



EAST RIDING
OF YORKSHIRE COUNCIL

East Riding Local Plan

Additional Schedule of Modifications (Allocations Documents)

Revised Habitats Regulations Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal Note for SMB-B

January 2016

Revised HRA Note for SMB-B

Following consultation on modifications to the East Riding Local Plan, this note updates the Stamford Bridge section (pages 173 to 177) of the Habitat Regulation Assessment Note (March 2015). This update has been prepared to address comments raised by Natural England in relation to the proposed allocations of Policy SMB-B (modification ref: AM218).

Ref.	Para	Proposed Modification	Justification	HRA Review
Stamford Bridge				
AM217	49.3	Amend text: 'Stamford Bridge is identified as a Rural Service Centre in the <i>Strategy Document</i> and 295+70 new houses are proposed for the village over the period to 2028/29. Taking into account the number of existing commitments and the number of completed plots in the settlement since the start of the Plan period (5 dwellings), the Plan allocates <u>two sites</u> one site for residential development....'	To reflect the change to the housing requirement for the village. This change follows the removal of the 'cap' on Rural Service Centres and Primary Villages set out in Policy S5 of the Strategy Document (see new site SMB-B below for details).	This change has implications for the international designated sites. See HRA Review for new site SMB-B below.
AM218	New site (SMB-B) & Stamford Bridge inset 47	Add new policy: 'Policy SMB-B – Land North of A166 (6.50ha) <u>This site is allocated for housing development. Proposals will be</u>	This site has been identified to respond to the need for more residential development land in Stamford Bridge.	The Stamford Bridge sites are in the 'amber risk zone' for international sites (see Table 2: Stage I Screening Summary of the Submission HRA Stage I Report dated April 2014) with the River Derwent SAC and the Lower Derwent Valley SPA/Ramsar Site in the vicinity.

Ref.	Para	Proposed Modification	Justification	HRA Review
		<p><u>required to:</u> <u>a. Provide additional landscaping to the eastern and northern boundaries;</u> <u>b. Avoid any built development in the area of the site that is within Flood Zone 3a and 3b; and</u> <u>c. Incorporate comprehensive sustainable drainage systems.'</u></p> <p>Add supporting text:</p> <p><u>'This site is located relatively close to the village centre on the northern side of the A166 (Roman Road) and has an indicative capacity of 131 dwellings. To the south and south west corner is existing residential development, whilst the River Derwent is to the west. As the site forms part of the rural approach to the village, landscaping will be required on the eastern and northern boundaries to integrate the development into the landscape. The landscaping should also provide a buffer between the development and the River Derwent nature Conservation Area. Due to the likelihood of archaeological deposits</u></p>	<p>This change follows the removal of the 'cap' on Rural Service Centres and Primary Villages set out in Policy S5 of the Strategy Document. The implication of removing this cap is that land for 295 dwellings (rather than 170 dwellings) is required in Stamford Bridge.</p>	<p>River Derwent SAC</p> <p>As site SMB-B is located approximately 60 m at its closest point from the River Derwent SAC, it is considered that there will be no physical loss of habitat within the SAC. The site is designated for its water courses of plain to montane levels with Ranuncion fluitantis and Callitricho-Batrachion vegetation, sea lamprey, salmon, bullhead and otter. It is not anticipated that the qualifying species will be impacted by noise, light or visual disturbance at this distance during construction or operation of the development. However, as the site is close to the SAC there is potential for impacts to occur, principally related to increased recreational pressure and water quality.</p> <p><u>Recreational Impacts</u></p> <p>The potential increase in recreational use of the public right of way which runs along the left bank (southern bank) of the River Derwent is identified as having the potential to effect the SAC qualifying features, principally otters. Otters are primarily nocturnal and therefore during the day when dog walkers are most active any otters present will be lying up. At this location the river banks are heavily vegetated and the river is approximately 20m wide. The footpath is already in use and therefore any otters utilising this stretch of river will be used to human activities although the development of SMB-B may see an increase in the number of dog walkers. In considering whether this increase may have a likely significant effect</p>

Ref.	Para	Proposed Modification	Justification	HRA Review
		<p><u>associated with Roman occupation, an archaeological evaluation of the site will also be required prior to any development taking place. The site is also close to the Conservation Area and proposals will need to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.</u></p> <p><u>The western boundary of the site is located within an area of high flood risk (Flood Zone 3a and 3b) where built development should be avoided. Water compatible uses, such as the public open space required as part of the development should be located in this area. The capacity of the site has been calculated to reflect this. Due to the large size of the allocation, proposals should develop a comprehensive Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) drainage plan for the site. Proposals will need to ensure that any issues</u></p>		<p>on the otters it must also be recognised that there is no public access or development along the vegetated right (northern) bank of the river, therefore should there be an increase in the number of dog walkers on the left bank there would be plenty of shelter for otters along the right bank which thus limits the potential for disturbance. In addition it should be noted that although allocation SMB-B is located approximately 60m from the river/public footpath at its closest point no direct access to the river/footpath will be possible. Therefore any dog walkers coming from the allocation site will need to walk along the busy A166 to gain access to the river which will further reduce the number of dog walkers who may potentially use the river footpath. In addition, the footpath does not offer a circular route for walkers which decreases its attractiveness for use by dog walkers.⁵ As a result it is considered that the footpath along the river would be less desirable for regular use by dog walkers. There is a pending planning application to the south of Stamford Bridge (off Low Catton Road - rejected site SMB8) which, given its distance from SMB-B, is unlikely to result in an in-combination impact when considered alongside the effects resulting from allocation SMB-B. Site SMB-A, which was considered through the HRA Screening Report for the Proposed Submission</p>

⁵ The English Nature Research Report Number 649 on 'Dogs, access and nature conservation' (2005) identifies that the length of walk is 0.5hr to 1.5hrs and owners tend to stick to the same routes. Their needs include: sufficient dog bins vegetation not too overgrown, clear and sufficient signage, through/ circular routes (they dislike having to turn back).

Ref.	Para	Proposed Modification	Justification	HRA Review
		<p><u>associated with ponding of surface water on the site are satisfactorily investigated and addressed. Advice is available from the Council's Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Team on SuDS requirements.'</u></p> <p>Amend policies map:</p> <p>Add new housing allocation SMB-B and realign the development limit to bound the new site</p>		<p>Allocations Document (April 2014), has subsequently been granted planning permission for a maximum of 200 dwellings. A HRA Screening Report was prepared as part of the planning application and identifies that 'the risk of disturbance to the SAC along the River Derwent was negligible' and would not give rise to significant effects that would harm the integrity of the SAC. It identifies this as being due to the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • distance of the access point of the SAC from the development and route conditions (the footpath along the SAC is approximately 500m from the access to SMB-A); • availability of a public right of way immediately to the south of the proposed development (this provides a direct connection to the national off road cycle and walking routes (NCR66) to the south with opportunities for circular walks that do not utilise the footpaths along the river); and • provision of alternative public open green space and copse woodland (included as part of the development). <p>In response to the planning application for SMB-A, Natural England concurred with the HRA Screening Report that there was no likely significant effects either alone or in-combination. With regards to the potential in-combination effects of allocations SMB-A and SMB-B the two sites could deliver over 300 properties. However, with the implementation of the measures identified for SMB-A which is located further away from the River Derwent than SMB-B and the provision of</p>

Ref.	Para	Proposed Modification	Justification	HRA Review
				<p>open and amenity space as part of the development of SMB-B, as required in policies ENV5 and C3 of the Strategy Document, which will also seek to ensure that the effect of increased recreational use of the footpath on the SAC would not be significant. The inclusion of the additional wording of policy SMB-B for the design of open and amenity space to include the provision of dog waste bins, allow for a circular walk (as preferred by dog walkers), improvements to public footpaths and clear signage within SSSI/SAC. Once these development requirements are taken into account, the likely effects resulting from the development of SMB-B alone and in-combination are not considered to be significant.</p> <p><u>Water Quality</u> The dumping, spreading or discharge of waste material during any development may damage the water quality of the SAC and residential use of the site may lead to domestic sewage effluent affecting the water quality of the SAC and the supporting processes on which the qualifying natural habitats and the habitats of the qualifying species rely. In addition impacts on the SAC could arise from an increase in sediment from run-off and drainage, which would affect water quality within the river (i.e. through increased levels of silt deposition). However, the implementation of best practice construction methods and the Environment Agency's pollution prevention guidance⁶ (particularly</p>

⁶ <http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/business/topics/pollution/39083.aspx>

Ref.	Para	Proposed Modification	Justification	HRA Review
				<p>PPG1 and PPG5), would mitigate against any significant impacts.</p> <p>There is a pending planning application to the south of Stamford Bridge (off Low Catton Road - rejected site SMB8) which, given its distance from SMB-B, is unlikely to result in an in-combination impact when considered alongside the effects resulting from allocation SMB-B. Site SMB-A, which was considered through the HRA Screening Report for the Proposed Submission Allocations Document (April 2014), has subsequently been granted planning permission for a maximum of 200 dwellings. A HRA Screening Report was prepared as part of the planning application and identifies that 'it was an unlikely possibility that there will be occasions where there is run-off from the proposed development to the River Derwent.' This was due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • principal surface run-off disposal route is to be a ditch to the south-east or north • secondary disposal route via ground infiltration • discharge rate set by East Riding of Yorkshire Council (1.4 l/s/ha) • the use of one or more detention basins for storage and swales for storage • attenuation storage will be for volumes up to the 1 in 100 year plus change storm <p>In response to the planning application for SMB-A, Natural England concurred with the HRA Screening Report that there was no likely significant effects either</p>

