.01 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water					
2.9 SFRA Level 2 Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(-)
Major constraints exist - middle 250m buffer and outer 280m buffer of Cawood to Susworth T West gas pipeline cross south west part of site					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to type of development Natural England need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Woodlark (2011), Barn owl (2016), Pillwort (2019), Common lizard (2011) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Single parcel of deciduous woodland within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan</p>	
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>within incompatible area - within 100m of A road and within 100m of waste facility</p>	(-)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.</p>	(-)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.</p>	(o)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. No viability assessment undertaken. Possible decontamination may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Beal	Size (Ha)	0.65	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	13	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land North of Ings Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Grazing/pony paddock				
Surrounding Land Uses	River Aire to North. Residential to East/South/West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BEAL/001	SHLAA Ref	Beal-1		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 30.55%, Flood Zone 2 - 68.75%, Flood Zone 1 - 0.7%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					1.64 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 14.34 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 35.74 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Site is within 500m of a SINC					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
No protected species records within 1km that are less than 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 800m of LEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. 1 year for existing land use to cease.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation measures may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Beal	Size (Ha)	0.38	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	8	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Dorham Hollygarth Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Residential				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to North/East. Agricultural to West/South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BEAL/004	SHLAA Ref	Beal-4		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	80	2.7 % PDL	20
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Site is within 500m of a SINC					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
No protected species records within 1km that are less than 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(--)
Traditional Orchard on site					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 150m of pig farm	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 800m of LEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. 1 year for existing land use to cease.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Beal	Size (Ha)	4.77	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	81	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to the west side of New Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural Field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the North and North west with agricultural land surrounding the majority of the rest of site apart from a small road to the west.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BEAL/005	SHLAA Ref	Beal-8		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.27 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 0.67 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 1.44 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Site is within 500m of a SINC					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
No protected species records within 1km that are less than 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Site adjacent to Traditional Orchard					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 150m of pig farm	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 800m of LEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Beal	Size (Ha)	17.17	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	223	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to the East site of New Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural Field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Minor roads surrounding on 3 sides of the site with agricultural land surrounding the majority of the site. In North west there is residential land.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BEAL/006	SHLAA Ref	Beal-9		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(--)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	1.47 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 3.13 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 8.5 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(-)
Site is adjacent to a SINC					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
No protected species records within 1km that are less than 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.</p>	N/A
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 150m of pig farm</p>	(-)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 800m of LEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Biggin	Size (Ha)	3.31	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	56	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land south of Sycamore Farm				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to South west corner, road to the North and east. Residential to the west and South.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BIGGIN/002	SHLAA Ref	Biggin-2		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	90	2.7 % PDL	10	
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 10.66%, Flood Zone 2 - 89.34%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					0.85 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 1.94 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 6.27 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Bluebell (2015) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(++)
Development would add an open space asset identified as required in the vicinity (Site is in an area of identified need as falls outside buffer of LEAPS, NEAPS and LAPs, Amenity Greenspace, Parks and recreation, skate parks, allotment and small natural/semi natural greenspace areas.)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation and decontamination measures may add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Biggin	Size (Ha)	0.99	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	20	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land north of Sycamore Farm				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the west, Road to the South and east. Agricultural to the North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BIGGIN/007	SHLAA Ref	Biggin-6		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	90	2.7 % PDL	10
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 2 - 99.21%, Flood Zone 1 - 0.79%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					3.46 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 9.49 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 20.12 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Bluebell (2015) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Grade II listed Barn to the South East of the site					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.</p>	N/A
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	(o)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.</p>	(-)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would add an open space asset identified as required in the vicinity (Site is in an area of identified need as falls outside buffer of LEAPS, NEAPS and LAPs, Amenity Greenspace, Parks and recreation, skate parks, allotment and small natural/semi natural greenspace areas.)</p>	(++)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation and decontamination measures may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Biggin	Size (Ha)	4.77	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	81	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Field adjacent to entrance to Biggin Lodge Farm on Oxmoor Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	Surrounded by agricultural apart from road to east.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BIGGIN/004	SHLAA Ref	Biggin-3		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 58.14%, Flood Zone 2 - 33.46%, Flood Zone 1 - 8.41%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					1.02 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 4.29 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 16.57 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Bluebell (2015) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.</p>	N/A
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	(o)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would add an open space asset identified as required in the vicinity (Site is in an area of identified need as falls outside buffer of LEAPS, NEAPS and LAPs, Amenity Greenspace, Parks and recreation, skate parks, allotment and small natural/semi natural greenspace areas.)</p>	(++)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation measures may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Biggin	Size (Ha)	1.70	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	29	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Field to left of entrance to Biggin Lodge Farm on Oxmoor Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	Employment to North east and farm buildings to South east. Road to the west with agricultural surrounding the remainder of land.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BIGGIN/005	SHLAA Ref	Biggin-4		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 28.91%, Flood Zone 2 - 67.08%, Flood Zone 1 - 4.01%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					0.22 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 0.59 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 8.9 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Bluebell (2015) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(++)
Development would add an open space asset identified as required in the vicinity (Site is in an area of identified need as falls outside buffer of LEAPS, NEAPS and LAPs, Amenity Greenspace, Parks and recreation, skate parks, allotment and small natural/semi natural greenspace areas.)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation measures may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Biggin	Size (Ha)	0.97	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	19	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Field to right of entrance to Biggin Lodge Farm on Oxmoor Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	Farm buildings to east. Road to the west with agricultural surrounding the remainder of land.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BIGGIN/006	SHLAA Ref	Biggin-5		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 17.31%, Flood Zone 2 - 76.16%, Flood Zone 1 - 6.53%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					0.99 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 1.3 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 5.73 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Bluebell (2015) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.</p>	N/A
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	(o)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would add an open space asset identified as required in the vicinity (Site is in an area of identified need as falls outside buffer of LEAPS, NEAPS and LAPs, Amenity Greenspace, Parks and recreation, skate parks, allotment and small natural/semi natural greenspace areas.)</p>	(++)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation measures may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Bilbrough	Size (Ha)	0.22	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	4	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land adjacent to 3 The Old Stables, Moor Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Large residential extraneous garden land				
Surrounding Land Uses	Predominantly agriculture with residential to East				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BILBROUGH/001	SHLAA Ref	Bilbrough-1		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	95	2.7 % PDL	5	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Barn owl (2017), Bluebell (2019), Bats (2012) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(o)
Site is not within a mineral safeguarding area	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 800m of LEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Bilbrough	Size (Ha)	2.21	Proposed Use	Employment
Housing Capacity	Housing Capacity Notes				
Site Location	Land at Bilbrough Top adjacent A64				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Scrubland				
Surrounding Land Uses	Bilbrough Service Station South/East. Agriculture North/West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BILBROUGH/003	SHLAA Ref	N/A		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					N/A
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(-)
Site has poor access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(++)
Development would create employment					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(+)
Good sub-regional accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	90	2.7 % PDL	10	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.03 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Barn owl (2017), Bluebell (2019), Bats (2012) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Site comprises rough grassland and scrub with boundary trees and a number of waterbodies within the surrounding area - some engineered and some natural. There is a small building on site. Deciduous woodland within 100m					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW and within 150m of Trunk road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(o)
Site is not within a mineral safeguarding area	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Bilbrough	Size (Ha)	3.72	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	63	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to the South East of Cat Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural Field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the west of the site, and a road abutting the North of the site. The remaining surrounding land is agricultural.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BILBROUGH/004	SHLAA Ref		Bilbrough-8	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	12.68 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Barn owl (2017), Bluebell (2019), Bats (2012) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
This site adjoins the boundary of the Bilbrough Conservation Area					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.</p>	N/A
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW</p>	(-)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 800m of LEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Bilbrough	Size (Ha)	1.24	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	21	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to the west of Redhill Field Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural Field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the North. Agricultural/ open Land surrounding rest of the site.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BILBROUGH/005	SHLAA Ref	Bilbrough-11		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					N/A
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(-)
Site has poor access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	1.82 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Barn owl (2017), Bluebell (2019), Bats (2012) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
This site adjoins the boundary of the Bilbrough Conservation Area					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(o)
Site is not within a mineral safeguarding area	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 800m of LEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Bilbrough	Size (Ha)	0.45	Proposed Use	Employment
Housing Capacity	Housing Capacity Notes				
Site Location	Land at Bilbrough Top adjacent A64				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural Field				
Surrounding Land Uses	A64 so the South of the site. Slip road to the North and east of the site. Agricultural and scrubland to the east.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BILBROUGH/006	SHLAA Ref	N/A		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(++)
Development would create employment					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(+)
Good sub-regional accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Barn owl (2017), Bluebell (2019), Bats (2012) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW and within 150m of Trunk road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(o)
Site is not within a mineral safeguarding area	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Bilbrough	Size (Ha)	0.50	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	10	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to rear of Redhill House				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Residential Garden Land				
Surrounding Land Uses	Road to the West, Residential North and South, and Agricultural to the East.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BILBROUGH/007	SHLAA Ref		Bilbrough-10	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes	Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.21 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Barn owl (2017), Bluebell (2019) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
This site adjoins the boundary of the Bilbrough Conservation Area					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (There are no known archaeological sites in the allocation area or the near vicinity.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(o)
Site is not within a mineral safeguarding area	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 800m of LEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years

Preferred Option Rejected

Preferred Option Explanation

No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy

Settlement	Birkin	Size (Ha)	0.84	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	17	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land North of Haddlesey Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Arable farming				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agriculture to North. Residential to East/South/West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BIRKIN/001	SHLAA Ref	Birkin-1		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 2 - 19.13%, Flood Zone 1 - 80.87%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					1.38 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Reed bunting (2010), 4 species of bat, including Soprano pipistrelle roost (2018) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Deciduous woodland within 100m					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. 1 year for existing land use to cease.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation measures may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Birkin	Size (Ha)	3.80	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	65	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land west of Main Street				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agriculture to West/North. Residential to East/South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BIRKIN/002	SHLAA Ref	Birkin-2		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Yes
Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy					Yes
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					(o)
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					(o)
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					(+)
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 40% Grade 3 60%					(-)
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings Flood Zone 2 - 43.19%, Flood Zone 1 - 56.81%					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW 0.9 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water					(o)
2.9 SFRA Level 2 Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					(o)
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					(o)
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					(+)
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					(o)
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					(+)
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Reed bunting (2010), 4 species of bat, including Soprano pipistrelle roost (2018) within 1km					(-)
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Site adjacent to Deciduous woodland and Traditional Orchard					(-)
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Birkin Lodge is immediately East of the site and is a Grade II Listed Building					(-)

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation measures may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	6-10 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Bolton Percy	Size (Ha)	0.51	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	10	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to the West of Marsh Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Vacant agricultural/scrubland				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to North. Agriculture to East/South/West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BOLTONPERCY/001	SHLAA Ref		BoltonPercy-1	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes		Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy. Site partially within flood Zone 3b			
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 40% Grade 3 60%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land		2.7 % GF	0	2.7 % PDL	100
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings		Flood Zone 3b - 25.94%, Flood Zone 2 - 4.37%, Flood Zone 1 - 69.7%			
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW		0.39 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water			
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(-)
Site is adjacent to a SINC					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2019), little owl nest (2019), fish (salmon, grayling, barbel) (2014), Natterer's and Brown long-eared bat roosts (2015), Common pipistrelle bat (2010) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(--)
Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh on site. Site adjacent to Lowland Fens					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(o)
Site is not within a mineral safeguarding area	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation measures may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Bolton Percy	Size (Ha)	1.05	Proposed Use	Mixed Use
Housing Capacity	18	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to the east of North House				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	Road to the South and west of the site. Farm buildings to the east of the site and agricultural to the North.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BOLTONPERCY/002	SHLAA Ref	BoltonPercy-4		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(-)
Site has poor access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(o)
Good Local Accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings Flood Zone 3b - 84.58%, Flood Zone 3a - 5.05%, Flood Zone 2 - 6.3%, Flood Zone 1 - 4.08%					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW 11.99 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 18.66 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 28.1 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water					
2.9 SFRA Level 2 Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(--)
Little owl (2019) observed within site. Great crested newt (2019), European eel (2010), Various fish (2014), Common pipistrelle and Brown long-eared bat (2016) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Deciduous woodland within 100m					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
This site adjoins the boundary of the Bolton Percy Conservation Area and site is immediately East of Grade II listed building.					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (The site contains well-preserved ridge and furrow earthworks that form part of the open field system surrounding the village.)</p>	(-)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.</p>	N/A
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	(o)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation measures may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy</p>	<p>Rejected</p>

Settlement	Bolton Percy	Size (Ha)	1.89	Proposed Use	Mixed Use
Housing Capacity	32	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to the west of North House				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural/ tea room car park				
Surrounding Land Uses	Road to the South and east of the site. Farm buildings to the west of the site and agricultural to the North.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BOLTONPERCY/003	SHLAA Ref	BoltonPercy-5		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(-)
Site has poor access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(o)
Good Local Accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 10% Grade 3 90%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	85	2.7 % PDL	15
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	12.14 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(--)
Little owl (2019) observed within site.Great crested newt (2019), Common pipistrelle and Brown long-eared bat (2016) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Deciduous woodland within 100m					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
This site adjoins the boundary of the Bolton Percy Conservation Area and site is immediately West of Grade II listed building.					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (The site contains well-preserved ridge and furrow earthworks that form part of the open field system surrounding the village.)</p>	(-)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.</p>	N/A
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	(o)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.</p>	(-)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>Joint ownership. No impact on availability from existing land use.</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.</p>	<p>Rejected</p>

Settlement	Bolton Percy	Size (Ha)	0.89	Proposed Use	Mixed Use
Housing Capacity	18	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land North of School Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Residential/ leisure				
Surrounding Land Uses	Forest to the east, agricultural to the North. Road to the South of the site and residential to the west.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BOLTONPERCY/004	SHLAA Ref	BoltonPercy-6		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(-)
Site has poor access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(o)
Good Local Accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	6.17 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2019), Little owl (2019), Common pipistrelle and Brown long-eared bat (2016) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Site is immediately East of the Bolton Percy conservation area.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(-)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (The site contains well-preserved ridge and furrow earthworks that form part of the open field system surrounding the village.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(o)
Site is not within a mineral safeguarding area	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use Multiple ownership (trust). 6 months for the existing land use to cease.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Brayton	Size (Ha)	3.86	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	66	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land North of Bridgfelde, Brayton Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agriculture fields to North/West/East. Farm to South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BRAYTON/002	SHLAA Ref	Brayton-2		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 2 - 98.06%, Flood Zone 1 - 1.94%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					0.05 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2017), Natterer's, Common pipistrelle and Brown long-eared bat roosts (2017) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Site is directly adjacent to Selby Canal on 1 side which may support otter/water vole. The site itself is arable farmland with some hedgerows and trees on the canal side. No priority habitats within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Brayton Bridge to the south of this area is a Grade II Listed Building.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(--)
Development occurs in and has a negative impact on the openness or setting of the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(-)
Moderate to high sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 400m of LAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Joint land ownership. 6 months for the existing land use to cease.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation works measures may add to costs. Enquiries received from developers.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Brayton	Size (Ha)	14.84	Proposed Use	Employment
Housing Capacity	Housing Capacity Notes				
Site Location	Land south of A63 and east of A19 (Doncaster Road)				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	A19 to the West, A63 to the North, Selby Canal to the South. Agricultural to the East				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BRAYTON/024	SHLAA Ref	N/A		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Yes
Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy					
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					N/A
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(++)
Site has excellent access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(++)
Development would create employment					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(+)
Good sub-regional accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(--)
Grade 2 5% Grade 3 95%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					(--)
Flood Zone 3a - 86.02%, Flood Zone 2 - 5.18%, Flood Zone 1 - 8.8%					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					(--)
0.11 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 0.86 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 10.61 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					(--)
Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Bluebell (2014) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Lowland Fens - floodplain of Selby Canal within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low - moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW and within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Brayton	Size (Ha)	1.15	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	29	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to east of Foxhill Lane and north of Brayton Community Centre				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Minor road to the west, Playing fields to the South. Open land/ agricultural to the West and North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BRAYTON/025	SHLAA Ref	Brayton-28		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 2 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
All protected species within 1km of site are over 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(--)
This site lies within the Brayton Conservation Area. Within the setting of the Church of St Wilfred which is a Grade I Listed Building and its vicarage a Grade II Building.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(--)
Development occurs in and has a negative impact on the openness or setting of the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(-)
Moderate to high sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of skatepark, 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site at risk of flooding	

Settlement	Brayton	Size (Ha)	13.62	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	266	Housing Capacity Notes	Smaller part of site for 60 homes proposed for allocation		
Site Location	Land South of Brackenhill Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Arable farming				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to East/South. Agricultural fields to North/West. Cemetery to North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BRAYTON/003	SHLAA Ref	Brayton-3		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(--)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	90	2.7 % PDL	10	
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 2 - 65.5%, Flood Zone 1 - 34.5%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.22 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 0.74 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 8.49 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Bluebell (2014), Natterer's, Common pipistrelle and Brown long-eared bat roosts (2017) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Large site comprising four arable fields with some boundary hedges and boundary trees. A field drain runs through part of the site and there is a domestic bungalow and agricultural building within the northern part of the site. No priority habitat within					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
The site is 500 metres west of Brayton Conservation Area.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(o)
moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(-)
Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on a Public Right of Way (PRoW) (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 800m of LEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace. PRoW runs through the site)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. 1 year for the existing land use to cease.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation works measures may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Residential
Preferred Option Explanation	
The development of the site would form a rounding-off of the village of Brayton on its north western edge, without significant detriment to the form or appearance of the village.	

Settlement	Brayton	Size (Ha)	2.63	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	67	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land East of Foxhill Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Grazing land				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to West. Community centre/playing fields to North. Church to East. Greenfield land to South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BRAYTON/005	SHLAA Ref	Brayton-5		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 2 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	5.93 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Natterer's, Common pipistrelle and Brown long-eared bat roosts (2017) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Site comprises two fields - 1 pasture, 1 arable with boundary hedgerows and trees (some of which are mature). There is a group of semi mature trees within the south of the site and a watercourse to the north. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(--)
This site lies within the Brayton Conservation Area. Within the immediate setting of the Church of St Wilfred which is a Grade I Listed Building and its vicarage a Grade II Building.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(--)
Development occurs in and has a negative impact on the openness or setting of the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(o)
moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(-)
Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on a Public Right of Way (PRoW) (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments. PRoW runs through the site)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation works measures may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site at risk of flooding	

Settlement	Brayton	Size (Ha)	6.12	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	147	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land East of Ness Bank Close				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural fields to West/North/East. Farm to South-East. Residential to West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BRAYTON/007	SHLAA Ref	Brayton-7		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 2 - 98%, Flood Zone 1 - 2% (D1 from EA Flood maps)				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site but impact insignificant or unknown					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
1 record of bat within 500m. Two further records of bat and 1 from swift within 1km. All other PS records are over 10yrs old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Arable field with minimal boundary features. Well managed field drain to the north. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Brayton Bridge to the south-east of this site is a Grade II listed Building					

2.17 Archaeological Impact The site contains or is close to little or no archaeological remains	(+)
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps Development occurs in and has a negative impact on the openness or setting of the SCG	(--)
2.19 Landscape Capacity Medium sensitivity to development	(-)
2.20 Amenity Impact Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW	(-)
2.21 Groundwater Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	(+)
2.22 Contamination Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	(o)
2.23 Mineral Resource Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	(--)
2.24 Provision of Open Space Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 400m of LAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	(+)
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	(o)
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use 1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs Possible flood mitigation works measures may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option Preferred Option Explanation Site at risk of flooding	Rejected

Settlement	Brayton	Size (Ha)	20.75	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	280	Housing Capacity Notes	Number of homes specified in site promoter's masterplan		
Site Location	Land north of Barff Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural fields to the North/South/East/West. Residential to South-East/North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BRAYTON/008	SHLAA Ref	Brayton-8		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(--)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 2 - 13.44%, Flood Zone 1 - 86.56%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.41 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 0.96 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 3.15 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites. The site is within 500m of an ancient woodland.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site but features likely to be protected					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Various birds (2017), Bluebell (2014), Natterer's, Common pipistrelle and Brown long-eared bat roosts (2017) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Large area of agricultural fields with areas of semi natural habitat including along the dismantled railway and adjacent to the cemetery. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development occurs in and has a negative impact on the openness or setting of the SCG</p>	(--)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>moderate sensitivity to development</p>	(o)
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 100m of railway</p>	(-)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site partly within Groundwater Protection Zone 3.</p>	(o)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.</p>	(-)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on a Public Right of Way (PRoW) (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 800m of LEAP, 400m of LAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace. PRoW runs through the site)</p>	(-)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible decontamination and flood mitigation measures may add to costs. .</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Brayton	Size (Ha)	5.68	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	136	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land east of Meadowcroft				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Woodland/residential to West. Agriculture to South/North. Primary School to East. Church to North. Bowling club to East				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BRAYTON/011	SHLAA Ref	Brayton-11		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 90% Grade 3 10%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings Flood Zone 2 - 97.62%, Flood Zone 1 - 2.38%					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW 0.52 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 1.53 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 11.61 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water					
2.9 SFRA Level 2 Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Natterer's, Common pipistrelle and Brown long-eared bat roosts (2017) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Arable field with minimal boundary features. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(--)
This site covers a large area of the Brayton Conservation Area. The Church of St Wilfred is a Grade I Listed Building and its vicarage a Grade II Building is located immediately North West.					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site contains or is close to known archaeological remains and presents a high level of risk (The site contains a complete medieval moated site. Well preserved archaeological sites of this type can be of national significance. Should remains be well preserved then the site may be unsuitable for development (NPPF para. 194 & 195).)</p>	<p>(-)</p>
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development occurs in and has a negative impact on the openness or setting of the SCG</p>	<p>(-)</p>
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Moderate to high sensitivity to development</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>within incompatible area - within 100m of A road</p>	<p>(-)</p>
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	<p>(+)</p>
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	<p>(-)</p>
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 400m of LAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)</p>	<p>(+)</p>
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>Joint land ownership. No impact on availability from existing land use.</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation works measures may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	<p>0-5 years</p>
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site at risk of flooding</p>	<p>Rejected</p>

Settlement	Brayton	Size (Ha)	4.59	Proposed Use	Residential	
Housing Capacity	117	Housing Capacity Notes				
Site Location	Land east of Linton Close					
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village					
Land Use	Agricultural fields					
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to West. Agriculture to South/North. Canal to East					
2020 Site Submission Reference	BRAYTON/012	SHLAA Ref	Brayton-12			
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?						No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None					
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment						(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment						
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services						N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land						(o)
Development does not impact on employment land						
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network						N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access						(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.						
2.6 Agricultural Land						(-)
Grade 2 70% Grade 3 30%						
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land						(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0		
2.8 Flood Risk						(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 56.45%, Flood Zone 2 - 33.27%, Flood Zone 1 - 10.28%					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.57 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 8.99 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water					
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints						(o)
No known constraints						
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)						(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,						
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)						(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites						
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site						(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site but impact insignificant or unknown						
2.14 Impact Protected Species						(-)
Great crested newt (2017), Natterer's, Common pipistrelle and Brown long-eared bat roosts (2017) within 1km						
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect						(-)
Site comprises two arable fields with boundary and internal hedgerows. Site lies directly adjacent to Selby Canal. No priority habitat within 100m.						
2.16 Heritage Assets						(o)
Brayton Bridge is located immediately North East of the site and is a Grade II Listed Building.						

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW and within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 400m of LAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Joint land ownership. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation works measures may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site at risk of flooding	

Settlement	Brayton	Size (Ha)	7.32	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	176	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land between Barff Lane and Mill Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Arable farming purposes				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the East, Agricultural surrounding the remainder of land with a road to the North of the site.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BRAYTON/018	SHLAA Ref	Brayton-22		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					0.19 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 0.58 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site but impact insignificant or unknown					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Various birds (2017), Bluebell (2014) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Arable field with some limited boundary hedgerows and trees. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	--
Development occurs in and has a negative impact on the openness or setting of the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site partly within Groundwater Protection Zone 3.	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(o)
Site is not within a mineral safeguarding area	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Negative impact on the openness or setting of the Strategic Countryside Gap (SCG)	

Settlement	Brayton	Size (Ha)	17.64	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	344	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Brayton Hall				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields and farm buildings				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to North/East/West. Agriculture to East/South-West. Highway to South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BRAYTON/019	SHLAA Ref	Brayton-19		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(-)
Access can be achieved through third party land but an agreement is not in place.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(--)
Grade 2 5% Grade 3 95%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 26.17%, Flood Zone 2 - 27.57%, Flood Zone 1 - 46.25%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.34 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 1.5 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 5.62 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2017), Otter (2016), Natterer's, Common pipistrelle and Brown long-eared bat roosts (2017) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Large site including Brayton Hall buildings and farmstead - potential for bats and nesting birds. Site also includes large agricultural fields with some boundary features and mature trees.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>moderate sensitivity to development</p>	(o)
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW and within 100m of A road</p>	(-)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.</p>	(-)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 400m of LAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>3rd party access required. Possible decontamination and flood mitigation measures may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Access can only be achieved through third party land and an agreement is not in place.</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Brayton	Size (Ha)	13.29	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	259	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land south of Mill Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields and low level grazing				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to North/East. A63 to South. Agricultural fields to South/East/West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BRAYTON/021	SHLAA Ref	Brayton-26		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(--)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					0.08 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 0.27 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Various birds (2017), Otter (2016), Bluebell (2014) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Southeast boundary of site adjacent to Deciduous woodland					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(o)
moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone (<1% in Zone 3)	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(-)
Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on a Public Right of Way (PRoW) (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP. PRoW runs through the site)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
No previous extant planning permissions. 1 landowner. 1 year to terminate existing use on the site.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Brayton	Size (Ha)	7.82	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	188	Housing Capacity Notes	Smaller part of site for 150 homes proposed for allocation		
Site Location	Land north of Mill Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural Field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the North/East. North-East agricultural. Residential and agricultural to South.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BRAYTON/020	SHLAA Ref	Brayton-23		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	1.79 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Various birds (2017), Bluebell (2014) within 1km. Re-assessed new boundary October 2020 (bats and otter records no longer within 1km).					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Large arable field with some limited boundary hedgerows and trees. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>moderate sensitivity to development</p>	(o)
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	(o)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Developers are in advanced legal discussions with landowner, with a view to concluding a development option shortly. High level development appraisal undertaken. Flood mitigation may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>The site marks a logical extension to the southern end of Brayton. It is currently surrounded by residential properties on its eastern and southern boundary, along with a housing site which is currently being built out on its northern boundary. Development of this site would form a natural infill to the built form. The site is also located wholly in Flood Zone 1.</p>	Residential

Settlement	Brayton	Size (Ha)	1.13	Proposed Use	Employment
Housing Capacity	Housing Capacity Notes				
Site Location	Land south west of A63/A19 roundabout				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural Field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Bypass to North with remainder of site surrounded by agricultural land				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BRAYTON/022	SHLAA Ref	N/A		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					N/A
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(+)
Site has good access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(++)
Development would create employment					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(+)
Good sub-regional accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 2 - 93.65%, Flood Zone 1 - 6.35%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					3.66 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Otter (2016), Bluebell (2014) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Part of a large arable field and some areas of screen planting. Deciduous woodland within 100m					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(o)
moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Developers are in advanced legal discussions with landowner, with a view to concluding a development option shortly. High level development appraisal undertaken. Flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Brayton	Size (Ha)	0.67	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	20	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land off St. Wilfred's Close				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Residual land from earlier development				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the North, East and West. Agricultural to the South.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BRAYTON/023	SHLAA Ref	Brayton-27		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	9.92 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Bluebell (2014) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(-)
Moderate to high sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Residential
Preferred Option Explanation	
The site marks a logical southern infill extension on the western edge of Brayton and it is surrounded by residential properties on its northern, eastern and western boundaries. The site is currently agricultural however, the site marks a logical southern infill extension on the western edge of Brayton with it being adjacent to residential properties on its north, east and western edge and a preferred site for residential development to its south. The site is also located wholly within Flood Zone 1. The NPPF requires that land is identified on small sites (i.e. those under 1ha) to accommodate at least 10% of housing requirements. This site is able to contribute to this requirement.	

Settlement	Brotherton	Size (Ha)	1.60	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	41	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Pasture Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Vehicle maintenance garage and storage				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to East and South. Industrial water pools to West. Employment to North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BROTHERTON/002	SHLAA Ref		Brotherton-2	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(--)
Development would result in a loss of employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(+)
Urban 70% Non-Agricultural 30%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land		2.7 % GF	0	2.7 % PDL	100
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 2 - 45.52%, Flood Zone 1 - 54.48%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					1.53 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 10.38 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(-)
Major constraints exist - major electricity line over site					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Frog spawn (2012), various birds (2012), Otter (2019), 4 species of bat, no roosts (2017) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(--)
Current light industrial use with buildings. Site also includes rough grassland, scrub, woodland and part of adjacent waterbodies. Surrounding area likely to be important for foraging bats. Deciduous woodland on site and adjacent to site.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The site is largely developed with agricultural buildings which will have had a negative impact on any archaeological remains, should they have been present.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for shallow coal/building stone/ Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(-)
Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on a Public Right of Way (PRoW) (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, and 1200m of Allotments. PRoW runs through the site)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation measures may add to costs. National grid guidelines concerning development around overhead lines may affect the viability of the site. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	6-10 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	Brotherton	Size (Ha)	0.12	Proposed Use	Leisure
Housing Capacity	Housing Capacity Notes				
Site Location	Land at North East side of Low Street				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Trees/ Car Park				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the East and West. School Grounds to the North and Road to the South.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BROTHERTON/004	SHLAA Ref	N/A		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					N/A
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(+)
Site has good access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(++)
Good national accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(o)
Mixed (Greenfield/ Previously Developed Land)	2.7 % GF	50	2.7 % PDL	50	
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.02 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 15.27 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 32.96 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Frog (2012), Goldfinch, Sand martin (2012), Water vole (2010), Otter (2019), four species of bats (2017) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (There are no known archaeological sites in the allocation area or the near vicinity.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low-moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Building stone/ Limestone/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site at risk of flooding	

Settlement	Brotherton	Size (Ha)	46.36	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	904	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Brotherton Quarry				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Site currently an active Quarry, To be close by 2025.				
Surrounding Land Uses	Primarily agricultural uses surrounding the site. Road to the east and Employment to the North west and residential to the South west.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BROTHERTON/005	SHLAA Ref		Brotherton-17	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(--)
Development would result in a loss of employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(---)
Grade 2 25% Grade 3 75%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					0.4 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 0.81 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 2.49 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(--)
Site overlaps a local or regional nature conservation site. Mitigation required to avoid significant impact.					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Various birds (2012), Water vole (2010), Otter (2019), four species of bats (2017) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(--)
Several parcels of deciduous woodland within boundary, including all western half of site. Further deciduous woodland adjacent to site.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Site is in the Southern setting of Grade II Poole Manor Farmhouse and associated Grade II agricultural buildings. North West of Byram Park Grade II buildings.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (There are no known archaeological sites in the allocation area or the near vicinity.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(+)
Proposed development replaces an existing negative amenity impact	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Building stone/ Limestone/ sand and gravel. Site is also allocated for Waste management capacity for CD and E waste (W05).	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible decontamination may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	6-10 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	Burton Salmon	Size (Ha)	0.10	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	2	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land adjacent to Hillam Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Residual land from development use				
Surrounding Land Uses	Roads to the North, West and South with residential to the East.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BSALMON/003	SHLAA Ref	Bsalmon-1		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes		Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy. Under 0.17ha in size (residential)			
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings		Flood Zone 1 - 100%			
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2		Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA			
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
All protected species within 1km of site are over 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Site is immediately West of Grade II Burton Salmon War Memorial					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (There are no known archaeological sites in the allocation area or the near vicinity.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of railway and within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/Limestone/sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy. Under 0.17ha in size (residential)	

Settlement	Burton Salmon	Size (Ha)	10.10	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	131	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to the east of Ledgate Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the South and South east and North west. Residential to the east and North east and agricultural to the west.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BSALMON/004	SHLAA Ref	BSalmon-5		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 40% Grade 3 60%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	1.58 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
All protected species within 1km of site are over 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Site is immediately East / South East of Grade II Burton Salmon War Memorial					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of railway and within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/Limestone/sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(++)
Development would add an open space asset identified as required in the vicinity (Site is in an area of identified need as falls outside buffer of LEAPS, NEAPS and LAPs, Amenity Greenspace, Parks and recreation, skate parks, allotment and small natural/semi natural greenspace areas.)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Burton Salmon	Size (Ha)	0.99	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	20	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Johns Drive south of New Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	Road to the North. Track to the west, Residential to the east and agricultural to the South.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BSALMON/005	SHLAA Ref	BSalmon-6		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	6.82 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
All protected species within 1km of site are over 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Deciduous woodland within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Limestone/sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Burton Salmon	Size (Ha)	1.31	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	22	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Drive End east of A162				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	Track to the east, road to the North/ west and residential to South west corner and agricultural the remaining areas				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BSALMON/006	SHLAA Ref	BSalmon-7		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Yes
Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy					
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					(o)
Flood Zone 1 - 100%					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					(o)
Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
All protected species within 1km of site are over 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Deciduous woodland adjacent to site.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Site is immediately East of a Grade II listed Milestone					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Limestone/sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Burton Salmon	Size (Ha)	7.33	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	117	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Poole off New Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	Track to the west, residential partly to the North along with trees. Farm buildings/ residential to the South and east. Trees/ woodland to the South.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BSALMON/007	SHLAA Ref	BSalmon-8		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Yes
Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy					
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 2 - 0.7%, Flood Zone 1 - 99.3%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	1.31 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					(o)
Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
All protected species within 1km of site are over 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Deciduous woodland adjacent to site. Two Traditional Orchards within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Limestone/sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Burn	Size (Ha)	6.17	Proposed Use	Mixed Use
Housing Capacity	99	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Burn Grange Farm, Doncaster Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural land to the North/West/East. Civil engineering company to the East. Residential to West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BURN/001	SHLAA Ref	Burn-1		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Yes
Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy					Yes
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					(+)
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and workforce					(o)
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(++)
Development would create employment					(++)
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(+)
Good sub-regional accessibility					(+)
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					(+)
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					(-)
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					(--)
Flood Zone 3a - 99.38%, Flood Zone 2 - 0.33%, Flood Zone 1 - 0.29%					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					(--)
0.36 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water					(--)
2.9 SFRA Level 2					(--)
Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					(--)
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					(o)
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					(-)
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					(o)
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					(o)
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Otter (2016) within 1km					(-)
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(--)
Traditional Orchard on site					(--)
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Grade II listed milestone is located on South Western extent of the site.					(-)

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(++)
Development would add an open space asset identified as required in the vicinity (Site is in an area of identified need as falls outside buffer of LEAPS, NEAPS and LAPs, Amenity Greenspace, Parks and recreation, skate parks, allotment and small natural/semi natural greenspace areas.)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Burn	Size (Ha)	1.15	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	20	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Millstones West Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural land to the North/East/West. Residential to South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BURN/007	SHLAA Ref	Burn-2		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 50% Grade 3 50%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 2 - 20.82%, Flood Zone 1 - 79.18%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					1.01 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
No protected species records within 1km that are less than 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (The site is within the historic core of the medieval settlement of Burn.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	

3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years

Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Burn	Size (Ha)	1.43	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	24	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Burn House Farm West Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural land to the East/South. Farm/residential to the West/North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BURN/003	SHLAA Ref	Burn-3		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 2 - 31.84%, Flood Zone 1 - 68.16%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					1.23 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 5.96 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 20.91 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(-)
major constraints exist - south of site within 380m outer buffer of Asselby to Pannal Gas pipeline					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
No protected species records within 1km that are less than 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible are - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation and decontamination measures may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Burn	Size (Ha)	228.80	Proposed Use	Mixed Use
Housing Capacity	3900	Housing Capacity Notes	Number of homes specified in site promoter's masterplan		
Site Location	Burn Airfield				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	New Settlement				
Land Use	Leisure and Agricultural fields. Former airfield.				
Surrounding Land Uses	Woodland to South-West. Residential North East. Remaining land surrounded by agricultural. Farm buildings to the East				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BURN/005	SHLAA Ref	Burn-8		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					HSE inner Zone from a gas pipeline in the southwest corner of the site.
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(-)
Site has poor access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(++)
Development would create employment					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(+)
Good sub-regional accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(---)
Grade 2 80% Grade 3 20%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	90	2.7 % PDL	10	
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 98.5%, Flood Zone 2 - 0.68%, Flood Zone 1 - 0.81%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					0.35 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 1.38 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 9.94 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					See results of Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(-)
major constraints exist - west of site crosses Asselby to Pannal gas pipeline and south-west of site within 290m middle buffer and 380m outer buffer of Asselby to Pannal Gas pipeline					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(--)
Site overlaps a local or regional nature conservation site. Mitigation needed to avoid significant impact.					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Otter (2016) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(--)
Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh and deciduous woodland on site					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Moderate to high sensitivity to development</p>	<p>(-)</p>
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW, within 100m of railway, within 100m of A road and within 100m of waste facility</p>	<p>(-)</p>
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	<p>(+)</p>
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.</p>	<p>(-)</p>
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	<p>(--)</p>
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on a Public Right of Way (PRoW) (Site within 400m of Amenity Greenspace. PRoW runs through the site)</p>	<p>(-)</p>
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>2 landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use.</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation and decontamination measures may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	<p>0-5 years</p>
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site at risk of flooding</p>	<p>New Settlement Proposal</p>

Settlement	Burn	Size (Ha)	1.92	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	33	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land East of Main Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	A19 to the west along with residential. Agricultural and open land surround the rest of the site.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BURN/006	SHLAA Ref	Burn-10		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Yes
Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy					
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					(--)
Flood Zone 3a - 97.63%, Flood Zone 2 - 2.37%					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					(--)
0.9 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					(--)
Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Otter (2016) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(-)
The site contains or is close to known archaeological remains and presents a high level of risk (This is largely a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement. Cropmark features of former enclosures are visible on parts of the site on aerial photographs. The site is also a former RAF Burn which served in World War II.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Burn	Size (Ha)	0.77	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	15	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Phase 1 – Burn Airfield				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural Fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural to the North, Residential to the West, Caravan Storage to the South, and Ancillary to Burn Airfield to the East.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BURN/008	SHLAA Ref	Burn-11		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 92.26%, Flood Zone 2 - 7.74%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					3.26 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 6.11 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
All protected species within 1km of site are over 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Byram	Size (Ha)	1.75	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	45	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land adjacent Primrose Dene				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Overgrown field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to North. Agriculture to East/South/West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BYRAM/001	SHLAA Ref	Byram-1		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 20% Grade 3 80%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.89 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England do not need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Birds (2015), Bats, no roosts (2012) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Site is currently rough grassland with some trees and boundary hedges. Site could be important for reptiles.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Low to moderate sensitivity to development</p>	(+)
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	(o)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.</p>	(-)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Limestone/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, 400m of LAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>2 landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use.</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site within the Green Belt</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Byram	Size (Ha)	15.62	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	305	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land south of Field View				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to North. Agriculture to East/South/West. Highway to West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BYRAM/002, BYRAM/008, BYRAM/009	SHLAA Ref	Byram-2		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	Site partially within flood Zone 3b				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(--)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3b - 53.13%, Flood Zone 3a - 8.13%, Flood Zone 2 - 2.96%, Flood Zone 1 - 35.79%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.64 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 1.63 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 8.13 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Requirement to consult with Natural England due to scale of development and mitigation or management may be required					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Various birds (2012), Otter (2019), 4 species of bat, no roosts (2017) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Large arable site with Marsh Drain along the east and south boundaries and also through the centre of the site. Some trees and hedges around the site boundary. Site is within 150m of the River Aire at the closest point. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for building stone/ Limestone/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
2 landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site at risk of flooding	

Settlement	Byram	Size (Ha)	2.73	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	70	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land North of Byram Park Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the west, agricultural to the North and east and road to the South.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BYRAM/003	SHLAA Ref	Byram-12		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.37 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 1.03 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England do not need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(-)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Four species of bats (2017) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Deciduous woodland within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development of this area would bring housing to within 500 metres of the Listed Buildings at Byram Hall.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
The site contains or is close to little or no archaeological remains (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, 400m of LAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	Byram	Size (Ha)	11.91	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	232	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land North of Byram Park Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential/ road to the South of the site. Agricultural to the North and east. Trees to the western portion of the site.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BYRAM/010	SHLAA Ref	Byram-13		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(--)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	2.01 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(--)
Site overlaps a local or regional nature conservation site. Mitigation required to avoid significant impact.					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Sand martin (2012), Otter (2019), four species of bats (2017) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Deciduous woodland adjacent to site.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Site is in the far South Western setting of Grade II Byram Hall					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Low to moderate sensitivity to development</p>	(+)
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road</p>	(-)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.</p>	(-)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Limestone.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, 400m of LAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible ground decontamination may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site within the Green Belt</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Byram	Size (Ha)	0.57	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	17	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land South of Byram Park Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	Road to the North, residential to the west, agricultural to the east and woodland/ trees to the South.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BYRAM/011	SHLAA Ref	Byram-14		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	6.72 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Four species of bats (2017) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Deciduous woodland adjacent to site.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, 400m of LAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	Byram	Size (Ha)	4.24	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	108	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Stack Yard Field				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	Woodland/trees to the North, agricultural to the east, road to the South and residential to the west.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BYRAM/012	SHLAA Ref	Byram-15		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 60% Grade 3 40%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	2.57 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Goldfinch, robin (2012) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Deciduous woodland adjacent to site.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Low to moderate sensitivity to development</p>	(+)
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	(o)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Limestone/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, 400m of LAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site within the Green Belt</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Byram	Size (Ha)	1.98	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	50	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Barrel Field				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	Road to the North, open land/ agricultural to the east, agricultural to the South and open/shrubland to the west.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BYRAM/013	SHLAA Ref	Byram-16		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 90% Grade 3 10%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Goldfinch, robin (2012) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ Limestone/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, 400m of LAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	Camblesforth	Size (Ha)	0.66	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	20	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land adjacent to Parkwood farm, Selby Road,				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural fields to North/South/West. Residential to East/North-West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CAMBLESFORTH/001	SHLAA Ref	Camblesforth-1		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings Flood Zone 3a - 97.27%, Flood Zone 1 - 2.73%					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW 0.06 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water					
2.9 SFRA Level 2 Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Common pipistrelle bat (2013), Brown long-eared bat (2010) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan</p>	
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road</p>	(-)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3</p>	(o)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.</p>	(-)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation and decontamination measures may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site at risk of flooding</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Camblesforth	Size (Ha)	2.03	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	52	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at New Oak Farm				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Farm buildings and agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural to the South/East/North. Residential to West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CAMBLESFORTH/002	SHLAA Ref		Camblesforth-2	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	75	2.7 % PDL	25
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	32.92 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Common pipistrelle bat (2013), Brown long-eared bat (2010) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Deciduous woodland within 100m					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation and decontamination measures may add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site at risk of flooding	

Settlement	Camblesforth	Size (Ha)	9.59	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	230	Housing Capacity Notes	Smaller part of site for 121 homes proposed for allocation		
Site Location	Land north of Beech Grove				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural land to the North/West. Residential to the South/East				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CAMBLESFORTH/003	SHLAA Ref	Camblesforth-3		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 60% Grade 3 40%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	90	2.7 % PDL	10	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 0.43%, Flood Zone 1 - 99.57%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.65 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Requirement to consult with Natural England due to scale of development and mitigation or management may be required					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Common pipistrelle bat (2013), Brown long-eared bat (2010) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Site adjacent to Deciduous woodland. Traditional orchard within 100m					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(--)
The site wraps around to the north and west of Camblesforth Hall, a Grade I Listed Building, and its associated Grade II Listed Dovecote. Development of this area has the potential to cause substantial harm to elements which contribute to their significance.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(-)
Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on a Public Right of Way (PRoW) (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace. PRoW runs through the site)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years

Preferred Option

Residential

Preferred Option Explanation

The site marks a logical north western extension to the village of Camblesforth. It is currently surrounded by residential properties on its southern and eastern boundary and development of this site would ensure the sustainability of local services. The site is also located primarily in Flood Zone 1 with only a small proportion falling in Flood Zone 3a (0.4%), whilst the remainder of land surrounding Camblesforth is located in Flood Zone 3. Furthermore, the site is situated close to the A1041 which provides easy access to Selby, Snaith and the M62.

