

# East Riding of Yorkshire Council

## Examination of the East Riding Local Plan Allocations Document

### Schedule of Matters and Issues for the Examination

Inspector: Simon Berkeley BA MA MRTPI

Programme Officer: Malcolm Wells  
Programme Officer  
Room GG9  
County Hall  
Beverley  
HU17 9BA  
01482 396285  
Malcolm.Wells@eastriding.gov.uk

## Draft timetable for the Hearing sessions

Date	Morning session 09.00am	Afternoon session 2pm
<b>Day 1</b> Tuesday 4 November	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Matter 1: Basis for the plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Matter 1 (cont)</li> </ul>
<b>Beverley and Central sub area</b>		
<b>Day 2</b> Wednesday 5 November	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Matter 2: Major Haltemprice Settlements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Matter 4: Elloughton/Brough and Hedon</li> </ul>
<b>Beverley and Central sub area</b>		
<b>Day 3</b> Thursday 6 November	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Matter 3: Beverley</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Matter 5: Rural Service Centres and Primary Villages</li> </ul>
<b>Bridlington Coastal sub area</b>		
<b>Day 4</b> Friday 7 November	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Matter 6: Bridlington</li> </ul>	Matter 7: Beeford and Flamborough
<b>Driffield and Wolds sub area</b>		
<b>Day 5</b> Tuesday 11 November	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Matter 8: Driffield</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Matter 9: Rural Service Centres and Primary Villages</li> </ul>
<b>Goole and Humberhead Levels sub area</b>		
<b>Day 6</b> Wednesday 12 November	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Matter 10: Goole</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Matter 11: Howden</li> <li>Matter 12: Rural Service Centres and Primary Villages</li> </ul>
<b>Holderness and Southern Coastal sub area</b>		
<b>Day 7</b> Thursday 13 November	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Matter 13: Hornsea</li> </ul>	Matter 14: Withernsea Matter 15: Rural Service Centres and Primary Villages
<b>Vale of York sub area</b>		
<b>Day 8</b> Friday 14 November	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Matter 16: Pocklington</li> </ul>	Matter 17: Market Weighton Matter 18: Rural Service Centres and Primary Villages
<b>Day 9</b> Tuesday 18 November	Reserve day	

As set out in the accompanying Guidance Note, if you have any comments on this draft timetable please contact the Programme Officer by **1 August 2014**.

Every effort will be made to keep to the timetable, but late changes may be unavoidable. Priority will be given to starting the debate on each matter at the appointed time, and it may be necessary to extend the discussion in the afternoon session. The Programme Officer will inform the participants of any late changes to the timetable, but it is the responsibility of the participants to keep themselves up to date with the arrangements and programme.

**The starting point for the examination is the submitted version of the Allocations Document ('the Plan'). However, the Council proposes a number of modifications to the Plan as originally submitted. These are set out in a schedule produced by the Council, which can be found in the examination library and on the Council's examination webpage. I may or may not accept these changes. The Council is consulting on these modifications separately. Comments on them insofar as they relate to the matters and issues set out below are also invited, and discussion about them will be included at the hearing sessions.**

---

**Where respondents answering the following questions identify a deficiency in the Plan they should make clear how it should be changed.**