Ref.	Para	Proposed Modification	Justification	HRA Review
				<p>alone or in-combination. Reference to the provision of SuDS has been included within modification AM218 as a policy requirement and in the supporting text for policy SMB-B. In addition, policy ENV6(D) of the Strategy Document seeks to ensure that surface water run-off on greenfield sites would be limited to existing run-off rates. Inclusion of appropriate SuDS would prevent increased discharge, mimic greenfield run-off rates and result in no increase to flood risk downstream. This will minimise the potential for any deterioration in water quality in the River Derwent ensuring that the any potential effects on the SAC are not significant. Once this development requirement is taken into account, the likely effects resulting from the development of SMB-B alone and in-combination are not considered to be significant. Land outwith the SAC boundary is not required for its function and loss of this land will not cause any likely significant effect on the SAC.</p> <p>Lower Derwent Valley SPA/Ramsar Site – The site is located approximately 5.5km from the Lower Derwent Valley SPA and Ramsar site and as such there will be no effects from physical loss or damage, noise, light, visual disturbance or residential impacts. Therefore, there would be no significant impacts on the SPA/Ramsar Site resulting from the development of this site alone or in combination. Any impacts will be limited to potential effects on water quality. Reference to the provision of SuDS has</p>

Ref.	Para	Proposed Modification	Justification	HRA Review
				<p>been included within modification AM218 as policy requirements and in the supporting text for policy SMB-B. In addition, policy ENV6(D) of the Strategy Document seeks to ensure that surface water run-off on greenfield sites would be limited to existing run-off rates. Inclusion of appropriate SuDS, which prevent increased discharge, mimic greenfield run-off rates, result in no increase to flood risk downstream and will minimise the potential for any deterioration in water quality in the River Derwent, will ensure that the any potential effects on the SPA/Ramsar site are not significant.</p> <p>The modified policy SMB-B will ensure no likely significant effect on the internationally designated sites and therefore a HRA Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment is not required.</p>

Revised SA Note for SMB-B

- 1 This note provides an updated position on the Sustainability Appraisal Note (March 2014) of sites in Stamford Bridge (pages 119-122), with specific reference to Policy SMB-B (modification ref: AM218) following responses to the proposed modifications consultation, principally Natural England but also Humber Archaeology Partnership. It reflects on further changes introduced to Policy SMB-B as a result of the additional HRA work set out in the the Habitats Regulation Assessment screening report.

- 2 All reasonable alternatives for Stamford Bridge have been assessed for the purposes of the Sustainability Appraisal and detailed appraisals are set out in Appendix A of this note. The detailed assessments show a number of significant constraints associated with many sites in the village. All sites, with the exception of SMB-A(i), SMB-A(ii) and SMB-B, have been 'excluded' as a result of the stage 1 assessment. One or more of the following factors have resulted in a site's exclusion⁷: location within a functional floodplain; potential impact on nature conservation sites where sites are directly adjacent to international and national sites; and potential impact on nationally important archaeological features such as Scheduled Monuments.

Table 1 - Proposed new housing allocation in Stamford Bridge

Site Policy	Site's name and size	Policy text
Policy SMB-B	Land South of A166 (6.50ha)	<p>This site is allocated for housing development. Proposals will be required to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Provide additional landscaping to the eastern and northern boundaries; b. Avoid any built development in the area of the site that is within Flood Zone 3a; c. Provide open space on site that would facilitate dog walking; and c. Incorporate comprehensive sustainable drainage systems.

Policy SMB-B

- 3 Policy SMB-B allocates one single site for residential development. The site has been subject to a detailed appraisal, the results of which are shown in Appendix A. The overall potential effects of the Policy SMB-B against the SA objectives are set out below.

Positive effects

- Objective 1 - *To improve levels of health and reduce health inequalities* – There is a GP surgery located in the village and other medical services in York are

⁷ For completeness, sites have been appraised against stages 2-4, despite failing stage 1.

accessible by bus. There is accessible open space around the village for recreation and leisure and walking and cycling routes to help promote healthier lifestyles.

- Objective 2 - *To reduce social exclusion and improve equality of opportunity amongst social groups* – The site is located relatively close to the village centre on the northern side of the A166 (Roman Road) with some services and facilities available locally. The site is located within an area classified as some of the 10% most deprived areas in the country (barriers to housing and services).
- Objective 3 - *To improve accessibility and public transport links to key services and employment areas* – The site supports good accessibility to key services and facilities, as there is a regular bus service links to York.
- Objective 4 - *To improve housing affordability* – The site is located within an area where the ratio of average house price is over eight times the average income and it will seek to provide 25% of affordable housing (the applicable threshold for the provision of affordable housing is 11 housing units or 1,001 sqm or more).
- Objective 5 - *To improve overall levels of education and skills and retain and attract local highly skilled labour* - The Infrastructure Delivery Plan identifies that there is no need to increase the capacity of the secondary school serving this settlement. There is a primary school in the village. The secondary school is located in Pocklington.
- Objective 16 - *To ensure compatibility of existing and proposed neighbouring land uses* - Development would be generally compatible with adjacent uses.
- Objective 19 - *To support the renaissance of rural areas* – The site will contribute positively to the renaissance of rural areas, as it is allocated in the village helping to maintain the vitality of its community and support local services.

Mixed effects

- Objective 10 - *To reduce levels of atmospheric GHG by reducing emissions and increasing extent of carbon sinks* and Objective 12 - *To reduce carbon based energy use by increasing energy efficiency and production of renewable energy* - No information submitted to demonstrate use of renewable, low carbon energy or to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. New development will likely lead an increase in carbon emissions from energy use in buildings and increased transport levels. However, all new development will need to comply with the Building Regulations stipulating higher energy efficiency standards. Additional landscaping provided on the northern and eastern boundaries of the site will contribute to a slight increase in carbon sink capacity.
- Objective 11 - *To minimise the impacts of climate change by developing in a way that reduces risk from flooding and coastal erosion* – The majority of the site is a more vulnerable use within Zone 1. A small area to the western edge is within zones 2,3a and 3b. The Policy states that proposals should develop a comprehensive Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) drainage plan for the site. Proposals will need to ensure that any issues associated with ponding of surface water on the site are satisfactorily investigated and addressed. Advice is available from the Council's Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Team on SuDS requirements.
- Objective 21 - *To ensure adequate infrastructure provision for new development* - Additional investment in the extra high voltage electricity distribution network will be required to serve developments in the area. The existing waste water treatment works has sufficient capacity to accommodate proposed growth. Stamford Bridge is connected to a mains gas distribution network with capacity. There is unlikely to be any issue with the bulk transfer and treatment of household water supplies in the area. Yorkshire Water have identified there is no sewerage capacity south of

the River Derwent due to the sewage pumping station being at capacity, therefore investment would be required. Proposals should develop a comprehensive SuDS drainage plan for the site.

Negative effects

- Objective 6 - *To improve air quality* - Air quality is acceptable. Air quality is acceptable for the site. The proposed development is unlikely to affect air quality although there may be some minor effects due to increased vehicle use.
- Objective 7 - *To reduce the growth of road traffic* – The site is located on the edge of the village, therefore, some increase in the use of the private car is likely to be inevitable, however, this effect may be tempered, as there is a bus service linking the village to York. Strategic capacity issues identified for the A166 / A64 Grimston Bar Interchange nearby with improvements needed.
- Objective 8 - *To encourage more efficient use of land* – The site has indicative capacity for 131 dwellings. The development of the site will lead to the loss of 100% of Greenfield land including agricultural land Grade 3b land or below.
- Objective 13 - *To protect and enhance biodiversity and important wildlife habitats and to conserve geology* – There are a number of mature trees within the site and a mature wooded area to the east. The additional note accompanying the Habitats Regulation Assessment screening report confirms that the site is within 60m of the River Derwent SAC and SSSI and approximately 5.5km from the Lower Derwent Valley SPA and Ramsar site. It notes that there may be an effect on the River Derwent SAC as a result of increased recreational pressure (primarily from dog walkers affecting otters). However, proposed Strategy Document policies ENV5 (Strengthening green infrastructure) and C3 (Open space, sport and recreation) together with additional policy text set in policy SMB-B making reference to the creation of an impenetrable buffer to prevent direct access between the development and the River Derwent nature conservation area together with the provision of open space on site that would facilitate dog-walking (e.g. circular route, provision of waste bins), along with off-site measures (e.g. signage within the SSSI/SAC, improvements to the Public Rights of Way Network) will reduce the potential for additional dog walkers along the river. Furthermore, whilst additional development has the potential to effect water quality of the SAC as a result of waste or surface water discharges, normal water management practices and the provision of SUDS would ensure any risk is minimised through restricting run-off to the greenfield rate and delivering water quality improvements before discharge. The River Derwent is also a SSSI and has additional notified features to those identified for the SAC (e.g. *Agrion splendens*, kingfisher, grey wagtails). Given that an intervening area of land exists between the site and the River, without direct access between the two, effects arising on the notified features are likely to be minimal. Effects may arise from additional recreational pressure and water quality (as described above for the SAC) but these can be adequately managed as indicated above and will simultaneously protect the additional SSSI features. It is noted that in-combination effects with site SMB-A are not considered to be significant. Site SMB-A includes the provision of open space to the south of the site and the recent planning approval (outline) contains a number of conditions to secure a “fully implemented and subsequently maintained” surface water drainage scheme as well as conditions relating to the separate systems for foul and surface water drainage which are to be approved by the local planning authority. Reference to the provision of SuDS has been included as a policy requirement and in the supporting text for policy SMB-B. In addition, policy ENV6 :Managing environmental hazards of the Strategy Document seeks to ensure that surface

water run-off on greenfield sites would be limited to existing run-off rates in requirement D1i. Inclusion of appropriate SuDS would prevent increased discharge, mimic greenfield run-off rates and result in no increase to flood risk downstream. This will minimise the potential for any deterioration in water quality in the River Derwent ensuring that the any potential effects on the SAC and SSSI are not significant. Once this development requirement is taken into account, the likely effects resulting from the development of SMB-B alone and in-combination are not considered to be significant.