Settlement	Camblesforth	Size (Ha)	0.13	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	4	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to the rear of Prospect Close and garages				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Open space and garage site				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential surrounding the site. With allotments South of the site.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CAMBLESFORTH/004	SHLAA Ref	Camblesforth-7		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Under 0.17ha in size (residential)
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(o)
Mixed (Greenfield/ Previously Developed Land)					2.7 % GF 50 2.7 % PDL 50
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					10.16 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
All protected species within 1km of site are over 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (There are no known archaeological sites in the allocation area or the near vicinity.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use - 4 weeks' notice to terminate existing uses.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Under 0.17ha in size (residential)	

Settlement	Carlton	Size (Ha)	12.58	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	245	Housing Capacity Notes	Smaller part of site for 123 homes proposed for allocation		
Site Location	Land north of Mill Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural Field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to East/South. Agricultural to North/East				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CARLTON/003	SHLAA Ref	Carlton-10		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(--)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.23 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 0.95 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 9.76 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(-)
Major constraints exist - North East of the site is within the 380m outer buffer of Asselby to Pannal Gas Pipeline					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Requirement to consult with Natural England due to scale of development and mitigation or management may be required					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Brown long-eared bat roost (2012) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Large arable field with some boundary hedgerows and trees. Deciduous woodland within 100m					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
There are no designated heritage assets in the vicinity of the site that are likely to be affected by development.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(o)
Moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(--)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 1 , 2 and 3	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(-)
Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on a Public Right of Way (PRoW) (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 800m of LEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments. PRoW runs through the site)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Under option to a developer. Engagement has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Residential
Preferred Option Explanation	
The site forms a logical extension to the village in this location. It is a flat greenfield site within Flood Zone 1. The village has good access to the road network and access to employment opportunities.	

Settlement	Carlton	Size (Ha)	1.53	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	39	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land adjacent to Holray Park				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the east, road to the North of the site. Trees/ woodland to the South of the site and agricultural to the west.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CARLTON/004	SHLAA Ref	Carlton-17		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 40% Grade 3 60%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings Flood Zone 3a - 100%					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW 0.73 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 0.95 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 2.35 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water					
2.9 SFRA Level 2 Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Brown long-eared bat roost (2012) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Site adjacent to Deciduous woodland. Lowland fens and Traditional orchard within 100m					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(-)
Moderate to high sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 800m of LEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. Agricultural Tenancy.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs. Market interest and under option to a developer.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site at risk of flooding	

Settlement	Carlton	Size (Ha)	0.58	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	17	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land West of Low Street and south of Hirst Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural Fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Road to the North, With Agricultural to the West and South. Residential also partially to South and residential in the East.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CARLTON/005	SHLAA Ref	Carlton-18		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					8.22 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 17.06 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 46.75 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Brown long-eared bat roost (2012) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Traditional orchard within 100m					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(-)
Moderate to high sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 800m of LEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. Agricultural Holdings Act	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site at risk of flooding	

Settlement	Carlton	Size (Ha)	10.55	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	137	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to the north of Holy Family School & east of Station Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural Fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Railway line to the North, A road to the West. School to the South of the site and Agricultural and Nursery (Garden) to the East.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CARLTON/006	SHLAA Ref	Carlton-19		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes	Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(--)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 13.86%, Flood Zone 2 - 8.75%, Flood Zone 1 - 77.39%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	1.18 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 1.92 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 5.03 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(--)
major constraints exist - north of site within 115m inner buffer, within 290m middle buffer and 380m outer buffer of Asselby to Pannal Gas pipeline and electricity pylons cross through site					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
All protected species within 1km of site are over 10 years old. RE-assessed in October 2020. Bat roost and records are no longer within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Deciduous woodland within 100m. Re-assessed October 2020 with no change.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of railway and 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 800m of LEAP, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. Farm Business Tenancy	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation measures may add to costs. National grid guidelines concerning development around overhead lines may affect the viability of the site.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Carlton	Size (Ha)	2.34	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	60	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land North of Lynwith Close and Columbine Grove				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural Fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the South and partially in East with the remaining land mainly surrounded by Agricultural with a small track also covering part of site in North.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CARLTON/007	SHLAA Ref	Carlton-20		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					
					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					
Site has good access to services and employment					(+)
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					
					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					
Development does not impact on employment land					(o)
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					
					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					(+)
2.6 Agricultural Land					
Grade 2 100%					(-)
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	(-)
2.8 Flood Risk					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	1.15 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 1.42 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 4.8 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					
Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					
No known constraints					(o)
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					(-)
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					(o)
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					(+)
2.14 Impact Protected Species					
Brown long-eared bat roost (2012) within 1km					(-)
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					
No priority habitat within 100m.					(+)
2.16 Heritage Assets					
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					(o)

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Moderate sensitivity to development</p>	(o)
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	(o)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3</p>	(o)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 800m of LEAP, and 1200m of Allotments)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. Farm Business Tenancy</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation may add to costs. Market interest.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site at risk of flooding</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Carlton	Size (Ha)	1.90	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	48	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Park Farm				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Currently a business				
Surrounding Land Uses	Road to the North, with open land/ tree coverage surrounding the remainder of the site.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CARLTON/008	SHLAA Ref	Carlton-21		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land	2.7 % GF	0	2.7 % PDL	100	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Brown long-eared bat roost (2012) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Site adjacent to Deciduous woodland					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Site is north of Grade I Carlton Towers					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (There are no known archaeological sites in the allocation area or the near vicinity.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(-)
Moderate to high sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(-)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 2 and 3	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 800m of LEAP, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. Farm Business Tenancy	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible ground decontamination may add to costs. Market interest. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	6-10 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Carlton	Size (Ha)	1.10	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	19	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to the west of Holy Family School and Station Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural Fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Site surrounded mainly by Agricultural with an A road to the East				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CARLTON/009	SHLAA Ref	Carlton-22		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 80% Grade 3 20%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 2 - 12.32%, Flood Zone 1 - 87.68%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					0.92 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Brown long-eared bat roost (2012) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Site adjacent to Deciduous woodland					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Moderate sensitivity to development</p>	(o)
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road</p>	(-)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3</p>	(o)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 800m of LEAP, and 1200m of Allotments)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. Agricultural Holdings Act</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation measures may add to costs. National grid guidelines concerning development around overhead lines may affect the viability of the site.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Carlton	Size (Ha)	6.04	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	145	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land South of Mill Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Primarily open land with some agricultural buildings on the site.				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the East with a road to the North. Land to the East is currently an employment site with open land/ tree coverage to the South,				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CARLTON/010	SHLAA Ref	Carlton-23		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					
					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					
Site has good access to services and employment					(+)
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					
					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					
Development does not impact on employment land					(o)
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					
					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					(+)
2.6 Agricultural Land					
Grade 3 100%					(o)
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	80	2.7 % PDL	20	(-)
2.8 Flood Risk					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	2.26 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					
Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					
No known constraints					(o)
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					(-)
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					(o)
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					(+)
2.14 Impact Protected Species					
Brown long-eared bat roost (2012) within 1km					(-)
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					
No priority habitat within 100m.					(+)
2.16 Heritage Assets					
Site is north of Grade I Carlton Towers					(-)

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(-)
Moderate to high sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(+)
replaces existing use which has negative impact	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3 (Less than 5% in 2)	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(-)
Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on a Public Right of Way (PRoW) (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 800m of LEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments. PRoW runs through the site)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple ownership. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible ground decontamination may add to costs. Market interest. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Catterton	Size (Ha)	1.22	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	21	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land South of Moor Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Minor road to the North and west of the site. Residential to the east. To the west, North and South of the site is agricultural land.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CATTERTON/004	SHLAA Ref	Catterton-3		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2015), Common pipistrelle and Brown long-eared bat roosts (2017) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Site adjacent to Traditional Orchard					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Site is in the northern setting of Catterton Hall moated site and adjacent building platforms which is a Scheduled Ancient Monument.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The site is adjacent to the medieval settlement at Catterton but is outside of the historic core within the open fields.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(o)
Site is not within a mineral safeguarding area	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(++)
Development would add an open space asset identified as required in the vicinity (Site is in an area of identified need as falls outside buffer of LEAPS, NEAPS and LAPs, Amenity Greenspace, Parks and recreation, skate parks, allotment and small natural/semi natural greenspace areas.)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Cawood	Size (Ha)	1.69	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	43	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land off Castle Close				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agriculture to West/South/North. Residential to East				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CAWOOD/004	SHLAA Ref	Cawood-4		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 47.83%, Flood Zone 1 - 52.17%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	2.78 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(-)
Major constraints exist - within 280m outer buffer of Pannal to Cawood gas pipeline					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site but impact insignificant or unknown					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Toad (2016), Frog, smooth newt, great crested newt (2017), tawny owl (2017), bluebell (2019), Common pipistrelle and Brown long-eared bat roosts (2014) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Site lies within 150m of Bishop Dyke. The site consists of part of two improved grassland fields with boundary hedges and trees. Field drains are present to the west. Several ponds lie within 500m of the site of which some are known to support great crest					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The site has been subject to previous archaeological evaluation with no finds or features of significance noted.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Cawood	Size (Ha)	1.03	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	18	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Field at Broad Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Animals on land				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural fields to East/South/West. Residential to North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CAWOOD/007	SHLAA Ref	Cawood-12		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(-)
Major constraints exist - within 280m outer buffer of Pannal to Cawood gas pipeline					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Toad (2016), Frog, smooth newt, great crested newt (2017), tawny owl (2017), bluebell (2019), Common pipistrelle and Brown long-eared bat roosts (2014), badger (2018) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Improved pasture surrounded by mature trees and hedgerows. Ponds in the area have the potential to support amphibians. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement. The site also contains upstanding earthworks of medieval ridge and furrow.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple ownership. No impact on availability from existing land use. Tenant on land at present.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Cawood	Size (Ha)	4.80	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	122	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land south east of Cawood off Bishop Dyke Road/Broad Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Arable farming				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the North, Agricultural to the South, Residential to the West. Residential and agricultural to the East.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CAWOOD/008	SHLAA Ref	Cawood-13		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings Flood Zone 3a - 99.94%, Flood Zone 1 - 0.06%					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW 3.07 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water					
2.9 SFRA Level 2 Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(-)
Major constraints exist - within 280m outer buffer of Pannal to Cawood gas pipeline					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Toad (2016), Frog, smooth newt, great crested newt (2017), tawny owl (2017), bluebell (2019), Common pipistrelle and Brown long-eared bat roosts (2014), badger (2018) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Part of a large arable field with gardens to the north, boundary hedges and trees to the east and west and Bishops Dyke is also along the west boundary. Lowland fens within 100m					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Development impacts on a heritage asset and mitigation measures are necessary.					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement. There are some cropmarks, particularly on the southern edge of the allocation consistent with former settlement or agriculture.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Low to moderate sensitivity to development</p>	(+)
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	(o)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation may add to costs. Market interest.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site at risk of flooding</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Church Fenton Airbase	Size (Ha)	181.79	Proposed Use	Mixed Use
Housing Capacity	3000	Housing Capacity Notes	Number of homes specified in site promoter's masterplan		
Site Location	RAF Church Fenton				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	New Settlement				
Land Use	Airbase				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural fields to North/East/South/West. Residential to West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	ULLESKELF/001	SHLAA Ref	Ulleskelf-1		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Site has a scheduled monument within its boundary
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(-)
Site has poor access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(++)
Development would create employment					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(o)
Good Local Accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(---)
Grade 2 10% Grade 3 2.5% Non-Agricultural 87.5%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land		2.7 % GF	0	2.7 % PDL	100
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 0.12%, Flood Zone 2 - 91.9%, Flood Zone 1 - 7.98%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					0.01 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 0.03 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 1.5 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					See results of Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(-)
major constraints exist - north of site within buffer of 270m middle Zone and within buffer of 280m outer Zone of Pannal to Cawood Gas pipeline					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Requirement to consult with Natural England due to scale of development and mitigation or management may be required. Site within 500m of an ancient woodland.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Smooth newt, great crested newt (2015), Barn owl roost (2019), Bluebell (2019), Water vole (2017), Myotis bat species roost, Common pipistrelle maternity roost (2013) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(--)
Deciduous woodland on and adjacent to site. Traditional orchard adjacent to site					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Development impacts on a heritage asset and mitigation measures are necessary. South East and southern boundary of the site includes World War II airfield defences which are Scheduled Ancient Monuments.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(--)
The site contains, or is close to known archaeological remains of national or regional significance (This site has two elements, the essentially greenfield elements beneath the former runways and dispersal areas, alongside the development of the airfield itself. The site has archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement. The site also contains military remains associated with the airfield itself. Elements of the airfield have been designated as a Scheduled Monument and these should not be allocated.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(o)
Moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(-)
Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Partially impacts on ULLE12 (Unallocated Amenity Greenspace) - CFA-07 TYPE_Natur (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. Tenancy agreements exist on the site previously the RAF were flying from the site until December 2013. Other tenancy agreements are limited to a small number of utility connections to the site to be terminated in due course	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible decontamination and flood mitigation measures may add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	New Settlement Proposal
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Church Fenton Airbase	Size (Ha)	7.32	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	117	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land east of Busk Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Open land				
Surrounding Land Uses	Former airfield to the east of the site. Residential to the South. Road to the west of the site and to the North a small track with then agricultural land.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CFENTON/022	SHLAA Ref	Ulleskelf-7		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Yes
Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy					
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 70% Non-Agricultural 30%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings Flood Zone 2 - 99.43%, Flood Zone 1 - 0.57%					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW 0.13 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water					
2.9 SFRA Level 2 Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Requirement to consult with Natural England due to scale of development and mitigation or management may be required. Site within 500m of an ancient woodland.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Barn owl roost (2019), Bluebell (2019), Myotis bat species roost, Common pipistrelle maternity roost (2013) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Deciduous woodland within 100m					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(--)
Existing open space asset or public accessibility would be lost. Mitigation measures unsatisfactory or not proposed - Impacts on CFA-07 (Natural & Semi Natural Greenspace) (Site within 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation and decontamination measures may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Church Fenton	Size (Ha)	1.53	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	39	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land North of Gate Bridge, Main Street				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Greenfield land - unused - overgrown field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Greenfield / agricultural use on all sides.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CFENTON/001	SHLAA Ref	CFenton-1		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 2 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.74 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 7.14 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 42.7 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Toad, Frog, Smooth newt (2016), Great crested newt (2019), Barn owl roost (2018), Myotis bat species roost, Common pipistrelle maternity roost (2013) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Site lies directly adjacent to Carr Dike and also has several ponds within 200m of the site. Whilst not recorded with NEYEDC there are known populations of great crested newt and other amphibians. The site itself is pasture with boundary hedges, trees and					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(--)
Development occurs in and has a negative impact on the openness or setting of the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site at risk of flooding	

Settlement	Church Fenton	Size (Ha)	6.61	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	159	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land East of Church Street				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Building company and office, yard and also paddock and ménage. 25% made up of buildings x three, 75%				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the North and West, church to the West. Open farmland to the East and South.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CFENTON/003	SHLAA Ref	CFenton-3		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 95% Grade 3 5%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 2 - 98.87%, Flood Zone 1 - 1.13%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.89 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 1.79 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 5.32 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Toad, Frog, Smooth newt (2016), Great crested newt (2019), Barn owl (2016), Common pipistrelle (2010) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Part of the site lies direct adjacent to Carr Dike, the site itself is a large arable field with field margins, hedgerows and tress. There are several ponds within 150m of the site and whilst records are not available from NEYEDC, there are known populati					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Development impacts on a heritage asset and mitigation measures are necessary					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Moderate sensitivity to development</p>	(o)
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	(o)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on a Public Right of Way (PRoW) (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace. PRoW runs through the site)</p>	(-)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>Extant planning permission. Multiple Landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site at risk of flooding</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Church Fenton	Size (Ha)	0.53	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	16	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land South of Sandwath Drive				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Scrub land				
Surrounding Land Uses	Drain runs along Southern boundary. Railway to the East. Residential to the South, West and North.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CFENTON/004	SHLAA Ref	CFenton-4 - Permission		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 5% Grade 3 95%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	75	2.7 % PDL	25
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings Flood Zone 3a - 83.4%, Flood Zone 2 - 16.6%					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW 5.8 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water					
2.9 SFRA Level 2 Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Toad, Frog, Smooth newt (2016), Great crested newt (2019), Barn owl (2016) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Site currently used for horse grazing and outdoor ménage. There are also some trees and boundary hedge. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)</p>	<p>(+)</p>
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Low to moderate sensitivity to development</p>	<p>(+)</p>
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 100m of railway</p>	<p>(-)</p>
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	<p>(+)</p>
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.</p>	<p>(-)</p>
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay.</p>	<p>(--)</p>
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)</p>	<p>(+)</p>
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use.</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation and decontamination measures may add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	<p>0-5 years</p>
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site at risk of flooding</p>	<p>Rejected</p>

Settlement	Church Fenton	Size (Ha)	0.10	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	3	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land south of Hall Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Residential garden land				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural land to the West, South residential to the East and North beyond gardens				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CFENTON/005	SHLAA Ref	Cfenton-5		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Under 0.17ha in size (residential)
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land		2.7 % GF	0	2.7 % PDL	100
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings		Flood Zone 2 - 100%			
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW		1.23 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 7.42 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water			
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Toad, Frog, Smooth newt, Great crested newt (2016), Bluebell (2019), Common pipistrelle (2010) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(o)
Moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs. Third party land required.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Under 0.17ha in size (residential)	

Settlement	Church Fenton	Size (Ha)	7.74	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	186	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land North of Station Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Railway track to West. Agricultural fields to North/East. Residential to South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CFENTON/008	SHLAA Ref	CFenton-8		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	95	2.7 % PDL	5	
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 2 - 99.72%, Flood Zone 1 - 0.28%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.58 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 2.55 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 15.16 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Toad, Frog, Smooth newt (2016), Great crested newt (2019), Barn owl roost (2018) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Large arable site with minimal boundary features - ponds within the local area may have potential to support amphibians. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of railway	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site at risk of flooding	

Settlement	Church Fenton	Size (Ha)	1.74	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	44	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land west of Northfield Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Residential				
Surrounding Land Uses	Arable farmland to the North and West, existing residential to the East and South.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CFENTON/017	SHLAA Ref	CFenton-9		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 2 - 99.78%, Flood Zone 1 - 0.22%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	4.39 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 25.11 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Toad, Frog, Smooth newt (2016), Great crested newt (2019), Barn owl (2016), Common pipistrelle (2010) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Part of a large arable field with minimal boundary features. Site includes a domestic dwelling and associated garden. To the southwest of the site is the old moat feature with standing water, trees and scrub. There is also a pond. These waterbodies may su					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation and access requirements may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site at risk of flooding	

Settlement	Church Fenton	Size (Ha)	0.55	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	17	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land west of Busk lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Residential				
Surrounding Land Uses	Sports pitches to North/West. Residential to East/South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CFENTON/010	SHLAA Ref	CFenton-10		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land		2.7 % GF	0	2.7 % PDL	100
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 2 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.92 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Toad, Frog, Smooth newt, Great crested newt (2016), Barn owl (2016), Bluebell (2019), Myotis bat species roost, Common pipistrelle roost (2013) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Site has domestic dwelling with associated gardens that may support bats, amphibians (if ponds present). No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)</p>	<p>(+)</p>
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development occurs in and has a negative impact on the openness or setting of the SCG</p>	<p>(--)</p>
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Moderate sensitivity to development</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	<p>(+)</p>
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.</p>	<p>(-)</p>
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	<p>(--)</p>
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)</p>	<p>(+)</p>
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation and decontamination measures may add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	<p>0-5 years</p>
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site at risk of flooding</p>	<p>Rejected</p>

Settlement	Church Fenton	Size (Ha)	2.70	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	69	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Mountain Ash, Sandwath Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Farm buildings and land				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural land to the North and West. Existing residential to the East and South.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CFENTON/011	SHLAA Ref	CFenton-11		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(o)
Mixed (Greenfield/ Previously Developed Land)		2.7 % GF	70	2.7 % PDL	30
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.57 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(-)
Major constraints exist - part of the site is impacted by proposed HS2 route					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Toad, Frog, Smooth newt (2016), Great crested newt (2019), Barn owl (2016) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Site comprises rough grassland with possible scrapes/ponds and a watercourse on the east boundary which could be important for water vole. Managed by a wildlife charity it has the potential to support a range of species. A domestic dwelling is also included					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of proposed railway	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation, covenant and decontamination measures may add to costs. Viability assessment has been conducted. Market interest. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site at risk of flooding	

Settlement	Church Fenton	Size (Ha)	2.34	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	40	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land south of Sandwath Farm				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Community Field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural fields to North/East/South/West. Residential to South-West. Farm buildings to North-west				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CFENTON/012	SHLAA Ref	CFenton-12		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					0.34 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(--)
Major constraints which are difficult to mitigate - site is impacted by proposed HS2 route					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Toad, Frog, Smooth newt (2016), Great crested newt (2019), Barn owl roost (2018) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of proposed railway	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Church Fenton	Size (Ha)	3.21	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	82	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land north of Sandwath Drive				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Scrubland				
Surrounding Land Uses	Railway line to the East, Residential to the South, Agricultural / grazing land to the West and North.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CFENTON/013	SHLAA Ref	CFenton-13		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 95% Grade 3 5%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 56.56%, Flood Zone 2 - 39.49%, Flood Zone 1 - 3.95%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.52 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 3.36 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(-)
Major constraints exist - part of the site is impacted by proposed HS2 route					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(--)
Great crested newt (2019) within site boundary, Barn owl roost (2018), Toad, Frog, Smooth newt (2016) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Old tip site with ponds known to support amphibians including great crested newt. Watercourse on the west boundary may support water vole and habitats on site include rough grassland, trees and scrub. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement. The site also contains the route of a historic railway and timber yard.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Low to moderate sensitivity to development</p>	(+)
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 100m of railway and within 100m of proposed railway</p>	(-)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.</p>	(-)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation, covenant and decontamination measures may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site at risk of flooding</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Church Fenton	Size (Ha)	0.16	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	3	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land west of Sandwath Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Woodland				
Surrounding Land Uses	Lake to the West agricultural land to the South and North, unused field to the East				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CFENTON/014	SHLAA Ref	CFenton-6		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Under 0.17ha in size (residential) & Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(-)
Major constraints exist - site is impacted by adjacent proposed HS2 route					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Toad, Frog, Smooth newt (2016), Great crested newt (2019), Barn owl (2016) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)</p>	<p>(+)</p>
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Low to moderate sensitivity to development</p>	<p>(+)</p>
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 100m of proposed railway</p>	<p>(-)</p>
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	<p>(+)</p>
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.</p>	<p>(-)</p>
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	<p>(--)</p>
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation and decontamination measures may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	<p>0-5 years</p>
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site failed initial sift - Under 0.17ha in size (residential) & Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy</p>	<p>Rejected</p>

Settlement	Church Fenton	Size (Ha)	3.39	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	58	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land west of Sandwath Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Fishing lake to the North, residential to the East and agriculture to the West and South.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CFENTON/016	SHLAA Ref	CFenton-15		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes	Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 30% Grade 3 70%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 99.74%, Flood Zone 2 - 0.26%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	1.81 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(--)
Major constraints which are difficult to mitigate - site is impacted by proposed HS2 route					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Toad, Frog, Smooth newt (2016), Great crested newt (2019), Barn owl roost (2019) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Site itself comprises intensive agricultural land with minimal hedges and trees. However, Sandwath lake is present to the north (unknown water quality, surrounded by broadleaved woodland) and there are field drains to the south and east that could support					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of proposed railway	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. Site is subject to a Farm Tenancy expiring 2 April 2020. Subject to a part resumption clause upon providing 12 months prior written notice to the tenant	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Church Fenton	Size (Ha)	0.28	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	8	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land South of Hall Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Paddock				
Surrounding Land Uses	Farm land/buildings to East/South. Residential to West/North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CFENTON/018	SHLAA Ref	CFenton-27		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land		2.7 % GF	0	2.7 % PDL	100
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 2 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Bluebell (2019), Common pipistrelle (2010) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Improved pasture surrounded by mature hedgerows and trees. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site at risk of flooding	

Settlement	Church Fenton	Size (Ha)	1.34	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	34	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to north of Station Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Scrub, rough grazing				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural to the West, Agricultural to the East, Residential South-East. Agricultural to North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CFENTON/019	SHLAA Ref	CFenton-28		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	95	2.7 % PDL	5	
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 2 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	1.67 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 4.29 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Toad, Frog, Smooth newt (2016), Great crested newt (2019), Barn owl (2016) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Arable field with minimal boundary features. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of railway	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs. Under option to a developer. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site at risk of flooding	

Settlement	Church Fenton	Size (Ha)	1.77	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	45	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	South of Common Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural Field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential / Scrubland to West. Railway to South/South-West. Dwellings / Scrubland to North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CFENTON/020	SHLAA Ref	CFenton-29		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 90% Grade 3 10%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 92.7%, Flood Zone 2 - 3.95%, Flood Zone 1 - 3.35%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	5.53 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 27.34 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Toad, Frog, Smooth newt (2016), Great crested newt (2019), Barn owl (2016) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Improved pasture with mature trees and hedgerow to the railway line. More limited trees and hedges to the other boundaries. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of railway	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation and decontamination measures may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site at risk of flooding	

Settlement	Church Fenton	Size (Ha)	1.20	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	31	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	The Orchards				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Woodland				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the North. Agricultural to West. Agricultural to East. Residential South-East. Agricultural to the South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CFENTON/021	SHLAA Ref		CFenton-32 (CFenton-30 - Permission)	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 2 - 95.93%, Flood Zone 1 - 4.07%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.88 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 2.61 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 7.11 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Toad, Frog, Smooth newt (2016), Great crested newt (2019), Barn owl (2016), Common pipistrelle (2010) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Four veteran trees recorded on site. NPPF highlights these as irreplaceable habitat. Site comprises an existing dwelling with large gardens containing a number of mature trees/woodland. There also appear to be several ponds within the site and bats are li					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (The site is within the historic core of the medieval settlement of Church Fenton.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs. Viability assessment undertaken.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site at risk of flooding	

Settlement	Church Fenton	Size (Ha)	0.46	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	14	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land adjacent Kennel Garth Farm				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Site is currently a grass field. It isn't used for any purpose at the moment.				
Surrounding Land Uses	Road to the North of the site. To the east is farm buildings and to the South of the site is farm land. To the west is open land.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CFENTON/023	SHLAA Ref	CFenton-31		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 90% Grade 3 10%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 2 - 86.34%, Flood Zone 1 - 13.66%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Bluebell (2019), Common pipistrelle (2010) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(o)
Moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation and decontamination measures may add to costs. Market interest.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site at risk of flooding	

Settlement	Chapel Haddlesey	Size (Ha)	1.10	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	19	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land south of Millfield				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Grazing				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural fields to South/East. Residential/agricultural to North-West. Farm buildings to North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CHADDLESEY/001	SHLAA Ref	CHaddlesey-1		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes	Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy & Site partially within flood Zone 3b				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment	Site has good access to services and employment				(+)
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land	Development does not impact on employment land				(o)
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access	Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.				(+)
2.6 Agricultural Land	Grade 2 40% Grade 3 60%				(-)
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land	Greenfield				(-)
	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk	2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings Flood Zone 3b - 26.1%, Flood Zone 3a - 54.78%, Flood Zone 2 - 19.12%				(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints	No known constraints				(o)
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)	The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.				(+)
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)	Site does not fall within a SSSI impact risk Zone or does not affect an Ancient Woodland				(+)
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site	More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site				(+)
2.14 Impact Protected Species	Common pipistrelle (2013) within 1km				(-)
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect	No priority habitat within 100m.				(+)
2.16 Heritage Assets	Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting				(o)

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 800m of LEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. Farm Business Tenancy	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy & Site partially within flood Zone 3b	

Settlement	Chapel Haddlesey	Size (Ha)	1.39	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	24	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land west of Millfield				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Grazing				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural land to the South , West, North and residential/farmland to the East				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CHADDLESEY/002	SHLAA Ref	CHaddlesey-2		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes		Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy & Site partially within flood Zone 3b			
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings		Flood Zone 3b - 61.84%, Flood Zone 3a - 34.74%, Flood Zone 2 - 3.42%			
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW		0.92 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 3.93 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water			
2.9 SFRA Level 2		Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA			
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(+)
Site does not fall within a SSSI impact risk Zone or does not affect an Ancient Woodland					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Common pipistrelle (2013) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 800m of LEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. AHA (Agricultural Holdings Act tenancy).	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	6-10 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy & Site partially within flood Zone 3b	

Settlement	Chapel Haddlesey	Size (Ha)	0.23	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	5	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Manor Farm Court				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Open land				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the west, road to the North of the site. Open land to the east and agricultural fields to the South.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CHADDLESEY/004	SHLAA Ref	CHaddlesey-4		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Yes
Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy					
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					(--)
Flood Zone 3a - 100%					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					(--)
0.03 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					(--)
Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Common pipistrelle (2013) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site partly within Groundwater Protection Zone 3.	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 800m of LEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Cliffe	Size (Ha)	0.98	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	29	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to the north of the A63 adjacent to Garth House				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Mineral Use				
Surrounding Land Uses	Road to the South, west and North, residential/ agricultural to the east.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CLIFFE/023	SHLAA Ref	Cliffe-34		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(--)
Development would result in a loss of employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land	2.7 % GF	0	2.7 % PDL	100	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	1.54 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2019) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (A small enclosure of probable Iron Age or Romano-British date was noted during previous archaeological evaluation. Further recording works would be required prior to development (NPPF para. 199).)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(--)
Development occurs in and has a negative impact on the openness or setting of the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(-)
Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on CLIF-04 (Informal Greenspace) (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. The Site is currently part of a wider clay mineral extraction site, albeit the site itself currently includes an access track off the A63, grassland, scrub and an earth bund.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Need to remediate the quarry site.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	6-10 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Negative impact on the openness or setting of the Strategic Countryside Gap (SCG)	

Settlement	Cliffe	Size (Ha)	10.00	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	160	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to the north of the A63				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural/ Mineral use				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural to the North, employment/ agricultural/ road to the east, road to the South trees to the west.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CLIFFE/024	SHLAA Ref	Cliffe-35		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(---)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land		2.7 % GF	0	2.7 % PDL	100
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings		Flood Zone 1 - 100%			
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW		0.16 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 0.34 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 0.59 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water			
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Smooth newt (2018), Great crested newt (2019) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (A small enclosure of probable Iron Age or Romano-British date was noted during previous archaeological evaluation. Further recording works would be required prior to development (NPPF para. 199).)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(--)
Development occurs in and has a negative impact on the openness or setting of the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. The Site is currently part of a wider clay mineral extraction site, albeit the site itself currently includes an access track off the A63, grassland, scrub and an earth bund.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	6-10 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Cliffe	Size (Ha)	0.40	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	8	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to the south of Turnham Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	Road to the North, residential to the east, Agricultural to the South and west.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CLIFFE/025	SHLAA Ref	Cliffe-36		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 1 25% Grade 2 75%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 88.98%, Flood Zone 1 - 11.02%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					12.23 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Barn owl (including nest) (2014) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Although a Traditional orchard listed on the Priority Habitat Inventory is within 100m, from aerial photographs this appears to be an extended garden with an occasional tree rather than an orchard.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (There are no known archaeological sites in the allocation area or the near vicinity.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Cliffe	Size (Ha)	1.41	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	36	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Chapel Field				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	Trainline to the North, residential to the east, road to the South and agricultural to the west.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CLIFFE/026	SHLAA Ref	Cliffe-37		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
All protected species within 1km of site are over 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of railway and within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. There is an agreement allowing the land to be farmed by another until 31/12/2020	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Cliffe	Size (Ha)	0.14	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	3	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land off Ings Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	Track to the South west, agricultural land surrounds the remainder of land.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CLIFFE/027	SHLAA Ref	Cliffe-38		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes		Under 0.17ha in size (residential) & Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy			
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 1 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings		Flood Zone 3a - 100%			
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2		Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA			
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Barn owl (including nest) (2014) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(o)
Site is not within a mineral safeguarding area	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Under 0.17ha in size (residential) & Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Cliffe	Size (Ha)	0.12	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	2	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land off York Road, Cliffe Common				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Scrub and rough grasses				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential/ track to the North, Open land to the east and South and road to the west.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CLIFFE/028	SHLAA Ref	Cliffe-39		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes		Under 0.17ha in size (residential) & Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy			
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings		Flood Zone 1 - 100%			
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2		Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA			
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(--)
major constraints exist - eastern half of site within 289m outer Zone of Cawood to Susworth T West Gas pipeline					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
All protected species within 1km of site are over 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Coastal and floodplain grazing marsh adjacent to site.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (There are no known archaeological sites in the allocation area or the near vicinity.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Under 0.17ha in size (residential) & Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Cliffe	Size (Ha)	0.64	Proposed Use	Mixed Use
Housing Capacity	19	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Bon Accord Farm				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Farmland				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural land to the East-West, residential to the South. Agricultural land to the North beyond the A63 with some residential				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CLIFFE/003	SHLAA Ref	Cliffe-3		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(++)
Development would create employment					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(+)
Good sub-regional accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	1.68 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
No protected species records within 1km that are less than 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible ground decontamination may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years

Preferred Option

Residential

Preferred Option Explanation

Development of this site would result in the redevelopment of a farmyard and grazing land set within the context of the existing built form of the settlement. The site is set between residential development to both its north and south. The topography of the site and wider landscape is flat in nature, however by virtue of the position of the site within the existing built form of the settlement it is not considered the redevelopment of the site would materially impact the visual amenity of the wider landscape. The NPPF requires that land is identified on small sites (i.e. those under 1ha) to accommodate at least 10% of housing requirements. This site is able to contribute to this requirement.