## **Matter 1 – Overall basis for the Plan**

### **Issues**

#### **Legal requirements and procedures, and over-arching themes**

- 1.1 Overall, has the Plan been prepared in accordance with the legal requirements, including the 'duty to cooperate' imposed by Section 33A of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended)?
- 1.2 Does the Plan comply with the Public Sector Equality Duty?
- 1.3 How has the Plan been influenced by the Sustainable Community Strategy?
- 1.4 Has the plan been prepared in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement and met the minimum consultation requirements in the Regulations?
- 1.5 Is the Plan based on a sound process of sustainability appraisal and testing of reasonable alternatives? In particular:
  - a. what is the justification for the exclusion criteria applied (such as, for example, the minimum site size threshold for allocation)?
  - b. has the sustainability appraisal process been based on appropriate criteria?
  - c. in making judgements about the performance of each site against the sustainability appraisal criteria, what sources of evidence have been drawn on?
  - d. has greater weight/importance been given to any criteria over others and if so what is the justification for this 'weighting'?
  - e. what methodology has been applied to the identification of the development limits around settlements? Is the methodology appropriate and adequately robust?
- 1.6 In general terms, do the proposed allocations reflect the outcomes of the sustainability appraisal and testing of reasonable alternatives? Is there a clear audit trail in this respect?
- 1.7
  - a. How has the Flood Risk Sequential Test influenced site selection?
  - b. In undertaking the Flood Risk Sequential Test, what 'area of search' (for reasonably available sites in areas with a lower risk of flooding) has been applied?

- c. Has the Exception Test been applied and if so where is the evidence/audit trail of this?
- 1.8 Are the proposed allocations consistent with the Strategy Document?
- 1.9 Is the approach to existing residential commitments, set out in Policy AD1, appropriate and justified?
- 1.10 Should the policies allocating sites for mixed uses be more specific about the uses and mix allowed? In their present form, are these policies sufficiently appropriate and effective?
- 1.11 Are the proposed town centre boundaries, primary shopping areas and primary shopping frontages defined on the Policies Map appropriate and justified?
- 1.12 Are the proposed settlement development limits for the Villages, shown in Part 2 of the Policies Map:
  - a. consistent with the methodology for setting development limits?
  - b. appropriate and justified?

## **Beverley and Central sub area**

### **Matter 2 – Major Haltemprice Settlements**

**(Anlaby/Willerby/Kirk Ella, Cottingham and Hessle)**

#### **Issues**

- 2.1 Are the proposed settlement development limits:
  - a. consistent with the methodology for setting development limits?
  - b. appropriate and justified?
- 2.2 Are all of the proposed allocations justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of the development?
- 2.3 Are all of the proposed allocations deliverable? In particular, are they:
  - a. confirmed by all of the landowners involved as being available for the use proposed?
  - b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
  - c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?
- 2.4 A number of sites in each of the Major Haltemprice Settlements include land in Flood Zone 3a and/or in Flood Zone 2. For each site:
  - a. are there any reasonably available sites on land at a lower risk of flooding?  
If so
  - b. why have the proposed sites been chosen?
- 2.5 Policy COT-B says that this site is allocated for mixed uses. The Policies Map appears to show it as a housing allocation. Which is right?
- 2.6 Are all of the proposed allocations the most appropriate option given the reasonable alternatives?
- 2.7 If there is a need to identify additional land, are there alternative sites which are appropriate and deliverable? If so, have they been subject to Sustainability Appraisal and Appropriate Assessment compatible with that for the Allocations Plan, and to public consultation?
- 2.8 Are the Key Open Areas appropriate and is their extent justified?
- 2.9 It appears that a number of allocations will require the provision of open space. Should the relevant policies be more specific about this, and give more detail?

### **Matter 3 – Beverley**

#### **Issues**

- 3.1 Is the proposed settlement development limit:
  - a. consistent with the methodology for setting development limits?
  - b. appropriate and justified?

- 3.2 Are all of the proposed allocations justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of the development?
- 3.3 Are all of the proposed allocations deliverable? In particular, are they:
  - a. confirmed by all of the landowners involved as being available for the use proposed?
  - b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
  - c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?
- 3.4 A number of sites include land in Flood Zone 3a and/or in Flood Zone 2. For each site:
  - a. are there any reasonably available sites on land at a lower risk of flooding?  
If so
  - b. why have the proposed sites been chosen?
- 3.5 Taken together, sites BEV-L, BEV-J and BEV-K represent a significant southern extension of Beverley.
  - a. What has determined this spatial pattern of growth and why is it the most appropriate option?
  - b. BEV-J includes a significant area of land in Flood Zone 3a, and some in Flood Zone 2. Why should new housing be allowed on this land?
- 3.6 Are all of the proposed allocations the most appropriate option given the reasonable alternatives?
- 3.7 If there is a need to identify additional land, are there alternative sites which are appropriate and deliverable? If so, have they been subject to Sustainability Appraisal and Appropriate Assessment compatible with that for the Allocations Plan, and to public consultation?