As already mentioned, the site is also located approximately 5.5km from the Lower Derwent Valley SPA and Ramsar site. The HRA screening report concludes that no significant potential effects on the SPA/Ramsar site are expected.

- Objective 14 - *To conserve and enhance heritage assets and their settings* – The site is adjacent to a Conservation Area. The Policy states that due to the likelihood of archaeological deposits associated with Roman occupation, an archaeological evaluation of the site will also be required prior to any development taking place and that proposals will need to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- Objective 15 - *To protect and enhance the countryside and landscape quality* – Would introduce built form of development into open and rural approach to the village. The River Derwent is located to the north-west of the site. The Policy recommends that additional landscaping will be required along the northern and eastern boundaries to help integrate the development into the surrounding landscape and provide a soft edge to the settlement. The landscaping should also provide a buffer between the development and the River Derwent nature Conservation Area.

Neutral or no direct effects

- Objective 9 - *To improve the quality of local fresh water resources* - Development would not affect public drinking water supply.
- Objective 17 - *To maintain and strengthen the economy of East Riding* – This development is within the 10% most deprived area zone (barriers to housing and services) but it would not provide a specific regeneration or economic benefit.
- Objective 18 - *To increase diversity of employment* – No effect.
- Objective 20 - *To avoid sterilisation of mineral resources* – The site is not located within a relevant safeguarding or preferred area or area of search.

Policy Assessment Summary

- 4 Policy SMB-B performed relatively well in the assessment providing one site for a residential development with 131 dwellings. The site is compatible with its adjacent uses and provides good level of access to such local services and facilities as a shop, post office, GP surgery, butchers, three public house and primary school.
- 5 The key constraints on the site relate to landscaping, the loss of Greenfield land (although this would not lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land), and that development could potentially affect local heritage and biodiversity. The presence of the River Derwent SAC and SSSI just to the north of the site means that its development may impact on these designations but these effects can be managed and the risk reduced to a great extent through the application of policies set out in the Strategy Document (e.g. ENV6 – ‘Managing environmental hazards’ (limiting surface water run off and provision of SuDS; C3 – ‘Open space, sport and recreation’). The specific policy requirement for significant landscape buffering along the north-western boundary and the incorporation of

comprehensive sustainable drainage systems further minimise recreational and water quality effects respectively.

Recommendations

- 6 Following Natural England's comments on the proposed allocation of SMB-B (modification ref: AM218), it is recommended that the policy includes an additional requirement for open space on site to be provided on site that would facilitate circular dog walking and that the landscape buffer along the boundary of the site is designed so as to effectively prevent direct access to the river. This will ensure the risk of harm to the River Derwent SAC and SSSI is minimised by leading people and dogs away from the footpath along the river bank.

In order to ensure that mitigation measures set above remain effective during the life time of the development there is a need for a management plan to be prepared as part of the planning application.

Revised Site Assessments for Stamford Bridge

Summary Sheet Stamford Bridge - Rural Service Centre

Site Reference	SMB-A(i)	SMB-A(ii)	SMB-B	SMB3r	SMB4	SMB4r	SMB5	SMB6	SMB7	SMB7r	SMB8	SMB8r	SMB9	SMB10	SMB11
STAGE 1 Initial Assessment & Site Exclusion															
Conformity with Settlement Network (1)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Biodiversity and Geological Value (2)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Flood Risk & Coastal Change (3)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Heritage Assets (4)	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
STAGE 2 Initial Ranking															
Greenfield & Brownfield Land (5)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Accessibility by Public Transport (6)	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Accessibility by Walking & Cycling (7)	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Flood Risk (8)	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	-2	-2	-2
STAGE 3 Detailed Site Specific Considerations															
Settlement Vision (9)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(---)	(---)	(---)	(---)	(---)	(---)	(---)	(0)	(---)	(---)	(---)	(---)
Biodiversity and Geological Value (10)	(--)	(--)	(--)	(--)	(--)	(--)	(--)	(--)	(--)	(--)	(--)	(--)	(---)	(---)	(---)
Wildlife & Natural Environment (11)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Heritage Assets (12)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)
Built Character (13)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
Landscape Character (14)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(+)	(-)	(+)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(---)	(---)	(-)
Air Quality (15)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Agricultural Land (16)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Groundwater (17)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Compatibility with Neighbouring Uses (18)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(-)	(-)	(-)
Contaminated Land (19)	(0)	(+++)	(0)	(+++)	(+++)	(+++)	(+++)	(+++)	(+++)	(+++)	(0)	(+++)	(+++)	(+++)	(+++)
Mineral Resources (20)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (21)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Publicly Accessible Open Space (22)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(---)	(---)	(---)	(---)	(---)	(---)	(---)	(---)	(---)	(---)	(---)	(---)
Utilities Infrastructure Capacity (24)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
School Capacity (23)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Highway Network Capacity (25)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
Highway Non-Road Transport Network (26)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
Wider Non-Road Transport Network (26)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Community Facilities (27)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Town Centre Vitality and Viability (28)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Regeneration or Economic Benefits (29)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Affordable Housing (30)	(+++)	(+++)	(+)	(+++)	(+++)	(+++)	(+++)	(+++)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+++)	(+++)	(+++)
STAGE 4 Deliverability															
Insurmountable Constraints (31)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
Ownership and Market Constraints (32)	No	No	No	0 - 5 years	0 - 5 years	0 - 5 years	0 - 5 years	0 - 5 years	0 - 5 years	0 - 5 years	0 - 5 years	0 - 5 years	0 - 5 years	0 - 5 years	0 - 5 years
Deliverability (33)	0 - 5 years	0 - 5 years	0 - 5 years	developable	developable	developable	developable	developable	developable	developable	developable	developable	developable	developable	considered suitable for allocation

Summary Sheet

Stamford Bridge - Rural Service Centre

Site Reference	SMB12	SMB13	SMB14	SMB15	SMB16	SMB17	SMB18
STAGE 1 Initial Assessment & Site Exclusion							
Conformity with Settlement Network (1)	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Biodiversity and Geological Value (2)	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Flood Risk & Coastal Change (3)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Heritage Assets (4)	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
STAGE 2 Initial Ranking							
Greenfield & Brownfield Land (5)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Accessibility by Public Transport (6)	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Accessibility by Walking & Cycling (7)	1	1	0	1	0	0	1
Flood Risk (8)	4	-2	6	6	6	6	6
STAGE 3 Detailed Site Specific Considerations							
Settlement Vision (9)	(---)	(---)	(---)	(---)	(---)	(---)	(---)
Biodiversity and Geological Value (10)	(---)	(---)	(--)	(--)	(--)	(--)	(--)
Wildlife & Natural Environment (11)	(0)	(-)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Heritage Assets (12)	(+)	(-)	(---)	(---)	(---)	(---)	(---)
Built Character (13)	(+)	(0)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
Landscape Character (14)	(0)	(0)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
Air Quality (15)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Agricultural Land (16)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Groundwater (17)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Compatibility with Neighbouring Uses (18)	(-)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Contaminated Land (19)	(0)	(+++)	(+++)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Mineral Resources (20)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (21)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Publicly Accessible Open Space (22)	(0)	(0)	(-)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Utilities Infrastructure Capacity (23)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
School Capacity (24)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
Highway Network Capacity (25)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
Wider Non-Road Transport Network (26)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Community Facilities (27)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Town Centre Vitality and Viability (28)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Regeneration or Economic Benefits (29)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Affordable Housing (30)	(+++)	(+++)	(+++)	(+++)	(+++)	(+++)	(+++)
STAGE 4 Deliverability							
Insurmountable Constraints (31)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Ownership and Market Constraints (32)	Not considered suitable for allocation	Not considered suitable for allocation	Not developable	Not developable	Not developable	Not developable	Not developable
Deliverability (33)	considered suitable for allocation	considered suitable for allocation	developable	developable	developable	developable	developable