Settlement	Cliffe	Size (Ha)	2.87	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	73	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land east of York Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the South, agricultural to the North and East. Farmland to the West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CLIFFE/004	SHLAA Ref	Cliffe-4		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.53 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 1.45 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 13.07 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
No protected species records within 1km that are less than 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. The site is subject to a tenancy agreement for grazing and agricultural matters. To be relinquished upon the grant of planning permission.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Cliffe	Size (Ha)	0.23	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	7	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land off Fenwick Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Farm buildings				
Surrounding Land Uses	Farmland to the West agricultural to the North and East and some residential/agricultural to the South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CLIFFE/005	SHLAA Ref	Cliffe-5		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land	2.7 % GF	0	2.7 % PDL	100	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	4.62 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
No protected species records within 1km that are less than 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(+)
Proposed development replaces an existing negative amenity impact	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible ground decontamination may add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Cliffe	Size (Ha)	10.25	Proposed Use	Employment
Housing Capacity	Housing Capacity Notes				
Site Location	Whitemoor Business Park, Cliffe Common				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Business park surrounded by fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Roads to North and West. Agriculture land to North/South/East/West. Pig farm to North East				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CLIFFE/006	SHLAA Ref	N/A		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					N/A
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(--)
Site has very poor access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(++)
Development would create employment					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(o)
Good Local Accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(--)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land	2.7 % GF	0	2.7 % PDL	100	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.29 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 1.6 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 5.48 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England do not need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Toad (2012), tree pipit (2011), Common pipistrelle and Brown long-eared bat (2016) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Site adjacent to Deciduous woodland					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (This is a brownfield site with a low archaeological potential.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road and transfer waste facilities on site	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 extant permission. 1 landowner. Industrial units are let to a variety of local and multi-national businesses.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible ground decontamination may add to costs. Market interest. Site owned by a developer. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Cliffe	Size (Ha)	0.43	Proposed Use	Mixed Use
Housing Capacity	13	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land South of Station Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural land to the South residential to the West railway line to the North and residential beyond. Agricultural land to the East				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CLIFFE/007	SHLAA Ref	Cliffe-6		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(++)
Development would create employment					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(+)
Good sub-regional accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
No protected species records within 1km that are less than 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact

(+) 

There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)

2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps

(o) 

Development does not occur in the SCG

2.19 Landscape Capacity

Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan

2.20 Amenity Impact

(-) 

Within incompatible area - within 100m of railway

2.21 Groundwater

(+) 

Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone

2.22 Contamination

(o) 

Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated

2.23 Mineral Resource

(--)


Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.

2.24 Provision of Open Space

(+) 

Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)

2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area

(o) 

Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA

3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use

Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use.

3.2 Site viability abnormal costs

Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.

3.3 Overall Deliverability

0-5 years

Preferred Option

 Rejected

Preferred Option Explanation

Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.

Settlement	Cliffe	Size (Ha)	0.83	Proposed Use	Mixed Use
Housing Capacity	17	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land South of Turnham Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural land to the South and North. Farm buildings to the East and West, agricultural land beyond				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CLIFFE/008	SHLAA Ref	Cliffe-7		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(++)
Development would create employment					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(+)
Good sub-regional accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 1 20% Grade 2 80%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 93.21%, Flood Zone 1 - 6.79%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					0.69 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 0.79 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 2.29 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Barn owl (2014) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Site adjacent to Traditional orchard					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Cliffe	Size (Ha)	2.79	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	47	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land North of Turnham Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural land to the West, East and South. Barns to the North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CLIFFE/009	SHLAA Ref	Cliffe-9		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 1.53%, Flood Zone 1 - 98.47%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Barn owl (2014) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. 1 Year tenancy agreement.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Cliffe	Size (Ha)	3.03	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	77	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land north of Cliffe Primary School, Main Street				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural land to West, school to South and residential to East and North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CLIFFE/011	SHLAA Ref	Cliffe-10		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 2 - 2.1%, Flood Zone 1 - 97.9%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					0.16 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 0.82 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 2.69 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England do not need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
No protected species records within 1km that are less than 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. Main site is subject to a tenancy agreement expiring September 2017. A building to the north of the site is leased to Cliffe school. This lease can be terminated with 12 months prior notice in writing	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Residential
Preferred Option Explanation	
The site is located adjacent to existing properties on Main Street and its development will form a logical infilling of the settlement between Cliffe Pre School to the north of the site and Cliffe Primary School to the south of the site. Furthermore, the site is located close to the A63 which provides it with easy access to Selby in the west and the M62 to the east.	

Settlement	Cliffe	Size (Ha)	4.60	Proposed Use	Travellers Site
Housing Capacity	Housing Capacity Notes				
Site Location	Land West of Broadlands, Hull Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural Field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural to the West and East of the Site. To the North is the A63 and				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CLIFFE/001	SHLAA Ref	N/A		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings Flood Zone 3a - 11.37%, Flood Zone 2 - 1.83%, Flood Zone 1 - 86.81%					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW 1.45 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water					
2.9 SFRA Level 2 Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Barn owl (2014), Myotis bat species and Common pipistrelle bat (2010) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of railway and within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Cliffe	Size (Ha)	2.44	Proposed Use	Mixed Use
Housing Capacity	41	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land on south side of A163, either side of High Common Farm				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural Field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural to the South, East and West of the Site. A163 to the North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CLIFFE/013	SHLAA Ref	Cliffe-40		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Yes
Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy					Yes
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					(+)
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and workforce					(o)
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(++)
Development would create employment					(++)
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(+)
Good sub-regional accessibility					(+)
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					(+)
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					(o)
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					(o)
Flood Zone 1 - 100%					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					(o)
2.9 SFRA Level 2					(o)
Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					(o)
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					(o)
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					(-)
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					(o)
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					(+)
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Toad (2012), Tree pipit, lapwing (2011), pillwort (2019), Common lizard (2011).					(-)
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Traditional orchard within 100m.					(o)
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					(o)

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.</p>	N/A
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road</p>	(-)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would add an open space asset identified as required in the vicinity (Site is in an area of identified need as falls outside buffer of LEAPS, NEAPS and LAPs, Amenity Greenspace, Parks and recreation, skate parks, allotment and small natural/semi natural greenspace areas.)</p>	(++)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Cliffe	Size (Ha)	8.28	Proposed Use	Mixed Use
Housing Capacity	132	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land on west side of Lowmoor Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural Field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural to the South, North and West of the Site. Minor road to the East of the Site and also Whitemoor Business Park to the North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CLIFFE/014	SHLAA Ref	Cliffe-41		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(++)
Development would create employment					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(o)
Good Local Accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.03 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 0.12 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 0.83 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
No protected species records within 1km that are less than 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Coastal and floodplain grazing marsh within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(++)
Development would add an open space asset identified as required in the vicinity (Site is in an area of identified need as falls outside buffer of LEAPS, NEAPS and LAPs, Amenity Greenspace, Parks and recreation, skate parks, allotment and small natural/semi natural greenspace areas.)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Cliffe	Size (Ha)	1.03	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	18	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Cliffe Cottages Field				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural to the South, Agricultural/open land to the east. Road to the North and residential to the west.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CLIFFE/015	SHLAA Ref	Cliffe-26		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 1 25% Grade 2 75%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 66.16%, Flood Zone 2 - 2.18%, Flood Zone 1 - 31.65%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					1.09 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 1.43 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 3.62 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Barn owl (2014) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (There are no known archaeological sites in the allocation area or the near vicinity.)</p>	(+)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.</p>	N/A
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	(o)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Cliffe	Size (Ha)	0.24	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	5	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Green Lane Farm				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural/ Caravan Storage				
Surrounding Land Uses	Road/ track to the North, residential to the east, Caravan storage to South, Agricultural to the west.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CLIFFE/016	SHLAA Ref	Cliffe-27		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(o)
Mixed (Greenfield/ Previously Developed Land)		2.7 % GF	50	2.7 % PDL	50
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Barn owl (2014) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (There are no known archaeological sites in the allocation area or the near vicinity.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	6-10 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Cliffe	Size (Ha)	2.54	Proposed Use	Mixed Use
Housing Capacity	65	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to the south of Station Lane and north of the A63				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural to the North and east, road to the South and residential to the west.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CLIFFE/017	SHLAA Ref	Cliffe-28		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(o)
Good Local Accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					0.93 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 2.57 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 22.99 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
No protected species records within 1km that are less than 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of railway and within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Cliffe	Size (Ha)	0.27	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	5	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to the south of Turnham Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	Road to the North, agricultural to the east, South and west.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CLIFFE/018	SHLAA Ref	Cliffe-29		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 1 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 79.52%, Flood Zone 2 - 8.09%, Flood Zone 1 - 12.38%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					0.06 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 1.74 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Barn owl (2014) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (There are no known archaeological sites in the allocation area or the near vicinity.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Cliffe	Size (Ha)	1.09	Proposed Use	Mixed Use
Housing Capacity	19	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to the north of the A63				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural to the North, east and west, road to the South.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CLIFFE/019	SHLAA Ref	Cliffe-30		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(o)
Good Local Accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					1.24 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 5.82 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
All protected species within 1km of site are over 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Cliffe	Size (Ha)	1.65	Proposed Use	Mixed Use
Housing Capacity	28	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to the north of the A63				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural to the North, east and west, road and open land to the South.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CLIFFE/020	SHLAA Ref	Cliffe-31		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(o)
Good Local Accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	1.27 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 2.12 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 5.88 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
All protected species within 1km of site are over 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Cliffe	Size (Ha)	1.45	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	25	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Four Acres, South Duffield Road, Cliffe Common				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Residential/ Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	Road to the North and east, agricultural to the South and west.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CLIFFE/021	SHLAA Ref	Cliffe-32		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	80	2.7 % PDL	20	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.99 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
All protected species within 1km of site are over 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Although a Traditional orchard listed on the Priority Habitat Inventory is within 100m, from aerial photographs the deciduous woodland polygons are now park of Cliffe Country Lodges with only an occasional tree remaining, not deciduous woodland.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Cliffe	Size (Ha)	0.15	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	3	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to the north of the A63 adjacent to Chantry House				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Mineral Use				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural to the North and east, road to the South and residential to the west.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CLIFFE/022	SHLAA Ref	Cliffe-33		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes		Under 0.17ha in size (residential) & Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy			
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land		2.7 % GF	0	2.7 % PDL	100
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings		Flood Zone 1 - 100%			
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2		Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA			
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
All protected species within 1km of site are over 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (There are no known archaeological sites in the allocation area or the near vicinity.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(--)
Development occurs in and has a negative impact on the openness or setting of the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. The Site is currently part of a wider clay mineral extraction site, albeit the site itself currently includes an access track off the A63, grassland, scrub and an earth bund.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	6-10 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Under 0.17ha in size (residential) & Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Colton	Size (Ha)	1.71	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	29	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land North of Main Street				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural land to the North/East and residential to the South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	COLTON/001	SHLAA Ref	Colton-1		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.87 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 3.63 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2019), Bluebell (2019) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Traditional orchard within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Grade II Ye Olde Sun Inn located immediately South West					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(--)
The site contains, or is close to known archaeological remains of national or regional significance (The site contains the remains of a medieval moated site that may be of equivalent significance as a scheduled monument.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(o)
Site is not within a mineral safeguarding area	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Cridling Stubbs	Size (Ha)	3.45	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	59	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to the west of Cridling Stubbs and to the South of M62				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural fields mainly surrounding the site. With scattered buildings to the west and South and residential to the North east of the site along with minor roads.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CSTUBBS/003	SHLAA Ref	Cstubbs-1		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					N/A
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(-)
Site has poor access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2019), Little ringed plover, Kestrel (2010), Bluebell (2019), Common pipistrelle bat roost, Brown long-eared bat roost (2017) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (This is a brownfield site with a low archaeological potential.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel/ Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(++)
Development would add an open space asset identified as required in the vicinity (Site is in an area of identified need as falls outside buffer of LEAPS, NEAPS and LAPs, Amenity Greenspace, Parks and recreation, skate parks, allotment and small natural/semi natural greenspace areas.)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. Site is owned by a developer	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Cridling Stubbs	Size (Ha)	28.29	Proposed Use	Employment
Housing Capacity	Housing Capacity Notes				
Site Location	Land to the south of Wrights Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Quarry				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural land to the South/West. Highway to North. Railway to the East and farm buildings				
2020 Site Submission Reference	CSTUBBS/001	SHLAA Ref	N/A		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					
					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					
Site has poor access to services and employment					(-)
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					
					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					
Development would create employment					(++)
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					
Good national accessibility					(++)
2.5 Physical Point of Access					
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					(+)
2.6 Agricultural Land					
Grade 2 100%					(---)
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					
Previously Developed Land		2.7 % GF	0	2.7 % PDL	100
					(+)
2.8 Flood Risk					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	1.12 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 2.77 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 8.69 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					
Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					
No known constraints					(o)
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					(+)
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					(o)
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					(o)
2.14 Impact Protected Species					
Toad (2014), Smooth newt, Great crested newt (2018), various birds (2014, 2017), Grass snake (2014), five species of bat (2018) within 1km					(-)
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					
Site adjacent to Deciduous woodland					(-)
2.16 Heritage Assets					
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					(o)

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 150m of motorway	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Limestone. Site also has access to allocated site for a quarry for crushed stone (M09).	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. FCC have a tenancy agreement with restoration works needing to be carried out post extraction works, estimated to take more than 5 years.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible decontamination may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	6-10 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Drax	Size (Ha)	4.40	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	75	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land South of Main Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural land to the North, South, East and West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	DRAX/001	SHLAA Ref	Drax-1		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 69.61%, Flood Zone 2 - 12.95%, Flood Zone 1 - 17.43%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					0.88 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 4.39 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 20.99 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Requirement to consult with Natural England due to scale of development and mitigation or management may be required					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
No protected species records within 1km that are less than 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.</p>	N/A
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	(o)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3</p>	(o)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.</p>	(-)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use.</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation and decontamination measures may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Drax	Size (Ha)	0.69	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	14	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land adjacent to Read School				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Playing Fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential/school				
2020 Site Submission Reference	DRAX/002	SHLAA Ref	Drax-3		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(-)
Access can be achieved through third party land but an agreement is not in place.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					2.72 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 7.65 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 15.96 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
No protected species records within 1km that are less than 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)</p>	(+)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.</p>	N/A
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	(o)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3</p>	(o)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation may add to costs. Ransom Strip for access may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	6-10 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Drax	Size (Ha)	0.39	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	8	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land adjacent to former Adamson House				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural fields to East/West. Farm buildings to North/South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	DRAX/003	SHLAA Ref	Drax-4		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 0.01%, Flood Zone 2 - 47.59%, Flood Zone 1 - 52.41%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
No protected species records within 1km that are less than 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. Possible flood mitigation may add to costs. Situated within groundwater protection Zone.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Drax	Size (Ha)	0.15	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	3	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Back Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Storage of building supplies				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the East / South. Agricultural to the North. Lane/ residential to the West.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	DRAX/004	SHLAA Ref	Drax-5		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes		Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy. Under 0.17ha in size (residential)			
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	90	2.7 % PDL	10
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings		Flood Zone 3a - 100%			
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW		1.3 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 1.32 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 2.65 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water			
2.9 SFRA Level 2		Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA			
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
All protected species within 1km of site are over 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. Lease with notice period.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy. Under 0.17ha in size (residential)	

Settlement	Eggborough	Size (Ha)	0.86	Proposed Use	Mixed Use
Housing Capacity	26	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land West of Meadow View				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Residential and derelict farm buildings				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to North/East. Factory to South-East. Agricultural fields to South. Woodland to West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	EGGBOROUGH/002	SHLAA Ref	Eggborough-19 SDLP Allocation		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(++)
Good national accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	3.45 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
No protected species records within 1km that are less than 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Series of pasture fields with boundary and internal hedgerows and trees. There are field drains along the SE boundary and within the centre of the site. There are waterbodies outside the site within 150m that will need to be assessed for amphibians. No pr					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Site within the built form of the settlement	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 800m of LEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Eggborough	Size (Ha)	5.32	Proposed Use	Employment
Housing Capacity	Housing Capacity Notes				
Site Location	Land at Tranmore Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Industrial/employment sites to West/South/East. Recreation green space to North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	EGGBOROUGH/013	SHLAA Ref	N/A		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					N/A
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(++)
Development would create employment					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(++)
Good national accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(+)
Site does not fall within a SSSI impact risk Zone					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Grass snake (2017), Pipistrelle bat species (2017) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Site adjacent to Deciduous woodland					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (There are no known archaeological sites in the allocation area or the near vicinity.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(++)
Low sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of railway and within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site partly within Groundwater Protection Zone 3	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel. Site adjacent to site for Waste management (capacity for C and I waste).	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Expressions of interest received from developers but no formal option exists and the site has not been marketed. No viability assessment undertaken. Part of site situated within groundwater protection Zone.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Eggborough	Size (Ha)	2.76	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	70	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Teasle Hall Farm, Weeland Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural crops				
Surrounding Land Uses	Predominantly agriculture with residential to the South and Teasle Hall to the North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	EGGBOROUGH/016	SHLAA Ref	Eggborough-26		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	95	2.7 % PDL	5	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.34 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 0.96 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 7.61 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
No protected species records within 1km that are less than 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Arable field with some boundary features and drain to the eastern boundary. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(-)
Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on a Public Right of Way (PRoW) (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 800m of LEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace. PRoW runs through the site)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. Approximately 20 acres of the land is let on a gentleman's agreement of one year's notice for agricultural use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. There is an interested party ready to sign contracts to develop the site.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Eggborough	Size (Ha)	3.00	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	77	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land adjacent to 23 Tranmore Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural field and farm buildings				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential/agricultural fields to South. Fields to East/West. Employment to North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	EGGBOROUGH/018	SHLAA Ref	Eggborough-28		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Grass snake (2017), Pipistrelle bat species (2017) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Arable field with minimal boundary features, site includes a number of agricultural buildings of unknown age/construction which may support bats or birds. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (There are no known archaeological sites in the allocation area or the near vicinity.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of railway and within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 800m of LEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Eggborough	Size (Ha)	2.60	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	66	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land West of White House Farm, Low Eggborough Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the North and west. Open land to the South west and east. A19 is adjacent to the site in the South.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	EGGBOROUGH/014	SHLAA Ref	Eggborough-29		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 95% Grade 3 5%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	75	2.7 % PDL	25
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					1.28 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 3.32 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 27.29 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
No protected species records within 1km that are less than 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Deciduous woodland within 100m					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Site within the built form of the settlement</p>	N/A
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road</p>	(-)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.</p>	(-)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 800m of LEAP)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible decontamination may add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Eggborough	Size (Ha)	70.82	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	1350	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land West of Kellington Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the east along with minor road to the North/ South and east and then remaining land is surrounded by agricultural fields.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	EGGBOROUGH/023	SHLAA Ref	Eggborough-33		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					
					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					(o)
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					
					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					
Development does not impact on employment land					(o)
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					
					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					(o)
2.6 Agricultural Land					
Grade 2 20% Grade 3 80%					(---)
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	(-)
2.8 Flood Risk					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 2 - 5.39%, Flood Zone 1 - 94.61%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.04 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 0.26 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 3.3 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					
Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					
Major constraints exist - 2 powerlines run through the north of the site					(-)
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					(+)
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					(o)
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					(+)
2.14 Impact Protected Species					
No protected species records within 1km that are less than 10 years old.					(o)
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					
No priority habitat within 100m.					(+)
2.16 Heritage Assets					
The Church of St Edmund, 500 metres to the north west of this site, is a Grade I Listed Building. The gate piers and churchyard cross are also Grade II Listed.					(o)

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of railway and within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(-)
Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on a Public Right of Way (PRoW) (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 800m of LEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace. PRoW runs through the site)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years

Preferred Option	Residential
Preferred Option Explanation	
The site is greenfield but relatively unconstrained; it is flat, lies beyond the Green Belt and the site is also located primarily in Flood Zone 1 with only a small proportion falling in Flood Zone 2 (5.39%). The site benefits from its proximity to both the rail and road network, including the M62 motorway and A19 and will also benefit from the proposed new Knottingley Link Road (identified in the Wakefield Publication Local Plan) which will bypass the town of Knottingley, providing a link to the Kellingley Colliery site and beyond. Whitley Bridge railway station lies immediately to the south of the site and opportunities exist to create a new station gateway on the site which is accessible by car, foot and cycle.	

Settlement	Eggborough	Size (Ha)	1.35	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	34	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to the rear of Glenholme, Kellington Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Residential				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the east and then remaining land is surrounded by agricultural fields.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	EGGBOROUGH/024	SHLAA Ref	Eggborough-34		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 70% Grade 3 30%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	95	2.7 % PDL	5	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
No protected species records within 1km that are less than 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of railway	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 800m of LEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Escrick	Size (Ha)	18.79	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	366	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land north of Skipwith Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Multiple fields used for grazing and crops.				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to West. Woodland to North. Agricultural fields to the East/South. Pumping station to the South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	ESCRICK/001	SHLAA Ref		Escrick-1	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(--)
Grade 2 5% Grade 3 95%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 49.73%, Flood Zone 2 - 2.43%, Flood Zone 1 - 47.85%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					1.9 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 3.27 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 7.52 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Frog (2016), Great crested newt (2012), various birds (2016), Bluebell (2016), Soprano pipistrelle roost (2015) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Site comprises a mix of arable and pasture field with boundary hedges and trees (some mature). Records of veteran trees exist from Gashouse Plantation SINC within 100m of the site. Bridge Dike and Halfpenny Dike both run through the centre of the site and					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
This site adjoins the boundary of the Escrick Conservation Area.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(-)
Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on ESCR-04 (Informal Greenspace) and also a Public Right of Way (PRoW) (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments. PRoW runs through the site)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. Part subject to AHA tenancy	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	Escrick	Size (Ha)	16.43	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	320	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land West of Escrick				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Farm buildings/Residential to East. Agricultural fields to North/West/South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	ESCRICK/002	SHLAA Ref		Escrick-2	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(--)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 32.59%, Flood Zone 2 - 9.67%, Flood Zone 1 - 57.74%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	2.47 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 4.09 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 12.72 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Frog (2016), Great crested newt (2012), various birds (2016), Bluebell (2016), Soprano pipistrelle roost (2015) within 1km, RE-assessed in October 2020, no change to species identified within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Part of the site falls within 100m of a species rich wetland SINC which may support great crested newt, a veteran tree exists within 30m of the site boundary. Bridge dike and the old course of bridge dike run through the site and may support water vole.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
This site adjoins the boundary of the Escrick Conservation Area. Site is located immediately West of the Parsonage Country House which is a Grade II building and immediately west of the Church of St Helen which is Grade II* and the Jubilee Fountain which is Grade II.					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Moderate sensitivity to development</p>	(o)
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW and within 100m of A road</p>	(-)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use.</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site within the Green Belt</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Escrick	Size (Ha)	2.97	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	76	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to the West of Queen Margaret's School				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Open land/ woodland.				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural land to South. A19 to the west. Open land/ playing fields to the North and residential and school to the East.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	ESCRICK/004	SHLAA Ref	Escrick-3		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					
					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					
Site has good access to services and employment					(+)
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					
					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					
Development does not impact on employment land					(o)
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					
					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					(o)
2.6 Agricultural Land					
Grade 2 10% Grade 3 90%					(-)
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	(-)
2.8 Flood Risk					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	15.67 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 24.9 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 39.14 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					
Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					
No known constraints					(o)
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					(-)
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					(o)
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					
Site overlaps a local or regional nature conservation site. Mitigation required to avoid significant impact.					(--)
2.14 Impact Protected Species					
Great crested newt larvae netted within site (2012), various birds (2016), Bluebell (2016), Soprano pipistrelle roost (2015), Frog (2016) within 1km					(--)
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					
Deciduous woodland on and adjacent to site. Lowland fens on site.					(--)
2.16 Heritage Assets					
This site is located within the boundary of the Escrick Conservation Area.					(-)

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(-)
Moderate to high sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW and within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site at risk of flooding	

Settlement	Fairburn	Size (Ha)	0.85	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	26	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to rear of Renarta, Rawfield Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Residential				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the East and West, arable to the North, some residential/arable to the South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	FAIRBURN/001	SHLAA Ref	Fairburn-19		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	10.11 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Bluebell (2017) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Deciduous woodland within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Limestone/ Shallow Coal.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of skatepark, 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. Offer received for site.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	Fairburn	Size (Ha)	0.37	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	11	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at First Pinfold Farm, Caudle Hill				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Grazing land				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the East, South farmland to the West and North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	FAIRBURN/002	SHLAA Ref	Fairburn-2		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 20% Non-Agricultural 80%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Linnet (2014), Bluebell (2017) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Site adjacent to Deciduous woodland					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for building stone/ Limestone/ Shallow Coal.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of skatepark, 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible decontamination may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	Fairburn	Size (Ha)	2.35	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	60	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land North of Top House Farm Mews				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Arable				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the East, South, arable to the North and West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	FAIRBURN/008	SHLAA Ref	Fairburn-5		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Linnet (2014), Bluebell (2017) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Limestone/ Shallow Coal.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of skatepark, 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	Fairburn	Size (Ha)	1.03	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	26	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land west of Silver Street				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Overgrown area				
Surrounding Land Uses	Overgrown area. Field to the South arable to the East and lakes to the West. Residential to the North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	FAIRBURN/005	SHLAA Ref	Fairburn-3		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(+)
Non-Agricultural 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	90	2.7 % PDL	10	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(-)
Major constraints exist - powerline through the site					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England do not need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Linnet (2014), Shelduck (2012), Bluebell (2017) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Site adjacent to Deciduous woodland					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement. The site also contains the route of a historic railway and timber yard.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of railway and within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for building stone/ Limestone/ Shallow Coal/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of skatepark, 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
An appraisal carried out by the marketing manager for a developer considers the site to be viable for development.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	Fairburn	Size (Ha)	0.41	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	12	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land adjacent Beech House, Silver Street				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Arable				
Surrounding Land Uses	Part residential to the East and West, playing field to the North, fields to the South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	FAIRBURN/007	SHLAA Ref	Fairburn-4		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(+)
Non-Agricultural 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Linnet (2014), Shelduck (2012), Bluebell (2017) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Deciduous woodland within 100m					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for building stone/ Limestone/ Shallow Coal/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of skatepark, 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	Fairburn	Size (Ha)	2.62	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	67	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Watergarth Quarry, Lunnsfield Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Arable				
Surrounding Land Uses	Wooded area to the South, residential to the West, arable land to the East and South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	FAIRBURN/009	SHLAA Ref	Fairburn-6		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.06 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Bluebell (2017) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Site adjacent to Deciduous woodland					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
within incompatible area - adjacent to issued quarry	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Limestone/ Shallow Coal/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of skatepark, 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible decontamination may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	Fairburn	Size (Ha)	1.10	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	28	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land south of Rawfield Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Arable				
Surrounding Land Uses	Arable land to the North and South, residential to the West farmland to the East				
2020 Site Submission Reference	FAIRBURN/010	SHLAA Ref	Fairburn-7		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Bluebell (2017) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Limestone/ Shallow Coal.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of skatepark, 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	Fairburn	Size (Ha)	0.21	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	6	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Pear Tree House, Rawfield Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Wider non domesticated garden land				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to East/South. Residential to North. Highway to West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	FAIRBURN/012	SHLAA Ref	Fairburn-15		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Bluebell (2017) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Deciduous woodland within 100m					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Limestone/ Shallow Coal.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of skatepark, 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	Fairburn	Size (Ha)	0.28	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	6	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land adjacent Pollums Farm				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Caravan storage				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to South. Agricultural fields to North/West/East				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SMILFORD/022	SHLAA Ref	Fairburn-16		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land					2.7 % GF 20 2.7 % PDL 80
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					6.93 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Bluebell (2017), Noctule bat, Soprano pipistrelle, Common pipistrelle bats (2017) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Deciduous woodland within 100m					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible decontamination measures may add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Fairburn	Size (Ha)	128.36	Proposed Use	Employment
Housing Capacity	Housing Capacity Notes				
Site Location	Land at Junction 42 of A1 (M)				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural Field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Highway to the East/West. Agricultural to the West and South. Residential to the South and Highway to the North.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SMILFORD/023	SHLAA Ref	N/A		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					
					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					
None					
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					
					N/A
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					
Site has poor access to services and workforce					(-)
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					
Development would create employment					(++)
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					
Good national accessibility					(++)
2.5 Physical Point of Access					
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					(o)
2.6 Agricultural Land					
Grade 2 100%					(---)
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	(-)
2.8 Flood Risk					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings Flood Zone 1 - 100%					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW 0.02 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 0.06 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 0.36 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					
Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					
Major constraints exist - multiple powerlines run through the site					(--)
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					(+)
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England do not need to be consulted.					(-)
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					(o)
2.14 Impact Protected Species					
Blue tit, wren (2013), Yellowhammer (2018), Bluebell (2017), Noctule bat, Soprano pipistrelle, Common pipistrelle bats (2017) within 1km					(-)
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					
Site adjacent to Deciduous woodland					(-)
2.16 Heritage Assets					
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					(o)

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW, within 150m of motorway and within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Limestone/ Shallow Coal.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. Site is under option to a developer	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Major constraints which are difficult to mitigate or affect a large portion of the site.	

Settlement	Fairburn	Size (Ha)	0.03	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	1	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Beckfield Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Residential				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the East, South farmland to the West and North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	FAIRBURN/003	SHLAA Ref	Fairburn-17		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Under 0.17ha in size (residential)
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(+)
Non-Agricultural 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Linnet (2014), Bluebell (2017) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Site adjacent to Deciduous woodland					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (The site is within the historic core of the medieval settlement of Church Fenton.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for building stone/ Limestone/ Shallow Coal.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of skatepark, 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Under 0.17ha in size (residential)	

Settlement	Gateforth	Size (Ha)	0.61	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	12	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land south of Hillam Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Arable land to the South, West, residential/farmland to the North, residential to the East				
2020 Site Submission Reference	GATEFORTH/001	SHLAA Ref	Gateforth-1		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 11.09%, Flood Zone 2 - 55.57%, Flood Zone 1 - 33.34%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(--)
major constraints - within Asselby to Pannal gas pipeline middle 290m buffer and 380m outer buffer					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Bluebell (2014) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs. Potential ransom strip issues - Council strip of grass between field and road.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Hambleton	Size (Ha)	6.39	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	153	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	White House Farm & Manor Farm				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Farm buildings and agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to North/East/West. Farm buildings to North. Agricultural fields to South. Primary School to East				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HAMBLETON/001	SHLAA Ref	Hambleton-4		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(o)
Mixed (Greenfield/ Previously Developed Land)		2.7 % GF	70	2.7 % PDL	30
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings		Flood Zone 1 - 100%			
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW		0.33 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 0.81 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water			
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Bluebell (2014), Brandt's bat roost, Common pipistrelle roost, Brown long-eared bat roost (2016), Natterer's Bat (2014) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Large mixed site including a farm with associated buildings and grounds, arable and pasture fields with boundary trees and hedges. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Garth House on Chapel Street is immediately to the West and is a Grade II listed building, to the east of this area is The Old Vicarage a Grade II Listed Building. Grade II listed buildings are also located to the North and North East.					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Moderate to high sensitivity to development</p>	(-)
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	(o)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.</p>	(-)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 800m of LEAP, 400m of LAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use.</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible decontamination measures may add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Hambleton	Size (Ha)	4.46	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	114	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land West of Bar Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to East. Agriculture to South/West/North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HAMBLETON/003	SHLAA Ref		Hambleton-1	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 60% Grade 3 40%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 6.19%, Flood Zone 2 - 0.77%, Flood Zone 1 - 93.04%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.69 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 3.09 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 7.44 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(--)
Major constraints which are difficult to mitigate - Asselby to Pannal gas pipeline middle 290m buffer and outer 380m buffer					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Bluebell (2014), Brandt's bat roost, Common pipistrelle roost, Brown long-eared bat roost (2016), Natterer's Bat (2014) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Large arable field with minimal boundary features - field drain to the western boundary. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting. Grade II milestone located to the north.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 800m of LEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation measures may add to costs. Potential ransom strip issues - Council strip of grass between field and road.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Major constraints which are difficult to mitigate or affect a large portion of the site.	

Settlement	Hambleton	Size (Ha)	12.67	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	247	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land east of Common Lane and west of Station Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields and part old farmyard remainder arable				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to East/South/West. Agriculture to North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HAMBLETON/002/004/010	SHLAA Ref		Hambleton-2	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(---)
Grade 2 95% Grade 3 5%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	90	2.7 % PDL	10
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					0.5 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 1 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 2.8 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(-)
Major constraints exist but affect very small part of site - Asselby to Pannal gas pipeline 380m outer buffer					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Bluebell (2014), Brandt's bat roost, Common pipistrelle roost, Brown long-eared bat roost (2016), Natterer's Bat (2014) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Large arable field with minimal boundary features. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 800m of LEAP, 400m of LAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. Part subject to AHA tenancy	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. Site is under option to a developer	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Hambleton	Size (Ha)	5.15	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	124	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land North of Main Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural fields to the North, East, and South. Residential to the West.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HAMBLETON/008	SHLAA Ref		Hambleton-6	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.18 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 0.5 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 2.43 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Bluebell (2014), Brandt's bat roost, Common pipistrelle roost, Brown long-eared bat roost (2016), Natterer's Bat (2014) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Large arable field with minimal boundary features. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Site Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 800m of LEAP, 400m of LAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. Agricultural tenancy - 12 months' notice to be given of land no longer being available	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	6-10 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Hambleton	Size (Ha)	14.86	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	290	Housing Capacity Notes	Smaller part of site for 44 homes proposed for allocation		
Site Location	Land east of Gateforth Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural Field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to North-West. Agricultural to the South / West.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HAMBLETON/011	SHLAA Ref	Hambleton-22		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(--)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Bluebell (2014), Brandt's bat roost, Common pipistrelle roost, Brown long-eared bat roost (2016), Natterer's Bat (2014) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Large arable field with minimal boundary features. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
The Old Vicarage, 180 metres to the north of this site, is a Grade II Listed Building.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(-)
Moderate to high sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Site within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW and within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site partly within Groundwater Protection Zone 3	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 800m of LEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. Viability Assessment has been undertaken. Site is under option to a developer.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Residential
Preferred Option Explanation	
The site represents a southern extension to the village of Hambleton, extending the built form towards the cemetery which is located to the south of the site. The site is also located wholly in Flood Zone 1 and is situated close to the A63 which provides convenient access to both Selby and Leeds.	