## **Matter 4 – Elloughton/Brough and Hedon**

### **Issues**

- 4.1 Is the proposed settlement development limit:
  - a. consistent with the methodology for setting development limits?
  - b. appropriate and justified?
- 4.2 Are all of the proposed allocations justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of the development?
- 4.3 Are all of the proposed allocations deliverable? In particular, are they:
  - a. confirmed by all of the landowners involved as being available for the use proposed?
  - b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
  - c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?
- 4.4 Site ECB-C includes land in Flood Zone 3a and Flood Zone 2.

- a. Are there any reasonably available sites on land at a lower risk of flooding?  
If so
  - b. why have sites at a lower flood risk been rejected in favour of ECB-C?
- 4.5 Are all of the proposed allocations the most appropriate option given the reasonable alternatives?
- 4.6 If there is a need to identify additional land, are there alternative sites which are appropriate and deliverable? If so, have they been subject to Sustainability Appraisal and Appropriate Assessment compatible with that for the Allocations Plan, and to public consultation?

## **Matter 5 – Rural Service Centres and Primary Villages**

### **(Rural Service Centres: Keyingham and Leven)**

**(Primary Villages: Bilton, Brandesburton, Cherry Burton, Dunswell, Leconfield, North Cave, North Ferriby, Preston, Skirlaugh, South Cave, Swanland, Thorngumbald, Tickton, Walkington, Wawne, Woodmansey)**

### **Issues**

- 5.1 Are the proposed settlement development limits:
- a. consistent with the methodology for setting development limits?
  - b. appropriate and justified?
- 5.2 Are all of the proposed allocations justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of the development?
- 5.3 Are all of the proposed allocations deliverable? In particular, are they:
- a. confirmed by all of the landowners involved as being available for the use proposed?
  - b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
  - c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?
- 5.4 A number of sites in Cherry Burton, Leconfield, Dunswell, Wawne, Leven and Skirlaugh include land in Flood Zone 3a and/or in Flood Zone 2. For each site:
- a. are there any reasonably available sites on land at a lower risk of flooding?  
If so
  - b. why have the proposed sites been chosen?
- 5.5 Are all of the proposed allocations the most appropriate option given the reasonable alternatives?
- 5.6 If there is a need to identify additional land, are there alternative sites which are appropriate and deliverable? If so, have they been subject to Sustainability Appraisal and Appropriate Assessment compatible with that for the Allocations Plan, and to public consultation?

## **Bridlington Coastal sub area**

### **Matter 6 – Bridlington**

#### **Issues**

- 6.1 Is the proposed settlement development limit:
  - a. consistent with the methodology for setting development limits?
  - b. appropriate and justified?
- 6.2 Are all of the proposed allocations justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of the development?
- 6.3 Are all of the proposed allocations deliverable? In particular, are they:
  - a. confirmed by all of the landowners involved as being available for the use proposed?
  - b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
  - c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?
- 6.4 Are all of the proposed allocations the most appropriate option given the reasonable alternatives?
- 6.5 If there is a need to identify additional land, are there alternative sites which are appropriate and deliverable? If so, have they been subject to Sustainability Appraisal and Appropriate Assessment compatible with that for the Allocations Plan, and to public consultation?

### **Matter 7 – Beeford (Rural Service Centre) and Flamborough (Primary Village)**

#### **Issues**

- 7.1 Are the proposed settlement development limits:
  - a. consistent with the methodology for setting development limits?
  - b. appropriate and justified?
- 7.2 Are all of the proposed allocations justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of the development?
- 7.3 Are all of the proposed allocations deliverable? In particular, are they:
  - a. confirmed by all of the landowners involved as being available for the use proposed?
  - b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
  - c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?
- 7.4 Site BEE-C in Beeford includes land in Flood Zone 3a and Flood Zone 2.