SMB-A(i) (SMB2)		Outcome	Reasoning
Question			
Basic Information			
Land bid number:	38, 688		
Site area (ha)	5.27		
Proposed use	Residential		
Date received	06/12/2004		
Additional information			
STAGE 1 Initial Assessment & Site Exclusion			
Conformity with Settlement Network (1)	Yes		Rural Service Centre. Adjacent to settlement.
Biodiversity and Geological Value (2)	No		No effect on International or National site of biological or geological interest (subject confirmation as a result of Habitats Regulations Screening Report)
Flood Risk & Coastal Change (3)	No		Not in functional floodplain or affected by coastal erosion
Heritage Assets (4)	No		No substantial harm to any nationally designated asset
STAGE 2 Initial Ranking			
Greenfield & Brownfield Land (5)	1		100% Greenfield land
Accessibility by Public Transport (6)	2		
Accessibility by Walking & Cycling (7)	1		
Flood Risk (8)	6		More vulnerable use within Zone 1
STAGE 3 Detailed Site Specific Considerations			
Settlement Vision (9)	(0)		No settlement vision defined
Biodiversity and Geological Value (10)	(-)		Other (2002) Bats (2002) < 500m
Wildlife & Natural Environment (11)	(0)		No significant effect or existing features can be retained. Peripheral hedgrows.
Heritage Assets (12)	(-)		Unlikely to result in harm to any heritage assets
Built Character (13)	(-)		Whilst this will extend the built form of the settlement out into open countryside, this can be mitigated by additional planting. The large stand of trees at Burtonfield Hall provides a visual stop for the extended built form.
Landscape Character (14)	(-)		Would introduce built form of development into sensitive open and rural approach to town. However this side of the road is less sensitive than the other which would impinge on views over the Denwent Valley.
Air Quality (15)	(0)		Air quality acceptable - development unlikely to affect quality
Agricultural Land (16)	(0)		Grade 3b land or below
Groundwater (17)	(0)		Development would not affect public drinking water supply
Compatibility with Neighbouring Uses (18)	(0)		Development would be compatible with adjacent uses
Contaminated Land (19)	(0)		Development is not located on land that is likely to be contaminated.
Mineral Resources (20)	(0)		Not within a relevant safeguarding or preferred area or area of search.
Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (21)	(0)		No information submitted to demonstrate use of renewable, very low carbon energy or to reduce greenhouse gas emissions
Publicly Accessible Open Space (22)	(0)		No effect on existing open space or any obvious potential/opportunity for provision of new open space above that required by the Core Strategy policy.
School Capacity (23)	(0)		The Infrastructure Delivery Plan does not identify a need to increase the capacity of the schools serving this settlement.
Utilities Infrastructure Capacity (24)	(-)		No additional investment in the extra high voltage electricity distribution network will be required to serve developments in the area. The receiving Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity to accommodate development proposed as part of the Local Plan. Stamford Bridge is connected to a mains gas distribution network with capacity. There is unlikely to be any issue with the bulk transfer and treatment of household water supplies in the area. Yorkshire Water has identified that it is anticipated a connection to the public sewer network will incur additional costs from a developer.
Highway Network Capacity (25)	(-)		No significant highways issues anticipated. Strategic capacity issues identified for the A166 and the A64 Grimston Bar Interchange nearby with improvements needed.
Wider Non-Road Transport Network (26)	N/A		Housing use proposed
Community Facilities (27)	(0)		No proposed or loss of facilities
Town Centre Vitality and Viability (28)	N/A		Housing use proposed
Regeneration or Economic Benefits (29)	(0)		No effect on a recognised regeneration strategy or a deprived area
Affordable Housing (30)	(+++)		Within area where ratio of average house price is over 8 times the average income.
STAGE 4 Deliverability			
Insurmountable Constraints (31)	No		No known constraints
Ownership and Market Constraints (32)	No		No known constraints
Deliverability (33)	0 - 5 years		Site chosen to replace others now rejected

SMB-A(ii) (SMB3)		Outcome	Reasoning
Question			
Basic Information			
Land bid number	38		
Site area (ha)	3.42		
Proposed use	Residential		
Date received			
Additional information			
STAGE 1 Initial Assessment & Site Exclusion			
Conformity with Settlement Network (1)	Yes		Rural Service Centre. Adjacent to settlement. (in conjunction with SMB2)
Biodiversity and Geological Value (2)	No		No effect on International or National site of biological or geological interest (subject confirmation as a result of Habitats Regulations Screening Report)
Flood Risk & Coastal Change (3)	No		Not in functional floodplain or affected by coastal erosion
Heritage Assets (4)	No		No substantial harm to any nationally designated asset
STAGE 2 Initial Ranking			
Greenfield & Brownfield Land (5)	1		100% Greenfield land
Accessibility by Public Transport (6)	2		
Accessibility by Walking & Cycling (7)	0		
Flood Risk (8)	6		More vulnerable use within Zone 1
STAGE 3 Detailed Site Specific Considerations			
Settlement Vision (9)	(0)		No settlement vision defined
Biodiversity and Geological Value (10)	(--)		Bats (2003) < 500m & Traditional Orchard (HAP) on site
Wildlife & Natural Environment (11)	(0)		No significant effect or existing features can be retained. Peripheral hedgrows and group of trees but these could be retained within development.
Heritage Assets (12)	(-)		Adjacent to designated Battlefield Site (Stamford Bridge 1066).
Built Character (13)	(-)		Whilst this will extend the built form of the settlement out into open countryside, this can be mitigated by additional planting. The large stand of trees at Burtonfield Hall provides a visual stop for the extended built form.
Landscape Character (14)	(-)		Would introduce built form of development into sensitive open and rural approach to town. However this side of the road is less sensitive than the other which would impinge on views over the Derwent Valley.
Air Quality (15)	(0)		Air quality acceptable - development unlikely to affect quality
Agricultural Land (16)	(0)		Grade 3b land or below
Groundwater (17)	(0)		Development would not affect public drinking water supply
Compatibility with Neighbouring Uses (18)	(0)		Development would be compatible with adjacent uses
Contaminated Land (19)	(+++)		The site contains areas of potentially contaminated land as there is a farm with associated out buildings in the west of the site. This potentially contaminated land is likely to be addressed through appropriate planning conditions and/or suitable design/layout.
Mineral Resources (20)	(0)		Not within a relevant safeguarding or preferred area or area of search.
Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (21)	(0)		No information submitted to demonstrate use of renewable, very low carbon energy or to reduce greenhouse gas emissions
Publicly Accessible Open Space (22)	(0)		No effect on existing open space or any obvious potential/opportunity for provision of new open space above that required by the Core Strategy policy. PROW runs along south western boundary but could be incorporated into any development of the site.
School Capacity (23)	(0)		The Infrastructure Delivery Plan does not identify a need to increase the capacity of the schools serving this settlement.
Utilities Infrastructure Capacity (24)	(-)		No additional investment in the extra high voltage electricity distribution network will be required to serve developments in the area. The receiving Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity to accommodate development proposed as part of the Local Plan. Stamford Bridge is connected to a mains gas distribution network with capacity. There is unlikely to be any issue with the bulk transfer and treatment of household water supplies in the area. Yorkshire Water has identified that it is anticipated a connection to the public sewer network will incur additional costs from a developer.
Highway Network Capacity (25)	(-)		No significant highways issues anticipated. Strategic capacity issues identified for the A166 and the A64 Grimston Bar Interchange nearby with improvements needed.
Wider Non-Road Transport Network (26)	N/A		Housing use proposed
Community Facilities (27)	(0)		No proposed or loss of facilities
Town Centre Vitality and Viability (28)	N/A		Housing use proposed
Regeneration or Economic Benefits (29)	(0)		No effect on a recognised regeneration strategy or a deprived area
Affordable Housing (30)	(+++)		Within area where ratio of average house price is over 8 times the average income.
STAGE 4 Deliverability			
Insurmountable Constraints (31)	No		No known constraints
Ownership and Market Constraints (32)	No		No known constraints
Deliverability (33)	0 - 5 years		Site chosen to replace others now rejected