Settlement	Hambleton	Size (Ha)	0.91	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	27	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land east of Gateforth Court				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the North and west. Agricultural land to the South and east.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HAMBLETON/009	SHLAA Ref	Hambleton-19		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Bluebell (2014), Brandt's bat roost, Common pipistrelle roost, Brown long-eared bat roost (2016), Natterer's Bat (2014) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Moderate to high sensitivity to development</p>	(-)
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	(o)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 800m of LEAP, 400m of LAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. Developer Interest in the site historically.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Hirst Courtney	Size (Ha)	0.34	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	7	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Royal Oak, Hirst Courtney				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Public House with car park				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the South, West, farmland to the East and North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	H COURTNEY/001	SHLAA Ref	HCourtney-1		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land	2.7 % GF	0	2.7 % PDL	100	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
All protected species within 1km of site are over 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(+)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.</p>	N/A
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	(o)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3</p>	(o)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.</p>	(o)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs. Site marketed - enquiries have been received</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Great Heck	Size (Ha)	1.52	Proposed Use	Mixed Use
Housing Capacity	26	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land east of Great Heck Basin				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Horse paddocks				
Surrounding Land Uses	South Yorkshire boat club (marina to the east). River to the North. Agricultural land to the East and South.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	GHECK/001	SHLAA Ref	GHeck-1		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(-)
Site has poor access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(++)
Development would create employment					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(-)
Poor local accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 94.78%, Flood Zone 2 - 5.22%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					0.8 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 2.6 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(-)
Site is adjacent to a SINC					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
No protected species records within 1km that are less than 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Site is directly adjacent to the Aire & Calder Navigation and the Disused Railway line which supports semi improved species rich grassland and regenerated woodland. The site itself comprises three pasture fields with hedgerows and trees. A pond exists on					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (This is a brownfield site with a low archaeological potential.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	

3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years

Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Great Heck	Size (Ha)	1.98	Proposed Use	Mixed Use
Housing Capacity	34	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land west of Long Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Former gravel pit.				
Surrounding Land Uses	Sellite Blocks site to the South and West. Residential to South and former employment site to the East. Agriculture to North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	GHECK/002	SHLAA Ref	Gheck-6		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(++)
Development would create employment					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(o)
Good Local Accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site but impact insignificant or unknown					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
No protected species records within 1km that are less than 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Rough grassland pasture with trees and scrub around the boundary. Site adjacent to Deciduous woodland					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of waste facility	
2.21 Groundwater	(-)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 2 and 3	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel. Site is located adjacent to Mill Balk Quarry and in the area of ancillary infrastructure	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible decontamination measures may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Hemingbrough	Size (Ha)	3.40	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	87	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to West of Chapel Balk Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agriculture to South/North-East. School to North-West. Residential to West/East				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HEMINGBROUGH/001	SHLAA Ref		Hemingbrough-1	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 1 95% Grade 2 5%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.51 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 0.93 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 2.61 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England do not need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2019), Common pipistrelle, Brown long-eared bat (2014) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Arable fields with minimal boundary features - field drain within the centre of the site and along part of the eastern boundary. Is within 100m of a pond that could support amphibians. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Moderate to high sensitivity to development</p>	(-)
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW</p>	(-)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Hemingbrough	Size (Ha)	1.14	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	19	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at chapel Fields				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural to North, west and east of the site and A63 to the South of the site.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HEMINGBROUGH/023	SHLAA Ref		Hemingbrough-35	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 2 - 16.91%, Flood Zone 1 - 83.09%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England do not need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Smooth newt (2018), Great crested newt (2019), Myotis bat species, Common pipistrelle and Brown long-eared bat (2014) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(-)
Moderate to high sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs. Site marketed - enquiries have been received	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Hemingbrough	Size (Ha)	1.68	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	43	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Chantry Field				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural land/ track to the North, employment to the east, residential to the South and Agricultural/ open land to the west.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HEMINGBROUGH/024	SHLAA Ref		Hemingbrough-36	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.88 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2019) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(--)
Development occurs in and has a negative impact on the openness or setting of the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Negative impact on the openness or setting of the Strategic Countryside Gap (SCG)	

Settlement	Hemingbrough	Size (Ha)	8.34	Proposed Use	Leisure
Housing Capacity	Housing Capacity Notes				
Site Location	The old Brickyard				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Lake/ Agricultural/ Employment				
Surrounding Land Uses	Employment to the North, agricultural to the east and South, employment/agricultural to the west.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HEMINGBROUGH/025	SHLAA Ref	N/A		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					N/A
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(-)
Poor local accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land					2.7 % GF 0 2.7 % PDL 100
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					0.18 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 0.25 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 5.93 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Smooth newt (2018), Great crested newt (2019), Unidentified Myotis bats (2012) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Low to moderate sensitivity to development</p>	(+)
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 100m of waste facility</p>	(-)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.</p>	(-)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel. Site is also allocated for the provision of clay (MJP45)</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.</p>	(o)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible decontamination measures may add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	6-10 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Hemingbrough	Size (Ha)	2.29	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	58	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Brickyard Field, land to the north of the A63				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the South and agricultural, road to the west. Lake/ employment/agricultural to the North and agricultural to the east.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HEMINGBROUGH/026	SHLAA Ref		Hemingbrough-37	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings Flood Zone 3a - 1.46%, Flood Zone 2 - 26.4%, Flood Zone 1 - 72.14%					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW 1.03 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Smooth newt (2018), Great crested newt (2019), Unidentified Myotis bats (2012) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Site is North of Grade II listed The Villa					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Low to moderate sensitivity to development</p>	(+)
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road and within 100m of waste facility</p>	(-)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. Site has an agricultural tenancy that can be brought to an end within 6 months</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Hemingbrough	Size (Ha)	1.17	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	20	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land West of Chapel Balk Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural land to the North, South, East and West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HEMINGBROUGH/003	SHLAA Ref		Hemingbrough-3	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 1 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	1.77 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2019), Myotis bat species, Common pipistrelle and Brown long-eared bat (2014) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(-)
Moderate to high sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years

Preferred Option Rejected

Preferred Option Explanation

Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy

Settlement	Hemingbrough	Size (Ha)	1.46	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	37	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Plinthstones, School Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Garden area				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential and road to the North Agricultural to the west and South. To the east there is a road and then farm buildings.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HEMINGBROUGH/007	SHLAA Ref		Hemingbrough-8	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2019), Myotis bat species (2012) within 1km. Site re-assessed in October 2020 - Common pipistrelle and Brown long-eared bat no longer within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m. Re-assessed October 2020.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Moderate to high sensitivity to development</p>	(-)
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	(o)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.</p>	(-)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible decontamination measures may add to costs. Site is owned by a developer</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Hemingbrough	Size (Ha)	0.86	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	26	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land South of Orchard End				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural Fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the North, East. Agricultural to the South and West.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HEMINGBROUGH/010	SHLAA Ref	Hemingbrough-10		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 1 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings Flood Zone 3a - 2%, Flood Zone 2 - 2.12%, Flood Zone 1 - 95.88%					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW 0.01 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water					
2.9 SFRA Level 2 Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(++)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2019), Myotis bat species, Common pipistrelle and Brown long-eared bat (2014) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Large arable field with minimal boundary features - pond 65m to the south. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Hemingbrough Conservation Area is located 215 metres to the north of the site.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(--)
High sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation measures may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Residential
Preferred Option Explanation	
The site presents the opportunity to extend the settlement within strong field boundaries. The NPPF requires that land is identified on small sites (i.e. those under 1ha) to accommodate at least 10% of housing requirements and this site is able to contribute to this requirement. Development on this site will have a lesser impact on the built and natural landscape than in other locations in the village due to its compact nature and meagre extension into the Countryside. The site is also located primarily in Flood Zone 1 with only a small proportion falling in Flood Zone 3a (2%) and Flood Zone 2 (2.12%)	

Settlement	Hemingbrough	Size (Ha)	1.59	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	41	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land East of Mill Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to North-West. Agricultural to North-East/East/South/West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HEMINGBROUGH/011	SHLAA Ref		Hemingbrough-11	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 1 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.65 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 2.09 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2019), Myotis bat species, Common pipistrelle and Brown long-eared bat (2014) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Large arable field with minimal boundary features - pond 180m to the south-west. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Hemingbrough Conservation Area is located 210 metres to the north west of the site.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(-)
Moderate to high sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner (Trust). Subject to Agricultural Holdings Act tenancy	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years

Preferred Option

Residential

Preferred Option Explanation

The site presents the opportunity to extend the settlement within strong field boundaries. Development on this site will have a lesser impact on the built and natural landscape than in other locations in the village due to its compact nature and meagre extension into the Countryside. The site is also located wholly in Flood Zone 1.

Settlement	Hemingbrough	Size (Ha)	1.91	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	32	Housing Capacity Notes	Smaller part of site for 8 homes proposed for allocation		
Site Location	Land south of School Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential with long gardens to East. More residential to West. Field to West/South/North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HEMINGBROUGH/012	SHLAA Ref	Hemingbrough-12		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 1 40% Grade 2 60%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					0.75 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 2.98 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England do not need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2019), Myotis bat species, Common pipistrelle and Brown long-eared bat (2014) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Large arable field with some boundary features including mature trees - pond 15m to the southwest. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(-)
Moderate to high sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. Agricultural Holdings Act tenancy. If planning consent is obtained the owner can serve a Case B Notice to Quit	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years

Preferred Option

Residential

Preferred Option Explanation

The site presents the opportunity to provide additional dwellings within the village boundaries on a site that is located wholly within Flood Zone 1 and that can also respect and reflect the historical features of the village. The NPPF requires that land is identified on small sites (i.e. those under 1ha) to accommodate at least 10% of housing requirements and this site is able to contribute to this requirement.

Settlement	Hemingbrough	Size (Ha)	1.90	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	48	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land East of Poorlands Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to West. Agriculture to North. Paddocks to East. Field to South.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HEMINGBROUGH/013	SHLAA Ref		Hemingbrough-13	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 2 - 6.53%, Flood Zone 1 - 93.47%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England do not need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site but impact insignificant or unknown					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Smooth newt (2018), Great crested newt (2019), Myotis bat species, Common pipistrelle and Brown long-eared bat (2014) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Large arable field with some boundary features including mature trees - pond 15m to the north. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a brownfield site with a low archaeological potential.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Moderate to high sensitivity to development</p>	(-)
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road</p>	(-)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. Agricultural Holdings Act tenancy. If planning consent is obtained the owner can serve a Case B Notice to Quit</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation measures may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Hemingbrough	Size (Ha)	0.64	Proposed Use	Mixed Use
Housing Capacity	13	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land west of Selchant Gardens				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agriculture to West/North/South. A63 to North. Farm with greenhouses to East.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HEMINGBROUGH/016	SHLAA Ref	Hemingbrough-16		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(+)
Good sub-regional accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 1 45% Grade 2 55%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 76.83%, Flood Zone 2 - 3.52%, Flood Zone 1 - 19.65%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					0.78 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England do not need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Smooth newt (2018), Great crested newt (2019), Myotis bat species, Common pipistrelle and Brown long-eared bat (2014) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Improved grassland field with minimal boundary features. Oldmill Field drain lies to the southern boundary of the site. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development occurs in and has a negative impact on the openness or setting of the SCG</p>	(--)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.</p>	N/A
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road</p>	(-)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy</p>	<p>Rejected</p>

Settlement	Hemingbrough	Size (Ha)	6.58	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	158	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at A63				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Farm/agriculture to West/North/East. Nature site/woodland to West. Shops/restaurant to South. Residential to South-East.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HEMINGBROUGH/020	SHLAA Ref		Hemingbrough-31	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 2 - 41.97%, Flood Zone 1 - 58.03%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					1.38 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 14.97 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Requirement to consult with Natural England					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(--)
Site overlaps a local or regional nature conservation site. Mitigation needed to avoid significant impact.					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(--)
Great crested newt population monitoring within site boundary (2013-2019), Myotis bat species, Common pipistrelle and Brown long-eared bat (2014), Smooth newt (2018), within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(--)
Large site direct adjacent to SINC known to support amphibians. Site includes ponds, boundary hedges and trees, also includes two agricultural buildings but the majority of the site is arable farmland. Deciduous woodland on and adjacent to site.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(-)
Moderate to high sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible decontamination and flood mitigation measures may add to costs. Market Interest - Site is under option to a developer.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Hemingbrough	Size (Ha)	1.63	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	42	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land between Barmby Ferry Road and Chapel Balk Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agriculture to North/East/South/West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HEMINGBROUGH/004	SHLAA Ref	Hemingbrough-4		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 1 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					1.72 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 4.04 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 14.15 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2019), Myotis bat species, Common pipistrelle and Brown long-eared bat (2014) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Large arable field with minimal boundary features - pond 220m to the south-west. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(-)
Moderate to high sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. The land is subject to a farm business tenancy agreement with the term expiring on 30 September 2022.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Hemingbrough	Size (Ha)	1.62	Proposed Use	Mixed Use
Housing Capacity	41	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	The Coach Station, Hull Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Bus and coach depot				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to East/West. Agricultural fields to North/East/South/West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HEMINGBROUGH/022	SHLAA Ref	Hemingbrough-20		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(-)
Site has poor access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(++)
Development would create employment					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(+)
Good sub-regional accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land		2.7 % GF	25	2.7 % PDL	75
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 10.3%, Flood Zone 2 - 3.46%, Flood Zone 1 - 86.24%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England do not need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Smooth newt (2018), Great crested newt (2019), Myotis bat species, Common pipistrelle and Brown long-eared bat (2014) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Site currently used as a transport depot with industrial buildings and hard standing. Buildings may support bats/birds depending on their construction. There is also an area the north and east of the site which is comprised of grassland with trees and sc					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road and within 100m of waste facility	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible decontamination and flood mitigation measures may add to costs. Site marketed - enquiries have been received. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Hensall	Size (Ha)	0.97	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	24	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to North of Weeland Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Vacant grassland of low ecological value				
Surrounding Land Uses	Fields to the North, Church and grounds to the South, residential to the East, farm and paddocks to the South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HENSALL/001	SHLAA Ref	Hensall-1		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	2.85 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(+)
Site does not fall within a SSSI impact risk Zone or does not affect an Ancient Woodland					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site but impact insignificant or unknown					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Grass snake (2011), Noctule bat, Common pipistrelle (2010) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(--)
Two Grade II* Listed Buildings are located to the south of the site, The Red House and Church of St Paul. The Grade II Listed Hensall Primary School Schoolmaster's House also lies to the south of the site. Development of this area could harm elements which contribute to the significance of these heritage assets.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of railway and within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Joint landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years

Preferred Option

Residential

Preferred Option Explanation

The site marks a logical extension to the southern end of Hensall village. It is currently surrounded by a mixture of residential and commercial properties on its northern, western and southern boundaries and its redevelopment would form a natural infill to the built form. The site's proximity to Hensall railway station could help towards ensuring sustainable patterns of development are created. The NPPF requires that land is identified on small sites (i.e. those under 1ha) to accommodate at least 10% of housing requirements and this site is able to contribute to this requirement.

Settlement	Hensall	Size (Ha)	1.60	Proposed Use	Mixed Use
Housing Capacity	27	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	A19 Caravan Storage Ltd, Hazel Old Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Caravan storage				
Surrounding Land Uses	Power station to the North, fields to the East West, Morris Trucks to the South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HENSALL/002	SHLAA Ref	Hensall-2 - Permission		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(++)
Good national accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land		2.7 % GF	0	2.7 % PDL	100
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	3.56 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(+)
Site does not fall within a SSSI impact risk Zone or does not affect an Ancient Woodland					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site but impact insignificant or unknown					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
No protected species records within 1km that are less than 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs</p>	(+)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan</p>	(o)
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road</p>	(-)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3</p>	(o)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.</p>	(-)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. A19 Caravan Storage Ltd have a tenancy agreement with SPH Transport Ltd owned both by Peter Brian Hill</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible decontamination measures may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.</p>	<p>Rejected</p>

Settlement	Hensall	Size (Ha)	0.81	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	24	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land East of Heck Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Residential				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the North and West, farmland to the East and South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HENSALL/003	SHLAA Ref	Hensall-3		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	95	2.7 % PDL	5
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(+)
Site does not fall within a SSSI impact risk Zone or does not affect an Ancient Woodland					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
No protected species records within 1km that are less than 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 800m of LEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs. Site is owned by a developer.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Hensall	Size (Ha)	0.22	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	7	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land north of Dovecote Gardens				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Informal garden				
Surrounding Land Uses	Farmland to the North, East and West. Residential to the South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HENSALL/008	SHLAA Ref	Hensall-7		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	75	2.7 % PDL	25	
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 96.22%, Flood Zone 2 - 3.78%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	2.52 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 4.96 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 6.99 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(+)
Site does not fall within a SSSI impact risk Zone or does not affect an Ancient Woodland					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
No protected species records within 1km that are less than 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs</p>	<p>(+)</p>
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan</p>	
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.</p>	<p>(--)</p>
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 800m of LEAP)</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation may add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	<p>0-5 years</p>
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site at risk of flooding</p>	<p>Rejected</p>

Settlement	Hensall	Size (Ha)	1.51	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	39	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land south of Field Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the North arable to the East and West, aggregate field to the South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HENSALL/010	SHLAA Ref	Hensall-16		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings Flood Zone 2 - 8.84%, Flood Zone 1 - 91.16%					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW 1.64 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water					
2.9 SFRA Level 2 Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(+)
Site does not fall within a SSSI impact risk Zone or does not affect an Ancient Woodland					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
No protected species records within 1km that are less than 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of waste facility	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 800m of LEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	6-10 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Hensall	Size (Ha)	3.28	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	84	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land adjacent to Dene Close				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Currently being used to construct a foodbank				
Surrounding Land Uses	Farmland to the North, East, wooded area and fields to the South, residential/farmland to the West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HENSALL/011	SHLAA Ref	Hensall-17		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(-)
Access can be achieved through third party land but an agreement is not in place.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 52.31%, Flood Zone 2 - 21.31%, Flood Zone 1 - 26.38%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(+)
Site does not fall within a SSSI impact risk Zone or does not affect an Ancient Woodland					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
No protected species records within 1km that are less than 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan</p>	<p></p>
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW</p>	<p>(-)</p>
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.</p>	<p>(-)</p>
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	<p>(--)</p>
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 800m of LEAP)</p>	<p>(+)</p>
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible decontamination and flood mitigation measures may add to costs. The land to the south has planning permission for housing. Access would need to be negotiated through this area</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	<p>6-10 years</p>
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site at risk of flooding</p>	<p>Rejected</p>

Settlement	Hensall	Size (Ha)	3.82	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	97	Housing Capacity Notes	Smaller part of site for 57 homes proposed for allocation		
Site Location	Land north of Wand Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Scrubland				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural to the North. Residential to the West. Agricultural to the East. Residential to the South.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HENSALL/012	SHLAA Ref	Hensall-19		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings Flood Zone 3a - 19.4%, Flood Zone 2 - 18.41%, Flood Zone 1 - 62.19%					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2 Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(+)
Site does not fall within a SSSI impact risk Zone or does not affect an Ancient Woodland					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
No protected species records within 1km that are less than 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 800m of LEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible decontamination and flood mitigation measures may add to costs. Site is owned by a land promotor.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years

Preferred Option

Residential

Preferred Option Explanation

The site is located wholly within Flood Zone 1 and would provide a logical extension to the west of North Hensall. The development of residential dwellings along Wand Lane would link the development in the main body of the village to the cluster of dwellings located on Dene Close.

Settlement	Hensall	Size (Ha)	0.73	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	22	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land south of Field Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the North and west with agricultural to South and east.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HENSALL/013	SHLAA Ref		Hensall-20	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings Flood Zone 2 - 56.66%, Flood Zone 1 - 43.34%					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW 10.77 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 28.92 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water					
2.9 SFRA Level 2 Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(+)
Site does not fall within a SSSI impact risk Zone or does not affect an Ancient Woodland					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
No protected species records within 1km that are less than 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan</p>	
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 100m of waste facility</p>	(-)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3</p>	(o)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 800m of LEAP)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	6-10 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Hensall	Size (Ha)	0.24	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	7	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Main Street				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Residual land from initial bungalow development				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural to the North and East. Residential/ Farm Buildings to the West and Road to the South.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HENSALL/014	SHLAA Ref	Hensall-21		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
All protected species within 1km of site are over 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m. Re-assessed October 2020.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)</p>	<p>(+)</p>
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan</p>	<p></p>
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.</p>	<p>(--)</p>
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 800m of LEA. HENS05 - Natural Woodland - Not said to be included)</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	<p>0-5 years</p>
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.</p>	<p>Rejected</p>

Settlement	Hensall	Size (Ha)	0.12	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	4	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to the rear of Wand Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Open Land				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural to the North. Residential surrounding the remainder of site.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HENSALL/015	SHLAA Ref	Hensall-24		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Under 0.17ha in size (residential)
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
All protected species within 1km of site are over 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m. Re-assessed October 2020.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 800m of LEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Under 0.17ha in size (residential)	

Settlement	Hensall	Size (Ha)	6.21	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	149	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land South of Station Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural and Eastern part of site is a Registered greyhound exercise paddock and breeding centre.				
Surrounding Land Uses	Open land/ residential/ farm/ employment buildings to the North, railway line to the South. Open land to the east and road to the west.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HENSALL/016	SHLAA Ref	Hensall-26		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	75	2.7 % PDL	25
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings Flood Zone 3a - 39.91%, Flood Zone 2 - 7.46%, Flood Zone 1 - 52.63%					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW 0.78 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water					
2.9 SFRA Level 2 Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(+)
Site does not fall within a SSSI impact risk Zone or does not affect an Ancient Woodland					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
All protected species within 1km of site are over 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Traditional orchard in garden adjacent to site. Difficult to tell from aerial photographs whether orchard remains.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Site is north-east of Grade II listed Hensall Signal Box					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development occurs in and has a negative impact on the openness or setting of the SCG</p>	(--)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan</p>	
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 100m of railway and within 100m of waste facility</p>	(-)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3</p>	(o)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.</p>	(-)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 800m of LEAP)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>Multiple landowners. Tenancy agreement on part of the site</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible decontamination and flood mitigation measures may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Negative impact on the openness or setting of the Strategic Countryside Gap (SCG)</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Hensall	Size (Ha)	1.02	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	26	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land north of Ashleigh				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural to the North, east and west. Residential/ open land to the South.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HENSALL/017	SHLAA Ref	Hensall-27		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 18.4%, Flood Zone 2 - 8.86%, Flood Zone 1 - 72.75%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.03 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 0.05 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 0.19 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
All protected species within 1km of site are over 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m. Re-assessed October 2020.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan</p>	
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	(o)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3</p>	(o)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 800m of LEAP)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Hensall	Size (Ha)	2.22	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	38	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land West of Ings Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural land to the North, east, South and west.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HENSALL/018	SHLAA Ref	Hensall-28		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes	Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 26.43%, Flood Zone 2 - 7.13%, Flood Zone 1 - 66.43%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.7 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 1.17 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
All protected species within 1km of site are over 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m. Re-assessed October 2020.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.</p>	N/A
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	(o)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3</p>	(o)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.</p>	(-)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 800m of LEAP)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible decontamination and flood mitigation measures may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy</p>	<p>Rejected</p>

Settlement	Hillam	Size (Ha)	2.34	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	33	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land West of Main Street				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to Northeast and South, footpath to the West with pond to West of that, agriculture fields to South-West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HILLAM/001	SHLAA Ref	Hillam-1		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					
					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					
Site has good access to services and employment					(+)
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					
					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					
Development does not impact on employment land					(o)
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					
					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					(o)
2.6 Agricultural Land					
Grade 2 100%					(-)
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	95	2.7 % PDL	5
					(-)
2.8 Flood Risk					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.37 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					
Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					
No known constraints					(o)
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					(+)
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England do not need to be consulted.					(-)
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					
Adjacent to a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					(-)
2.14 Impact Protected Species					
Grass snake (2011), Noctule bat, Common pipistrelle (2010) within 1km					(-)
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					
Series of small paddocks adjacent to wetland SINC. Fields have good hedges and potential for mature trees. Site also includes two domestic dwellings with curtilage. Site adjacent to Deciduous woodland.					(-)
2.16 Heritage Assets					
The south east corner of the site is within the Hillam Conservation Area. Its loss and subsequent development could harm elements which contribute to the significance of the Conservation Area.					(-)

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(-)
Moderate to high sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(-)
Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on a Public Right of Way (PRoW) (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace. PRoW runs through the site)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs. Site is under option to a developer	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years

Preferred Option

Residential

Preferred Option Explanation

Development of this site would provide a logical infill extension to the west of the settlement between existing residential development to the north and south and is set within an area excluded from the Green Belt. Development of this site would effectively round off this part of the village.

Settlement	Hillam	Size (Ha)	2.02	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	52	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Hillam Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the North, overgrown cottage garden to West, agriculture field to South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HILLAM/007	SHLAA Ref	Hillam-11		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	5.95 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(-)
Major constraints exist - major power line crosses site					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England do not need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site but impact insignificant or unknown					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Grass snake (2011) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Large arable field with well managed ditches to the east and south of the site. Some boundary hedges and trees. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ Limestone/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. Current farm agreement runs until 15.9.2020	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
National grid guidelines concerning development around overhead lines may affect the viability of the site. Site marketed - enquiries have been received	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	Hillam	Size (Ha)	4.00	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	102	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Orchard Farm				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural land to the North and East. Residential to the West and South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HILLAM/009, HILLAM/010, HILLAM/011		SHLAA Ref	Hillam-3	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	80	2.7 % PDL	20	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.26 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 12.85 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England do not need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site but impact insignificant or unknown					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Grass snake (2011), Noctule bat, Common pipistrelle (2010) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Most of the site comprises two large arable fields with limited boundary features. Also on site are two domestic dwellings and a series of agricultural buildings of different ages and construction which may support bats/nesting birds. A pond lies within 8					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
This site lies marginally within and adjoins the boundary of the Hillam Conservation Area. Small number of Grade II listed buildings located south west of the site.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (There are no known archaeological sites in the allocation area or the near vicinity.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible decontamination measures may add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	Hillam	Size (Ha)	0.41	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	12	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land east of Betteras Hill Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Open land				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the South and east of the site. Open land to the North and minor road the west of the site.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HILLAM/014	SHLAA Ref	Hillam-17		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	1.02 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site but impact insignificant or unknown					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Grass snake (2011), Noctule bat, Common pipistrelle (2010) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Deciduous woodland within 100m					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
This site adjoins the boundary of the Hillam Conservation Area.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(-)
Moderate to high sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Hillam	Size (Ha)	0.06	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	2	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to the rear of Hillam Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Additional garden area				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the South East with the remainder of the site surrounded by Agricultural land.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HILLAM/015	SHLAA Ref	Hillam-18		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Under 0.17ha in size (residential)
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.15 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Grass snake (2011) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m. Re-assessed October 2020.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Site within the built form of the settlement	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. Garden licence - 4 weeks' notice.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Under 0.17ha in size (residential)	

Settlement	Kelfield	Size (Ha)	1.00	Proposed Use	Mixed Use
Housing Capacity	20	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Institute Field, Riccall Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Builders storage yard				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural fields to the East and South. Residential development to the North and West.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	KELFIELD/001	SHLAA Ref	Kelfield-1		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(-)
Site has poor access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(o)
Good Local Accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	80	2.7 % PDL	20	
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 2 - 98.73%, Flood Zone 1 - 1.27%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					5.66 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 8.16 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 39.29 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Frog, Smooth newt, Great crested newt (2016) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs. Site is owned by a developer. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	6-10 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Kelfield	Size (Ha)	0.48	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	10	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Cherry Trees, Main Street				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Residential/ Farm Buildings				
Surrounding Land Uses	Farm buildings, trees and agricultural to the North, residential to the east and west. Road to the South.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	KELFIELD/002	SHLAA Ref	Kelfield-4		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land		2.7 % GF	25	2.7 % PDL	75
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings		Flood Zone 1 - 100%			
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW		2.69 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water			
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Smooth newt, Great crested newt, Frog (2016), Cornflower (2016), Tansy beetle (2012) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Deciduous woodland within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Site is adjacent to the Grade II village farmhouse and around 200m south-west of a moated site which is a scheduled ancient monument					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (The site is within the historic core of the medieval settlement of Kelfield and close to or within the manorial complex.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(-)
Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on a Public Right of Way (PRoW) (Site within 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments. PRoW runs through the site)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. Public footpath through village farm	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible decontamination measures may add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Kelfield	Size (Ha)	0.21	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	4	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land opposite Orchard House, Moor End				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential/ road to the North, agricultural/ road to the east. Residential to the South and road/ residential to the west.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	KELFIELD/003	SHLAA Ref	Kelfield-5		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes		Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy			
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings		Flood Zone 2 - 85.5%, Flood Zone 1 - 14.5%			
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2		Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA			
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Smooth newt, Great crested newt, Frog (2016), Cornflower (2016), Tansy beetle (2011) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Traditional orchard in garden adjacent to western polygon.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs. Viability Assesment has been undertaken - Site previously assessed by SDC in 2008 as being "suitable for development as a rural exception site". All services available as assessed in previous outline planning application in 1981.)	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Kellington	Size (Ha)	2.26	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	58	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land off Roall Lane and Uppercommon Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural - crops / open field landscape				
Surrounding Land Uses	Primarily agricultural. Small residential development to the South West, agricultural land to the East and South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	KELLINGTON/001	SHLAA Ref	Kellington-1		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings Flood Zone 3a - 42.43%, Flood Zone 2 - 31.33%, Flood Zone 1 - 26.24%					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW 0.23 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 0.52 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 1.01 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water					
2.9 SFRA Level 2 Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site but impact insignificant or unknown					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
No protected species records within 1km that are less than 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Very large area of arable farm land (approx. 10 fields). Site also includes boundary hedges, trees, woodland, pond, field drains and is within 400m of Beal Carrs SINC which is an important site for wintering birds. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
This site lies 190 metres to the south of a Roman Fort which is designated a Scheduled Monument.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(-)
Moderate to high sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 800m of LEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site at risk of flooding	

Settlement	Kellington	Size (Ha)	8.42	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	202	Housing Capacity Notes	Smaller part of site for 72 homes proposed for allocation		
Site Location	Land off Church Lane and Lunn Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural - crops / open field landscape				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to East. Farm to South. Listed church to West and agricultural fields to North/West/South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	KELLINGTON/002	SHLAA Ref	Kellington-2		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.19 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 3.05 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site but impact insignificant or unknown					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
No protected species records within 1km that are less than 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Site directly adjacent to Beal Carrs SINC. Site comprises a series of arable fields with boundary hedges and trees. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(--)
The Church of St Edmund, less than 200 metres to the south west of this site, is a Grade I Listed Building. The gate piers and churchyard cross are also Grade II Listed. Development of this area could harm elements which contribute to the significance of these heritage assets.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(-)
Moderate to high sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(-)
Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on a Public Right of Way (PRoW) (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 800m of LEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace. PRoW runs through the site)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Residential
Preferred Option Explanation	
The site has no known constraints, it is within flood zone 1, and access can be taken directly from the main road.	

Settlement	Kellington	Size (Ha)	0.15	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	5	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land North of Manor Garth				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Open space and former garage plots				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential surrounding the majority of the site with some minor roads to the West and South of the site.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	KELLINGTON/003	SHLAA Ref	Kellington-3		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes		Under 0.17ha in size (residential)			
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(o)
Mixed (Greenfield/ Previously Developed Land)		2.7 % GF	50	2.7 % PDL	50
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings		Flood Zone 1 - 100%			
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2		Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA			
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(-)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
All protected species within 1km of site are over 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Small site within Kellington village. Site comprises amenity grassland, trees and garages, along with some hard standing. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Site within the built form of the settlement	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(-)
Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on KELL-02 (Informal Greenspace) (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 800m of LEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. Garage Plot Tenancy Agreement - 4 Weeks' Notice Period.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Under 0.17ha in size (residential)	

Settlement	Kellington	Size (Ha)	3.21	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	82	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land on West side of Broach Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Residential and Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the North of the site, employment to the west. Agricultural land to the South of the site. Road to the east.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	KELLINGTON/005	SHLAA Ref	Kellington-5 - Permission		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
No protected species records within 1km that are less than 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	--
Development occurs in and has a negative impact on the openness or setting of the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(-)
Moderate to high sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - adjacent to intensive business use	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	--
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 800m of LEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. One year Agricultural Tenancy adjacent with Poskitt's Farm	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Negative impact on the openness or setting of the Strategic Countryside Gap (SCG)	

Settlement	Kellington	Size (Ha)	0.91	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	27	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land east of Manor Garth				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Primary school to the North, fields to the East and South residential units to the West.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	KELLINGTON/007	SHLAA Ref	Kellington-7		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site but impact insignificant or unknown					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
No protected species records within 1km that are less than 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Area of rough grassland (may be unimproved or semi improved and therefore species rich). Also has potential to support reptiles. Site has boundary hedges and trees. Traditional orchard within 100m					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(-)
Moderate to high sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 800m of LEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace. Also Proposed Recreational Open Space - Amenity Greenspace - Informal - Not said to include)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. Site marketed - enquiries have been received	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years

Preferred Option

Residential

Preferred Option Explanation

The site represents a logical extension to the built form of the village on its eastern boundary and its development would extend the settlement in line with the Primary School which lies directly to the north. The NPPF requires that land is identified on small sites (i.e. those under 1ha) to accommodate at least 10% of housing requirements. This site is able to contribute to this requirement.

Settlement	Kellington	Size (Ha)	2.61	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	67	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land off Church Lane and Lunn Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Primary school to the North, fields to the East and South residential units to the West.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	KELLINGTON/008	SHLAA Ref	Kellington-9		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site but impact insignificant or unknown					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
No protected species records within 1km that are less than 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Site is located roughly 150m to the east of the Grade I listed Church of St Edmund					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(-)
Moderate to high sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(-)
Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on a Public Right of Way (PRoW) (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 800m of LEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace. PRoW runs through the site)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Kellington	Size (Ha)	4.37	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	74	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land off Roall Lane and Uppercommon Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the east. Agricultural surrounding the remainder of the site.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	KELLINGTON/009	SHLAA Ref	Kellington-10		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.95 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(--)
major constraints exist - major pylon on site, another adjacent to site and 2 power lines cross site					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
No protected species records within 1km that are less than 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(--)
Development occurs in and has a negative impact on the openness or setting of the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(-)
Moderate to high sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - adjacent to intensive business use	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 800m of LEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
National grid guidelines concerning development around overhead lines may affect the viability of the site.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Kellington	Size (Ha)	10.69	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	139	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land off Roall Lane and Uppercommon Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Employment/ residential to the North. Agricultural surrounding the majority of the site with a small road to the west.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	KELLINGTON/010	SHLAA Ref	Kellington-11		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(--)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 2 - 4.68%, Flood Zone 1 - 95.32%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					0.21 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 0.26 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 0.53 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Common pipistrelle (2015) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Site is located roughly 200m to the South of a Roman Fort which is a Scheduled Ancient Monument.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(-)
The site contains or is close to known archaeological remains and presents a high level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(-)
Moderate to high sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 800m of LEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Kellington	Size (Ha)	4.49	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	76	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land on West side of Broach Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Residential and Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural surrounding the site. Abutted by three roads on the South, east and west. Employment land to the South west also.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	KELLINGTON/011	SHLAA Ref	Kellington-12		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.37 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 0.79 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(--)
major constraints exist - major pylon on site, another adjacent to site and 2 power lines cross site					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
No protected species records within 1km that are less than 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(--)
Development occurs in and has a negative impact on the openness or setting of the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(-)
Moderate to high sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 800m of LEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. One year Agricultural Tenancy adjacent with Poskitt's Farm	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs. National grid guidelines concerning development around overhead lines may affect the viability of the site.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Kirk Smeaton	Size (Ha)	0.37	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	7	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land East of Rectory Court				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to West. Farm to East. School playing fields to North. Agricultural fields to South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	KSMEATON/001	SHLAA Ref	KSmeaton-1		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
White-letter Hairstreak butterfly (2015) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
This site is located within the boundary of the Kirk Smeaton Conservation Area and located south west of Rectory Farm House which is a Grade II listed building.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The site is within the historic core of the medieval village of Fairburn. There are feint traces of earthworks on aerial photographs.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for building stone/ Limestone/ Shallow Coal.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(-)
Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on a Public Right of Way (PRoW) (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 800m of LEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments. PRoW runs through the site)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Kirk Smeaton	Size (Ha)	1.35	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	23	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land north of Went Bridge Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Woodland to North. Agricultural fields to West/South/East. Barns to East				
2020 Site Submission Reference	KSMEATON/002	SHLAA Ref	KSmeaton-2		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(--)
Site adjacent to a SSSI. Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England do not need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
White-letter Hairstreak butterfly (2015), Bluebell (2010) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Deciduous woodland within 100m					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for building stone/ Limestone/ Shallow Coal.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. Five year agricultural tenancy expiry date 2017	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Kirk Smeaton	Size (Ha)	0.30	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	6	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Garden to Rear The Manor House, Pinfold lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	House and gardens				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to North/East/West. Paddocks to South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	KSMEATON/004	SHLAA Ref	Ksmeaton-8		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(o)
Mixed (Greenfield/ Previously Developed Land)		2.7 % GF	30	2.7 % PDL	70
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings		Flood Zone 1 - 100%			
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2		Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA			
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
White-letter Hairstreak butterfly (2015), Bluebell (2010) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Site is partially within and adjoins the Kirk Smeaton Conservation Area.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (There are no known archaeological sites in the allocation area or the near vicinity.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for building stone/ Limestone/ Shallow Coal.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Kirk Smeaton	Size (Ha)	1.36	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	23	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Paddock adjacent The Manor House				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Stables for three horses				
Surrounding Land Uses	Road to the South and west of site. Residential to the North of the site. Agricultural fields to the west, South and east of the site.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	KSMEATON/005	SHLAA Ref	Ksmeaton-9		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
White-letter Hairstreak butterfly (2015), Bluebell (2010) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (There are no known archaeological sites in the allocation area or the near vicinity.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for building stone/ Limestone/ Shallow Coal.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Little Smeaton	Size (Ha)	0.52	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	10	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at College Farm				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Farm - horse livery				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to East/South/West. Agricultural fields to North/West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	LSMEATON/001	SHLAA Ref	LSmeaton-1		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	80	2.7 % PDL	20
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
White-letter Hairstreak butterfly (2015) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Site is within the Little Smeaton Conservation Area.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(+)
Proposed development replaces an existing negative amenity impact	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for building stone/ Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 800m of LEAP, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. Licences for stabling	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible decontamination measures may add to costs. Site is under option to a developer. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Little Smeaton	Size (Ha)	0.12	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	2	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land east of Windy Ridge				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Disused land				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to West. Agricultural fields to North. Woodland to East. Play area to South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	LSMEATON/002	SHLAA Ref	LSmeaton-2		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes		Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy. Under 0.17ha in size (residential)			
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings		Flood Zone 1 - 100%			
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2		Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA			
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
White-letter Hairstreak butterfly (2015) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(-)
The site contains or is close to known archaeological remains and presents a high level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 800m of LEAP, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy. Under 0.17ha in size (residential)	

Settlement	Little Smeaton	Size (Ha)	1.46	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	25	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land south of Mount Pleasant				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to North/South-East. Woodland to West. Agricultural fields to South/North-West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	LSMEATON/003	SHLAA Ref	LSmeaton-3		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
White-letter Hairstreak butterfly (2015) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Deciduous woodland within 100m					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(-)
The site contains or is close to known archaeological remains and presents a high level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 800m of LEAP, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible decontamination measures may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Little Smeaton	Size (Ha)	1.58	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	27	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land north of New Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Farm buildings/ residential to the west and South west of site. Agricultural land surrounds the remainder of the site.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	LSMEATON/004	SHLAA Ref	LSmeaton-5		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 5% Grade 3 95%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
White-letter Hairstreak butterfly (2015) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(-)
The site contains or is close to known archaeological remains and presents a high level of risk (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 800m of LEAP, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Little Smeaton	Size (Ha)	1.14	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	19	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land south of Main Street				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Road/ residential to the North and west of the site. Open land/ agricultural to the east and South of the site.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	LSMEATON/005	SHLAA Ref	LSmeaton-6		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Yes
Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy					
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					(o)
Flood Zone 1 - 100%					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					(o)
Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
White-letter Hairstreak butterfly (2015) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Site is partially within the Little Smeaton Conservation Area.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 800m of LEAP, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible decontamination measures may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Little Smeaton	Size (Ha)	1.47	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	25	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Field next to Windy Ridge				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Open land to the North and west of the site. To the North is also a road. To the east is a farm building(s)/ and residential to the South of the site.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	LSMEATON/006	SHLAA Ref	LSmeaton-7		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
White-letter Hairstreak butterfly (2015) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Site adjoins the Little Smeaton Conservation Area					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for building stone/ Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(-)
Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on a Public Right of Way (PRoW) (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 800m of LEAP, and 1200m of Allotments. PRoW runs through the site)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Lumby	Size (Ha)	3.47	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	59	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land between Old Quarry Lane and Cass Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to West. Agricultural fields to North/East/South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SMILFORD/016	SHLAA Ref	Lumby-3		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.92 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 9.11 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England do not need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Common pipistrelle roost (2015) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. Site is under option to a developer	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Monk Fryston	Size (Ha)	3.17	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	81	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land between Water Land and Main Street				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Residential/ Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to North and South West, Ashfield house to the East, agricultural land to the South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	MFRYSTON/002, MFRYSTON/005, MFRY	SHLAA Ref	MFryston-6		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England do not need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(-)
Site is adjacent to a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Grass snake (2011), Noctule bat, Common pipistrelle (2010) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Improved grassland and arable fields with boundary hedges and mature trees, the site also includes a former petrol station site (now a car wash) with building and hard standing. The site is within 50m of a wetland SINC to the north. Site adjacent to Coast					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
This site lies partially adjacent to the Monk Fryston Conservation Area.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(-)
Moderate to high sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(-)
Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on a Public Right of Way (PRoW) (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, 400m of LAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace. PRoW runs through the site)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	Monk Fryston	Size (Ha)	1.08	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	28	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land South of Fryston Common Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Organic farm				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to West. Deer park grange to North West. Farms to North/East. Woodland to South/South-East				
2020 Site Submission Reference	MFRYSTON/004	SHLAA Ref	MFryston-3		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					
					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					
Site has good access to services and employment					(+)
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					
					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					
Development does not impact on employment land					(o)
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					
					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					(+)
2.6 Agricultural Land					
Grade 2 45% Grade 3 55%					(-)
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	90	2.7 % PDL	10	(-)
2.8 Flood Risk					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 2 - 5.55%, Flood Zone 1 - 94.45%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	2.45 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					
Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					
No known constraints					(o)
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					(+)
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					(o)
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					(o)
2.14 Impact Protected Species					
Grass snake (2011), Noctule bat, Common pipistrelle (2010) within 1km					(-)
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					
Improved pasture with some boundary hedges and mature trees. Site also includes a domestic dwelling and garden. A watercourse runs along the eastern boundary and there is a wetland SINCC hydrologically connected to the site and adjacent to the south east.					(-)
2.16 Heritage Assets					
Development impacts on a heritage asset and mitigation measures are necessary					(-)