- a. Are there any reasonably available sites on land at a lower risk of flooding?  
If so
  - b. why have sites at a lower flood risk been rejected in favour of site BEE-C?
- 7.5 Are all of the proposed allocations the most appropriate option given the reasonable alternatives?
- 7.6 If there is a need to identify additional land, are there alternative sites which are appropriate and deliverable? If so, have they been subject to Sustainability Appraisal and Appropriate Assessment compatible with that for the Allocations Plan, and to public consultation?

## **Driffield and Wolds sub area**

### **Matter 8 – Driffield**

#### **Issues**

- 8.1 Is the proposed settlement development limit:
  - a. consistent with the methodology for setting development limits?
  - b. appropriate and justified?
- 8.2 Are all of the proposed allocations justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of the development?
- 8.3 Are all of the proposed allocations deliverable? In particular, are they:
  - a. confirmed by all of the landowners involved as being available for the use proposed?
  - b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
  - c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?
- 8.4 A number of sites include land in Flood Zone 3a and/or in Flood Zone 2. For each site:
  - a. are there any reasonably available sites on land at a lower risk of flooding?  
If so
  - b. why have the proposed sites been chosen?
- 8.5 Are all of the proposed allocations the most appropriate option given the reasonable alternatives?
- 8.6 If there is a need to identify additional land, are there alternative sites which are appropriate and deliverable? If so, have they been subject to Sustainability Appraisal and Appropriate Assessment compatible with that for the Allocations Plan, and to public consultation?

### **Matter 9 – Rural Service Centres and Primary Villages**

**(Rural Service Centres: Hutton Cranswick, Kilham, Middleton-on-the-Wolds, Wetwang)**

**(Primary Village: Nafferton)**

#### **Issues**

- 9.1 Are the proposed settlement development limits:
  - a. consistent with the methodology for setting development limits?
  - b. appropriate and justified?
- 9.2 Are all of the proposed allocations justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of the development?
- 9.3 Are all of the proposed allocations deliverable? In particular, are they:

- a. confirmed by all of the landowners involved as being available for the use proposed?
  - b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
  - c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?
- 9.4 The proposed allocation in Middleton on the Wolds (MID-A) includes land in Flood Zone 3a and/or in Flood Zone 2.
- a. Are there any reasonably available sites on land at a lower risk of flooding?  
If so
  - b. why has site MID-A been chosen?
- 9.5 Are all of the proposed allocations the most appropriate option given the reasonable alternatives?
- 9.6 If there is a need to identify additional land, are there alternative sites which are appropriate and deliverable? If so, have they been subject to Sustainability Appraisal and Appropriate Assessment compatible with that for the Allocations Plan, and to public consultation?

## Goole and Humberhead Levels sub area

### Matter 10 – Goole

#### Issues

- 10.1 Is the proposed settlement development limit:
  - a. consistent with the methodology for setting development limits?
  - b. appropriate and justified?
- 10.2 Are all of the proposed allocations justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of the development?
- 10.3 Are all of the proposed allocations deliverable? In particular, are they:
  - a. confirmed by all of the landowners involved as being available for the use proposed?
  - b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
  - c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?
- 10.4 A number of sites include land in Flood Zone 3a and/or in Flood Zone 2. For each site:
  - a. are there any reasonably available sites on land at a lower risk of flooding?  
If so
  - b. why have the proposed sites been chosen?
- 10.5 Are all of the proposed allocations the most appropriate option given the reasonable alternatives?
- 10.6 If there is a need to identify additional land, are there alternative sites which are appropriate and deliverable? If so, have they been subject to Sustainability Appraisal and Appropriate Assessment compatible with that for the Allocations Plan, and to public consultation?