Question		Outcome	Reasoning
Basic Information			
Land bid number	913, 1846		
Site area (ha)	6.50		
Proposed use	Residential		
Date received	05/08/2003, 27/4/2011		
Additional information			
STAGE 1 Initial Assessment & Site Exclusion			
Conformity with Settlement Network (1)	Yes		Rural Service Centre. Adjacent to settlement.
Biodiversity and Geological Value (2)	No		Close to SSSI and SAC (River Derwent). Development may increase recreational pressure as site is close to public footpath along the river bank. The intervening strip of land and sufficient space within site to mitigate any significant impact. Measures would be required to ensure integrity of water quality is maintained. Habitats Regulations Screening Report confirms no likely significant effects subject to small-scale mitigation measures (e.g. signage, SuDS). Additional notified features for the SSSI are unlikely to be significantly affected following the implementation of policies in the Strategy Document (e.g. through provision of on-site open space, SuDS)
Flood Risk & Coastal Change (3)	No		Vast majority of site not in functional floodplain or affected by coastal erosion. Very small part along western boundary within zone 3b.
Heritage Assets (4)	No		No substantial harm to any nationally designated asset
STAGE 2 Initial Ranking			
Greenfield & Brownfield Land (5)	1		100% Greenfield land
Accessibility by Public Transport (6)	2		
Accessibility by Walking & Cycling (7)	1		
Flood Risk (8)	6		Majority of site more vulnerable use within Zone 1. Small area to western edge within zones 2, 3a and 3b.
STAGE 3 Detailed Site Specific Considerations			
Settlement Vision (9)	(0)		No settlement vision or place statement defined.
Biodiversity and Geological Value (10)	(-)		Other (2002) Bats (2005) < 500m. No on site impacts on protected species confirmed through Environmental Statement accompanying planning application. See also (O2) above.
Wildlife & Natural Environment (11)	(0)		No significant effect or existing features can be retained. Peripheral hedgerows and copse of trees to western boundary.
Heritage Assets (12)	(-)		Adjacent to Conservation Area. The pleasant open and landscaped entrance to town along the A166 that was provided by the recent development to the east is referred to in the conservation area appraisal. Initial survey results indicate that the area appears to have low archaeological potential. However, further archaeological evaluation may be required prior to development.
Built Character (13)	(-)		Site is in an open and rural approach to the town and affords views of the Derwent valley. The site rises up from the south western corner to a plateau approx one third along road frontage to A166. Beyond this, it extends out from the existing built form and would intrude into open countryside and is separated from built up area of village by the Roman Road.
Landscape Character (14)	(-)		Site is in an open and rural approach to the town and affords views of the Derwent valley. The land is undulating and rolls towards the river and is part of an important landscape area. There is a degree of separation from the village as a result of the Roman Road (A166) and therefore quite rural in nature.
Air Quality (15)	(0)		Air quality acceptable - development unlikely to affect quality
Agricultural Land (16)	(0)		Grade 3b land or below
Groundwater (17)	(0)		Development would not affect public drinking water supply
Compatibility with Neighbouring Uses (18)	(0)		Development would be compatible with adjacent uses
Contaminated Land (19)	(0)		Development is not located on land that is likely to be contaminated, however there is potentially contaminated land adjacent to the site. At the south western corner of the site there is a former garage/petrol filling station. This garage has been redeveloped into housing. The planning file for this redevelopment may contain information regarding site investigations and possible remediation. Depending on the extent of previous site investigations there may be a need for appropriate planning conditions and/or a suitable design/layout to mitigate the risk of contamination from the garage.
Mineral Resources (20)	(0)		Not within a relevant safeguarding or preferred area or area of search.
Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (21)	(0)		No information submitted to demonstrate use of renewable, very low carbon energy or to reduce greenhouse gas emissions
Publicly Accessible Open Space (22)	(0)		No effect on existing open space or any obvious potential/opportunity for provision of new open space above that required by the Core Strategy
School Capacity (23)	(0)		The Infrastructure Delivery Plan does not identify a need to increase the capacity of the schools serving this settlement.
Utilities Infrastructure Capacity (24)	(-)		No additional investment in the extra high voltage electricity distribution network will be required to serve developments in the area. The receiving Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity to accommodate development proposed as part of the Local Plan. Stamford Bridge is connected to a mains gas distribution network with capacity. There is unlikely to be any issue with the bulk transfer and treatment of household water supplies in the area. Yorkshire Water have identified there is no sewerage capacity south of the River Derwent due to the sewage pumping station being at capacity, therefore investment would be required.
Highway Network Capacity (25)	(-)		No significant highways issues anticipated. Strategic capacity issues identified for the A166 and the A64 Grimston Bar Interchange nearby with improvements needed.
Wider Non-Road Transport Network (26)	N/A		Housing use proposed
Community Facilities (27)	(0)		No proposed or loss of facilities
Town Centre Viability and Viability (28)	N/A		Housing use proposed
Regeneration or Economic Benefits (29)	(0)		Within the 10% most deprived area zone but this development would not provide a specific benefit.
Affordable Housing (30)	(+)		Within area where ratio of average house price is under 8 times the average income.
STAGE 4 Deliverability			
Insurmountable Constraints (31)	No		No known constraints
Ownership and Market Constraints (32)	No		No known constraints
Deliverability (33)	0 - 5 years		Site is next most appropriate site for development following the need to identify additional sites to meet the higher housing requirement for Stamford Bridge as a result of the proposed Main Modification to Policy S5 of the Strategy Document. Mitigation will be required to limit impact of development on landscape character and biodiversity

Question		Outcome	Reasoning
Basic Information			
Land bid number	38		
Site area (ha)	5.01		
Proposed use	Residential		
Date received			
Additional information			
STAGE 1 Initial Assessment & Site Exclusion			
Conformity with Settlement Network (1)	Yes		Rural Service Centre. Not well related to the existing settlement limit. Adjacent to the proposed new development limit.
Biodiversity and Geological Value (2)	No		No effect on International or National site of biological or geological interest (subject confirmation as a result of Habitats Regulations Screening Report)
Flood Risk & Coastal Change (3)	No		Not in functional floodplain or affected by coastal erosion
Heritage Assets (4)	Yes		Adjacent to designated Battlefield Site (Stamford Bridge 1066) and development would likely cause substantial harm to those elements which contribute to the significance of the Registered Battlefield and its setting.
STAGE 2 Initial Ranking			
Greenfield & Brownfield Land (5)	1		100% Greenfield land
Accessibility by Public Transport (6)	2		
Accessibility by Walking & Cycling (7)	0		
Flood Risk (8)	6		More vulnerable use within Zone 1
STAGE 3 Detailed Site Specific Considerations			
Settlement Vision (9)	(---)		No settlement vision defined though site may impact on the setting on the designated Battlefield (Stamford Bridge 1066) referred to in sub area policy A6
Biodiversity and Geological Value (10)	(--)		Bats (2003) < 500m & Traditional Orchard (HAP) on site
Wildlife and Natural Environment (11)	(0)		No significant effect or existing features can be retained. Peripheral hedgrows and group of trees but these could be retained within development.
Heritage Assets (12)	(-)		Adjacent to designated Battlefield Site (Stamford Bridge 1066).
Built Character (13)	(-)		Would extend built form of development out into open rural countryside.
Landscape Character (14)	(-)		Would introduce built form of development into sensitive open and rural approach to town.
Air Quality (15)	(0)		Air quality acceptable - development unlikely to affect quality
Agricultural Land (16)	(0)		Grade 3b land or below
Groundwater (17)	(0)		Development would not affect public drinking water supply
Compatibility with Neighbouring Uses (18)	(0)		Development would be compatible with adjacent uses
Contaminated Land (19)	(+++)		The site contains areas of potentially contaminated land as there is a farm with associated out buildings in the west of the site. This potentially contaminated land is likely to be addressed through appropriate planning conditions and/or suitable design/layout.
Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (21)	(0)		Not within a relevant safeguarding or preferred area or area of search.
Publicly Accessible Open Space (22)	(0)		No information submitted to demonstrate use of renewable, very low carbon energy or to reduce greenhouse gas emissions
School Capacity (23)	(---)		Large part of site identified for open space provision following approval of development on SMB-A
Utilities Infrastructure Capacity (24)	(-)		The Infrastructure Delivery Plan does not identify a need to increase the capacity of the schools serving this settlement. No additional investment in the extra high voltage electricity distribution network will be required to serve developments in the area. The receiving Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity to accommodate development proposed as part of the Local Plan. Stamford Bridge is connected to a mains gas distribution network with capacity. There is unlikely to be any issue with the bulk transfer and treatment of household water supplies in the area. Yorkshire Water have identified there is no sewerage capacity south of the River Derwent due to the sewerage pumping station being at capacity, therefore investment would be required.
Highway Network Capacity (25)	(-)		No significant highways issues anticipated. Strategic capacity issues identified for the A166 and the A64 Grimston Bar Interchange nearby with improvements needed.
Wider Non-Road Transport Network (26)	N/A		Housing use proposed
Community Facilities (27)	(0)		No proposed or loss of facilities
Town Centre Vitality and Viability (28)	N/A		Housing use proposed
Regeneration or Economic Benefits (29)	(0)		No effect on a recognised regeneration strategy or a deprived area
Affordable Housing (30)	(+++)		Within area where ratio of average house price is over 8 times the average income.
STAGE 4 Deliverability			
Insurmountable Constraints (31)	No		No known constraints
Ownership and Market Constraints (32)	No		No known constraints
Deliverability (33)	Not developable		Development would likely cause substantial harm to those elements which contribute to the significance of the Registered Battlefield and its setting. It would also significantly extend the built form of the settlement out into sensitive open countryside, resulting in harm to the character of the settlement and landscape. In addition, part of the site has been identified for open space provision following the approval of development on SMB-A