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, and 400m of LAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Viability assessment has been undertaken. Possible flood mitigation may add to costs. Site marketed - enquiries have been received. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	Monk Fryston	Size (Ha)	0.98	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	29	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land north of Fryston Common Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Garden to Deer Park Range				
Surrounding Land Uses	Historic park and garden to North and West. Farm buildings to North/East. Agricultural field to East				
2020 Site Submission Reference	MFRYSTON/006	SHLAA Ref	MFryston-4		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 70.37%, Flood Zone 2 - 11.58%, Flood Zone 1 - 18.05%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	9.52 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 25.07 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 54.3 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Noctule bat (2010), Common pipistrelle roost (2018), Soprano pipistrelle (2018) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(--)
Improved amenity grassland (garden) with mature boundary trees/hedges. The site is close to wetlands to the north and a drain runs along the southern boundary. Deciduous woodland on and adjacent to site.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(--)
This site lies within the Monk Fryston Conservation Area.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement. The site contains a number of cropmarks that are consistent with previous enclosures or field systems.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Site within the built form of the settlement	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, 400m of LAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs. Site is owned by a developer	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site at risk of flooding	

Settlement	Monk Fryston	Size (Ha)	0.63	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	19	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land South of 8 Priory Park Grove				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Overgrown fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Stream to the North, 3 long fields to the West, fields to the North, pond to the East, main road to South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	MFRYSTON/011	SHLAA Ref	MFryston-7		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(-)
Site is adjacent to a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Grass snake (2011), Noctule bat, Common pipistrelle (2010) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(--)
Site is directly adjacent to a wetland SINC. It comprises rough grassland, woodland, mature hedges and trees and there is a watercourse to the north boundary of the site which is directly linked to the SINC. There appears to be a building on site of unkno					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
This site adjoins the Monk Fryston Conservation Area.					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement. The site contains a number of cropmarks that are consistent with previous enclosures or field systems.)</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Moderate to high sensitivity to development</p>	<p>(-)</p>
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road</p>	<p>(-)</p>
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	<p>(+)</p>
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.</p>	<p>(-)</p>
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ Limestone.</p>	<p>(--)</p>
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, 400m of LAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)</p>	<p>(+)</p>
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible decontamination measures may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	<p>0-5 years</p>
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site within the Green Belt</p>	<p>Rejected</p>

Settlement	Hillam	Size (Ha)	0.64	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	19	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land South of Old Vicarage Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Pasture land East and South along with associated farm to South-East. Residential to North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HILLAM/002	SHLAA Ref	Hillam-19		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	7.46 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 13.35 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 21.14 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(-)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Grass snake (2011) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Improved pasture with a field drain along the western boundary. Some hedges and mature trees. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
The site contains or is close to little or no archaeological remains	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(--)
High sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, 400m of LAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. The owner has had enquires about the site recieved.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	Monk Fryston	Size (Ha)	2.50	Proposed Use	Mixed Use
Housing Capacity	43	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at North Priory Park Farm				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural Fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural land surrounding the whole of the site with a minor road to the east of the site.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	MFRYSTON/016	SHLAA Ref	Mfryston-18		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(++)
Development would create employment					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(o)
Good Local Accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 34.9%, Flood Zone 2 - 3.3%, Flood Zone 1 - 61.8%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Noctule bat (2010), Common pipistrelle roost (2018), Soprano pipistrelle (2018) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Monk Fryston	Size (Ha)	0.07	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	2	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Former garage site off Mill Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Open Land				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the North and East. Open Land to the South with in the East and South a pond area.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	MFRYSTON/017	SHLAA Ref	Mfryston-19		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Under 0.17ha in size (residential)
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land					2.7 % GF 0 2.7 % PDL 100
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					0.19 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Grass snake (2011) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Deciduous woodland adjacent to site.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Site within the built form of the settlement	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. Garage tenancy agreement – requires 4 weeks' notice	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Under 0.17ha in size (residential)	

Settlement	Monk Fryston	Size (Ha)	33.36	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	500	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to the north of A63				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	To the North is a road and to the South is the A63, to the east is agricultural and to the west is agricultural/ farm buildings.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	MFRYSTON/018	SHLAA Ref	Mfryston-20		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					
					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					
Site has good access to services and employment					(+)
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					
					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					
Development does not impact on employment land					(o)
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					
					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					(+)
2.6 Agricultural Land					
Grade 2 100%					(---)
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	(-)
2.8 Flood Risk					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 18.51%, Flood Zone 2 - 4.95%, Flood Zone 1 - 76.54%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.48 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 1.25 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 5.11 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					
Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					
no known constraints					(o)
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					(+)
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England need to be consulted.					(-)
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					(o)
2.14 Impact Protected Species					
Grass snake (2011), Common and Soprano pipistrelle bats (2018) within 1km.					(-)
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					
Lowland fens and deciduous woodland within 100m.					(o)
2.16 Heritage Assets					
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					(o)

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan</p>	(o)
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road</p>	(-)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ Limestone.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, and 400m of LAP)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Viability assessment has been undertaken. Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site within the Green Belt</p>	Rejected

Settlement	North Duffield	Size (Ha)	2.67	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	68	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to the West and South of Meadow Gate				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural land to the West and South, residential to the North East, agricultural land to the East				
2020 Site Submission Reference	NDUFFIELD/003	SHLAA Ref	NDuffield-2		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(o)
Mixed (Greenfield/ Previously Developed Land)		2.7 % GF	70	2.7 % PDL	30
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.87 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 8.57 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England do not need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Frog, Smooth newt (2014), Great crested newt (2017) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Large area of improved horse grazed pasture with some boundary hedges and mature trees. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	North Duffield	Size (Ha)	3.58	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	91	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land South of A163 and East of Menthorpe Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	agricultural land to the South, East. Residential North-east and farm to the West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	NDUFFIELD/004	SHLAA Ref	NDuffield-3		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 2 - 0.01%, Flood Zone 1 - 99.99%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	2.49 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 11.61 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England do not need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Frog, Smooth newt (2014), Great crested newt (2017), various birds (2011) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Large arable field with some large mature trees on Dyon Lane and the A63. There is a small block of woodland on the north east boundary. Site is 500m from SAC/SPA/RAMSAR. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	North Duffield	Size (Ha)	1.76	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	45	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land North of A163				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Paddocks/grazing land to the North, agricultural land to the East and South and residential to the West.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	NDUFFIELD/005	SHLAA Ref	NDuffield-4		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	12.98 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Frog, Smooth newt (2014), Great crested newt (2017), various birds (2011) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Arable field with boundary hedgerows and mature trees. Drainage ditches to the north and east boundary flow towards the SAC/SPA/RAMSAR which is 350m from the site. Site adjacent to Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(o)
Moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Residential
Preferred Option Explanation	
Development of this site provides a small scale extension to the village in an area that is located wholly within Flood Zone 1, and is within strong field boundaries. Development on this site will have a lesser impact on the built and natural landscape than in other locations in the village due to its compact nature and meagre extension into the Countryside.	

Settlement	North Duffield	Size (Ha)	4.28	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	109	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at York Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural / open land				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the South and South and West of the site. With Agricultural to the East and North.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	NDUFFIELD/014	SHLAA Ref	NDuffield-9		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	95	2.7 % PDL	5	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.5 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 1.52 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 3.54 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Requirement to consult with Natural England					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(++)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Frog, Smooth newt (2014), Great crested newt (2017), Yellowhammer (2011) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Large arable field with some large mature trees and hedgerows. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(o)
Moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. Site is under option to a developer	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	North Duffield	Size (Ha)	0.33	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	10	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Gothic Farm, Back Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Residential				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential/ road to the west and South of the site with agricultural land to the North and the east.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	NDUFFIELD/015	SHLAA Ref	NDuffield-11		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	75	2.7 % PDL	25
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Frog, Smooth newt (2014), Great crested newt (2017), various birds (2011) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(o)
Part of the site in a landscape which has a moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible decontamination measures may add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Residential
Preferred Option Explanation	
The site marks a logical small scale extension to North Duffield with it being adjacent to residential properties on its southern and western edge. The site is also located wholly within Flood Zone 1. The NPPF requires that land is identified on small sites (i.e. those under 1ha) to accommodate at least 10% of housing requirements and this site is able to contribute to this requirement.	

Settlement	North Duffield	Size (Ha)	2.73	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	46	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Hall Farm				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural land the North, East South and farm to the East				
2020 Site Submission Reference	NDUFFIELD/013	SHLAA Ref	NDuffield-12		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	2.44 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 9.98 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England do not need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Frog, Smooth newt (2014), Great crested newt (2017), various birds (2011) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Part of a large arable field with boundary hedges and mature trees. There is a field drain to the south which connects the site to the SAC/SPA/RAMSAR site which is just 210m away at the closest point. Site adjacent to Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(o)
Moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Third party land is required.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	6-10 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	North Duffield	Size (Ha)	2.94	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	50	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to the South of A163				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural to the South, East and West of the Site. A163 to the North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	NDUFFIELD/016	SHLAA Ref	NDuffield-30		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	1.7 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 6.53 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2017) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Moderate sensitivity to development</p>	(o)
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road</p>	(-)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use.</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Newland	Size (Ha)	1.27	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	22	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Newlands adjacent to Wood Lane between Langrick House and Owl Lodge				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural Fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the West and East of the Site with Agricultural to the North. Road and River to the South of the Site.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	NEWLAND/001	SHLAA Ref		Newland-2	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes	Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(-)
Site has poor access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 1 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3b - 3.15%, Flood Zone 3a - 96.85%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(--)
major constraints exist which are difficult to mitigate - Cawood to Susworth Trent West gas pipeline runs through site and site within its inner 80m and middle 250m consultation Zones					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
No protected species records within 1km that are less than 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh and Mudflats within 100m					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(o)
Site is not within a mineral safeguarding area.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(++)
Development would add an open space asset identified as required in the vicinity (Site is in an area of identified need as falls outside buffer of LEAPS, NEAPS and LAPs, Amenity Greenspace, Parks and recreation, skate parks, allotment and small natural/semi natural greenspace areas.)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. Agricultural Holdings Act for agriculture	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Newton Kyme	Size (Ha)	0.45	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	9	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land South of Papyrus Villas				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural fields to South/West. Residential to North/East				
2020 Site Submission Reference	NEWTONKYME/002	SHLAA Ref	NKyme-2		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(--)
Major constraints exist - within Yarforth to Towton Gas pipeline middle 300m and outer 340m buffer Zones					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Various birds (2016), Salmon, Grayling (2014), Bluebell (2019), four species of bat (2016) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Deciduous woodland within 100m					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 800m of LEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible decontamination measures may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Newton Kyme	Size (Ha)	33.81	Proposed Use	Mixed Use
Housing Capacity	440	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land east of Newton Kyme Papyrus Works				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural Field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural fields to East. Residential to West. River Wharfe to North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	NEWTONKYME/003	SHLAA Ref	NKyme-4		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes	Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(++)
Development would create employment					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(+)
Good sub-regional accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(---)
Grade 2 85% Grade 3 15%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3b - 26.43%, Flood Zone 3a - 1.07%, Flood Zone 2 - 5.8%, Flood Zone 1 - 66.7%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.75 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 1.26 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 4.68 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(--)
Major constraints exist which are difficult to mitigate - Yarforth to Towton gas pipeline crosses south of site and site within inner 100m, middle 300m and outer 340m buffer Zones					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Smooth newt (2012), Various birds (2016), Salmon, Grayling (2014), Bluebell (2019), five species of bat (2016) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(--)
Deciduous woodland on and adjacent to site. Good quality semi-improved grassland on site					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(--)
Wharfe Bridge is located to the North East of the site and is a Grade II listed structure. The partially includes and is adjacent to Two Roman forts, two Roman camps, vicus, Iron Age enclosure, Bronze Age barrows and Neolithic henge monument west of Newton Kyme which is a designated Scheduled Ancient Monument.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact The site contains, or is close to known archaeological remains of national or regional significance	(--)
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps Development does not occur in the SCG	(o)
2.19 Landscape Capacity Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	N/A
2.20 Amenity Impact Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW and within 100m of A road	(-)
2.21 Groundwater Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	(+)
2.22 Contamination Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	(o)
2.23 Mineral Resource Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Limestone/ sand and gravel.	(--)
2.24 Provision of Open Space Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on NEWT-01 (Equipped Play Areas - LEAP). (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 800m of LEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	(-)
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	(o)
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use 1 landowner. Agricultural Holdings Act for agriculture	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option Preferred Option Explanation Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	Rejected

Settlement	Newthorpe	Size (Ha)	0.45	Proposed Use	Travellers Site
Housing Capacity	Housing Capacity Notes				
Site Location	Land at Hillcrest, Old Great North Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Storage/ hard standing				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural to the North and East of the site. Further storage to West of the Site and A63 to the South and West of the Site.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	NEWTHORPE/001	SHLAA Ref	N/A		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land		2.7 % GF	0	2.7 % PDL	100
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Nuthutch (2015), Bluebell (2017), Noctule Bat (2012), Soprano pipistrelle bat roost, brown long-eared bat roost (2012) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Deciduous woodland within 100m					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
To the south of the site is Grade I Ledston Lodge, and designated Park and Garden of Ledston Hall and Park.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for building stone/ Limestone/ Shallow Coal.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years

Preferred Option

Gypsy and Traveller

Preferred Option Explanation

The exceptional circumstances for Green Belt Removal in this case are: The lack of deliverable alternative sites; The site already benefits from an existing temporary consent, is privately owned, well established and provides a settled base that enable its occupants to access health, education, welfare and employment infrastructure; and The site comprises previously developed land. Whilst the site is located within a Locally Important Landscape Area, the site and area in the immediate vicinity is not reflective of, and does not contribute positively to the landscape quality of the wider area as it remains relatively commercial in appearance with a number of disused buildings and considerable areas of hardstanding. Existing development within and near the site has already changed the character of the countryside in this vicinity. In this respect, a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site at this location is not considered to have a significant negative impact on the landscape character of the wider area.

Settlement	Osgodby	Size (Ha)	0.84	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	25	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land East of St Leonards Avenue				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to West. Agricultural fields to North/East/South.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	OSGODBY/003	SHLAA Ref	Osgodby-3		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 1 5% Grade 2 95%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings Flood Zone 3a - 18.17%, Flood Zone 1 - 81.83%					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2 Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Barn owl (2011), Common pipistrelle bat (2011) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Part of an arable field with some boundary hedges and trees. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(o)
Moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs. Site is under option to a developer. Site is for Phase II of neighbouring Development The Fossard's currently under development	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Osgodby	Size (Ha)	0.80	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	24	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Osgodby Nurseries, Hull Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields/ Residential				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural land to the South/East/West and residential to the North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	OSGODBY/006	SHLAA Ref	Osgodby-4		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	80	2.7 % PDL	20	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	1.84 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 6.11 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 22.17 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site but impact insignificant or unknown. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Barn owl (2011), Common pipistrelle bat (2011) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Improved paddock with boundary hedges and trees. A field drain is present on the eastern boundary. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(o)
Moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Extant planning permission. Multiple Landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
The gaining of a planning permission previously by a developer is some indication that the site is economically viable to the housing market. Site is under option to a developer. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Osgodby	Size (Ha)	0.69	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	21	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Lake View Farm				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential East, South and West, farm to the North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	OSGODBY/007	SHLAA Ref	Osgodby-7		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(o)
Mixed (Greenfield/ Previously Developed Land)		2.7 % GF	50	2.7 % PDL	50
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings		Flood Zone 1 - 100%			
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2		Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA			
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Barn owl (2011) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Site includes a farmstead with traditional brick buildings (which could support bats/nesting birds), modern barns, dwelling and paddock. Ponds in the local area may support amphibians. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Site within the built form of the settlement	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. Site is subject to an Agricultural Holdings Act Tenancy with security for the lifetime of the tenant.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible decontamination measures may add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	6-10 years

Preferred Option

Residential

Preferred Option Explanation

Development of the site would mark a logical infilling within Osgodby as it is located within the built form of the settlement with adjacent residential properties on all sides. Furthermore, redevelopment of the site is likely to improve the amenity of the area by the removal of agricultural buildings within a predominantly residential area. The site is also located wholly in Flood Zone 1. The NPPF requires that land is identified on small sites (i.e. those under 1ha) to accommodate at least 10% of housing requirements. This site is able to contribute to this requirement.

Settlement	Osgodby	Size (Ha)	39.65	Proposed Use	Mixed Use
Housing Capacity	773	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land south of Hull Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to North, agriculture to remainder				
2020 Site Submission Reference	OSGODBY/008	SHLAA Ref	Osgodby-8		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(+)
Good sub-regional accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(---)
Grade 1 40% Grade 2 60%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings Flood Zone 3a - 66.25%, Flood Zone 2 - 1.68%, Flood Zone 1 - 32.06%					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW 0.23 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 0.4 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 1.81 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water					
2.9 SFRA Level 2 Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Various birds (2011), Barn owl (2011), Grass snake (2018), Water vole, Common pipistrelle bat (2011) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Very large area of arable farm land (approx. 8 fields). Site also includes boundary hedges, trees, field drains and has ponds within the local area. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(o)
Moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(-)
Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on a Public Right of Way (PRoW) (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments. PRoW runs through the site)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. Site is subject to an Agricultural Holdings Act Lifetime Tenancy. Approximately 12.5 years remaining on term (figure from Parry's Valuation & Conversion Tables). Part resumption clause within agreement to reclaim 25% of holding in any one year	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	11-15 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Osgodby	Size (Ha)	2.81	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	72	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land east of Sand Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural land to the East and South, arable land to the North and residential to the East and partly to the North.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	OSGODBY/009	SHLAA Ref	Osgodby-9		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	1.24 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 3.25 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Barn owl (2011), Common pipistrelle bat (2011) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Arable field with good boundary hedgerows and mature trees - especially along the southern boundary - close proximity to an area of semi natural habitat to the north which contains a pond which might support amphibians. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible decontamination measures may add to costs. Site is owned by a developer.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years

Preferred Option

Residential

Preferred Option Explanation

Development of the site would mark a logical eastern extension to the settlement of Osgodby, without significant detriment to the character and form of the village. The site is also located wholly in Flood Zone 1.

Settlement	Osgodby	Size (Ha)	0.73	Proposed Use	Mixed Use
Housing Capacity	22	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at South Duffield Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural Field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agriculture to west and North, residential to the east and South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	OSGODBY/011	SHLAA Ref	Osgodby-15		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					N/A
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(+)
Good sub-regional accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	3.18 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 25.93 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England do not need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Barn owl (2011) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Site comprises rough grassland with boundary hedges and some trees. There is a pond adjacent to the site which could potentially support amphibians. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues (Viability Assessment has been undertaken). Not formally marketed but developer interest shown in the sites	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Osgodby	Size (Ha)	9.82	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	236	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at site directly north of Barlby and Osgodby Methodist Church				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural to the North, agricultural/ residential/ road to the east and South and road to the west.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	OSGODBY/012	SHLAA Ref	Osgodby-16		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	1.88 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Barn owl (2011), Tansy beetle (2012) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Deciduous woodland within 100m					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	--
Development occurs in and has a negative impact on the openness or setting of the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	--
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Negative impact on the openness or setting of the Strategic Countryside Gap (SCG)	

Settlement	Riccall	Size (Ha)	6.47	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	155	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land North of Riccall				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural uses to the North, West. Allotments to the South and residential along the South and East.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	RICCALL/007	SHLAA Ref	Riccall-6		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 48.14%, Flood Zone 2 - 40.02%, Flood Zone 1 - 11.83%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	1.04 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 1.33 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 4.32 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2015), Dunnock (2015), Bluebell (2018), four species of bat (2016) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
A large arable field and a smaller grassland field with good hedgerows and trees. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
This site lies 185 metres from the boundary of York prebendary manor moated site. This is a Scheduled Monument. The Manor House is a Grade II* Listed Building and its Pigeoncote a Grade II Listed Building.					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Moderate sensitivity to development</p>	(o)
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road</p>	(-)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on a Public Right of Way (PRoW) (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments. PRoW runs through the site)</p>	(-)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation may add to costs. Viability assessment has been undertaken - Good market area with good revenues (Positive). Site is under option to a developer</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site at risk of flooding</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Riccall	Size (Ha)	26.99	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	351	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Riccall Business Park, Selby Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Employment - Part of the site is currently utilised as a mixed use business park. Part is used for temporar				
Surrounding Land Uses	Primarily agricultural uses.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	RICCALL/008	SHLAA Ref	Riccall-10		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(--)
Development would result in a loss of employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(---)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(o)
Mixed (Greenfield/ Previously Developed Land)		2.7 % GF	50	2.7 % PDL	50
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings		Flood Zone 1 - 100%			
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW		1.21 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 2.88 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 8.72 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water			
2.9 SFRA Level 2		Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA			
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(-)
major constraints exist - western part of site crosses Cawood to Susworth Trent West gas pipeline and western half of site within inner 80m, middle 250m and outer 280m buffer Zones					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Toad (2012), Smooth newt (2015), Great crested newt 2019), Woodlark (2011), Barn owl (2019), Grass snake (2016), Common Lizard (2011) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(--)
Deciduous woodland on site					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of intensive farm	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(-)
Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on RICC-11 (Formal Outdoor Sports Provision) (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. Office suites and industrial units let to a variety of local and national business.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible decontamination measures may add to costs. Site is owned by a developer. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Riccall	Size (Ha)	9.94	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	239	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land between Landing Lane and Kelfield				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural Fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the East of the Site. Agricultural to the East. Open Land/ Residential to the North. Minor road to North and South of the site.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	RICCALL/009	SHLAA Ref	Riccall-8		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 96.58%, Flood Zone 2 - 3.42%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					0.33 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 3.23 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(-)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2015), Reed bunting (2011), House sparrow, Dunnock (2015), Bluebell (2014), Tansy beetle (2012), Common pipistrelle bat (2014) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Site itself comprises part of a very large arable field with boundary hedges and trees. The site lies within 350m of the River Ouse to the west and is almost directly adjacent to Dame Dike to the north which flows into the river.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
This site lies 215 metres from the boundary of York prebendary manor moated site. This is a Scheduled Monument. The Manor House is a Grade II* Listed Building and its Pigeoncote a Grade II Listed Building.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site at risk of flooding	

Settlement	Riccall	Size (Ha)	8.96	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	180	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Landing Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural Fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the North with Agricultural surrounding the majority of the site. There is a farm to the South West of the site and small road to the North West of the site.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	RICCALL/010	SHLAA Ref		Riccall-11	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	95	2.7 % PDL	5
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 6.06%, Flood Zone 2 - 10.91%, Flood Zone 1 - 83.02%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.93 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2015), Reed bunting (2011), House sparrow, Dunnock (2015), Barn owl (2018), Bluebell (2014), Grass snake (2016), Common pipistrelle bat (2014) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Tower House, 150 metres to the west of the site, is a Grade II Listed Building. Riccall Conservation Area is 140 metres to the north of the site.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Residential
Preferred Option Explanation	
Development of the site marks a logical southern extension to the settlement of Riccall and the site is adjacent to residential properties on its northern edge. the edge of Riccall with it being adjacent to residential properties on its northern edge.	

Settlement	Ryther	Size (Ha)	2.86	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	49	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Woodbine Grange Farm				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to East/South. Agricultural fields to North/West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	RYTHER/001	SHLAA Ref	Ryther-1		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	80	2.7 % PDL	20	
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 81.81%, Flood Zone 2 - 15.99%, Flood Zone 1 - 2.2%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					1.67 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Frog, Great crested newt (2015), Bluebell (2019), Badger (2015), Common pipistrelle bat roost (2015), brown long-eared bat (2018) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh within 100m					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 800m of LEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
No previous unimplemented residential permissions/1 landowner/No impact on availability from existing land use. The site is subject to an Agricultural Holdings Act tenancy (AHA).	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible decontamination and flood mitigation measures may add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	11-15 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Ryther	Size (Ha)	1.64	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	28	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land east of Mill Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to North-West. Agricultural fields to North/East/South/South-West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	RYTHER/002	SHLAA Ref	Ryther-2		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 7.76%, Flood Zone 2 - 30.54%, Flood Zone 1 - 61.7%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Frog, Great crested newt (2015), Bluebell (2019), Badger (2015), Common pipistrelle bat roost (2015), brown long-eared bat (2018) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 800m of LEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
No previous unimplemented residential permissions/1 landowner/No impact on availability from existing land use. The site is subject to an Agricultural Holdings Act tenancy (AHA).	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	11-15 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Saxton	Size (Ha)	2.10	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	36	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land East of Milner Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Unused field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to South. Agriculture fields to North/East/West.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SAXTON/001	SHLAA Ref	Saxton-1		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
European eel (2011), Brown trout (2014), Noctule bat, Common pipistrelle bat (2017) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m. Re-assessed October 2020.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(--)
Site is located within the South Western extent of the Towton Battlefield. Site adjoins the Saxton Conservation Area.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for building stone/ Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 800m of LEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	

3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. Subject to an Agricultural Holdings Act 1988 retirement tenancy without succession rights. Right to resume possession of 25% of the land following the grant of planning consent.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years

Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Saxton	Size (Ha)	3.85	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	65	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Scarthingwell Park				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Scrubland				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential care home to North. Residential to South. Agricultural fields to West/East. Farm buildings to East				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SAXTON/005	SHLAA Ref	Saxton-2		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Barn owl roost (2019), five species of bat, including Common pipistrelle roost (2015) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(--)
Deciduous woodland on and adjacent to site					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Scarthingwell Lodge is a Grade II listed building and located to the South West of the site. Grade II Village cross is also located to the South West of the site.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(++)
Development would add an open space asset identified as required in the vicinity (Site is in an area of identified need as falls outside buffer of LEAPS, NEAPS and LAPs, Amenity Greenspace, Parks and recreation, skate parks, allotment and small natural/semi natural greenspace areas.)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. Subject to an Agricultural Holdings Act 1988 retirement tenancy without succession rights. Right to resume possession of 25% of the land following the grant of planning consent.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	South Duffield	Size (Ha)	3.06	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	52	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land adjacent to Willow Cottage, Mill Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to East/South. Agricultural fields to North/West/South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SDUFFIELD/001	SHLAA Ref	SDuffield-1		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(-)
Site has poor access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 85% Grade 3 15%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.65 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 0.73 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 1.67 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2015) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Traditional orchard within 100m					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Site is immediately West of Grade II listed Mill House, Windmill.					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.</p>	N/A
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	(o)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on a Public Right of Way (PRoW) (Site is in an area of identified need as falls outside buffer of LEAPS, NEAPS and LAPs, Amenity Greenspace, Parks and recreation, skate parks, allotment and small natural/semi natural greenspace areas. . PRoW runs through the site)</p>	(-)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy</p>	Rejected

Settlement	South Duffield	Size (Ha)	0.45	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	9	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Haymoor House Moor Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Residential				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to South/East. Greenfield land to North/West. Agricultural field to South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SDUFFIELD/002	SHLAA Ref	SDuffield-2		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(-)
Site has poor access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	95	2.7 % PDL	5
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	4.69 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2015) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Site adjacent to Traditional orchard					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	South Duffield	Size (Ha)	1.15	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	20	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land South of Moor Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential fields to North/East/West. Agricultural fields to West/South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SDUFFIELD/003	SHLAA Ref	SDuffield-3		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(-)
Site has poor access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	95	2.7 % PDL	5
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	15.36 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2015) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Traditional orchard within 100m					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(++)
Development would add an open space asset identified as required in the vicinity (Site is in an area of identified need as falls outside buffer of LEAPS, NEAPS and LAPs, Amenity Greenspace, Parks and recreation, skate parks, allotment and small natural/semi natural greenspace areas.)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible decontamination measures may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	South Duffield	Size (Ha)	0.15	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	3	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to the west of Hagg Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural land surrounds the whole of the site with a minor road to the east.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SDUFFIELD/005	SHLAA Ref	SDuffield-5		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes		Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy. Under 0.17ha in size (residential)			
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings		Flood Zone 1 - 100%			
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2		Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA			
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2015) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy. Under 0.17ha in size (residential)	

Settlement	South Duffield	Size (Ha)	0.25	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	5	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to the west of Hagg Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural land surrounds the whole of the site with a minor road to the east.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SDUFFIELD/006	SHLAA Ref	SDuffield-6		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.08 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 30.92 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(--)
major infrastructure constraints - within inner 80m and middle 250m buffer Zones of Cawood to Susworth Trent West gas pipeline					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2015) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	South Duffield	Size (Ha)	0.75	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	15	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Orchard House				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Residential				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential/ track to the North. Residential/ open land to the east. Open land to the South and residential/ open land to the west.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SDUFFIELD/007	SHLAA Ref	SDuffield-7		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(-)
Site has poor access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	80	2.7 % PDL	20
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	1.31 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 2.09 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 7.61 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2015) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Traditional orchard within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Site is in close proximity to Grade II listed Corner House Farm					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.</p>	N/A
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	(o)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would add an open space asset identified as required in the vicinity (Site is in an area of identified need as falls outside buffer of LEAPS, NEAPS and LAPs, Amenity Greenspace, Parks and recreation, skate parks, allotment and small natural/semi natural greenspace areas.)</p>	(++)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Selby	Size (Ha)	1.75	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	52	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to West of Selby Business Park				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Selby Urban Area				
Land Use	Greenfield land				
Surrounding Land Uses	Wooded 3 lakes area to the North, Selby business park with light industrial units to the East. A63 bypass to the South and railway line to the West.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BRAYTON/001	SHLAA Ref	Selby-42		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(--)
Development would result in a loss of employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 2 - 3.2%, Flood Zone 1 - 96.8%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Requirement to consult with Natural England					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Site is within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2017), Barn owl (2014), Natterer's bat, Common pipistrelle, Brown long-eared bat roosts (2017), Soprano pipistrelle (2010) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Industrial and warehousing buildings present on Site, just South of River Ouse. Site adjacent to Deciduous woodland					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Site within the built form of the settlement	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW, within 100m of railway and within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Joint land ownership. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
There is developer interest without active marketing. Viability appraisal of the site has been conducted. Abnormal costs include the restricting the surface water discharge, dealing with the water main that runs through the site in relation to the foundations of some of the buildings.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Selby	Size (Ha)	8.19	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	330	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Rigid Group Ltd, Denison Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Selby Urban Area				
Land Use	Grassland site, with areas of hardstanding				
Surrounding Land Uses	River Ouse to North. Industrial buildings to East. Residential to South. Canal and Residential buildings to West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SELBY/038	SHLAA Ref	Selby-87		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(+)
Urban 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land	2.7 % GF	0	2.7 % PDL	100	
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3b - 3.97%, Flood Zone 3a - 96.03%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	1.49 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 7.78 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	See results of Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(++)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(--)
Smooth newt (2017), Grass snake (2017), Otter (2017) observed within site. Various breeding birds, including Skylark, Yellowhammer, Reed bunting, Linnet, House sparrow and Lapwing (2018), European eel (2011), Grass snake (2018), Water vole (2018), Five s					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
This site is between the River Ouse and Selby Canal, there is also a large waterbody to the east. The site previously had an industrial use however, buildings have been cleared and the site is a mix of grassland with some hard standing.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
The site is adjacent to the Selby Lock on the Aire and Calder Navigation which, along with the Lock House and Bridge House, are Grade II Listed Buildings. the eastern boundary of Selby Town Conservation Area is 180 metres to the west of the site. Development of this area could harm elements which contribute to the significance of these heritage assets.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Within the settlement	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - adjacent to industrial estate	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(-)
Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on a Public Right of Way (PRoW) (Site within 1200m of skatepark, 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, 400m of LAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments. PRoW runs through the site)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(-)
Scale and type of growth could generate increased emissions within 800m of AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Extant permission. 1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible decontamination and flood mitigation measures may add to costs. Site marketed - enquiries have been received	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Residential
Preferred Option Explanation	
This is a brownfield site within the development limits of Selby. The site has been allocated in part for retail use because it occupies a location that is very close to Selby Town Centre, and is sequentially preferable to Rejected sites, this allocation will enhance the health and well-being of the town centre. The site is located within a short distance of many services and employment opportunities and has no major constraints, this site also has the opportunity to add services which can be used by the local community.	

Settlement	Selby	Size (Ha)	15.02	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	450	Housing Capacity Notes	Number of homes specified in site promoter's masterplan		
Site Location	Industrial Chemicals Ltd, Canal View, Bawtry Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Selby Urban Area				
Land Use	Chemical works, with large heavy-industrial buildings				
Surrounding Land Uses	Railway line/residential to West. Canal and retail park to East. Residential and light industrial to North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SELBY/002 (/003)	SHLAA Ref	Selby-2/3		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Within HSE blast Zone.
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(--)
Development would result in a loss of employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 5% Urban 95%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(o)
Mixed (Greenfield/ Previously Developed Land)					2.7 % GF 50 2.7 % PDL 50
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 83.4%, Flood Zone 2 - 14.53%, Flood Zone 1 - 2.07%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					0.1 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 1.12 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 5.96 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					See results of Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(--)
Major infrastructure constraints - within inner middle and outer HSE consultation Zones					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Smooth newt (2017), Pied wagtail (2017), breeding House sparrow (2018), European eel (2011), Grass snake (2017), Otter (2017), Noctule bat, Common pipistrelle bat (2015) within 1km. Re-assessed new boundary in October 2020.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Within adjacent to S41 Deciduous woodland. Adjacent to River Ouse. Numerous trees and hedgerows present on Site. Site adjacent to Deciduous woodland					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Site within the built form of the settlement	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(+)
Proposed development replaces an existing negative amenity impact	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of skatepark, 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments. Also Impacts on TYPE_Natur - not included (BRAY/05 SDLP Local Amenity Space ENV29 - Amenity Greenspace - Woodland))	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(-)
Scale and type of growth could generate increased emissions within 800m of AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 Owner. The chemical works site remains in active use and will continue to be in active use until such time as it is required to be relocated to enable residential development to come forward on the site.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Part of the site represents previously developed land and is an established chemical works. Previous site investigations have identified the presence of some land contamination and therefore remediation would be necessary, which would be addressed. Possible flood mitigation may also add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Residential
Preferred Option Explanation	
The northern part of the site is previously developed and development of the overall site marks a logical infilling within Selby, with residential and commercial uses located beyond the site boundary on all sides. The site is constrained to the west by the railway line and to the east and south by the canal.	

Settlement	Selby	Size (Ha)	19.58	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	335	Housing Capacity Notes	Number of homes specified in site promoter's masterplan		
Site Location	Land west of Foxhill Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Selby Urban Area				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to North/East/South. Agricultural fields/farms to East/South/West. Sports facilities to North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BRAYTON/013	SHLAA Ref	Selby-43		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(---)
Grade 2 95% Grade 3 5% (Urban <1%)					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 2 - 95.1%, Flood Zone 1 - 4.9%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.61 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 6.46 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Bluebell (2014), Natterer's bat, Common pipistrelle, Brown long-eared bat roosts (2017), Soprano pipistrelle bat (2010) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Pond within 250m to South. Few PS records mainly bats. Site predominantly fields with hedgerows. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
This site adjoins the boundary of the Brayton Conservation Area. The Church of St Wilfred is a Grade I Listed Building and its vicarage a Grade II Listed Building					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(--)
Development occurs in and has a negative impact on the openness or setting of the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(-)
Moderate to high sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of railway	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of skatepark, 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, 400m of LAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. The site has had interest from a national housebuilder. 2 years to end current farm tenancy.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
A range of technical appraisals have been carried out by the site promoter.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site at risk of flooding	

Settlement	Selby	Size (Ha)	6.20	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	174	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land between Baffam Lane and Selby Canal				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Selby Urban Area				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential development on its Northern edge. The Selby Canal and public footpath forms the Eastern				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BRAYTON/017	SHLAA Ref	Selby-46		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 2 - 99.66%, Flood Zone 1 - 0.34%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.81 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 4.51 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2017), Natterer's bat roost, common pipistrelle bat roost, brown long-eared bat roost (2017), Soprano pipistrelle bat (2010) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Within 50m of S41 Deciduous woodland. Adjacent to Selby Canal. Deciduous woodland within 100m					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
This site adjoins the boundary of the Brayton Conservation Area.					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development occurs in and has a negative impact on the openness or setting of the SCG</p>	<p>--</p>
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Moderate to high sensitivity to development</p>	<p>(-)</p>
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW</p>	<p>(-)</p>
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	<p>(+)</p>
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	<p>--</p>
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 400m of LAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)</p>	<p>(+)</p>
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	<p>0-5 years</p>
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site at risk of flooding</p>	<p>Rejected</p>

Settlement	Selby	Size (Ha)	4.97	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	148	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land north of Brayton Bridge, east of canal				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Selby Urban Area				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Canal/Agricultural fields to West. Residential to North-West/South. Woodland to East.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BRAYTON/016	SHLAA Ref	Selby-45		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 84.53%, Flood Zone 2 - 10.47%, Flood Zone 1 - 5%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.42 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 6.74 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(-)
Site is adjacent to a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2017), Natterer's bat roost, common pipistrelle bat roost, brown long-eared bat roost (2017), Soprano pipistrelle bat (2010) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Within 50m of S41 Deciduous woodland. Site predominantly fields with hedgerows and trees present on Site. Selby Canal along its Western edge and railway along Eastern edge. Small pond near Northern tip and larger waterbodies to North East. Site adjacent t					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Brayton Bridge is a Grade II Listed Building.					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development occurs in and has a negative impact on the openness or setting of the SCG</p>	(--)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Moderate to high sensitivity to development</p>	(-)
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW and within 100m of railway</p>	(-)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, 400m of LAP, and 1200m of Allotments)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation works measures may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site at risk of flooding</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Selby	Size (Ha)	0.23	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	8	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land off Canal Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Selby Urban Area				
Land Use	Residential/ Paddocks				
Surrounding Land Uses	Stalled (housing) vacant site to South. Parking/residential development to North. Primarily residential development to the West/East				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SELBY/032	SHLAA Ref	Selby-31		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					
					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					
Site has excellent access services and employment					(++)
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					
					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					
Development does not impact on employment land					(o)
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					
					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					(+)
2.6 Agricultural Land					
Urban 100%					(+)
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	90	2.7 % PDL	10	(-)
2.8 Flood Risk					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.28 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 16.27 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					
See results of Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					
No known constraints					(o)
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					(-)
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					(o)
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					(+)
2.14 Impact Protected Species					
Toad (2018), Smooth newt, (2017), Linnet (2018), Pied wagtail (2017), Grass snake (2017), Otter spraint (2017), Common pipistrelle bat roost (2017), Whiskered bat, Noctule bat, Soprano pipistrelle bat, brown long-eared bat (2010) within 1km					(-)
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					
Buildings and trees present on Site. No priority habitat within 100m.					(-)
2.16 Heritage Assets					
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					(o)

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Site within the built form of the settlement</p>	N/A
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 100m of waste facility</p>	(-)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.</p>	(-)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of skatepark, 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, 400m of LAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)</p>	(o)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Potential third party land issue - may need for additional land to enlarge current access to meet adoptable standards. Possible decontamination and flood mitigation measures may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site at risk of flooding</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Selby	Size (Ha)	1.99	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	59	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to the north west of Selby Business Park				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Selby Urban Area				
Land Use	Greenfield with a wood.				
Surrounding Land Uses	Business park to the East, Greenfield covers the rest of the surrounding area.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BRAYTON/026	SHLAA Ref	Selby-70		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings Flood Zone 2 - 70.05%, Flood Zone 1 - 29.95%					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW 1.71 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water					
2.9 SFRA Level 2 See results of Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England do not need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(-)
Site is adjacent to a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2017), Barn owl (2014), Natterer's bat roost, common pipistrelle bat roost, brown long-eared bat roost (2017), Soprano pipistrelle bat (2010) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(--)
Deciduous woodland on and adjacent to site					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Site within the built form of the settlement	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW and within 100m of railway	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple ownership. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site at risk of flooding	

Settlement	Selby	Size (Ha)	80.10	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	1270	Housing Capacity Notes	Number of homes specified in site promoter's masterplan		
Site Location	Land at Cross Hills Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Selby Urban Area				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to North-East and South. Agricultural fields to North-West/West. Farm buildings to West. Allotments to East.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SELBY/001/009/024/025/030	SHLAA Ref	Selby-1/8/15/69		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(---)
Grade 2 90% Urban 10%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	95	2.7 % PDL	5	
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings Flood Zone 3a - 81.5%, Flood Zone 2 - 18.31%, Flood Zone 1 - 0.19%					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW 0.3 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 0.91 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 4.61 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water					
2.9 SFRA Level 2 See results of Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site but impact insignificant or unknown					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Various birds (2016), European eel (2014), Bluebell (2016), Hedgehog (2019), Badger (2016), three species of bat (2019) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(--)
Within 50m of S41 Mixed Broadleaved Woodland. Trees present on Site. Deciduous woodland on site					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
The easternmost part of the site adjoins Leeds Road Conservation Area. The site is also close to a number of Grade II Listed Buildings on the north side of Leeds Road. Development of this area could harm elements which contribute to the significance of these heritage assets.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of skatepark, 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, 400m of LAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use. Tenancy or operational requirements remain on all or part of the site.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Site is partially owned/ under option to a developer but currently in multiple ownership (Viability assessment has been undertaken - The site is viable if affordable housing provision is reduced to allow for costs of access from Meadway and additional flood mitigation requirements). Possible decontamination and flood mitigation measures may add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Residential
Preferred Option Explanation	
The allocation of a large area for development presents opportunities for place making, such as the provision of new community facilities including the provision of a primary school, the creation of green infrastructure links to the town centre and the potential to contribute towards the creation of a north west relief road between Leeds Road and Flaxley Road, which will direct traffic away from the town centre. Development will enable a landscaped corridor of open space and environmental assets to be provided along the Selby Dam, views to the Selby Abbey from the west of the town will be enhanced as a result of this development.	