### Matter 11 – Howden

#### Issues

- 11.1 Is the proposed settlement development limit:
  - a. consistent with the methodology for setting development limits?
  - b. appropriate and justified?
- 11.2 Are all of the proposed allocations justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of the development?
- 11.3 Are all of the proposed allocations deliverable? In particular, are they:
  - a. confirmed by all of the landowners involved as being available for the use proposed?
  - b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?

- c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?
- 11.4 A number of sites include land in Flood Zone 3a and/or in Flood Zone 2. For each site:
- a. are there any reasonably available sites on land at a lower risk of flooding?  
If so
  - b. why have the proposed sites been chosen?
- 11.5 Are all of the proposed allocations the most appropriate option given the reasonable alternatives?
- 11.6 If there is a need to identify additional land, are there alternative sites which are appropriate and deliverable? If so, have they been subject to Sustainability Appraisal and Appropriate Assessment compatible with that for the Allocations Plan, and to public consultation?

## **Matter 12 – Rural Service Centres and Primary Villages**

**(Rural Service Centres: Gilberdyke/Newport, Snaith)  
(Primary Villages: Eastrington, Rawcliffe)**

### **Issues**

- 12.1 Are the proposed settlement development limits:
- a. consistent with the methodology for setting development limits?
  - b. appropriate and justified?
- 12.2 Are all of the proposed allocations justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of the development?
- 12.3 Are all of the proposed allocations deliverable? In particular, are they:
- a. confirmed by all of the landowners involved as being available for the use proposed?
  - b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
  - c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?
- 12.4 Site SNA-A in Snaith and site NEW-A in Gilberdyke/Newport include land in Flood Zone 3a. For both sites:
- a. are there any reasonably available sites on land at a lower risk of flooding?  
If so
  - b. why have the proposed sites been chosen?
- 12.5 Are all of the proposed allocations the most appropriate option given the reasonable alternatives?
- 12.6 If there is a need to identify additional land, are there alternative sites which are appropriate and deliverable? If so, have they been subject to Sustainability Appraisal and Appropriate Assessment compatible with that for the Allocations Plan, and to public consultation?

## Holderness and Southern Coastal sub area

### Matter 13 – Hornsea

#### Issues

- 13.1 Is the proposed settlement development limit:
  - a. consistent with the methodology for setting development limits?
  - b. appropriate and justified?
- 13.2 Are all of the proposed allocations justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of the development?
- 13.3 Are all of the proposed allocations deliverable? In particular, are they:
  - a. confirmed by all of the landowners involved as being available for the use proposed?
  - b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
  - c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?
- 13.4 Sites HOR-E and HOR-H include land in Flood Zone 3a and/or in Flood Zone 2. For both sites:
  - a. are there any reasonably available sites on land at a lower risk of flooding?  
If so
  - b. why have the proposed sites been chosen?
- 13.5 Are all of the proposed allocations the most appropriate option given the reasonable alternatives?
- 13.6 If there is a need to identify additional land, are there alternative sites which are appropriate and deliverable? If so, have they been subject to Sustainability Appraisal and Appropriate Assessment compatible with that for the Allocations Plan, and to public consultation?

### Matter 14 – Withernsea

#### Issues

- 14.1 Is the proposed settlement development limit:
  - a. consistent with the methodology for setting development limits?
  - b. appropriate and justified?
- 14.2 Are all of the proposed allocations justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of the development?
- 14.3 Are all of the proposed allocations deliverable? In particular, are they:
  - a. confirmed by all of the landowners involved as being available for the use proposed?
  - b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?

- c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?
- 14.4 Are all of the proposed allocations the most appropriate option given the reasonable alternatives?
- 14.5 If there is a need to identify additional land, are there alternative sites which are appropriate and deliverable? If so, have they been subject to Sustainability Appraisal and Appropriate Assessment compatible with that for the Allocations Plan, and to public consultation?