Question		Outcome	Reasoning
Basic Information			
Land bid number	912, 1847		
Site area (ha)	0.57		
Proposed use	Residential		
Date received	05/08/2003, 27/4/2011		
Additional information			
STAGE 1 Initial Assessment & Site Exclusion			
Conformity with Settlement Network (1)	Yes		Rural Service Centre. Adjacent to settlement.
Biodiversity and Geological Value (2)	No		No effect on International or National site of biological or geological interest (subject confirmation as a result of Habitats Regulations Screening Report)
Flood Risk & Coastal Change (3)	No		Not in functional floodplain or affected by coastal erosion
Heritage Assets (4)	Yes		Site has been identified as being within an area of nationally significant archaeological importance and is not considered appropriate for future development.
STAGE 2 Initial Ranking			
Greenfield & Brownfield Land (5)	1		100% Greenfield land
Accessibility by Public Transport (6)	2		
Accessibility by Walking & Cycling (7)	0		
Flood Risk (8)	6		More vulnerable use within Zone 1
STAGE 3 Detailed Site Specific Considerations			
Settlement Vision (9)	(---)		No settlement vision or place statement defined. Would undermine vision of the plan due to impact on a scheduled monument
Biodiversity and Geological Value (10)	(--)		Water Vole (1999) Otter (1996) Bats (2003) < 500m
Wildlife & Natural Environment (11)	(0)		No significant effect or existing features can be retained.
Heritage Assets (12)	(---)		Within an area of nationally significant archaeological importance where development is likely to have an impact on those elements which contribute to the significance of the asset.
Built Character (13)	(0)		Site could be developed to follow on from the recently completed affordable housing site as this would round off the existing built form of the settlement.
Landscape Character (14)	(+)		Small incursion into open countryside but could be developed to follow on from the recently completed affordable housing site. However access could be maintained.
Air Quality (15)	(0)		Air quality acceptable - development unlikely to affect quality
Agricultural Land (16)	(0)		Shown as urban land on classification maps
Groundwater (17)	(0)		Development would not affect public drinking water supply
Compatibility with Neighbouring Uses (18)	(0)		Development would be compatible with adjacent uses
Contaminated Land (19)	(0)		Development is not located on land that is likely to be contaminated.
Mineral Resources (20)	(0)		Not within a relevant safeguarding or preferred area or area of search.
Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (21)	(0)		No information submitted to demonstrate use of renewable, very low carbon energy or to reduce greenhouse gas emissions
Publicly Accessible Open Space (22)	(0)		No effect on existing open space or any obvious potential/opportunity for provision of new open space above that required by the Core Strategy policy.
School Capacity (23)	(0)		The Infrastructure Delivery Plan does not identify a need to increase the capacity of the schools serving this settlement.
Utilities Infrastructure Capacity (24)	(-)		No additional investment in the extra high voltage electricity distribution network will be required to serve developments in the area. The receiving Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity to accommodate development proposed as part of the Local Plan. Stamford Bridge is connected to a mains gas distribution network with capacity. There is unlikely to be any issue with the bulk transfer and treatment of household water supplies in the area. Yorkshire Water have identified there is no sewerage capacity south of the River Denwent due to the sewage pumping station being at capacity, therefore investment would be required.
Highway Network Capacity (25)	(-)		Access would have to come from High Catton Road, possibly via the new affordable housing access. No significant highways issues anticipated. Strategic capacity issues identified for the A166 and the A64 Grimston Bar Interchange nearby with improvements needed.
Wider Non-Road Transport Network (26)	N/A		Housing use proposed
Community Facilities (27)	(0)		No proposed or loss of facilities
Town Centre Vitality and Viability (28)	N/A		The bid discusses a possible retail or commercial centre within the site (out of town centre retail could impact on the Town Centre Vitality and Viability)
Regeneration or Economic Benefits (29)	(0)		No effect on a recognised regeneration strategy or a deprived area
Affordable Housing (30)	(+++)		Within area where ratio of average house price is over 8 times the average income.
STAGE 4 Deliverability			
Insurmountable Constraints (31)	No		No known constraints
Ownership and Market Constraints (32)	No		No known constraints
Deliverability (33)	Not developable		Site has been identified as being within an area of nationally significant archaeological importance and is not considered appropriate for future development.

Question		ERYC Outcome	ERYC Reasoning
Basic Information			
Land bid number	912, 1847		
Site area (ha)	3.00		
Proposed use	Residential		
Date received	05/08/2003, 27/4/2011		
Additional information			
STAGE 1 Initial Assessment & Site Exclusion			
Conformity with Settlement Network (1)	Yes		Rural Service Centre. Close to settlement and adjoining recent affordable housing scheme.
Biodiversity and Geological Value (2)	No		No effect on International or National site of biological or geological interest (subject confirmation as a result of Habitats Regulations Screening Report)
Flood Risk & Coastal Change (3)	No		Not in functional floodplain or affected by coastal erosion
Heritage Assets (4)	Yes		Site has been identified as being within an area of nationally significant archaeological importance and is not considered appropriate for future development.
STAGE 2 Initial Ranking			
Greenfield & Brownfield Land (5)	1		100% Greenfield land
Accessibility by Public Transport (6)	2		
Accessibility by Walking & Cycling (7)	0		
Flood Risk (8)	6		More vulnerable use within Zone 1. Drain adjoining southern boundary - zone 3b.
STAGE 3 Detailed Site Specific Considerations			
Settlement Vision (9)	(---)		No settlement vision or place statement defined. Would undermine vision of the plan due to impact on a scheduled monument
Biodiversity and Geological Value (10)	(--)		Water Vole (1999) Otter (1996) Bats (2003) < 500m
Wildlife & Natural Environment (11)	(0)		No significant effect or existing features can be retained.
Heritage Assets (12)	(---)		Within an area of nationally significant archaeological importance where development is likely to have an impact on those elements which contribute to the significance of the asset. Also adjacent to designated Battlefield Site (Stamford Bridge 1066)
Built Character (13)	(-)		Would significantly extend built form of development out into open rural countryside.
Landscape Character (14)	(-)		Would introduce built form of development into sensitive open and rural approach to town.
Air Quality (15)	(0)		Air quality acceptable - development unlikely to affect quality
Agricultural Land (16)	(0)		Grade 3b land or below
Groundwater (17)	(0)		Development would not affect public drinking water supply
Compatibility with Neighbouring Uses (18)	(0)		Development would be compatible with adjacent uses
Contaminated Land (19)	(0)		Development is not located on land that is likely to be contaminated.
Mineral Resources (20)	(0)		Not within a relevant safeguarding or preferred area or area of search.
Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (21)	(0)		No information submitted to demonstrate use of renewable, very low carbon energy or to reduce greenhouse gas emissions
Publicly Accessible Open Space (22)	(0)		No effect on existing open space or any obvious potential/opportunity for provision of new open space above that required by the Core Strategy policy.
School Capacity (23)	(0)		The Infrastructure Delivery Plan does not identify a need to increase the capacity of the schools serving this settlement.
Utilities Infrastructure Capacity (24)	(-)		No additional investment in the extra high voltage electricity distribution network will be required to serve developments in the area. The receiving Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity to accommodate development proposed as part of the Local Plan. Stamford Bridge is connected to a mains gas distribution network with capacity. There is unlikely to be any issue with the bulk transfer and treatment of household water supplies in the area. Yorkshire Water have identified there is no sewerage capacity south of the River Denwent due to the sewage pumping station being at capacity, therefore investment would be required.
Highway Network Capacity (25)	(-)		No significant highways issues anticipated. Strategic capacity issues identified for the A166 and the A64 Grimston Bar Interchange nearby with improvements needed.
Wider Non-Road Transport Network (26)	N/A		Housing use proposed
Community Facilities (27)	(0)		No proposed or loss of facilities
Town Centre Vitality and Viability (28)	N/A		Housing use proposed
Regeneration or Economic Benefits (29)	(0)		No effect on a recognised regeneration strategy or a deprived area
Affordable Housing (30)	(+++)		Within area where ratio of average house price is over 8 times the average income.
STAGE 4 Deliverability			
Insurmountable Constraints (31)	No		No known constraints
Ownership and Market Constraints (32)	No		No known constraints
Deliverability (33)	Not developable		Development would extend the built form of the settlement out into sensitive open countryside, resulting in harm to the character of the settlement and landscape. Could also affect battlefield site. Site has been identified as being within an area of nationally significant archaeological importance and is not considered appropriate for future development.

SMB5	
Question	Reasoning
Basic Information	
Land bid number	912, 1848
Site area (ha)	0.65
Proposed use	Residential
Date received	05/08/2003, 27/4/2011
Additional information	
STAGE 1 Initial Assessment & Site Exclusion	
Conformity with Settlement Network (1)	Yes
Biodiversity and Geological Value (2)	No
Flood Risk & Coastal Change (3)	No
Heritage Assets (4)	Yes
	Rural Service Centre. Adjacent to settlement. No effect on International or National site of biological or geological interest (subject confirmation as a result of Habitats Regulations Screening Report)
	Not in functional floodplain or affected by coastal erosion Site has been identified as being within an area of nationally significant archaeological importance and is not considered appropriate for future development.
STAGE 2 Initial Ranking	
Greenfield & Brownfield Land (5)	1
Accessibility by Public Transport (6)	2
Accessibility by Walking & Cycling (7)	0
Flood Risk (8)	6
	100% Greenfield land More vulnerable use within Zone 1
STAGE 3 Detailed Site Specific Considerations	
Settlement Vision (9)	(---)
Biodiversity and Geological Value (10)	(--)
Wildlife & Natural Environment (11)	(0)
Heritage Assets (12)	(---)
Built Character (13)	(0)
Landscape Character (14)	(+)
Air Quality (15)	(0)
Agricultural Land (16)	(0)
Groundwater (17)	(0)
Compatibility with Neighbouring Uses (18)	(0)
Contaminated Land (19)	(0)
Mineral Resources (20)	(0)
Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (21)	(0)
Publicly Accessible Open Space (22)	(0)
School Capacity (23)	(0)
Utilities Infrastructure Capacity (24)	(-)
	No settlement vision or place statement defined. Would undermine vision of the plan due to impact on a scheduled monument Water Vole (1999) Otter (1996) Bats (2003) < 500m No significant effect or existing features can be retained. Within an area of nationally significant archaeological importance where development is likely to have an impact on those elements which contribute to the significance of the asset. Site could be developed to follow on from the recently completed affordable housing site as this would round off the existing built form of the settlement. Small incursion into open countryside but could be developed to follow on from the recently completed affordable housing site. However access could be improved. Air quality acceptable - development unlikely to affect quality Shown as urban land on classification maps Development would not affect public drinking water supply Development would be compatible with adjacent uses Development is not located on land that is likely to be contaminated. Not within a relevant safeguarding or preferred area or area of search. No information submitted to demonstrate use of renewable, very low carbon energy or to reduce greenhouse gas emissions No effect on existing open space or any obvious potential/opportunity for provision of new open space above that required by the Core Strategy policy The Infrastructure Delivery Plan does not identify a need to increase the capacity of the schools serving this settlement. No additional investment in the extra high voltage electricity distribution network will be required to serve developments in the area. The receiving Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity to accommodate development proposed as part of the Local Plan. Stamford Bridge is connected to a mains gas distribution network with capacity. There is unlikely to be any issue with the bulk transfer and treatment of household water supplies in the area. Yorkshire Water have identified there is no sewerage capacity south of the River Denwent due to the sewage pumping station being at capacity, therefore investment would be required.
Highway Network Capacity (25)	(-)
	Access would have to come from High Catton Road, possibly via the new affordable housing access. No significant highways issues anticipated. Strategic capacity issues identified for the A166 and the A64 Grimston Bar Interchange nearby with improvements needed.
Wider Non-Road Transport Network (26)	N/A
	Housing use proposed
Community Facilities (27)	(0)
Town Centre Vitality and Viability (28)	N/A
Regeneration or Economic Benefits (29)	(0)
Affordable Housing (30)	(+++)
	The bid discusses a possible retail or commercial centre within the site (out of town centre retail could impact on the Town Centre Vitality and Viability) No effect on a recognised regeneration strategy or a deprived area Within area where ratio of average house price is over 8 times the average income.
STAGE 4 Deliverability	
Insurmountable Constraints (31)	No
Ownership and Market Constraints (32)	No
Deliverability (33)	Not developable
	Site has been identified as being within an area of nationally significant archaeological importance and is not considered appropriate for future development.