Settlement	Selby	Size (Ha)	60.43	Proposed Use	Employment
Housing Capacity	Housing Capacity Notes				
Site Location	Olympia Park, Barlby Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Selby Urban Area				
Land Use	Employment on part of the site. Agricultural Fields.				
Surrounding Land Uses	River Ouse to the South. Agricultural to the West. To the North is railway lines and to the East is the A19				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BARLBY/007	SHLAA Ref	Selby-47		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(++)
Site has excellent access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(++)
development would create employment					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(+)
Good sub-regional accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(---)
Grade 1 70% Urban 30%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(o)
Mixed (Greenfield/ Previously Developed Land)	2.7 % GF	70	2.7 % PDL	30	
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3b - 1.13%, Flood Zone 3a - 98.87%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.44 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 1.36 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 6.33 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	See results of Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site but impact insignificant or unknown					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(--)
Various birds (2018), Grass snake (2018), Water vole (2018), Common pipistrelle bat roost (2018) identified within site boundary. Toad (2018), Smooth newt (2017), Otter spraint (2017), Whiskered bat, Noctule bat, Soprano pipistrelle bat, Brown long-eared					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Large site with various former/current uses including industrial (partly demolished), allotments, improved amenity grassland, woodland, hedgerows, trees, arable farmland with a field drain to the eastern boundary. The site is in close proximity to the Riv					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
The Former War Department Munitions Depot, 200 metres to the north of the site, is Grade II Listed.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (Previous archaeological evaluation has demonstrated that paleoenvironmental deposits are present on this site. An appropriate scheme of mitigation would be required to record these remains prior to or during the development (NPPF para. 199).)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(-)
Medium sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of railway, within 100m of A road and waste facility on site	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel. Site is also an allocated site for Minerals and waste transport infrastructure (I01)	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Previous applications on site have lapsed. 1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
The gaining of a planning permission by a developer is some indication that the site is economically viable to the housing market. Possible flood mitigation and ground decontamination may add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	11-15 years

Preferred Option

Employment

Preferred Option Explanation

The site enjoys a unique location on the edge of the built-up area but close to Selby Town Centre and provides an opportunity to create a sustainable urban extension through the regeneration of former industrial land and premises. Redevelopment of this key site would serve to enhance the landscape and marks a logical infilling within the wider Selby Urban Area. The site is located in a highly sustainable location, close to existing shops, services, employment opportunities and Selby Railway Station.

Settlement	Selby	Size (Ha)	5.62	Proposed Use	Employment
Housing Capacity	Housing Capacity Notes				
Site Location	Land between A19 and A63 bypass				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Selby Urban Area				
Land Use	Agricultural Land				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the North, former industrial to the west, agricultural to the South (South of railway line) and bypass to the east.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	BARLBY/004	SHLAA Ref	N/A		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					N/A
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(+)
Site has good access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(++)
Development would create employment					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(+)
Good sub-regional accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 1 70% Urban 30%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	95	2.7 % PDL	5	
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					0.15 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 2.75 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					See results of Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Smooth newt (2017), Various birds (2018), Grass snake (2018), Water vole (2018), Otter spraint (2017), Common pipistrelle bat roost (2018), Whiskered bat, Noctule bat, Soprano pipistrelle bat, Brown long-eared bat (2018) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Site within the built form of the settlement	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
within incompatible area - within 100m of railway and within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(o)
Site is not within a mineral safeguarding area.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Previous applications on site have lapsed. 1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
The gaining of a planning permission by a developer is some indication that the site is economically viable to the housing market. Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	6-10 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site at risk of flooding	

Settlement	Selby	Size (Ha)	42.71	Proposed Use	Mixed Use	
Housing Capacity	972	Housing Capacity Notes				
Site Location	Olympia Park, Barlby Road					
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Selby Urban Area					
Land Use	Storage, Vacant Land, Allotments, Sports Pitches, Previous employment.					
Surrounding Land Uses	Mixed - residential, employment, river and countryside					
2020 Site Submission Reference	BARLBY/014	SHLAA Ref		Selby-7 SDLP allocation (CA reduced)		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?						No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	Site partially within flood Zone 3b					
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment						(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment						
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services						(+)
Site has good access to services and workforce						
2.3 Loss of Employment Land						(++)
Development would create employment						
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network						(++)
Good national accessibility						
2.5 Physical Point of Access						(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.						
2.6 Agricultural Land						(-)
Grade 1 5% Urban 95%						
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land						(o)
Mixed (Greenfield/ Previously Developed Land)	2.7 % GF	50	2.7 % PDL	50		
2.8 Flood Risk						(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3b - 0.92%, Flood Zone 3a - 99.08%, Flood Zone 2 - 0.01%					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.44 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 1.73 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 8.09 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water					
2.9 SFRA Level 2	See results of Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints						(o)
No known constraints						
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)						(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,						
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)						(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites						
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site						(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site						
2.14 Impact Protected Species						(-)
Whiskered bat, Noctule bat (2018), Common pipistrelle bat, Soprano pipistrelle bat, Brown long-eared bat (2019) within site boundary. Toad (2018), Smooth newt (2017), Various birds (2018), Grass snake (2018), Water vole (2018), Otter spraint (2017) within						
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect						(--)
Deciduous woodland on site						
2.16 Heritage Assets						(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting						

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Site within the built form of the settlement	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of railway and within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(-)
Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on BARLB-04 (Allotments) and BARLB-12 (Formal Outdoor Sports Provision) (Site within 1200m of skatepark, 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, 400m of LAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(-)
Scale and type of growth could generate increased emissions within 800m of AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Previous applications on site have lapsed. 1 landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
The gaining of a planning permission by a developer is some indication that the site is economically viable to the housing market. Possible flood mitigation and ground decontamination may add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site at risk of flooding	

Settlement	Selby	Size (Ha)	1.12	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	33	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land off Friars Meadow				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Selby Urban Area				
Land Use	Residential/ Paddocks				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the South west with the remainder of the site surrounded by agricultural land.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SELBY/033	SHLAA Ref	Selby-80		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	90	2.7 % PDL	10	
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.4 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 0.5 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 0.88 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	See results of Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Common pipistrelle bat, Soprano pipistrelle bat, Brown long-eared bat (2019) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Potential third party land issue - may need for additional land to enlarge current access to meet adoptable standards. Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site at risk of flooding	

Settlement	Selby	Size (Ha)	11.51	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	262	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Cockret Farm				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Selby Urban Area				
Land Use	Residential				
Surrounding Land Uses	Mainly surrounded by agricultural fields/ open land. There is a road to the North west of the site and also residential to the South of the site.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SELBY/027	SHLAA Ref	Selby-20		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					
					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					
Site has excellent access services and employment					(++)
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					
					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					
Development does not impact on employment land					(o)
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					
					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					(+)
2.6 Agricultural Land					
Grade 2 95% Urban 5%					(---)
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	(-)
2.8 Flood Risk					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 68.65%, Flood Zone 2 - 31.35%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.84 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 1.58 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 4.72 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					
See results of Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					
No known constraints					(o)
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					(-)
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England do not need to be consulted.					(-)
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					(+)
2.14 Impact Protected Species					
House sparrow (2019), European eel (2011), Hedgehog (2019), three species of bat (2019) within 1km. Re-assessed new boundary in October 2020.					(-)
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					
No priority habitat within 100m.					(+)
2.16 Heritage Assets					
Hempbridge Farm is located to the South of the site and is a Grade II Listed Building					(o)

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of skatepark, 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners (within the same family). No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs. Viability Assessment has been undertaken - Area subject to flood risk would affect developable area. Site marketed - enquiries have been received	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site at risk of flooding	

Settlement	Selby	Size (Ha)	0.07	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	2	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land adjacent to St. James's Church				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Selby Urban Area				
Land Use	Open land/ tree covered				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential surrounding on all sides apart from St James Church to the North East.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SELBY/034	SHLAA Ref	Selby-81		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Under 0.17ha in size (residential)
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(+)
Urban 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 2 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.16 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					See results of Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Smooth newt (2017), Pied wagtail (2017), breeding House sparrow (2018), European eel (2011), Hedgehog (2019), Otter (2017), three species of bat (2019) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(--)
Site is within the Selby Town Conservation area and immediately South West of Grade II Church of St James. Site is also to the rear of Grade II listed properties 46-72 New Lane.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This site has archaeological potential, particularly for medieval settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Site within the built form of the settlement	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of skatepark, 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Potential third party land issue - Proposal to enter into 6 year lease agreement on area of land which includes access lane to site. Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	6-10 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Under 0.17ha in size (residential)	

Settlement	Selby	Size (Ha)	0.07	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	2	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Benedict Avenue				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Selby Urban Area				
Land Use	Garage site				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential surrounding on all sides.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SELBY/035	SHLAA Ref	Selby-82		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Under 0.17ha in size (residential)
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(+)
Urban 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land		2.7 % GF	0	2.7 % PDL	100
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings		Flood Zone 3a - 96.34%, Flood Zone 2 - 0.77%, Flood Zone 1 - 2.89%			
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW		0.91 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water			
2.9 SFRA Level 2					See results of Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Within 500m of an Ancient Woodland					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Smooth newt (2017), Various breeding birds, including Skylark, Yellowhammer, Reed bunting, Linnet, House sparrow and Lapwing (2018), Grass snake (2017), Water vole (2018), Otter (2017), Five species of bat (2018) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Site within the built form of the settlement	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Under 0.17ha in size (residential)	

Settlement	Selby	Size (Ha)	0.10	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	4	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Richard Street				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Selby Urban Area				
Land Use	Garage site				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the North and East. Football ground to the West and Leisure Centre and car park to the South.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SELBY/036	SHLAA Ref	Selby-83		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Under 0.17ha in size (residential)
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(+)
Urban 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land					2.7 % GF 0 2.7 % PDL 100
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					2.59 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 4.22 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 9.8 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					See results of Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
House sparrow (2019), European eel (2011), Hedgehog (2019), three species of bat (2019) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Site within the built form of the settlement	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(+)
Proposed development replaces an existing negative amenity impact	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of skatepark, 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. Site is currently a Garage Site.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Under 0.17ha in size (residential)	

Settlement	Selby	Size (Ha)	0.61	Proposed Use	Employment
Housing Capacity	Housing Capacity Notes				
Site Location	Land at Former Police Station Site				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Selby Urban Area				
Land Use	Former Police Station.				
Surrounding Land Uses	Former Council offices now demolished to the West of the Site. Residential to the East and South of the Site and minor road to the North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SELBY/037	SHLAA Ref	N/A		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					N/A
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(++)
Site has excellent access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(++)
Development would create employment					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(++)
Good national accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(+)
Urban 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land					2.7 % GF 0 2.7 % PDL 100
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 20.3%, Flood Zone 2 - 79.7%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					1.91 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 9.59 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					See results of Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Smooth newt (2017), Pied wagtail (2017), House sparrow (2019), European eel (2011), Grass snake (2017), Hedgehog (2019), Otter (2017), Noctule bat, (2015), Common pipistrelle, Soprano pipistrelle, Brown long-eared bat (2019) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (This is a brownfield site with a low archaeological potential.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of railway	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(-)
Scale and type of growth could generate increased emissions within 800m of AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible decontamination and flood mitigation measures may add to costs. Site is owned by a developer. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site at risk of flooding	

Settlement	Selby	Size (Ha)	3.01	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	51	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land north of Flaxley Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural Field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the East of the site. Road to the South of the Site. Agricultural to the North and West of the Site.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SELBY/031	SHLAA Ref	Selby-69		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 69.42%, Flood Zone 2 - 30.58%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					0.62 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 0.75 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 1.28 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
House sparrow (2019), Hedgehog (2019), three species of bat (2019) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Site is East of Grade II listed Hempbridge Farm House and associated buildings.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of skatepark, 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. Site was previously subject to an annual Farm business Tenancy.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Selby	Size (Ha)	0.27	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	9	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Bondgate				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Selby Urban Area				
Land Use	Site is used as reclaimed landfill site				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the South and East and South West. Agricultural to the west and North West.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SELBY/013 (/004)	SHLAA Ref	Selby-6/11		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 10% Urban 90%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land	2.7 % GF	0	2.7 % PDL	100	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 39.12%, Flood Zone 2 - 4.87%, Flood Zone 1 - 56%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.29 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 0.64 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 3.3 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Common pipistrelle bat, Soprano pipistrelle bat, Brown long-eared bat (2019) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Mount Pleasant, less than 30 metres north of the site, is a Grade II Listed Building. Development of this area could harm elements which contribute to the significance of this heritage asset.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(-)
Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on SELB-47 (Park) (Site within 1200m of skatepark, 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. Contaminated site needing remediation as part of redevelopment. Site not subject to any tenancies	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible decontamination and flood mitigation measures may add to costs. Viability Assessment has been undertaken - Site appraised for residential use. Likely to be majority affordable housing, or 100% affordable. Detailed ground investigations carried out. Site marketed - enquiries have been received.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years

Preferred Option

Residential

Preferred Option Explanation

The site comprises a small infill development in Selby and is adjacent to residential properties on its northern and southern boundaries. It is within a short distance to many services and employment opportunities and has no major physical constraints. The NPPF requires that land is identified on small sites (i.e. those under 1ha) to accommodate at least 10% of housing requirements. This site is able to contribute to this requirement.

Settlement	Selby	Size (Ha)	32.57	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	741	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Holmes Field, South of Lordship Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Selby Urban Area				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural fields to West/East/North. Residential development site to South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SELBY/005	SHLAA Ref	Selby-4		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(---)
Grade 1 90% Grade 2 5% Urban 7.5%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.23 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 7.64 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	See results of Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Requirement to consult with Natural England					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
House sparrow (2019), European eel (2011), Hedgehog (2019), Five species of bat (2019) within 1km. Re-assessed new boundary in October 2020.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Within 50m of S41 Traditional Orchard. Site predominantly fields with hedgerows. Holmes Dyke runs along Northern and Western edge. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Mount Pleasant, 450 metres from the western edge of this area, is a Grade II Listed Building.					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Low to moderate sensitivity to development</p>	(+)
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	(o)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of skatepark, 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, 400m of LAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth could generate increased emissions within 800m of AQMA</p>	(-)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use.</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation may add to costs. Viability Assessment has been undertaken - Standard allowances for build, revenue, sales and planning costs. Site is viable for residential development.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site at risk of flooding</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Selby	Size (Ha)	1.60	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	27	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land north of Brayton Lane, south of bypass				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Wooded area to the West of the site. A63 bypass to the North. Large agricultural fields to the South and East.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SELBY/020	SHLAA Ref	Selby-18		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 15.23%, Flood Zone 2 - 73.38%, Flood Zone 1 - 11.39%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2017), Barn owl (2014) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Arable/amenity grassland present on Site. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW and within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 800m of LEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple Ownership. Agricultural land subject to tenancy	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs. A developer has expressed interest in the site.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Selby	Size (Ha)	1.50	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	26	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land south of Brayton Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Farm building to the West, large agricultural fields on all sides.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SELBY/021	SHLAA Ref	Selby-19		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 71.21%, Flood Zone 2 - 27.57%, Flood Zone 1 - 1.22%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					5.03 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2017), Barn owl (2014) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Arable/amenity grassland present on Site. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW and within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, and 800m of LEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	

3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 owner. Agricultural land subject to tenancy	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs. A developer has expressed interest in the site.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years

Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Sherburn in Elmet	Size (Ha)	102.54	Proposed Use	Employment
Housing Capacity	Housing Capacity Notes				
Site Location	Gascoigne Wood Interchange (former Gascoigne Wood mine site)				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Largely agricultural fields. Industrial buildings, railway lines and associated infrastructure				
Surrounding Land Uses	Aeroclub to North-West. Agricultural fields to West/North/East/South. Former mining infrastructure to East				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SHERBURN/028	SHLAA Ref	N/A		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					N/A
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(--)
Site has very poor access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(++)
Development would create employment					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(o)
Good local accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(--)
Grade 2 5% Grade 3 95%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(o)
Mixed (Greenfield/ Previously Developed Land)	2.7 % GF	60	2.7 % PDL	40	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 8.02%, Flood Zone 2 - 18.9%, Flood Zone 1 - 73.08%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	1.84 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 4.09 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 11.66 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Common pipistrelle bat roost (2018), Soprano pipistrelle (2018) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(--)
Deciduous woodland on and adjacent to site					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(-)
The site contains or is close to known archaeological remains and presents a high level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(++)
The brownfield rail interchange in the south of the site has a low sensitivity to commercial forms of development. The northern greenfield part of the site is outside the assessment area	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW, within 100m of railway, within 100m of waste facility	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ Limestone/ Sand and Gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 extant permission on site. 1 landowner. The agricultural land on the site is subject of tenancies.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Viability Assessment has been undertaken. Site is owned by a developer. Possible decontamination and flood mitigation measures may add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Employment
Preferred Option Explanation	
This site represents a unique opportunity to deliver the redevelopment of a key brownfield site with regionally significant rail freight infrastructure, close to the settlement of Sherburn in Elmet and a significant area of existing employment land to the north west of the site. It is considered that there are significant benefits in bringing the site back into employment use that can make use of the existing rail connections and foster the movement of goods by more sustainable means. The redevelopment of the site for rail-related purposes would meet Government objectives to increase the role of rail in the movement of freight to support wider environmental objectives.	

Settlement	Sherburn in Elmet	Size (Ha)	3.50	Proposed Use	Employment
Housing Capacity	Housing Capacity Notes				
Site Location	Land North of Lennerton Farm, Lennerton Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Disused field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Overgrown field to West. Sewage works to North. Agriculture fields to East/South/West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SHERBURN/029	SHLAA Ref	N/A		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					N/A
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(--)
Site has very poor access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(++)
Development would create employment					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(o)
Good local accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 8.47%, Flood Zone 2 - 91.53%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	4.2 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 6.61 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 23.05 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Badger sett (2013), Soprano pipistrelle bat roost (2013) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Agricultural grassland with watercourse to the north and western boundary. Some mature trees along the watercourse. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(-)
Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on a Public Right of Way (PRoW) (PRoW runs through the site)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site at risk of flooding	

Settlement	Sherburn in Elmet	Size (Ha)	2.85	Proposed Use	Mixed Use
Housing Capacity	48	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Chapel Hill, Tadcaster Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Arable cropping				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural fields to North/East/West. Football pitches to the East. Residential/field to the South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SHERBURN/033	SHLAA Ref		Sherburn-24	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes	Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(+)
Site has good access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(+)
Good sub-regional accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 60% Grade 3 40%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 2.01%, Flood Zone 2 - 0.38%, Flood Zone 1 - 97.61%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	7.62 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Common pipistrelle bat roost (2015) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Arable field with Stream Dike along the northern boundary. Some boundary hedges and trees. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. Land subject to annual cropping agreement.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Developer interest shown in the site. Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Sherburn in Elmet	Size (Ha)	6.16	Proposed Use	Employment
Housing Capacity	Housing Capacity Notes				
Site Location	Land South of Moor Lane Trading Estate				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural land to the South and West (beyond railway line), airfield to the East and Sherburn Enterprise Park to the North.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SHERBURN/021	SHLAA Ref	N/A		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					N/A
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(++)
Development would create employment					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(-)
Poor local accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	85	2.7 % PDL	15	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					2.6 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 5.9 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 14.41 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England do not need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site but impact insignificant or unknown					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Badger (2014) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Area of farmland with field drain along the northern and south east boundary, mature vegetation (trees and scrub) along the railway line and southern drain. There is a pond within 230m of the site but separated by the railway line and arable fields. No pr					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan</p>	
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 100m of railway</p>	<p>(-)</p>
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	<p>(+)</p>
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.</p>	<p>(-)</p>
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ Limestone.</p>	<p>(--)</p>
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use.</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Site marketed - enquiries have been received. Possible decontamination measures may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	<p>0-5 years</p>
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.</p>	<p>Rejected</p>

Settlement	Sherburn in Elmet	Size (Ha)	6.78	Proposed Use	Employment
Housing Capacity	Housing Capacity Notes				
Site Location	Land east of A162				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural fields with an Anaerobic Digestion plant and associated buildings				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural fields to North/East/South/West. Industrial estate to North-East				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SHERBURN/044	SHLAA Ref	N/A		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					N/A
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(+)
Site has good access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(++)
Development would create employment					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(+)
Good sub-regional accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 0.07%, Flood Zone 1 - 99.93%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	2.84 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 7.45 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 25.51 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Badger (2014), Grey wagtail (2018) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Site adjacent to Deciduous woodland					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan</p>	
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	(o)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ Limestone.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.</p>	(o)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Sherburn in Elmet	Size (Ha)	1.22	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	36	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Old Vicarage, Church Hill				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Local Service Centre				
Land Use	Vicarage and garden curtilage				
Surrounding Land Uses	Church and grounds to East. Residential to South. Agricultural fields to West/North.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SHERBURN/040	SHLAA Ref		Sherburn-14	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	90	2.7 % PDL	10
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site but impact insignificant or unknown					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Badger (2017) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Vicarage and mature gardens. There are likely to be several very mature trees and the old buildings in close proximity to the church and mature trees have high potential to support bats. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(--)
This site adjoins the edge of the site of King Athelstan's Palace which is a Scheduled Monument and the churchyard of the Grade I Listed Church of All Saints.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(o)
Moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel/ Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible decontamination measures may add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Sherburn in Elmet	Size (Ha)	22.91	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	521	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land between Coldhill Lane and Finkle Hill				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Local Service Centre				
Land Use	Agricultural Field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural to West/South/North. Dwelling South-East. Agricultural North-East.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SHERBURN/041	SHLAA Ref		Sherburn-3/48	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(---)
Grade 2 95% Grade 3 5%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	95	2.7 % PDL	5	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 4.85%, Flood Zone 2 - 0.22%, Flood Zone 1 - 94.93%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.06 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 0.26 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 4.53 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Requirement to consult with Natural England					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Badger (2017), Pipistrelle bat species roost (2015) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Large arable field with a drainage ditch to the north of the site which make support water vole. Site has limited boundary features with some trees along the northern boundary. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Development impacts on a heritage asset and mitigation measures are necessary					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(o)
Moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 800m of LEAP, 400m of LAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	

3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years

Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	Sherburn in Elmet	Size (Ha)	60.84	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	1384	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Sherburn in Elmet South				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Local Service Centre				
Land Use	Agricultural Field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential/ railway line to the South of the site. To the North of the site is residential. To the west and east of the site is agricultural fields/ open land.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SHERBURN/045	SHLAA Ref		Sherburn-57	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	Adjacent to SSSI.				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(--)
Grade 3 100 (<1% Grade 2)					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 2.01%, Flood Zone 2 - 1.08%, Flood Zone 1 - 96.9%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.04 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 0.06 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 0.51 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(--)
Site adjacent to a SSSI. Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England do not need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site but impact insignificant or unknown					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Badger (2017), Pipistrelle bat species roost (2013) within 1km. Sherburn Willows YWT Reserve records have Red kite (2013) and Harvest mouse (2014) within 1km. New boundary re-assessed in October 2020, no change					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(--)
Small Traditional Orchard in centre of site. Lowland calcareous grassland and lowland fens on Sherburn Willows YWT Reserve, adjacent to site.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(-)
Moderate to high sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of railway	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Brick clay/ sand and gravel/ Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(-)
Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on a Public Right of Way (PRoW) (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 800m of LEAP, 400m of LAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments. PRoW runs through the site)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Negotiations ongoing with a strategic land company. Possible decontamination and flood mitigation measures may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	Sherburn in Elmet	Size (Ha)	2.99	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	51	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land associated with The Wheatsheaf				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Local Service Centre				
Land Use	Leisure				
Surrounding Land Uses	A162 to the west of the site, employment to the South of the site. Railway line to the east of the site. With agricultural land to the North.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SHERBURN/046	SHLAA Ref	Sherburn-58		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	85	2.7 % PDL	15	
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings Flood Zone 2 - 92.52%, Flood Zone 1 - 7.48%					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW 0.06 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 1.6 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water					
2.9 SFRA Level 2 Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site but impact insignificant or unknown					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Toad, Smooth newt (2013), Frog (2015), Various birds (2013), badger sett (2013), Noctule bat, Common pipistrelle bat, Soprano bat, Brown long-eared bat (2013), Pipistrelle bat species roost (2013) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Traditional orchard within 100m					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of railway and within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 800m of LEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Site marketed - enquiries have been received. Possible flood mitigation may add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site at risk of flooding	

Settlement	Sherburn in Elmet	Size (Ha)	0.50	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	10	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land on the south side of Church Hill				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Road to the North of the site. With open land/ agricultural surrounding the remainder of the site.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SHERBURN/047	SHLAA Ref	Sherburn-59		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site but impact insignificant or unknown					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Badger (2017) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Development impacts on a heritage asset and mitigation measures are necessary					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(o)
Moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel/ Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Site is owned by a developer. Possible decontamination measures may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years

Preferred Option Rejected

Preferred Option Explanation

Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy

Settlement	Sherburn in Elmet	Size (Ha)	0.21	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	7	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at the Back of No.44 Garden Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Local Service Centre				
Land Use	Overgrown Orchard				
Surrounding Land Uses	Open land to the North, residential to the east, Nurseries (Garden) to the South and Agricultural to the west.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SHERBURN/049	SHLAA Ref		Sherburn-65	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					0.34 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 0.97 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 20.08 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Badger (2017) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (This is a brownfield site with a low archaeological potential.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(o)
Moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel/ Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 800m of LEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years

Preferred Option Rejected

Preferred Option Explanation

Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.

Settlement	Sherburn in Elmet	Size (Ha)	24.05	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	313	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land South of Leeds Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Residential				
Surrounding Land Uses	Road/ open land to the North, open land/agricultural/employment to the east, employment/agricultural to the South and agricultural/open land and trees to the west.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SHERBURN/051	SHLAA Ref		Sherburn-67	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy & Adjacent to SSSI.
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(--)
Grade 2 5% Grade 3 95%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 1.87%, Flood Zone 2 - 0.52%, Flood Zone 1 - 97.6%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					0.09 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 0.88 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Badger (2017) within 1km. Sherburn Willows YWT Reserve records have Red kite (2013) and Harvest mouse (2014) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Sherburn Willows YWT Reserve adjacent to site, comprising deciduous woodland and lowland fens adjacent to site and lowland calcareous grassland within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This site has archaeological potential, particularly for medieval settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(o)
Moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of waste facility	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel/ Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(-)
Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on a Public Right of Way (PRoW) (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 800m of LEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace. PRoW runs through the site)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible decontamination and flood mitigation measures may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years

Preferred Option Rejected

Preferred Option Explanation

Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy & Adjacent to SSSI.

Settlement	Sherburn in Elmet	Size (Ha)	17.39	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	300	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land adjacent to Prospect Farm, Low Street				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Local Service Centre				
Land Use	Leisure				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural land - residential to the West, agricultural to the North, East and South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SHERBURN/011	SHLAA Ref	Sherburn-7		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(--)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 4.53%, Flood Zone 2 - 1.55%, Flood Zone 1 - 93.92%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.09 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 0.19 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 0.34 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Requirement to consult with Natural England					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(-)
Adjacent to a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Badger (2017) within 1km. New boundary re-assessed October 2020, only badger record remains within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Large arable field with minimal boundary features. Field drain along the eastern boundary. Traditional orchard within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Moderate sensitivity to development</p>	(o)
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	(o)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.</p>	(-)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ Limestone.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 800m of LEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Developer interest shown in the site. Possible decontamination and flood mitigation measures may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>The site provides a logical extension to the housing site which is located directly to the north and is now nearly complete. The development of this site will extend the settlement of Sherburn in Elmet south in line with the built form that exists on the western side of Low Lane and in this respect is regarded as an appropriate rounding off of the town. The site is outside of the worst affected flood Zones and has no other constraints.</p>	Residential

Settlement	Sherburn in Elmet	Size (Ha)	0.47	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	16	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to west of Nos. 8 to 36 (even) Garden Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Local Service Centre				
Land Use	Greenfield land with allotments				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the East, North and North West of the site. Private residential gardens to the West and South of the site				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SHERBURN/006	SHLAA Ref		Sherburn-61	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	95	2.7 % PDL	5
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.61 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(++)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Badger (2017) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Site comprises a series of rough grassland fields with an area of woodland, additional trees (some possibly mature), scrub and hedgerows. There is a small structure on site of unknown age/construction. No priority habitats within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(o)
Moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel/ Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 800m of LEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Sherburn in Elmet	Size (Ha)	2.30	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	68	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land west of Garden Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Local Service Centre				
Land Use	Redundant plant nursery				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the East, agricultural land to the West, field to the South and waste recycling plant				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SHERBURN/019	SHLAA Ref	Sherburn-13		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land		2.7 % GF	0	2.7 % PDL	100
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	3.15 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 8 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 16.31 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(--)
Badger sett on site boundary with SHER-W (2017)					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Agricultural and an area possibly used in the past as a nursery with glass houses, building and growing beds. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Development impacts on a heritage asset and mitigation measures are necessary					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Moderate sensitivity to development</p>	(o)
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 100m of waste facility</p>	(-)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel/ Limestone.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 800m of LEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Sherburn in Elmet	Size (Ha)	0.30	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	6	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Plot 4a & 5a, Church Hill				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Scrubland				
Surrounding Land Uses	Private residential garden to the East. Church Hill road to the North. Fields to the South and West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SHERBURN/048	SHLAA Ref	Sherburn-15		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site but features likely to be protected					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Badger (2017) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Arable field with some boundary hedges and trees. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Development impacts on a heritage asset and mitigation measures are necessary					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(o)
Moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel/ Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use (Historically site was under Multiple land owners caught up in a land banking scam that divided the site up into dozens of tiny ownership parcels)	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. Site is owned by a developer.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Sherburn in Elmet	Size (Ha)	1.18	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	35	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land North of Leeds Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Local Service Centre				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural land to North/South/West. Residential to the East				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SHERBURN/023	SHLAA Ref		Sherburn-62	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site but impact insignificant or unknown					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Badger (2017) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Improved grassland field with good hedgerow to the south and a line of mature trees to the north. No priority habitats within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(--)
This site lies 140 metres from the edge of the site of King Athelstan's Palace which is a Scheduled Monument. The development of this area could also affect the setting of the Grade I Listed Church of All Saints.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(o)
Moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel/ Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	Sherburn in Elmet	Size (Ha)	4.99	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	85	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land North of Millcroft House, Garden Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Surrounded by green field / agricultural land on all sides (disused quarry to the South).				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SHERBURN/024	SHLAA Ref	Sherburn-17		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	2 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Requirement to consult with Natural England					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(--)
Badger sett on site boundary with SHER-R (2017)					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Part of a large arable field with some boundary hedges and trees. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Development impacts on a heritage asset and mitigation measures are necessary					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(-)
The site contains or is close to known archaeological remains and presents a high level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(o)
Moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of waste facility	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel/ Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 800m of LEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible decontamination measures may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Sherburn in Elmet	Size (Ha)	10.32	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	235	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Ellarfield Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Local Service Centre				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural land to the North/ East. Football ground to the West. Existing residential to the South and South-West.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SHERBURN/025	SHLAA Ref		Sherburn-63	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 5% Grade 3 95%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.5 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 1.32 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 10.07 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(++)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Frog (2015) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Arable field with some boundary hedges and trees. There is a field drain on the eastern boundary. No priority habitats within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Low to moderate sensitivity to development</p>	(+)
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road</p>	(-)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.</p>	(-)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ Limestone.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on a Public Right of Way (PRoW) (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 800m of LEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace. PRoW runs through the site)</p>	(-)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible decontamination measures may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Sherburn in Elmet	Size (Ha)	2.54	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	43	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land West of Tadcaster Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	agricultural land to the East, West, unused field to the North and farm to the South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SHERBURN/027	SHLAA Ref	Sherburn-64		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes	Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 95% Grade 3 5%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 6.98%, Flood Zone 2 - 0.75%, Flood Zone 1 - 92.27%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	15.33 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(++)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
All protected species within 1km of site are over 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Arable field with Stream Dike along the northern boundary. Some boundary hedges and trees, particularly to the south and east boundaries. No priority habitats within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Development impacts on a heritage asset and mitigation measures are necessary					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Moderate sensitivity to development</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	<p>(+)</p>
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ Limestone.</p>	<p>(--)</p>
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)</p>	<p>(+)</p>
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	<p>0-5 years</p>
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy</p>	<p>Rejected</p>

Settlement	South Milford	Size (Ha)	6.89	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	165	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land North of LundSyke Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Petrol station/residential to North. Site is bound by A162 to East and South. Agricultural fields to South/South-West/East				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SMILFORD/003	SHLAA Ref	SMilford-40		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 25% Grade 3 75%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.24 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 2.9 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 21.93 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Requirement to consult with Natural England					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(++)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Pipistrelle bat species (2013) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Parcel of arable land and also two small grassland fields all with limited boundary features (well-maintained hedges and few trees). No priority habitats within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact The site contains or is close to little or no archaeological remains	(+)
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps Development does not occur in the SCG	(o)
2.19 Landscape Capacity Low to moderate sensitivity to development	(+)
2.20 Amenity Impact Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	(-)
2.21 Groundwater Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	(+)
2.22 Contamination Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	(o)
2.23 Mineral Resource Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ Limestone.	(--)
2.24 Provision of Open Space Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 800m of LEAP, 400m of LAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	(+)
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	(o)
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use 1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. Site marketed - enquiries have been received	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	South Milford	Size (Ha)	3.09	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	79	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land South of Mill Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural land to South. Residential to West. Civil engineering company to North and nursery to the South-East				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SMILFORD/004	SHLAA Ref	SMilford-41		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					
					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					
Site has excellent access services and employment					(++)
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					
					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					
Development does not impact on employment land					(o)
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					
					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					(o)
2.6 Agricultural Land					
Grade 3 100%					(o)
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	(-)
2.8 Flood Risk					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	2.7 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					
Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					
No known constraints					(o)
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					(+)
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					(o)
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					(-)
2.14 Impact Protected Species					
Pipistrelle bat species (2013) within 1km					(-)
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					
Arable field with good boundary hedges and trees. No priority habitats within 100m.					(+)
2.16 Heritage Assets					
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					(o)

2.17 Archaeological Impact The site contains or is close to little or no archaeological remains	(+)
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps Development does not occur in the SCG	(o)
2.19 Landscape Capacity Low to moderate sensitivity to development	(+)
2.20 Amenity Impact Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	(-)
2.21 Groundwater Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	(+)
2.22 Contamination Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	(o)
2.23 Mineral Resource Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ Limestone.	(--)
2.24 Provision of Open Space Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 800m of LEAP, 400m of LAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	(+)
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	(o)
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use 1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. Site marketed - enquiries have been received	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	South Milford	Size (Ha)	9.81	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	235	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land South of Legion Street				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural fields to the West/South. Restaurant to East. Residential to North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SMILFORD/005	SHLAA Ref	SMilford-42		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(---)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.1 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 1.14 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 4.73 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Requirement to consult with Natural England					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(++)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Pipistrelle bat species (2013) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Large arable field with very limited boundary features. No priority habitats within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact The site contains or is close to known archaeological remains and presents a high level of risk	(-)
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps Development does not occur in the SCG	(o)
2.19 Landscape Capacity Moderate to high sensitivity to development	(-)
2.20 Amenity Impact Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	(-)
2.21 Groundwater Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	(+)
2.22 Contamination Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	(o)
2.23 Mineral Resource Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ Limestone.	(--)
2.24 Provision of Open Space Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 800m of LEAP, 400m of LAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	(+)
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	(o)

3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use 1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs Possible decontamination and flood mitigation measures may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years

Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	South Milford	Size (Ha)	2.61	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	67	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Whitecote Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Farmland to the South, West and North. High Street to the North, existing residential to the East.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SMILFORD/009	SHLAA Ref	SMilford-13		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 0.27%, Flood Zone 1 - 99.73%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	5.88 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England do not need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Pipistrelle bat species roost (2013) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Arable field with some boundary hedges and trees, close to two small woodlands. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
This site lies just 100 metres from the edge of Steeton Hall medieval magnate's residence and manorial centre. This is a Scheduled Monument. Steeton gatehouse and the Hall are both Grade I Listed Buildings and the barn, granary and cartshed Grade II Listed Buildings.					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Moderate to high sensitivity to development</p>	(-)
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	(o)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Limestone.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site within the Green Belt</p>	Rejected