## **Matter 15 – Rural Service Centres and Primary Villages**

### **(Rural Service Centres: Aldbrough and Patrington) (Primary Villages: Easington and Roos)**

#### **Issues**

- 15.1 Are the proposed settlement development limits:
- a. consistent with the methodology for setting development limits?
  - b. appropriate and justified?
- 15.2 Are all of the proposed allocations justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of the development?
- 15.3 Are all of the proposed allocations deliverable? In particular, are they:
- a. confirmed by all of the landowners involved as being available for the use proposed?
  - b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
  - c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?
- 15.4 Site ALD-A in Aldbrough includes land in Flood Zone 3a and in Flood Zone 2.
- a. Are there any reasonably available sites on land at a lower risk of flooding?  
If so
  - b. why have sites at a lower flood risk been rejected in favour of site ALD-A?
- 15.5 Are all of the proposed allocations the most appropriate option given the reasonable alternatives?
- 15.6 If there is a need to identify additional land, are there alternative sites which are appropriate and deliverable? If so, have they been subject to Sustainability Appraisal and Appropriate Assessment compatible with that for the Allocations Plan, and to public consultation?

## Vale of York sub area

### Matter 16 – Pocklington

#### Issues

- 16.1 Is the proposed settlement development limit:
  - a. consistent with the methodology for setting development limits?
  - b. appropriate and justified?
- 16.2 Are all of the proposed allocations justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of the development?
- 16.3 Are all of the proposed allocations deliverable? In particular, are they:
  - a. confirmed by all of the landowners involved as being available for the use proposed?
  - b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
  - c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?
- 16.4 A number of sites include land in Flood Zone 3a and/or in Flood Zone 2. For each site:
  - a. are there any reasonably available sites on land at a lower risk of flooding?  
If so
  - b. why have the proposed sites been chosen?
- 16.5 Are all of the proposed allocations the most appropriate option given the reasonable alternatives?
- 16.6 If there is a need to identify additional land, are there alternative sites which are appropriate and deliverable? If so, have they been subject to Sustainability Appraisal and Appropriate Assessment compatible with that for the Allocations Plan, and to public consultation?

### Matter 17 – Market Weighton

#### Issues

- 17.1 Is the proposed settlement development limit:
  - a. consistent with the methodology for setting development limits?
  - b. appropriate and justified?
- 17.2 Are all of the proposed allocations justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of the development?
- 17.3 Are all of the proposed allocations deliverable? In particular, are they:
  - a. confirmed by all of the landowners involved as being available for the use proposed?
  - b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?

- c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?
- 17.4 Site MW-C includes land in Flood Zone 3a and Flood Zone 2.
- a. Are there any reasonably available sites on land at a lower risk of flooding?  
If so
  - b. why has site MW-C been chosen?
- 17.5 Are all of the proposed allocations the most appropriate option given the reasonable alternatives?
- 17.6 If there is a need to identify additional land, are there alternative sites which are appropriate and deliverable? If so, have they been subject to Sustainability Appraisal and Appropriate Assessment compatible with that for the Allocations Plan, and to public consultation?

## **Matter 18 – Rural Service Centres and Primary Villages**

**(Rural Service Centres: Bubwith, Holme on Spalding Moor, Stamford Bridge)  
(Primary Villages: Melbourne and Wilberfoss)**

### **Issues**

- 18.1 Are the proposed settlement development limits:
- a. consistent with the methodology for setting development limits?
  - b. appropriate and justified?
- 18.2 Are all of the proposed allocations justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of the development?
- 18.3 Are all of the proposed allocations deliverable? In particular, are they:
- a. confirmed by all of the landowners involved as being available for the use proposed?
  - b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
  - c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?
- 18.4 Are all of the proposed allocations the most appropriate option given the reasonable alternatives?
- 18.5 If there is a need to identify additional land, are there alternative sites which are appropriate and deliverable? If so, have they been subject to Sustainability Appraisal and Appropriate Assessment compatible with that for the Allocations Plan, and to public consultation?