Question		Outcome	Reasoning
Basic Information			
Land bid number	912		
Site area (ha)	2.72		
Proposed use	Residential		
Date received	05/08/2003		
Additional information			
STAGE 1 Initial Assessment & Site Exclusion			
Conformity with Settlement Network (1)	Yes		Rural Service Centre. Adjacent to settlement.
Biodiversity and Geological Value (2)	No		No effect on International or National site of biological or geological interest (subject confirmation as a result of Habitats Regulations Screening Report)
Flood Risk & Coastal Change (3)	No		Not in functional floodplain or affected by coastal erosion
Heritage Assets (4)	Yes		Site has been identified as being within an area of nationally significant archaeological importance and is not considered appropriate for future development.
STAGE 2 Initial Ranking			
Greenfield & Brownfield Land (5)	1		100% Greenfield land
Accessibility by Public Transport (6)	2		
Accessibility by Walking & Cycling (7)	0		
Flood Risk (8)	6		More vulnerable use within Zone 1
STAGE 3 Detailed Site Specific Considerations			
Settlement Vision (9)	(---)		No settlement vision or place statement defined. Would undermine vision of the plan due to impact on a scheduled monument
Biodiversity and Geological Value (10)	(--)		Kingfisher (2001) Water Vole (1999) Otter (1996) Bats (2003) < 500m & Adj LWS (Low Catton Road)
Wildlife & Natural Environment (11)	(0)		No significant effect or existing features can be retained. Trees/hedgerow to W & N bdy.
Heritage Assets (12)	(---)		Within an area of nationally significant archaeological importance where development is likely to have an impact on those elements which contribute to the significance of the asset.
Built Character (13)	(-)		Would extend built form of development out into open countryside.
Landscape Character (14)	(-)		Would introduce built form of development into sensitive open and rural approach to town.
Air Quality (15)	(0)		Air quality acceptable - development unlikely to affect quality
Agricultural Land (16)	(0)		Grade 3b land or below
Groundwater (17)	(0)		Development would not affect public drinking water supply
Compatibility with Neighbouring Uses (18)	(0)		Development would be compatible with adjacent uses
Contaminated Land (19)	(0)		Development is not located on land that is likely to be contaminated.
Mineral Resources (20)	(0)		Not within a relevant safeguarding or preferred area or area of search.
Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (21)	(0)		No information submitted to demonstrate use of renewable, very low carbon energy or to reduce greenhouse gas emissions
Publicly Accessible Open Space (22)	(---)		Development would result in loss of open space (existing playing pitches)
School Capacity (23)	(0)		The Infrastructure Delivery Plan does not identify a need to increase the capacity of the schools serving this settlement.
Utilities Infrastructure Capacity (24)	(-)		No additional investment in the extra high voltage electricity distribution network will be required to serve developments in the area. The receiving Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity to accommodate development proposed as part of the Local Plan. Stamford Bridge is connected to a mains gas distribution network with capacity. There is unlikely to be any issue with the bulk transfer and treatment of household water supplies in the area. Yorkshire Water have identified there is no sewerage capacity south of the River Derwent due to the sewage pumping station being at capacity, therefore investment would be required.
Highway Network Capacity (25)	(-)		No significant highways issues anticipated. Strategic capacity issues identified for the A166 and the A64 Grimston Bar Interchange nearby with improvements needed.
Wider Non-Road Transport Network (26)	N/A		Housing use proposed
Community Facilities (27)	(0)		No proposed or loss of facilities
Town Centre Vitality and Viability (28)	N/A		Housing use proposed
Regeneration or Economic Benefits (29)	(0)		No effect on a recognised regeneration strategy or a deprived area
Affordable Housing (30)	(+++)		Within area where ratio of average house price is over 8 times the average income.
STAGE 4 Deliverability			
Insurmountable Constraints (31)	No		No known constraints
Ownership and Market Constraints (32)	No		No known constraints
Deliverability (33)	Not developable		Development would result in the loss of playing fields and would extend the built form of the settlement out into sensitive open countryside, resulting in harm to the character of the settlement and landscape. Site has been identified as being within an area of nationally significant archaeological importance and is not considered appropriate for future development.

SMB7		Outcome	Reasoning
Question			
Basic Information			
Land bid number	675. 1073		
Site area (ha)	2.55		
Proposed use	Residential		
Date received			
Additional information			
STAGE 1 Initial Assessment & Site Exclusion			
Conformity with Settlement Network (1)	Yes		Rural Service Centre. Adjacent to settlement limit (separated only by road)
Biodiversity and Geological Value (2)	No		No effect on International or National site of biological or geological interest (subject confirmation as a result of Habitats Regulations Screening Report)
Flood Risk & Coastal Change (3)	No		Not in functional floodplain or affected by coastal erosion. Adjacent to flood zone 3b
Heritage Assets (4)	Yes		Site has been identified as being within an area of nationally significant archaeological importance and is not considered appropriate for future development.
STAGE 2 Initial Ranking			
Greenfield & Brownfield Land (5)	1		100% Greenfield land
Accessibility by Public Transport (6)	2		
Accessibility by Walking & Cycling (7)	0		
Flood Risk (8)	6		Majority of site more vulnerable use within Zone 1. Small area to western edge within zones 2, 3a and 3b.
STAGE 3 Detailed Site Specific Considerations			
Settlement Vision (9)	(---)		No settlement vision or place statement defined. Would undermine vision of the plan due to impact on a scheduled monument
Biodiversity and Geological Value (10)	(--)		Kingfisher (2001) Water Vole (1999) Otter (2002) Bats (2005) < 500m & Adj LWS (Low Catton Road)
Wildlife & Natural Environment (11)	(0)		No significant effect or existing features can be retained. Peripheral and central hedgrows.
Heritage Assets (12)	(---)		Within an area of nationally significant archaeological importance where development is likely to have an impact on those elements which contribute to the significance of the asset.
Built Character (13)	(-)		Extension of the built form of development into open countryside however, relatively flat terrain and presence of existing development to east provides some mitigation as will additional planning to south and west.
Landscape Character (14)	(-)		Extension of the built form of development into open countryside and an important landscape area. However, relatively flat terrain and presence of existing development to east provides some mitigation as will additional planting to south and west.
Air Quality (15)	(0)		Air quality acceptable - development unlikely to affect quality
Agricultural Land (16)	(0)		Grade 3b land or below
Groundwater (17)	(0)		Development would not affect public drinking water supply
Compatibility with Neighbouring Uses (18)	(0)		Development would be compatible with adjacent uses
Contaminated Land (19)	(0)		Development is not located on land that is likely to be contaminated.
Mineral Resources (20)	(0)		Most of site not within a relevant safeguarding or preferred area or area of search. Small area in centre of site identified as sand and gravel safeguarding area but this is a very small and insignificant element.
Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (21)	(0)		No information submitted to demonstrate use of renewable, very low carbon energy or to reduce greenhouse gas emissions
Publicly Accessible Open Space (22)	(0)		No effect on existing open space or any obvious potential/opportunity for provision of new open space above that required by the Core Strategy policy.
School Capacity (23)	(0)		PROW runs along western boundary but this could be incorporated into any development of the site.
Utilities Infrastructure Capacity (24)	(-)		The Infrastructure Delivery Plan does not identify a need to increase the capacity of the schools serving this settlement.
Highway Network Capacity (25)	(-)		No additional investment in the extra high voltage electricity distribution network will be required to serve developments in the area. The receiving Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity to accommodate development proposed as part of the Local Plan. Stamford Bridge is connected to a mains gas distribution network with capacity. There is unlikely to be any issue with the bulk transfer and treatment of household water supplies in the area. Yorkshire Water has advised that the public foul sewer network does not have adequate capacity to accommodate the anticipated foul water discharge from this proposal and that it is anticipated that connection to the public sewer network will incur additional costs.
Wider Non-Road Transport Network (26)	N/A		No significant highways issues anticipated. Strategic capacity issues identified for the A166 and the A64 Grimston Bar Interchange nearby with improvements needed.
Community Facilities (27)	(0)		Housing use proposed
Town Centre Vitality and Viability (28)	N/A		No proposed or loss of facilities
Regeneration or Economic Benefits (29)	(0)		The bid discusses a possible retail or commercial centre within the site (out of town centre retail could impact on the Town Centre Vitality and Viability)
Affordable Housing (30)	(+)		No effect on a recognised regeneration strategy or a deprived area
STAGE 4 Deliverability			
Insurmountable Constraints (31)	No		Within area where ratio of average house price is under 8 times the average income.
Ownership and Market Constraints (32)	No		
Deliverability (33)	Not developable		No known constraints No known constraints Site has been identified as being within an area of nationally significant archaeological importance and is not considered appropriate for future development.