Settlement	South Milford	Size (Ha)	2.67	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	68	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land east of Common Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural to the North, residential to the West, field to the East beyond A162 and field to the South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SMILFORD/010	SHLAA Ref	SMilford-12		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	5.56 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 8.5 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 23 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England do not need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Badger (2014), Common pipistrelle bat roost (2015), Brown long-eared bat maternity roost (2016) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Arable field with good boundary hedges and trees. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 800m of LEAP, 400m of LAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. Site is marketed- no offers.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	South Milford	Size (Ha)	3.54	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	90	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land East of Milford Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Arable farming				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural field to North and East of the Site. Residential and 'gas governor' to the West. Train line to South of site boundary.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SHERBURN/015	SHLAA Ref	SMilford-2		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					
					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					
None					
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					
Site has excellent access services and employment					(++)
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					
					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					
Development does not impact on employment land					(o)
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					
					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					(o)
2.6 Agricultural Land					
Grade 3 100%					(o)
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
					(-)
2.8 Flood Risk					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					(o)
Flood Zone 1 - 100%					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					
Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					
No known constraints					(o)
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					(+)
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					
Requirement to consult with Natural England due to the scale of the development					(-)
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					(o)
2.14 Impact Protected Species					
Badger (2017), Pipistrelle bat species roost (2013) within 1km					(-)
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					
Arable field with limited boundary features except to the south along the railway corridor. No priority habitat within 100m.					(+)
2.16 Heritage Assets					
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					(o)

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(o)
Moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of railway	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 800m of LEAP, 400m of LAP, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	

3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years

Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	Fairburn	Size (Ha)	22.30	Proposed Use	Employment
Housing Capacity	Housing Capacity Notes				
Site Location	Land at junction 42 of the A1(M)				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural Field				
Surrounding Land Uses	A1 to the East of the Site, A63 to the West. Agricultural to the North and South of the Site.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SMILFORD/024	SHLAA Ref	N/A		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					N/A
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(++)
Development would create employment					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(++)
Good national accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(---)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					0.03 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Requirement to consult with Natural England due to the scale of the development					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Blue tit, Wren (2013), Lapwing (2010), Rare spring-sedge, Pasqueflower (2019), Bluebell (2017), three species of bat (2017) within 1km. New boundary re-assessed October 2020.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Deciduous woodland within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for building stone/ shallow coal/ Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(-)
Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on a Public Right of Way (PRoW) (PRoW runs through the site)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners (Site promoted by land promoter). No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Viability Assessment has been undertaken. Possible decontamination measures may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	Fairburn	Size (Ha)	5.92	Proposed Use	Employment
Housing Capacity	Housing Capacity Notes				
Site Location	Land between A1 (Junction 42) and A63				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural Field				
Surrounding Land Uses	A1 to the East of the Site, to the South is the A63 and roundabout for the A1. Agricultural and track to the West of the site and to the North of the site is Agricultural.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SMILFORD/025	SHLAA Ref	N/A		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					N/A
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(++)
Development would create employment					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(++)
Good national accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Requirement to consult with Natural England due to the scale of the development					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(--)
Site overlaps a local or regional nature conservation site. Mitigation required to avoid significant impact.					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Various birds (2013), Bluebell (2017), Noctule bat, Common pipistrelle bat, Soprano pipistrelle bat (2017) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Deciduous woodland within 100m					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 150m of motorway and within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for shallow coal/ Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	South Milford	Size (Ha)	0.58	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	12	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to the south of China Palace, London Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Extant planning permission for partially constructed 60 bed hotel				
Surrounding Land Uses	Employment to the North and South, road/ trees to the east, track/agricultural to the west.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	SMILFORD/026	SHLAA Ref	Smilford-43		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(++)
Site has excellent access services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land		2.7 % GF	0	2.7 % PDL	100
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings		Flood Zone 1 - 100%			
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW		0.85 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water			
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Pipistrelle bat species roost (2013) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 800m of LEAP, 400m of LAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. Site is owned by a developer.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Stillingfleet	Size (Ha)	0.52	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	10	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land south of The Green				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Open grassland				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to North/West. Agricultural fields to South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	STILLINGFLEET/002	SHLAA Ref		Stillingfleet-2	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Smooth newt (2016), Great crested newt (2018), Barn owl (2017), Noctule bat, Soprano bat (2018), Myotis bat species roost, Common pipistrelle bat roost, Brown long-eared bat roost (2018) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Lowland fens within 100m					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Site is located within the South Eastern extent of the Stillingfleet Conservation Area.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Stillingfleet	Size (Ha)	31.67	Proposed Use	Employment
Housing Capacity	Housing Capacity Notes				
Site Location	Former Stillingfleet Mine, Cawood Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural fields and old mine buildings				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural fields to North/East/South/West. Farmhouse to North-West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	STILLINGFLEET/003	SHLAA Ref	N/A		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					N/A
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(--)
Site has very poor access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(++)
Development would create employment					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(o)
Good local accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(--)
Grade 2 10% Grade 3 90%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(o)
Mixed (Greenfield/ Previously Developed Land)	2.7 % GF	50	2.7 % PDL	50	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 2 - 1.12%, Flood Zone 1 - 98.88%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	2.74 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 4.74 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 10.72 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Smooth newt (2016), Great crested newt (2018), Barn owl (2017), Noctule bat, Soprano bat (2018), Myotis bat species roost, Common pipistrelle bat roost, Brown long-eared bat roost (2018) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(--)
Deciduous woodland on site					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(+)
Proposed development replaces an existing negative amenity impact	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. Site is currently being used for Coal Mine Methane Extraction (A planning permission for mine gas methane electricity generators has been granted until 2029)	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Site is owned by a developer. Possible decontamination and flood mitigation measures may add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Stillingfleet	Size (Ha)	173.70	Proposed Use	Mixed Use
Housing Capacity	3000	Housing Capacity Notes	Number of homes specified in site promoter's masterplan		
Site Location	Land to the south of Escrick Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	New Settlement				
Land Use	Agricultural/ farm houses				
Surrounding Land Uses	To the North of the two parcels is a road to the east of the easterly parcel is the A19 and to the east of westerly parcel is trees. To the west of the easterly parcel is trees and to the west of westerly parcel is				
2020 Site Submission Reference	STILLINGFLEET/004	SHLAA Ref	Stillingfleet-14		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					
					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes Ancient woodland within the site.					
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					
Site has good access to services and employment					(+)
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					
Site has acceptable access to services and workforce					(o)
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					
Development would create employment					(++)
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					
Good sub-regional accessibility					(+)
2.5 Physical Point of Access					
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					(+)
2.6 Agricultural Land					
Grade 2 40% Grade 3 60%					(---)
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	95	2.7 % PDL	5	(-)
2.8 Flood Risk					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings Flood Zone 2 - 6.4%, Flood Zone 1 - 93.6%					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW 0.68 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 1.64 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 6.85 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water					
2.9 SFRA Level 2 Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					
major constraint - electricity pylons cross the site					(--)
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					(-)
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					
Site is adjacent to an Ancient Woodland. Appropriate mitigation must be provided.					(--)
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					
Site overlaps a local or regional nature conservation site. Mitigation required to avoid significant impact.					(--)
2.14 Impact Protected Species					
Great crested newt (2012), Bluebell (2018), Depressed river mussel (2014), Common pipistrelle and brow long-eared bat (2013) within 1km.					(-)
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					
Deciduous woodland within boundary.					(--)
2.16 Heritage Assets					
Site is South East of Escrick Conservation Area					(-)

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Site within the built form of the settlement	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW and within 100m Of waste facility	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel. Part of site allocated for the provision of clay and waste management capacity for CD and E waste (M13, W05).	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(-)
Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on a Public Right of Way (PRoW) (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments. PRoW runs through the site)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. Site subject to an agricultural tenancy agreement	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
There have been some discussions with a potential developer partner. Possible decontamination and flood mitigation measures may add to costs. National grid guidelines concerning development around overhead lines may affect the viability of the site. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	New Settlement Proposal
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Tadcaster	Size (Ha)	1.19	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	5	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Fircroft and Former Barnado's Home, Wighill Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Local Service Centre				
Land Use	Vacant children's home and residential				
Surrounding Land Uses	agricultural land to the North and West, Residential to the East and South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	TADCASTER/019	SHLAA Ref	Not added to SHLAA as not formally submitted		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land	2.7 % GF	0	2.7 % PDL	100	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	2.01 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 2.35 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 4.2 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Requirement to consult with Natural England					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(-)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Various birds (2017), Barbel, grayling fish (2014), Salmon (2010), Bluebell (2019), Noctule bat (2011), Soprano pipistrelle bat maternity roost (2013) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Site includes a number of old buildings which have high potential to support bats & nesting birds, the site also has an area of grassland and several large mature trees. The site is directly adjacent to the River Wharfe which is likely to support a range					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(--)
The site includes Fircroft country house, a Grade II Listed Building. Development of this area could harm elements which contribute to the significance of this heritage asset.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(o)
Moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(-)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 2	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Limestone/ Brick Clay	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 800m of LEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Part of the site has previously had a permission (CO/1992/32091). 1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years

Preferred Option

Residential

Preferred Option Explanation

As well as the Listed Building on-site, the site is close to the disused railway viaduct which is also Grade II listed. The development of this area could also affect the setting of the nearby Tadcaster Conservation Area. A Heritage Impact Assessment will need to be undertaken for this site. The development of this site must ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of the designated historic assets are not harmed. It is proposed to allocate this site, but only the bringing back into use the existing buildings amounting to about 5 dwellings. Allocating this small site and bringing back into use these vacant listed buildings will secure their viable future use and will have significant positive benefits for the buildings themselves as well as the immediate surroundings. The aim will be to retain the heritage asset within its formal landscape setting, whilst ensuring occupation and good stewardship into the future.

Settlement	Tadcaster	Size (Ha)	0.95	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	30	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Hillcrest				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Local Service Centre				
Land Use	Greenfield area				
Surrounding Land Uses	Vacant grassed area, residential North South East and West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	TADCASTER/020	SHLAA Ref	Tadcaster-17		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(+)
Urban 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(o)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100% (D1 from EA flood maps)				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(++)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Bluebell (2019), Common pipistrelle bat (2011), Soprano pipistrelle bat (2013) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Area of improved pasture with some hedges and trees on the boundaries. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(-)
The site is within the Roman and medieval town of Tadcaster. Any development proposal would require an archaeological assessment in line with the advice given in the NPPF (para. 189).	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Within the settlement	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Compatible with nearby land uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(-)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 2	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 800m of LEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments. Not included in GSA but impacts on (Recreation Open Space RT1 - recreation ground - TADC08))	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Site has previously had a permission (CO/1976/29931). 1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Residential
Preferred Option Explanation	
The site is close to the town centre and accessible by public transport and close to employment opportunities. There is existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works. There are no know constraints. Allocating this site, on an underused plot of land will have significant positive benefits for the town. The site provides a significant contribution towards the housing needed in the town as part of the mixed portfolio of sites.	

Settlement	Tadcaster	Size (Ha)	4.01	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	119	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land north of Edgerton Drive				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Local Service Centre				
Land Use	Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the North/North-East. Residential to the South. Agricultural to the West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	TADCASTER/011	SHLAA Ref		Tadcaster-25	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(-)
Access can be achieved through third party land but an agreement is not in place.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Requirement to consult with Natural England					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site but impact insignificant or unknown					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Barbel, grayling fish (2014), Salmon (2010), Bluebell (2019), Noctule bat (2011), Common pipistrelle bat roost (2011), Soprano pipistrelle bat maternity roost (2013) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Number of improved pasture fields with hedgerows and mature trees along field boundaries. There is a linear band of broadleaved woodland along the disused railway line to the north. Site likely to support nesting birds and foraging bats. Site adjacent to					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Moderate sensitivity to development</p>	(o)
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	(o)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 1 and 2</p>	(--)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.</p>	(-)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for building stone/ Limestone.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible decontamination measures may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Access can only be achieved through third party land and an agreement is not in place.</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Tadcaster	Size (Ha)	0.27	Proposed Use	Employment
Housing Capacity	Housing Capacity Notes				
Site Location	Land East of Grimston Grange				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Open Land				
Surrounding Land Uses	Business and storage to the West, Agricultural to the South, East and North.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	TADCASTER/012	SHLAA Ref	N/A		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					N/A
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(++)
Development would create employment					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(-)
Poor local accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 2 - 29.54%, Flood Zone 1 - 70.46%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Site is within 500m of an Ancient Woodland					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site but impact insignificant or unknown					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Bluebell (2019), Common pipistrelle bat, Soprano pipistrelle bat (2010), Brown long-eared bat (2018) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone (<1% in Zone 1)	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Viability Assessment has been undertaken. Possible decontamination and flood mitigation measures may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Tadcaster	Size (Ha)	0.08	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	3	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Garage site off Wharfedale Crescent				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Local Service Centre				
Land Use	Garage site				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the West, and South. Open land to the East and Allotments towards the North of the Site.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	TADCASTER/014	SHLAA Ref	Tadcaster-26		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes		Under 0.17ha in size (residential)			
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(+)
Urban 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land		2.7 % GF	0	2.7 % PDL	100
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings		Flood Zone 1 - 100%			
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW		45.1 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water			
2.9 SFRA Level 2		Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA			
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Trecreeper, Great tit (2017), European eel, Atlantic salmon (2010), Barbel, Brown trout, Grayling fish (2014), Bluebell (2019), Common pipistrelle (2011), Soprano pipistrelle (2013) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Coastal and floodplain grazing marsh adjacent to site and deciduous woodland within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Site is adjacent to the Tadcaster conservation area and in the setting of the Grade II listed Tadcaster viaduct and Scheduled monument.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (This is a brownfield site with a low archaeological potential.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(o)
Moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(--)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 1 and 2	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 800m of LEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	

3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. Site has a garage tenancy agreement (4 weeks' notice).	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years

Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Under 0.17ha in size (residential)	

Settlement	Tadcaster	Size (Ha)	31.49	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	368	Housing Capacity Notes	Number of homes specified in site promoter's masterplan		
Site Location	Land north of Kelcbar Hill				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Local Service Centre				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	River to North/East. Agricultural fields to West. Primary school to South. Residential to South-West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	TADCASTER/002, TADCASTER/008	SHLAA Ref	Tadcaster-2		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes		Green Space elements of the site partially within flood Zone 3b & Site has a scheduled monument within its boundary			
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(---)
Grade 2 50% Grade 3 25% Urban 25%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings		Flood Zone 3b - 38.53%, Flood Zone 3a - 3.01%, Flood Zone 2 - 8.22%, Flood Zone 1 - 50.24%			
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW		0.9 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 1.97 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 7.04 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water			
2.9 SFRA Level 2		Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA			
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(-)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Various birds (2017), Barbel, grayling fish (2014), Salmon (2010), Bluebell (2019), Noctule bat (2011), Common pipistrelle bat (2010), Soprano pipistrelle bat maternity roost (2013) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(--)
Within 50m of S41 Broadleaved Woodland and Coastal and floodplain grazing marsh. Trees and hedgerow present on Site. Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh on and adjacent to site. Deciduous woodland adjacent to site.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Part of this site lies within the Tadcaster Conservation Area. This site includes the disused railway viaduct (a Grade II Listed Building) and could affect the setting of Fircroft (another Grade II Listed Building) and the Grade II* Listed Church of St Mary. It also adjoins the edge of Tadcaster motte and bailey castle a Scheduled Monument.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(-)
The site contains or is close to known archaeological remains and presents a high level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(o)
Moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(--)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 1 and 2	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for building stone/ Limestone/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(-)
Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on a Public Right of Way (PRoW) (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 800m of LEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments. PRoW runs through the site)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. Site subject to an agricultural tenancy agreement	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible decontamination and flood mitigation measures may add to costs. Site is under option to a developer.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Site partially within flood Zone 3b & Site has a scheduled monument within its boundary	

Settlement	Tadcaster	Size (Ha)	4.44	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	132	Housing Capacity Notes	Number of homes specified in site promoter's masterplan		
Site Location	Land north of Kelcbar Close				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Local Service Centre				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural land to the South, West, residential to the East and a farm to the North with agricultural land				
2020 Site Submission Reference	TADCASTER/003	SHLAA Ref	Tadcaster-3		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 90% Grade 3 10%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings		Flood Zone 1 - 100%			
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2		Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA			
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site but impact insignificant or unknown					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Various birds (2017), Barbel, grayling fish (2014), Salmon (2010), Bluebell (2019), Noctule bat (2011), Common pipistrelle bat (2011), Soprano pipistrelle bat maternity roost (2013) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Within 50m of S41 Broadleaved Woodland and Coastal Floodplains. Arable field present on Site. Deciduous woodland within 100m					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(-)
The site contains or is close to known archaeological remains and presents a high level of risk (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(o)
Moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(--)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 1 and 2	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for building stone/ Limestone/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner (site promoted by Land Promoter). No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible decontamination measures may add to costs. Site is under option to a developer.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	Tadcaster	Size (Ha)	0.15	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	5	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Auster Bank Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Local Service Centre				
Land Use	Garage site				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the West and South of the Site. Allotments to the East and Agricultural to the North.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	TADCASTER/004	SHLAA Ref	Tadcaster-4		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Under 0.17ha in size (residential)
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(+)
Urban 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land		2.7 % GF	0	2.7 % PDL	100
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings		Flood Zone 1 - 100%			
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW		11.91 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water			
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Trecreeper, Great tit (2017), European eel, Atlantic salmon (2010), Barbel, Brown trout, Grayling fish (2014), Bluebell (2017) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (This is a brownfield site with a low archaeological potential.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Site within the built form of the settlement	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 800m of LEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. Site has a garage tenancy agreement (4 weeks' notice).	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Under 0.17ha in size (residential)	

Settlement	Tadcaster	Size (Ha)	0.66	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	43	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Central Area Car Park				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Local Service Centre				
Land Use	Car park and public house				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential/Commercial to East/South/West. Council offices to North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	TADCASTER/016	SHLAA Ref		Not added to SHLAA as not formally submitted	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(+)
Urban 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land		2.7 % GF	0	2.7 % PDL	100
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 2 - 7.27%, Flood Zone 1 - 92.73%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	1.64 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 5.45 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 30.74 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Various birds (2017), Barbel, grayling fish (2014), Salmon (2010), Bluebell (2019), Noctule bat (2011), Common pipistrelle bat (2011), Soprano pipistrelle bat maternity roost (2013) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Trees and buildings present on Site. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(--)
Development of this site could impact upon the significance of a number of designated heritage assets in its vicinity. These include The Ark and The Old Vicarage to the north of the site, both of which are Grade II* Listed Buildings, and several Grade II Listed Buildings along High Street to the south.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(-)
The site contains or is close to known archaeological remains and presents a high level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Site within the built form of the settlement	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(--)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 1 and 2	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 800m of LEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Residential
Preferred Option Explanation	
This is a brownfield site within Development Limits in the centre of the town and due to its location provides an opportunity for an enhancement of this site through the redevelopment for a high density residential scheme. The proposal provides an opportunity to redevelop the existing car park for a high density residential scheme, which will reinstate the historic residential land use on this site and attract new residents to the town centre.	

Settlement	Tadcaster	Size (Ha)	3.03	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	248	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Mill Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Local Service Centre				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to North/East. Convenience store to South. Open fields/viaduct to North-West. River to West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	TADCASTER/022	SHLAA Ref		Tadcaster-19	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(+)
Urban 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land		2.7 % GF	0	2.7 % PDL	100
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3b - 8.84%, Flood Zone 3a - 37.03%, Flood Zone 2 - 10.84%, Flood Zone 1 - 43.29%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.09 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 1.38 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	See results of Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(-)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Trecreeper, Great tit (2017), European eel, Atlantic salmon (2010), Barbel, Brown trout, Grayling fish (2014), Bluebell (2019), Soprano pipistrelle bat (2013) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
A mixed site with some farmland (pasture), mature trees along Mill Lane, adjacent to the river and within the field. Site is directly adjacent to the River Wharfe. Coastal and floodplain grazing marsh and deciduous woodland within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(--)
Development of this site could impact upon the significance of a number of designated heritage assets in its vicinity. Parts of the site are within Tadcaster Conservation Area. There are a number of Listed Buildings in the vicinity of the site including the Church of St Mary, a Grade II* Listed Building. The Disused Railway Viaduct over the River Wharf at the sites northern end, and Wharf Bridge at its southern end, are both Grade II Listed. When assessing this site, consideration should be given as to whether any of the buildings or structures on the site associated with the former mill should be classified as non-designated heritage assets.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(o)
Moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(--)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 1, and 3.	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Limestone/ Brick Clay	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 800m of LEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 Extant permission (CO/1992/1168). 1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
The gaining of a planning permission previously by a developer is some indication that the site is economically viable to the housing market. Possible decontamination and flood mitigation measures may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years

Preferred Option

Residential

Preferred Option Explanation

This large, well located site with an extant planning permission as well as current planning application, will make a major contribution to meeting housing needs for the town and support the wider regeneration ambitions through the town centre strategy. A small part of the site is within the Conservation Area and the remainder is in very close proximity. The site is a prominent site as viewed from the west across the river to the riverside area and town centre beyond where there are a number of listed buildings and a Scheduled Monument.

Settlement	Tadcaster	Size (Ha)	3.47	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	104	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Station Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Local Service Centre				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	To the South/East are residential properties. The rest of the site neighbours agricultural land.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	TADCASTER/024	SHLAA Ref	Not added to SHLAA as not formally submitted		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 90% Urban 10%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.36 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Barbel, grayling fish (2014), Salmon (2010), Bluebell (2019), Noctule bat (2011), Common pipistrelle bat (2011), Soprano pipistrelle bat maternity roost (2013) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Arable oil seed rape field present on site. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Site within the built form of the settlement</p>	N/A
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Compatible with nearby land uses</p>	(o)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 1 and 2</p>	(--)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for building stone/ Limestone.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 800m of LEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use. Site previously allocated in the 2005 Selby District Local Plan and has not been developed by the land owner.</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>The site represents a sustainable rounding off for the town in this area significantly contributing to meeting the housing needs as part of the mixed portfolio of sites in this option. The site was previously allocated for residential use in the Selby District Local Plan (reference TAD/2) but had not been brought forward.</p>	Residential

Settlement	Tadcaster	Size (Ha)	0.24	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	17	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Wighill Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Local Service Centre				
Land Use	Derelict Residential properties				
Surrounding Land Uses	Site is surrounded by residential properties. Vacant land to the South.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	TADCASTER/018	SHLAA Ref	Tadcaster-10		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(+)
Urban 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land		2.7 % GF	0	2.7 % PDL	100
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(-)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Trecreeper, Great tit (2017), European eel, Atlantic salmon (2010), Barbel, Brown trout, Grayling fish (2014), Bluebell (2019) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Site with some derelict buildings and some development already taking place. Some of the old buildings have potential to support bats. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Consideration should be given as to whether any buildings or structures on the site, or in its vicinity, should be classified as non-designated heritage assets and treated accordingly in developing proposals for the site.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement. Any development proposal would require an archaeological assessment in line with the advice given in the NPPF (para. 189). (The site is adjacent to and partly includes the Scheduled Monument of Newton Kyme Roman Fort, Henge and Roman civilian settlement. The scheduled part of the site should not be allocated. The remainder of the site has a high archaeological potential for associated features.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Within the settlement	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(-)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 2	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Limestone/ Brick Clay	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 800m of LEAP, 400m of Amenity Greenspace, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Site has previously had a permission (2014/0645/FUL). 1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
The gaining of a planning permission previously by a developer is some indication that the site is economically viable to the housing market. Possible decontamination measures may add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Residential
Preferred Option Explanation	
Part of the site has outstanding planning permission and has therefore been considered sustainable through the application process and has been further assessed through the SAM. Allocating this small site and bringing back into use these vacant buildings will have significant positive benefits for the buildings themselves as well as the immediate surroundings. The site provides for a small contribution towards the housing needed in the town as part of the mixed portfolio of sites.	

Settlement	Tadcaster	Size (Ha)	12.57	Proposed Use	Leisure
Housing Capacity	Housing Capacity Notes				
Site Location	London Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Local Service Centre				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to West. Sports facilities to North. Agricultural fields to East/South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	TADCASTER/023	SHLAA Ref	N/A		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					N/A
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(+)
Good sub-regional accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 30% Grade 3 40% Urban 40%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	80	2.7 % PDL	20	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 2 - 1.62%, Flood Zone 1 - 98.38%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	2.37 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 4.41 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 11.59 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England do not need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Barbel, grayling fish (2014), Salmon (2010), Bluebell (2019), Noctule bat (2011), Common pipistrelle bat (2011), Soprano pipistrelle bat maternity roost (2013), Brown long-eared bat roost (2018) within 1km. New boundary re-assessed in October 2020, no cha					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Within 50m of S41 Broadleaved Woodland. Large area of arable grassland present on Site. Deciduous woodland within 100m					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
There are no designated heritage assets in the vicinity of the site that are likely to be affected by development.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Site within the built form of the settlement	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Proposed recreational use is compatible with adjoining uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(--)
Site partly within Groundwater Protection Zone 1, 2 and 3	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(-)
Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on TADC-08 (Formal Outdoor Sports Provision)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years

Preferred Option

Car Parking

Preferred Option Explanation

This preferred option: brings much needed housing back into the centre of the town; is heritage-led; protecting and enhancing the town's rich historic fabric; brings forward brownfield sites before greenfield land in a planned and phased approach; provides a comprehensive and flexible car parking strategy to support shoppers, workers, residents and visitors; delivers replacement car parking prior to the redevelopment of the Central Area Car Park; will be a catalyst for bringing back into use a number of empty properties and sites for housing and commercial use; supports a new Sports Park and Community Hub, significantly enhancing sports and recreation provision for the community; can be delivered within the Plan period to 2040; and avoids releasing land from the Green Belt.

Settlement	Tadcaster	Size (Ha)	0.34	Proposed Use	Parking
Housing Capacity	Housing Capacity Notes				
Site Location	Robin Hood Yard, Kirkgate				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Local Service Centre				
Land Use	Car park and access for shops.				
Surrounding Land Uses	The site is in the town centre. Housing to North and East. Shops on Kirkgate and Bridge Street to South and West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	TADCASTER/017	SHLAA Ref	N/A		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					
					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					
					N/A
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					
Site has acceptable access to services and workforce					(o)
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					
Development does not impact on employment land					(o)
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					
Poor local accessibility					(-)
2.5 Physical Point of Access					
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					(o)
2.6 Agricultural Land					
Urban 100%					(+)
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					
Previously Developed Land					(+)
		2.7 % GF	0	2.7 % PDL	100
2.8 Flood Risk					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					(--)
Flood Zone 3b - 83.18%, Flood Zone 3a - 14.39%, Flood Zone 2 - 2.44%					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
This is over 100% speak to Aecom 14.57 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 43.59 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 59.49 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					
Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					
No known constraints					(o)
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					(+)
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England do not need to be consulted.					(-)
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					(o)
2.14 Impact Protected Species					
Various birds (2017), Barbel, grayling fish (2014), Salmon (2010), Bluebell (2019), Noctule bat (2011), Common pipistrelle bat (2011), Soprano pipistrelle bat maternity roost (2013) within 1km					(-)
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					
Urban location with trees and buildings present on Site. Deciduous woodland within 100m					(-)
2.16 Heritage Assets					
Development of this site could impact upon the significance of a number of designated heritage assets in its vicinity. The site is within Tadcaster Conservation Area. There are a number of Listed Buildings in the vicinity of the site including the Church of St Mary to the north east of the site, a Grade II* Listed Building, along with numerous Grade II Listed Buildings on Kirkgate, Bridge Street and Wharfe Bank Terrace.					(--)

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(-)
The site contains or is close to known archaeological remains and presents a high level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Site within the built form of the settlement	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(--)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 1	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(-)
Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on a Public Right of Way (PRoW) (PRoW runs through the site)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years

Preferred Option

Car Parking

Preferred Option Explanation

This preferred option: brings much needed housing back into the centre of the town; is heritage-led; protecting and enhancing the town's rich historic fabric;brings forward brownfield sites before greenfield land in a planned and phased approach; provides a comprehensive and flexible car parking strategy to support shoppers, workers, residents and visitors; delivers replacement car parking prior to the redevelopment of the Central Area Car Park; will be a catalyst for bringing back into use a number of empty properties and sites for housing and commercial use; supports a new Sports Parka and Community Hub, significantly enhancing sports and recreation provision for the community; can be delivered within the Plan period to 2040; and avoids releasing land from the Green Belt.

Settlement	Tadcaster	Size (Ha)	0.22	Proposed Use	Parking
Housing Capacity	Housing Capacity Notes				
Site Location	Land at Powerplus				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Local Service Centre				
Land Use	commercial buildings				
Surrounding Land Uses	River to South. Public houses/bus station to East. Convenience store to North-West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	TADCASTER/021	SHLAA Ref	N/A		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					N/A
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(+)
Site has good access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(+)
Good sub-regional accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(+)
Urban 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land	2.7 % GF	0	2.7 % PDL	100	
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3b - 100% (D1 from EA Flood maps)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England do not need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(-)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Trecreeper, Great tit (2017), European eel, Atlantic salmon (2010), Barbel, Brown trout, Grayling fish (2014), Bluebell (2019), Soprano pipistrelle bat maternity roost (2013) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Trees, scrub and buildings present on Site. River Wharfe adjacent to the South of the Site.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(--)
The site is within the Tadcaster Conservation Area and adjacent to the Grade II Listed Wharf Bridge. Development of this area could harm elements which contribute to the significance of these heritage assets.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Within the settlement	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(--)
Site in Groundwater Protection Zone 1 and 2	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(-)
Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on a Public Right of Way (PRoW) (PRoW runs through the site)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site at risk of flooding	

Settlement	Tadcaster	Size (Ha)	1.93	Proposed Use	Employment
Housing Capacity	Housing Capacity Notes				
Site Location	Willow Farm, Doncaster Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Local Service Centre				
Land Use	Farm and agriculture field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural land to the West/East. wooded area to the South and agricultural to the North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	TADCASTER/009	SHLAA Ref	N/A		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Site partially within flood Zone 3b
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					N/A
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(++)
Development would create employment					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(+)
Good sub-regional accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	85	2.7 % PDL	15	
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3b - 1.49%, Flood Zone 2 - 54.93%, Flood Zone 1 - 43.57%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					0.32 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England do not need to be consulted. Site is within 100m of an Ancient Woodland.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Bluebell (2019), Common pipistrelle bat (2011), Soprano pipistrelle bat maternity roost (2013) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Within 50m of S41 Broadleaved Woodland. Trees, building and hedgerow present on Site. Deciduous woodland and Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh within 100m					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 150m of Trunk road and within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(-)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 2 and 3	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Viability Assessment has been undertaken. Possible decontamination and flood mitigation measures may add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site at risk of flooding	

Settlement	Tadcaster	Size (Ha)	3.86	Proposed Use	Employment
Housing Capacity	Housing Capacity Notes				
Site Location	Land West of Grimston Grange				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural Field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Business and Agricultural to the East, Agricultural to the North, West and South. Track to the business also to the South.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	TADCASTER/013	SHLAA Ref	N/A		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					N/A
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(++)
Development would create employment					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(-)
Poor local accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3b - 5.2%, Flood Zone 3a - 0.01%, Flood Zone 2 - 74.59%, Flood Zone 1 - 20.2%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Site is within 500m of an Ancient Woodland					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Bluebell (2019), Common pipistrelle bat (2011), Soprano pipistrelle bat (2010), Brown long-eared bat roost (2018) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Deciduous woodland and Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh within 100m					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan</p>	<p></p>
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site partly within Groundwater Protection Zone 1 and 2</p>	<p>(--)</p>
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Limestone.</p>	<p>(--)</p>
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Viability Assessment has been undertaken. Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	<p>0-5 years</p>
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site at risk of flooding</p>	<p>Rejected</p>

Settlement	Thorganby	Size (Ha)	0.28	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	6	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to the west of The Poplars, Westfield Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Land owned by the resident of The Poplars, but falls outside the curtilage.				
Surrounding Land Uses	Minor road to the North. Residential/ farm buildings to the east and open land/ surrounding the remainder of the site.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	THORGANBY/002	SHLAA Ref		Thorganby-1	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Toad (2011), Bluebell (2014), Myotis bat species roost (2012) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(--)
Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh on and adjacent to site. Deciduous woodland within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Site is located adjacent to the Western extent of the Thorganby conservation area. Thorganby House is located South East and is a Grade II listed building.					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)</p>	(+)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.</p>	N/A
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW</p>	(-)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)</p>	(o)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Thorganby	Size (Ha)	0.45	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	9	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Pinfold Farm, Main Street				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Vacant site				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the west of the site. With open land surrounding the remainder of land.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	THORGANBY/003	SHLAA Ref	Thorganby-2		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	90	2.7 % PDL	10	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 2 - 0.8%, Flood Zone 1 - 99.2%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	2.96 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Toad (2011), Bluebell (2014), Myotis bat species roost (2012) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh within 100m					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Site is located within the Thorganby conservation area. West Cottingwith Hall is located North East and is a Grade II listed building.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs. Site is owned by a developer	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Thorganby	Size (Ha)	0.20	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	4	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Yard to the rear of Pasture Cottage				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	The site is currently used as a Haulage Yard				
Surrounding Land Uses	To the North is open land/ agricultural to the east is residential, to the South is residential/garden land. To the west is open land/ agricultural.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	THORGANBY/004	SHLAA Ref	Thorganby-7		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(--)
Development would result in a loss of employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land		2.7 % GF	0	2.7 % PDL	100
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 2 - 0.98%, Flood Zone 1 - 99.02%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Various birds recorded between 2011 and 2015, Bluebell (2012), Marsh stitchwort (2015), Brown hare (2015) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Deciduous woodland within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Site is within the Thorganby conservation area.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (This is a brownfield site with a low archaeological potential.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Joint Landowners . No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs. Site marketed - enquiries have been received	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	Thorganby	Size (Ha)	0.23	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	5	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Thorganby Gale				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	To the North and South is residential to the east is a road and to the west is agricultural/ open land.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	THORGANBY/005	SHLAA Ref	Thorganby-8		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(-)
Site has poor access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
All protected species within 1km of site are over 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)</p>	(+)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.</p>	N/A
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	(o)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.</p>	(-)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)</p>	(o)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy</p>	<p>Rejected</p>

Settlement	Thorganby	Size (Ha)	0.16	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	3	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Thorganby Gale				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	to the North is residential, to the east and South is a road and to the west is agricultural/open land.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	THORGANBY/006	SHLAA Ref	Thorganby-9		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes		Under 0.17ha in size (residential) & Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy			
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(-)
Site has poor access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings		Flood Zone 1 - 100%			
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2		Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA			
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
All protected species within 1km of site are over 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)</p>	(+)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.</p>	N/A
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	(o)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.</p>	(o)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site failed initial sift - Under 0.17ha in size (residential) & Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy</p>	<p>Rejected</p>

Settlement	Thorpe Willoughby	Size (Ha)	2.01	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	51	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land North of Leeds Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Small cluster of dwellings / farm buildings to the East, fields to the North and West, with the A1238 providing a strong boundary to the South.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	THORPE/004	SHLAA Ref	ThorpeW-4		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 0.27%, Flood Zone 2 - 0.01%, Flood Zone 1 - 99.72%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					1.07 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 5.28 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Toad (2011), Bluebell (2014), Myotis bat species roost (2012) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Arable field with Town Dike along the northern boundary, limited boundary hedges and some mature trees. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of LAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. Site has a AHA (Agricultural Holdings Act tenancy). If planning permission was obtained, the owner can serve a Case B Notice to Quit.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Thorpe Willoughby	Size (Ha)	2.22	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	38	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land West of Harry Moor Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural land North, South, East and West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	THORPE/005	SHLAA Ref	ThorpeW-5		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	2.52 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Toad (2011), Bluebell (2014), Myotis bat species roost (2012) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW and within 100m of railway	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of LAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. Site has a AHA (Agricultural Holdings Act tenancy). If planning permission was obtained, the owner can serve a Case B Notice to Quit.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	6-10 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Thorpe Willoughby	Size (Ha)	5.75	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	92	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land west of Harry Moore Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural land West, South and East with railway line to the North.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	THORPE/007	SHLAA Ref	ThorpeW-6		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 95% Grade 3 5%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	16.13 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Myotis bat species roost (2012) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW and within 100m of railway	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. Site has a 3 year Farm Business Tenancy until 2021	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible decontamination measures may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Thorpe Willoughby	Size (Ha)	2.99	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	51	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land west of Meadow View Farm				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural land to the North, West and South with small cluster of houses / agricultural units to the East.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	THORPE/008	SHLAA Ref	ThorpeW-7		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 0.11%, Flood Zone 1 - 99.89%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					1.04 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 3.07 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 10.11 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Toad (2011), Bluebell (2014), Myotis bat species roost (2012) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of LAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. Site has a 3 year Farm Business Tenancy until 2021	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Site marketed - enquiries have been received. Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Thorpe Willoughby	Size (Ha)	2.50	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	70	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land north of Field Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Former pig farm				
Surrounding Land Uses	Parts of the centre to the North and West, sports pitches / facilities to the East with the A63 providing a strong boundary to the South.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	THORPE/010	SHLAA Ref	ThorpeW-9		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land		2.7 % GF	25	2.7 % PDL	75
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	2.38 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Toad (2011), Bluebell (2014) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Site with modern agricultural buildings, perimeter woodland, improved grassland and trees. Deciduous woodland within 100m					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(+)
Proposed development replaces an existing negative amenity impact	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 400m of LAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 Extant Permission. 1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
The gaining of a planning permission by a developer is some indication that the site is economically viable to the housing market. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Residential
Preferred Option Explanation	
This site was given planning permission for 70 houses (reference 2018/0134/REMM) on the 22 July 2020 - after the base date of this plan - therefore it is allocated for housing in this plan. The site represents an opportunity to remove derelict pig farm buildings and is also very well screened by existing vegetation	

Settlement	Thorpe Willoughby	Size (Ha)	4.99	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	127	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land South of Leeds Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Pig Breeding Centre				
Surrounding Land Uses	Former piggery to the South / South West with new housing development to the East and A1238 to the North with open field views.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	THORPE/012	SHLAA Ref	ThorpeW-11		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	85	2.7 % PDL	15
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	3.28 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Toad (2011), Bluebell (2014), Hedgehog (2017), Unidentified Myotis species of bat (2012) within 1km. Ne boundary re-assessed October 2020.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Agricultural field with hedgerows and some mature trees on the west and south boundaries. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 400m of LAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Interest from developers. Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years

Preferred Option

Residential

Preferred Option Explanation

The site marks a logical western extension to the village of Thorpe Willoughby. The site is currently surrounded by residential to the east and is contained by Leeds Road to the north and has established hedgerows to the west. The site is adjacent to Leeds Road and so has quick access to the A63 for access west towards Leeds and east towards Selby. In the landscape sensitivity it was identified as having a low to moderate sensitivity to development and the site is located wholly within Flood Zone 1.

Settlement	Thorpe Willoughby	Size (Ha)	14.96	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	292	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land South of Field Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	A63 defines the Southern edge of the site, residential to the North and Brayton Barff to the immediate East.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	THORPE/013/15/16	SHLAA Ref		ThorpeW-12	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes Adjacent to ancient woodland.					
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 40% Grade 4 60%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings Flood Zone 1 - 100%					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW 0.25 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 0.97 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 3.91 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water					
2.9 SFRA Level 2 Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(--)
Site is adjacent to an Ancient Woodland.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(-)
Site is adjacent to a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Toad (2011), Various birds (2017), Bluebell (2014) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Two rough grassland fields and 1 arable field with tree planting (assumed to be screen planting for the A63). Hedgerow along Field Lane and some mature trees along the east boundary. Site adjacent to Deciduous woodland					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Eastern extent of the site is in the southern setting of Grade II listed Barff Farmhouse.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (The site has been partly evaluated by geophysical survey with some anomalies of archaeological interest.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(-)
Moderate to high sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(-)
Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on a Public Right of Way (PRoW) (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace. PRoW runs through the site)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	6-10 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Thorpe Willoughby	Size (Ha)	3.82	Proposed Use	Mixed Use
Housing Capacity	65	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land East of A63 Roundabout				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Arable farming				
Surrounding Land Uses	A63 to the west, South, North agricultural land beyond. Residential/Agricultural to East				
2020 Site Submission Reference	HAMBLETON/007	SHLAA Ref	ThorpeW-14		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(+)
Good sub-regional accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.31 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Toad (2011) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (The site is partly brownfield and partly greenfield. The greenfield parts of the site have high archaeological potential, particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Low to moderate sensitivity to development</p>	(+)
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road</p>	(-)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3</p>	(o)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of LAP)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. Developer Interest in the site historically.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Thorpe Willoughby	Size (Ha)	2.47	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	42	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land north of Field Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Woodland and field				
Surrounding Land Uses	A63 to the South, woodland beyond. Sports ground to the west, agricultural to the North and west				
2020 Site Submission Reference	THORPE/019	SHLAA Ref	ThorpeW-19		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land		2.7 % GF	0	2.7 % PDL	100
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Toad (2011), Bluebell (2014) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road and within 100m of pig farm	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 400m of LAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. Site is owned by a developer.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Thorpe Willoughby	Size (Ha)	0.43	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	13	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Swallowvale Leeds Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Residential				
Surrounding Land Uses	Road to the North and residential/ farm buildings to the South. The remainder of land surrounding is agricultural land.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	THORPE/021	SHLAA Ref	ThorpeW-22		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land		2.7 % GF	0	2.7 % PDL	100
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Toad (2011) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is, in part, a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of LAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. Site marketed - enquiries have been received. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years

Preferred Option

Residential

Preferred Option Explanation

The site marks a logical western extension to the village of Thorpe Willoughby. The site is currently surrounded by residential to the east and is contained by Leeds Road to the north and has established hedgerows to the west. The site is adjacent to Leeds Road and so has quick access to the A63 for access west towards Leeds and east towards Selby. In the landscape sensitivity it was identified as having a low to moderate sensitivity to development and it is outside of any high flood risk areas. This site is able to contribute to the requirement in the NPPF for land on small sites (i.e. those under 1ha) to accommodate at least 10% of housing requirements.

Settlement	Thorpe Willoughby	Size (Ha)	5.07	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	122	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land east of Linden Way				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural buildings and land.				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the West and Barff House Farm to the South. Currently open fields to the North and to the East				
2020 Site Submission Reference	THORPE/014	SHLAA Ref		ThorpeW-16	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Adjacent to ancient woodland.
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 90% Grade 4 10%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	90	2.7 % PDL	10
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	2.29 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Toad (2011), Bluebell (2014), Various birds (2017), Myotis bat species roost (2012) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Site itself includes farmland, some small agricultural structures plus some hedgerows and trees. The site is in close proximity to Brayton Barff SINC which is an ancient semi natural woodland. Deciduous woodland within 100m					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(--)
Site is located immediately adjacent to Barff Farmhouse which is a Grade II listed building and would be a significant adverse impact on setting of heritage assets or involve loss of heritage asset.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(o)
Moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(-)
Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on a Public Right of Way (PRoW) (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 1200m of NEAP, 400m of LAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace. PRoW runs through the site)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years

Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.+BS328BS311:BS371BS294:BS371BS360BS345:BS371BS277:BS371BS360BS345:BS371BSBS345:BS371	

Settlement	Towton	Size (Ha)	0.67	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	13	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Towton Hall				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Employment use				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to North/East. Towton Hall to West. Residential to South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	TOWTON/002	SHLAA Ref	Towton-2		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land		2.7 % GF	25	2.7 % PDL	75
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(-)
Major constraints exist - northern tip of site within middle 270m and outer 80m buffer Zones of Pannal to Carnwood Gas pipeline					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Natterer's bat roost, Brown long-eared bat roost (2015), Common pipistrelle (2015) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Deciduous woodland within 100m					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(--)
Site located within the Eastern extent of the Towton designated battlefield.					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site contains or is close to known archaeological remains and presents a high level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement. The area is within the designated area of the Battle of Towton. The impact of the allocation on the legibility of the Battlefield is likely to preclude its deliverability (NPPF para. 194).)</p>	(-)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.</p>	N/A
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW and within 100m of A road</p>	(-)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for Limestone.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would add an open space asset identified as required in the vicinity (Site is in an area of identified need as falls outside buffer of LEAPS, NEAPS and LAPs, Amenity Greenspace, Parks and recreation, skate parks, allotment and small natural/semi natural greenspace areas.)</p>	(++)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues (Viability Assessment has been undertaken).</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Ulleskelf	Size (Ha)	2.83	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	72	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land south of Barley Horn Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to North/South. Agricultural fields to East/West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	ULLESKELF/005	SHLAA Ref	Ulleskelf-4		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 2 - 63.35%, Flood Zone 1 - 36.65%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	11.25 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(-)
Major constraint exists - within middle 270m and outer 280m buffers of Pannal to Cawood Gas Pipeline					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Barn owl (2019), Barbel, grayling, salmon (2014), Water vole (2017), Myotis bat species, Noctule bat, Common pipistrelle bat, Soprano pipistrelle bat (2015) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Large arable field with some boundary hedges and trees. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement. The area is also on the periphery of the Battle of Towton with skirmishes known to have taken place in this area before the main event.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Low to moderate sensitivity to development</p>	(+)
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 100m of railway</p>	(-)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, and 400m of LAP)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Viability Assessment has been undertaken. Possible decontamination and flood mitigation measures may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site at risk of flooding</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Ulleskelf	Size (Ha)	0.98	Proposed Use	Mixed Use
Housing Capacity	29	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Ulleskelf Station				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Railway Station				
Surrounding Land Uses	Railway line to West. Residential to North/East/South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	ULLESKELF/006	SHLAA Ref	Ulleskelf-5		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(++)
Development would create employment					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(++)
Good national accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land		2.7 % GF	0	2.7 % PDL	100
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	4.51 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Barn owl (2019), Barbel, grayling, salmon (2014), Water vole (2017), Myotis bat species, Noctule bat, Common pipistrelle bat, Soprano pipistrelle bat (2015) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Site consists of rough grassland, scrub, trees and some buildings of unknown age, use and construction. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Site within the built form of the settlement	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of railway	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 400m of LAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible decontamination measures may add to costs. Site previously not marketed due to affordability % issues. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Ulleskelf	Size (Ha)	3.54	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	90	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at New Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to North. Railway Station to East. Agricultural field to South. Sports facilities to West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	ULLESKELF/011	SHLAA Ref	Ulleskelf-13		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					
					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					(o)
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					
					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					
Development does not impact on employment land					(o)
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					
					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					(o)
2.6 Agricultural Land					
Grade 2 100%					(-)
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
					(-)
2.8 Flood Risk					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 2 - 95.14%, Flood Zone 1 - 4.86%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	1.94 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					
Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					
No known constraints					(o)
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					(+)
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England do not need to be consulted.					(-)
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					(+)
2.14 Impact Protected Species					
Barn owl (2019), Barbel, grayling, salmon (2014), Water vole (2017), Myotis bat species, Soprano pipistrelle bat (2015), Noctule bat (2016), Common pipistrelle bat roost, Brown long-eared bat roost (2016) within 1km					(-)
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					
Part of an arable field and also part of a sports field - with some hedgerows and trees to the north. No priority habitat within 100m.					(+)
2.16 Heritage Assets					
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					(o)

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Northern half of the site in an area with low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of railway	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(-)
Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on ULLE-01 (Formal Outdoor Sports Provision) (Site within 400m of LAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site at risk of flooding	

Settlement	Ulleskelf	Size (Ha)	7.00	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	168	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land off Bell Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural Field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to West/North. Agricultural fields to South/East				
2020 Site Submission Reference	ULLESKELF/012	SHLAA Ref	Ulleskelf-17		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	85	2.7 % PDL	15	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 0.59%, Flood Zone 2 - 1.07%, Flood Zone 1 - 98.34%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.28 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 5.39 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(-)
Major constraint exists - within middle 270m and outer 280m buffers of Pannal to Cawood Gas Pipeline					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Requirement to consult with Natural England					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(++)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(--)
Water vole (2017) observed within ditch along southern boundary of site. Barn owl roost (2019), Various fish (2014), Brown hare (2015), Three species of bat (2015) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Large site with a variety of agricultural fields with hedges, in field and boundary trees (some mature). No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Development impacts on a heritage asset and mitigation measures are necessary					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(-)
Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on a Public Right of Way (PRoW) (Site within 1200m of small natural and/or semi-natural greenspace, 400m of LAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace. PRoW runs through the site)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. Possible decontamination and flood mitigation measures may add to costs. Site marketed - enquiries have been received. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Potential negative impacts on the character and form of the settlement.	

Settlement	Ulleskelf	Size (Ha)	1.37	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	35	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land East of Bell Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	To the North is residential to the east is employment to the South and west is a road.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	ULLESKELF/010	SHLAA Ref	Ulleskelf-16		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Barn owl roost (2019), Various fish (2014), Brown hare (2015), Water vole (2017), Three species of bat (2015) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
The site is adjacent to Manor Farm Cottages, a Grade II Listed Building. Development of this area could harm elements which contribute to the significance of this heritage asset.					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 400m of LAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Residential
Preferred Option Explanation	
The site has no constraints, has good access to a B road and is in Flood Zone 1.	

Settlement	Ulleskelf	Size (Ha)	0.35	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	11	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Hall Garth				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	To the North is open land/ agricultural, to the east is residential/ road, to the South is a road and to the west is a railway line.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	ULLESKELF/013	SHLAA Ref	Ulleskelf-18		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	95	2.7 % PDL	5
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings Flood Zone 3b - 14.92%, Flood Zone 3a - 0.04%, Flood Zone 2 - 69.14%, Flood Zone 1 - 15.9%					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW 0.99 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 5.43 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 9.66 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water					
2.9 SFRA Level 2 Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Barn owl roost (2019), Various fish (2014), Brown hare (2015), Water vole (2017), Three species of bat (2015) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Coastal and floodplain grazing marsh adjacent to site.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This site has archaeological potential, particularly for medieval settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Site within the built form of the settlement	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of railway	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 400m of LAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. Possible flood mitigation may add to costs. Site marketed - enquiries have been received.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site at risk of flooding	

Settlement	West Haddlesey	Size (Ha)	0.23	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	5	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Main Street				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Playground				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural to the North and East of the site. Residential to the west and a road to the South of the site.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	WHADDLESEY/001	SHLAA Ref	Whaddlesey-3		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 20% Grade 3 80%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 2 - 86.79%, Flood Zone 1 - 13.21%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
All protected species within 1km of site are over 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(--)
Existing open space asset or public accessibility would be lost. Mitigation measures unsatisfactory or not proposed - Impacts on WHAD-01 (Park and Equipped Play Area - LEAP) (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 800m of LEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. Current lease agreement with Parish Council for Children’s Play park	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
No allocations proposed in this tier of the settlement hierarchy	

Settlement	West Haddlesey	Size (Ha)	0.11	Proposed Use	Leisure
Housing Capacity	Housing Capacity Notes				
Site Location	Land to the rear of Main Street				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Open Land				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural to the North and East with Open land to the South and West. Also a track to the West of the site.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	WHADDLESEY/002	SHLAA Ref	N/A		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					N/A
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(-)
Poor local accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(-)
Access can be achieved through third party land but an agreement is not in place.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					0.38 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 0.86 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 2.5 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
All protected species within 1km of site are over 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Whitley	Size (Ha)	0.38	Proposed Use	Residential	
Housing Capacity	11	Housing Capacity Notes				
Site Location	Ashcroft, Templar Close					
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village					
Land Use	Residential property and agricultural field					
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to North/South/East. Agricultural fields to West					
2020 Site Submission Reference	WHITLEY/001	SHLAA Ref	Whitley-1			
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?						No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None					
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment						(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment						
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services						N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land						(o)
Development does not impact on employment land						
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network						N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access						(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.						
2.6 Agricultural Land						(-)
Grade 2 100%						
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land						(o)
Mixed (Greenfield/ Previously Developed Land)	2.7 % GF	50	2.7 % PDL	50		
2.8 Flood Risk						(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW						
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints						(o)
No known constraints						
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)						(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.						
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)						(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites						
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site						(++)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site						
2.14 Impact Protected Species						(o)
All protected species within 1km of site are over 10 years old.						
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect						(+)
Horse pasture, boundary hedges and trees, domestic dwelling and associated garden. No priority habitat within 100m.						
2.16 Heritage Assets						(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting						

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(++)
Low sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible decontamination measures may add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	Whitley	Size (Ha)	5.95	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	143	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land east of Blackthorn Close				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	To the North, east and South is residential to the South is also a track. To the west is residential land.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	WHITLEY/023	SHLAA Ref	Whitley-25		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(-)
Site has poor access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	1.19 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Common pipistrelle bat roost (2015) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(-)
Existing open space asset would be adversely affected, and public accessibility reduced. Mitigation possible - Impacts on a Public Right of Way (PRoW) (Site is in an area of identified need as falls outside buffer of LEAPS, NEAPS and LAPs, Amenity Greenspace, Parks and recreation, skate parks, allotment and small natural/semi natural greenspace areas. . PRoW runs through the site)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Site submitted by Land Promoter. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Viability Assessment has been undertaken. Access to the site is currently via a right of way over a ransom strip. Site is under option to a developer	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	Whitley	Size (Ha)	11.06	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	216	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Whitley Bridge				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	To the North is open land/ employment to the east is a school/ residential/ church, to the South is employment/agricultural, and to the west is agricultural.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	WHITLEY/024	SHLAA Ref		Whitley-26	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					
					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					(o)
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					
					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					
Development does not impact on employment land					(o)
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					
					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					(+)
2.6 Agricultural Land					
Grade 2 100%					(---)
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	(-)
2.8 Flood Risk					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.09 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 1.22 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					
Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					
no known constraints					(o)
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					(+)
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					(o)
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					(+)
2.14 Impact Protected Species					
Bluebell (2019) within 1km.					(-)
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					
Deciduous woodland within boundary and within 100m.					(--)
2.16 Heritage Assets					
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					(o)

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development, Western extent of the site outside assessment parcel	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 150m of motorway and within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site partly within Groundwater Protection Zone 3	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible decontamination measures may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	Whitley	Size (Ha)	1.52	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	39	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land South of Gravel Hill Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural fields to North/West/South. Residential to East				
2020 Site Submission Reference	WHITLEY/002	SHLAA Ref	Whitley-2		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(-)
Site has poor access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.87 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Natterer's bat roost (2013), Common pipistrelle bat roost (2015) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Rough grassland of unknown condition. Plantation woodland (shelterbelt) along the western boundary. Residential properties to the east. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement. The area is also on the periphery of the Battle of Towton with skirmishes known to have taken place in this area before the main event.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues (Viability Assessment has been undertaken) Site is not being actively marketed however, there has been interest from developers.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	Whitley	Size (Ha)	1.12	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	29	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land north of Whitefield Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Derelict farm buildings				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential/Allotments to East. Agricultural fields to North/South/West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	WHITLEY/004	SHLAA Ref	Whitley-4		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land		2.7 % GF	0	2.7 % PDL	100
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Natterer's bat roost, Common pipistrelle bat roost (2015) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Site with derelict buildings, rubble and rough grassland. Site has the potential to support over wintering amphibians as there are ponds in the area. Site should also be checked for reptiles and nesting birds. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site partly within Groundwater Protection Zone 3 (less than 5% in Zone 3)	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Extant residential permission. 1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	Whitley	Size (Ha)	0.36	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	11	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Blenheim House				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Residential property and barns (Which includes garden and access/parking)				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural fields to North/East. Residential to South/West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	WHITLEY/008	SHLAA Ref	Whitley-8		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(-)
Site has poor access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(o)
Grade 3 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land		2.7 % GF	5	2.7 % PDL	95
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Pipistrelle bat roost (2010) within site boundary. Natterer's bat roost (2013), Common pipistrelle bat roost (2015) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Trees and buildings present on Site. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement. The area is also on the periphery of the Battle of Towton with skirmishes known to have taken place in this area before the main event.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Extant residential permission. 1 landowner. Blenheim Cottage on the site is currently rented accommodation	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	Whitley	Size (Ha)	3.05	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	78	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land North of Whitley Farm Close				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to North/West/South. Agricultural fields to East				
2020 Site Submission Reference	WHITLEY/009	SHLAA Ref	Whitley-9		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	1.5 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Natterer's bat roost, Common pipistrelle bat roost (2013) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Arable field with boundary hedges and mature trees. There is also a field drain along the eastern boundary. Site adjacent to Deciduous woodland					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. Site is not being actively marketed however, there has been interest from developers.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	Whitley	Size (Ha)	7.69	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	185	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land off Selby Road/ Whitfield Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Farm and residential to North/East. Agricultural fields to West/South/East				
2020 Site Submission Reference	WHITLEY/010	SHLAA Ref	Whitley-10		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.16 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constrains					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Natterer's bat roost, Common pipistrelle bat roost (2013) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Two arable fields with minimal boundary features. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Low to moderate sensitivity to development</p>	(+)
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road</p>	(-)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site partly within Groundwater Protection Zone 3</p>	(o)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would add an open space asset identified as required in the vicinity (Site is in an area of identified need as falls outside buffer of LEAPS, NEAPS and LAPs, Amenity Greenspace, Parks and recreation, skate parks, allotment and small natural/semi natural greenspace areas.)</p>	(++)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site within the Green Belt</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Whitley	Size (Ha)	11.00	Proposed Use	Mixed Use
Housing Capacity	215	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at rear of George and Dragon				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Arable farming				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to East/South. Agricultural fields to North/South/West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	WHITLEY/011	SHLAA Ref	Whitley-11		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(++)
Development would create employment					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(++)
Good national accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 60% Grade 3 40%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.11 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 2.83 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Natterer's bat roost (2013), Common pipistrelle bat roost (2015) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Large arable fields with minimal boundary features. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site partly within Groundwater Protection Zone 3	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. Site is not being actively marketed however, there has been interest from developers.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	Whitley	Size (Ha)	0.18	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	5	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land north of Firs Court				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Scrubland				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to South. Play area to North. Agricultural fields to East/West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	WHITLEY/012	SHLAA Ref	Whitley-12		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Natterer's bat roost, Common pipistrelle bat roost (2013) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Small area of rough grassland of unknown quality - could be important for ground nesting birds and/or reptiles. Some mature trees are present along the northern boundary. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	Whitley	Size (Ha)	7.99	Proposed Use	Employment
Housing Capacity	Housing Capacity Notes				
Site Location	Land west of Car Boot				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agriculture fields to North/West/South. M62 to North. Energy infrastructure to South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	WHITLEY/018	SHLAA Ref	N/A		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					N/A
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(++)
Good national accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.4 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 7.54 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Bluebell (2019), Natterer's bat roost, Common pipistrelle bat roost (2013) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Site adjacent to Deciduous woodland					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 150m of motorway	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	

3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years

Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	Whitley	Size (Ha)	16.49	Proposed Use	Leisure
Housing Capacity	Housing Capacity Notes				
Site Location	Land North of M62, West of templar Close, Whitley Bridge				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural fields				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agriculture and Canal to North. M62 to South. Residential to East and agricultural fields to the West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	WHITLEY/019	SHLAA Ref	N/A		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					N/A
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and workforce					(o)
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					(++)
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(++)
Good national accessibility					(+)
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					(---)
2.6 Agricultural Land					(---)
Grade 2 100%					(-)
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	(-)
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					(o)
Flood Zone 1 - 100%					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					(o)
2.9 SFRA Level 2					(o)
Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					(o)
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					(o)
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					(+)
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					(o)
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					(+)
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
No protected species records within 1km that are less than 10 years old.					(o)
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					(+)
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					(o)

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 150m of motorway and within 100m of railway	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Whitley	Size (Ha)	1.19	Proposed Use	Employment
Housing Capacity	Housing Capacity Notes				
Site Location	Land east of Selby Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural land to East. Residential to the West and industrial estate to North (North of river)				
2020 Site Submission Reference	WHITLEY/013	SHLAA Ref	N/A		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					N/A
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(++)
Development would create employment					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(++)
Good national accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					1.51 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
No protected species records within 1km that are less than 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Area of rough grassland of unknown quality, which appears to include some scrub. Adjacent to Selby Road screen planting embankments and Selby Canal and field drain to the north. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Low to moderate sensitivity to development</p>	(+)
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	(o)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.</p>	(o)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>Multiple Landowners (Father and Son and part owned by another landowner). No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Whitley	Size (Ha)	2.48	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	63	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to rear of Copper Beech Drive				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural Field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Recreation to the North. Agriculture to the East and Residential to the South/West.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	WHITLEY/015	SHLAA Ref	Whitley-17		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	85	2.7 % PDL	15	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	2.35 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Common pipistrelle bat roost (2015) within 1km. New boundary re-assessed October 2020.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
Site comprises hard standing with large buildings of unknown age/construction that may support bats and nesting birds. The site also includes part of a large arable field. No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(++)
Development would add an open space asset identified as required in the vicinity (Site is in an area of identified need as falls outside buffer of LEAPS, NEAPS and LAPs, Amenity Greenspace, Parks and recreation, skate parks, allotment and small natural/semi natural greenspace areas.)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Site submitted by Land Promoter. No impact on availability from existing land use.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues (Viability Assessment has been undertaken). Site is under option to a developer. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	Whitley	Size (Ha)	11.57	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	226	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to the North East of Whitley				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Open land/ Agricultural field.				
Surrounding Land Uses	M62 to the North of the site. River to the East of the site. Employment/ residential to west of the site and agricultural to the South of the site.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	WHITLEY/016	SHLAA Ref	Whitley-21		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(---)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	1.67 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Natterer's bat roost, Common pipistrelle bat roost (2013) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Site adjacent to Deciduous woodland					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 150m of motorway and within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	Whitley	Size (Ha)	0.21	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	6	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Site West of Templar Close				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Trees				
Surrounding Land Uses	M62 to the South of the site. Residential to the east and North and open land to the west.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	WHITLEY/017	SHLAA Ref	Whitley-22		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Natterer's bat roost, Common pipistrelle bat roost (2013) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 150m of motorway and within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	Whitley	Size (Ha)	2.64	Proposed Use	Leisure
Housing Capacity	Housing Capacity Notes				
Site Location	Land between Knottingley and Goole Canal and M62				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Knottingley and Goole canal to the North and East of the site. Agricultural to the West and M62 to the South of the site.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	WHITLEY/020	SHLAA Ref	N/A		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					N/A
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and workforce					
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					(++)
Good national accessibility					
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Natterer's bat roost, Common pipistrelle bat roost (2013) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(-)
Site adjacent to Deciduous woodland					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Low to moderate sensitivity to development</p>	(+)
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 150m of motorway</p>	(-)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3</p>	(o)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development.</p>	(o)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Whitley	Size (Ha)	2.38	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	40	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to the South of Whitfield Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Countryside				
Land Use	Agricultural field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Road to the North the remainder of land is surrounded by agricultural.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	WHITLEY/021	SHLAA Ref	Whitley-23		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 1 - 100%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Natterer's bat roost, Pipistrelle bat species roost (2010) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	(+)
Low to moderate sensitivity to development	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(++)
Development would add an open space asset identified as required in the vicinity (Site is in an area of identified need as falls outside buffer of LEAPS, NEAPS and LAPs, Amenity Greenspace, Parks and recreation, skate parks, allotment and small natural/semi natural greenspace areas.)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy	

Settlement	Whitley	Size (Ha)	1.98	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	50	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Site at Tunstall Healthcare				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 1 Village				
Land Use	Employment				
Surrounding Land Uses	To the North is open land to the east is open land to South and west is residential.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	WHITLEY/022	SHLAA Ref	Whitley-24		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(--)
Development would result in a loss of employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land	2.7 % GF	10	2.7 % PDL	90	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 1 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.05 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(o)
All protected species within 1km of site are over 10 years old.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(o)
Deciduous woodland within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Site within the built form of the settlement	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 150m of motorway and within 100m of A road	
2.21 Groundwater	(o)
Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3	
2.22 Contamination	(-)
Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, and 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible decontamination measures may add to costs (Site has asbestos that would need to be removed). The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site within the Green Belt	

Settlement	Wistow	Size (Ha)	0.92	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	28	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Plantation House / Plantation Garage, Cawood Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Open land with scattered buildings on the site.				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the South, West and North of the Site with Agricultural to the North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	WISTOW/002	SHLAA Ref	Wistow-2		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(+)
Previously Developed Land		2.7 % GF	25	2.7 % PDL	75
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 2 - 91.48%, Flood Zone 1 - 8.52%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					0.1 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 2.84 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2010), Common pipistrelle bat roost (2016) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(-)
Site is immediately adjacent to the Grade II listed Blacksmiths Shop					

2.17 Archaeological Impact

(o)

The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)

2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps

(o)

Development does not occur in the SCG

2.19 Landscape Capacity

Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan

2.20 Amenity Impact

(o)

Site within or adjacent to compatible uses

2.21 Groundwater

(+)

Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone

2.22 Contamination

(-)

Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.

2.23 Mineral Resource

(-)

Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.

2.24 Provision of Open Space

(+)

Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)

2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area

(o)

Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA

3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use

Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use

3.2 Site viability abnormal costs

Possible decontamination and flood mitigation measures may add to costs. The site is wholly/ partially previously developed land and the removal of buildings on the land may add to costs.

3.3 Overall Deliverability

0-5 years

Preferred Option

Rejected

Preferred Option Explanation

Site at risk of flooding

Settlement	Wistow	Size (Ha)	0.61	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	18	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land to rear of Oak Farm, Garmancarr Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to North/West/South. Agricultural fields to East				
2020 Site Submission Reference	WISTOW/004	SHLAA Ref	Wistow-4		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 19.29%, Flood Zone 2 - 78.77%, Flood Zone 1 - 1.94%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2010), Common pipistrelle bat roost (2016) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Site is to the rear of Oak Farm which is a Grade II listed building					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site at risk of flooding	

Settlement	Wistow	Size (Ha)	3.43	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	87	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land between Field Lane and Lordship Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural field/ Residential				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to West/South. Farm to East. Agricultural field to North				
2020 Site Submission Reference	WISTOW/005	SHLAA Ref		Wistow-5	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings Flood Zone 3a - 54%, Flood Zone 2 - 44.84%, Flood Zone 1 - 1.16%					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW 1.38 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 5.26 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 18.29 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water					
2.9 SFRA Level 2 Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2010), Common pipistrelle bat roost (2016) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years

Preferred Option Rejected

Preferred Option Explanation

Site at risk of flooding

Settlement	Wistow	Size (Ha)	6.39	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	153	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land south of Long Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural fields to North/South/West. Residential to East				
2020 Site Submission Reference	WISTOW/006	SHLAA Ref	Wistow-6		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 54.46%, Flood Zone 2 - 45.54%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.37 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 1.15 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 6.4 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2010), Common pipistrelle bat roost (2016) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs. Site is being marketed (Landowner in early discussions with a number of developers.)	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site at risk of flooding	

Settlement	Wistow	Size (Ha)	11.66	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	227	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land north of Long Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Agricultural fields to North/West/East. Residential to South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	WISTOW/007	SHLAA Ref	Wistow-7		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(---)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 3a - 0.21%, Flood Zone 2 - 97.55%, Flood Zone 1 - 2.24%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.94 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 3.05 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 11.47 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2010), Common pipistrelle bat roost (2016) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
West Villa is located to the South East from the site and is a Grade II listed building					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of NEAP)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
Multiple landowners. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs. Site is being marketed (Landowner in early discussions with a number of developers.)	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site at risk of flooding	

Settlement	Wistow	Size (Ha)	0.08	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	2	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Cawood Road (adjacent Wesgarth)				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Scrubland				
Surrounding Land Uses	Farm buildings to North/East/South. Residential to West. Agricultural fields to South-West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	WISTOW/010	SHLAA Ref	Wistow-22		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes					Under 0.17ha in size (residential)
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 2 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	0.32 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2010), Common pipistrelle bat roost (2016) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs</p>	<p>(+)</p>
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan</p>	<p></p>
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	<p>(+)</p>
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated.</p>	<p>(-)</p>
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	<p>(--)</p>
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of NEAP)</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible decontamination and flood mitigation measures may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	<p>0-5 years</p>
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site at risk of flooding</p>	<p>Rejected</p>

Settlement	Wistow	Size (Ha)	0.59	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	18	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Cawood Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to North/East/South. Agricultural to South/West				
2020 Site Submission Reference	WISTOW/011	SHLAA Ref	Wistow-18		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes	None				
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 2 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	8.44 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 16.48 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 36.77 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2	Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA				
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2010), Common pipistrelle bat roost (2016) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan</p>	
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	(o)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site at risk of flooding</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Wistow	Size (Ha)	3.00	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	77	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Cawood Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural Field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Employment and woodland to South-East. Dwellings to North-East/South-East. Rest of the land is surrounded by agricultural land				
2020 Site Submission Reference	WISTOW/012	SHLAA Ref	Wistow-23		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 2 - 58.99%, Flood Zone 1 - 41.01%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					1.3 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 5.75 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2010), Common pipistrelle bat roost (2016) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site at risk of flooding	

Settlement	Wistow	Size (Ha)	2.35	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	60	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Field Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural Field/ Residential				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the South. Agricultural land surrounds the remainder of site apart from 1 residential building to the North west.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	WISTOW/013	SHLAA Ref		Wistow-25	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(--)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 54.89%, Flood Zone 2 - 32.84%, Flood Zone 1 - 12.28%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2010), Common pipistrelle bat roost (2016) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan</p>	
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Site within or adjacent to compatible uses</p>	(o)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site at risk of flooding</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Wistow	Size (Ha)	6.65	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	160	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Selby Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural Field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the North/east. Agricultural fields surround the remainder of the site.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	WISTOW/014	SHLAA Ref		Wistow-26	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings Flood Zone 3a - 11.18%, Flood Zone 2 - 74.54%, Flood Zone 1 - 14.28%					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW 1.22 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water					
2.9 SFRA Level 2 Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2010), Common pipistrelle bat roost (2016) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(o)
The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	
Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(-)
Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(+)
Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Possible flood mitigation may add to costs. Site abuts Manor Field House which is a Grade II listed residential property on Selby Rd. Impact can be mitigated at this stage subject to detailed masterplanning of the site.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site at risk of flooding	

Settlement	Wistow	Size (Ha)	6.97	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	167	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land west of Carr Lane				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural Field				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential/ road to the North and east of the site. The remainder of land is surrounded by agricultural land.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	WISTOW/015	SHLAA Ref		Wistow-27	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings					Flood Zone 3a - 35.17%, Flood Zone 2 - 64.83%
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					0.05 % in 1 in 30 year risk, 0.28 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 2.2 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(-)
Mitigation or management may be required but due to scale of development Natural England need to be consulted.					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2010), Common pipistrelle bat roost (2016) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan</p>	
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW</p>	(-)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site at risk of flooding</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Wistow	Size (Ha)	4.53	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	116	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land east of Station Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural Field				
Surrounding Land Uses	A road to the North of the site. Residential to the North and east of the site with agricultural to the west and South of the site.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	WISTOW/016	SHLAA Ref		Wistow-28	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(o)
Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.)					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings Flood Zone 3a - 0.49%, Flood Zone 2 - 98.06%, Flood Zone 1 - 1.45%					
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW 3.75 % in 1 in 100 year risk, and 13.21 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water					
2.9 SFRA Level 2 Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA					
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SAC)					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2010), Common pipistrelle bat roost (2016) within 1km					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	(o)
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	(o)
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan</p>	
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW</p>	(-)
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	(+)
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	(o)
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	(--)
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)</p>	(+)
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	(o)
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>Site submitted by Land Promoter. No impact on availability from existing land use.</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation may add to costs. (Promotion Agreement agreed between landowner and developers.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	0-5 years
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site at risk of flooding</p>	Rejected

Settlement	Wistow	Size (Ha)	0.39	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	12	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land adjacent to Roselyn, Selby Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Tier 2 Village				
Land Use	Agricultural				
Surrounding Land Uses	To the North is residential, to the east is residential/ road to the South is residential, and to the west is agricultural.				
2020 Site Submission Reference	WISTOW/017	SHLAA Ref		Wistow-29	
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					No
1. Significant Constraint Notes					None
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(+)
Site has good access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield		2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0
2.8 Flood Risk					(-)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings	Flood Zone 2 - 100%				
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW	46.41 % in 1 in 1000 year risk of Flooding from Surface Water				
2.9 SFRA Level 2					Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
no known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(-)
The site is within 10km of an internationally protected site and whilst the effects of a proposal are not likely to be significant alone, there is likely to be significant effects in combination. Appropriate assessment is required. (Within 10km of a SPA,					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(+)
More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Great crested newt (2010) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

<p>2.17 Archaeological Impact</p> <p>The site is close to or contains some identified archaeological features which present an unknown level of risk (This is a greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement.)</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>Development does not occur in the SCG</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.19 Landscape Capacity</p> <p>Landscape sensitivity to be assessed in time for the Publication version of the Local Plan</p>	
<p>2.20 Amenity Impact</p> <p>Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW</p>	<p>(-)</p>
<p>2.21 Groundwater</p> <p>Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone</p>	<p>(+)</p>
<p>2.22 Contamination</p> <p>Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>2.23 Mineral Resource</p> <p>Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ sand and gravel.</p>	<p>(--)</p>
<p>2.24 Provision of Open Space</p> <p>Development would create an opportunity for open space asset to be created or improved, or public access improved to that asset. (Site within 1200m of NEAP, and 400m of Amenity Greenspace)</p>	<p>(+)</p>
<p>2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area</p> <p>Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA</p>	<p>(o)</p>
<p>3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use</p> <p>1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use</p>	
<p>3.2 Site viability abnormal costs</p> <p>Possible flood mitigation may add to costs.</p>	
<p>3.3 Overall Deliverability</p>	<p>0-5 years</p>
<p>Preferred Option</p> <p>Preferred Option Explanation</p> <p>Site at risk of flooding</p>	<p>Rejected</p>

Settlement	Womersley	Size (Ha)	0.14	Proposed Use	Residential
Housing Capacity	3	Housing Capacity Notes			
Site Location	Land at Station Road				
Proposed Settlement Hierarchy	Smaller Village				
Land Use	Open Land.				
Surrounding Land Uses	Residential to the west, road to the North. Railway line to the East and Agricultural to the South				
2020 Site Submission Reference	WOMERSLEY/003	SHLAA Ref	Womerley-1		
1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint?					Yes
1. Significant Constraint Notes		Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy. Under 0.17ha in size (residential)			
2.1 Housing - Accessibility to services and employment					(o)
Site has acceptable access to services and employment					
2.2 Employment - Accessibility to workforce and services					N/A
2.3 Loss of Employment Land					(o)
Development does not impact on employment land					
2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network					N/A
2.5 Physical Point of Access					(+)
Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works.					
2.6 Agricultural Land					(-)
Grade 2 100%					
2.7 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land					(-)
Greenfield	2.7 % GF	100	2.7 % PDL	0	
2.8 Flood Risk					(o)
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings		Flood Zone 3a - 37.17%, Flood Zone 1 - 62.83%			
2.8 SFRA Level 1 Findings RoFSW					
2.9 SFRA Level 2		Not assessed in Level 2 SFRA			
2.10 Physical / Infrastructure constraints					(o)
No known constraints					
2.11 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ram)					(+)
The site is more than 10km from an internationally protected site, and it is perceived that there are no credible threats posed by the development to any European site, either alone or in combination. Appropriate assessment is not required.					
2.12 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Wood)					(o)
Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites					
2.13 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site					(o)
Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site - mitigation may be required					
2.14 Impact Protected Species					(-)
Bluebell (2012), Common pipistrelle, Brown long-eared bat (2013) within 1km.					
2.15 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protect					(+)
No priority habitat within 100m.					
2.16 Heritage Assets					(o)
Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting					

2.17 Archaeological Impact	(+)
There are no known archaeological remains within the site or its immediate environs (The small scale of the allocation is unlikely to have a significant impact on archaeological remains)	
2.18 Strategic Countryside Gaps	(o)
Development does not occur in the SCG	
2.19 Landscape Capacity	N/A
Residential site not assessed as it is within a settlement which is not receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy.	
2.20 Amenity Impact	(o)
Site within or adjacent to compatible uses	
2.21 Groundwater	(+)
Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone	
2.22 Contamination	(o)
Development is not located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated	
2.23 Mineral Resource	(--)
Site is within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay/ Limestone.	
2.24 Provision of Open Space	(o)
An existing open space asset would be conserved, retained, or not impacted, and the site is not required to provide greenspace due to the size and/or type of development. (Site within 1200m of Park and Recreation, 800m of LEAP, and 1200m of Allotments)	
2.25 Impact on the Air Quality Management Area	(o)
Scale and type of growth unlikely to lead to notable emissions in AQMA	
3.1 Availability considerations impact of active use	
1 landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use - residual land from earlier development.	
3.2 Site viability abnormal costs	
Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.	
3.3 Overall Deliverability	0-5 years
Preferred Option	Rejected
Preferred Option Explanation	
Site failed initial sift - Disconnected from a settlement receiving planned growth in the spatial strategy. Under 0.17ha in size (residential)	



The Preferred Options Local Plan document is available to view online at: <https://selby-consult.objective.co.uk/kse/event/36012>

For further information

- Email to: localplan@selby.gov.uk; or
- Phone to: 01757 292134; or
- By post to: Planning Policy Team, Selby District Council, The Civic Centre, Doncaster Road, Selby, YO8