SMB7r		Outcome	Reasoning
Question			
Basic Information			
Land bid number	675. 1073		
Site area (ha)	7.78		
Proposed use	Residential		
Date received			
Additional information			
STAGE 1 Initial Assessment & Site Exclusion			
Conformity with Settlement Network (1)	No		Rural Service Centre. Not well related to the existing settlement.
Biodiversity and Geological Value (2)	No		No effect on International or National site of biological or geological interest (subject confirmation as a result of Habitats Regulations Screening Report)
Flood Risk & Coastal Change (3)	No		Not in functional floodplain or affected by coastal erosion. Adjacent to flood zone 3b
Heritage Assets (4)	Yes		Site has been identified as being within an area of nationally significant archaeological importance and is not considered appropriate for future development.
STAGE 2 Initial Ranking			
Greenfield & Brownfield Land (5)	1		100% Greenfield land
Accessibility by Public Transport (6)	2		
Accessibility by Walking & Cycling (7)	0		
Flood Risk (8)	6		Majority of site more vulnerable use within Zone 1. Small area to western edge within zones 2, 3a and 3b.
STAGE 3 Detailed Site Specific Considerations			
Settlement Vision (9)	(---)		No settlement vision or place statement defined. Would undermine vision of the plan due to impact on a scheduled monument
Biodiversity and Geological Value (10)	(--)		Kingfisher (2001) Water Vole (1999) Otter (2002) Bats (2005) < 500m & Adj LWS (Low Catton Road)
Wildlife & Natural Environment (11)	(0)		No significant effect or existing features can be retained. Peripheral and central hedgrows.
Heritage Assets (12)	(---)		Within an area of nationally significant archaeological importance where development is likely to have an impact on those elements which contribute to the significance of the asset.
Built Character (13)	(-)		Significant extension of the built form of development into open countryside.
Landscape Character (14)	(-)		Significant intrusion into open countryside and in an important landscape area. Harmful to open and rural character to entrance of town.
Air Quality (15)	(0)		Air quality acceptable - development unlikely to affect quality
Agricultural Land (16)	(0)		Grade 3b land or below
Groundwater (17)	(0)		Development would not affect public drinking water supply
Compatibility with Neighbouring Uses (18)	(0)		Development would be compatible with adjacent uses
Contaminated Land (19)	(0)		Development is not located on land that is likely to be contaminated.
Mineral Resources (20)	(0)		Most of site not within a relevant safeguarding or preferred area or area of search. Small area in centre of site identified as sand and gravel safeguarding area but this is a very small and insignificant element.
Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (21)	(0)		No information submitted to demonstrate use of renewable, very low carbon energy or to reduce greenhouse gas emissions
Publicly Accessible Open Space (22)	(0)		No effect on existing open space or any obvious potential/opportunity for provision of new open space above that required by the Core Strategy policy.
School Capacity (23)	(0)		PROW runs along western boundary but this could be incorporated into any development of the site.
Utilities Infrastructure Capacity (24)	(-)		The Infrastructure Delivery Plan does not identify a need to increase the capacity of the schools serving this settlement.
Highway Network Capacity (25)	(-)		No additional investment in the extra high voltage electricity distribution network will be required to serve developments in the area. The receiving Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity to accommodate development proposed as part of the Local Plan. Stamford Bridge is connected to a mains gas distribution network with capacity. There is unlikely to be any issue with the bulk transfer and treatment of household water supplies in the area. Yorkshire Water have identified there is no sewerage capacity south of the River Derwent due to the sewage pumping station being at capacity, therefore investment would be required.
Wider Non-Road Transport Network (26)	N/A		No significant highways issues anticipated. Strategic capacity issues identified for the A166 and the A64 Grimston Bar Interchange nearby with improvements needed.
Community Facilities (27)	(0)		Housing use proposed
Town Centre Vitality and Viability (28)	N/A		No proposed or loss of facilities
Regeneration or Economic Benefits (29)	(0)		Housing use proposed
Affordable Housing (30)	(+)		No effect on a recognised regeneration strategy or a deprived area
STAGE 4 Deliverability			
Insurmountable Constraints (31)	No		Within area where ratio of average house price is under 8 times the average income.
Ownership and Market Constraints (32)	No		No known constraints
Deliverability (33)	Not deliverable		Site has been identified as being within an area of nationally significant archaeological importance and is not considered appropriate for future development. Development would excessively intrude into open countryside to the detriment of the character and setting of the settlement.

SMB8	
Question	Outcome Reasoning
Basic Information	
Land bid number	1279
Site area (ha)	4.43
Proposed use	Residential
Date received	
Additional information	
STAGE 1 Initial Assessment & Site Exclusion	
Conformity with Settlement Network (1)	Yes
Biodiversity and Geological Value (2)	No
Flood Risk & Coastal Change (3)	No
Heritage Assets (4)	Yes
STAGE 2 Initial Ranking	
Greenfield & Brownfield Land (5)	1
Accessibility by Public Transport (6)	2
Accessibility by Walking & Cycling (7)	0
Flood Risk (8)	6
STAGE 3 Detailed Site Specific Considerations	
Settlement Vision (9)	(0)
Biodiversity and Geological Value (10)	(-)
Wildlife & Natural Environment (11)	(0)
Heritage Assets (12)	(-)
Built Character (13)	(-)
Landscape Character (14)	(-)
Air Quality (15)	(0)
Agricultural Land (16)	(0)
Groundwater (17)	(0)
Compatibility with Neighbouring Uses (18)	(0)
Contaminated Land (19)	(0)
Mineral Resources (20)	(0)
Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (21)	(0)
Publicly Accessible Open Space (22)	(0)
School Capacity (23)	(0)
Utilities Infrastructure Capacity (24)	(-)
Highway Network Capacity (25)	(-)
Wider Non-Road Transport Network (26)	N/A
Community Facilities (27)	(0)
Town Centre Viability and Viability (28)	N/A
Regeneration or Economic Benefits (29)	(0)
Affordable Housing (30)	(+)
STAGE 4 Deliverability	
Insurmountable Constraints (31)	No
Ownership and Market Constraints (32)	No
Deliverability (33)	Not considered suitable for allocation

Rural Service Centre. Adjacent to settlement limit (separated only by road). Close to SSSI and SAC (River Derwent). Development may increase recreational pressure as site is close to public footpath along the river bank. The intervening strip of land and sufficient space within site to potentially mitigate any significant impact. Measures would be required to ensure integrity of water quality is maintained.

Not in functional floodplain or affected by coastal erosion. Adjacent to flood zone 3b. Site is adjacent to Scheduled Monument and the site itself is likely to contain nationally significant archaeological remains. Evidence suggests presence of Roman Road through the site and was potentially a northern extension to the Roman small town scheduled to the south.

100% Greenfield land

Majority of site more vulnerable use within Zone 1. Small area to western edge within zones 2, 3a and 3b.

No settlement vision or place statement defined. Kingfisher (2001) Water Vole (1999) Otter (2002) Bats (2005) < 500m & Adj LWS (Low Catton Road). No 'on site' impacts on protected species confirmed through Environmental Statement accompanying planning application. See also (Q2) above.

No significant effect or existing features can be retained. Peripheral and central hedgrows. Site is adjacent to an area of nationally significant archaeological importance and development of the site could have an impact on the significance of the heritage assets. See Q4 above

Extension of the built form of development into open countryside however, relatively flat terrain and presence of existing development to east provides some mitigation as will additional planting to south and west.

Extension of the built form of development into open countryside and an important landscape area. However, relatively flat terrain and presence of existing development to east, provides some mitigation as will additional planting to south and west.

Air quality acceptable - development unlikely to affect quality

Grade 3b land or below

Development would not affect public drinking water supply

Development would be compatible with adjacent uses

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

Most of site not within a relevant safeguarding or preferred area or area of search. Small area in centre of site identified as sand and gravel safeguarding area but this is a very small and insignificant element.

No effect on existing open space or any obvious potential opportunity for provision of new open space above that required by the Core Strategy policy. PROW runs along western boundary but this could be incorporated into any development of the site.

The Infrastructure Delivery Plan does not identify a need to increase the capacity of the schools serving this settlement.

No additional investment in the extra high voltage electricity distribution network will be required to serve developments in the area. The receiving Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity to accommodate development proposed as part of the Local Plan. Stamford Bridge is connected to a mains gas distribution network with capacity. There is unlikely to be any issue with the bulk transfer and treatment of household water supplies in the area. Yorkshire Water has advised that the public foul sewer network does not have adequate capacity to accommodate the anticipated foul water discharge from this proposal and that it is anticipated that connection to the public sewer network will incur additional costs.

No significant highway issues anticipated. Strategic capacity issues identified for the A166 and the A64 Grimston Bar Interchange nearby with improvements needed.

Housing use proposed

No proposed or loss of facilities

The bid discusses a possible retail or commercial centre within the site (out of town centre retail could impact on the Town Centre Viability and Viability)

No effect on a recognised regeneration strategy or a deprived area

Within area where ratio of average house price is under 8 times the average income.

No known constraints

No known constraints

Site is adjacent to an area of nationally significant archaeological importance and although development with suitable mitigation may be possible, other sites in the village are more suitable for allocation.

SMB8r		Outcome	Reasoning
Question			
Basic Information			
Land bid number	1279		
Site area (ha)	0.41		
Proposed use	Residential		
Date received	24/11/2006		
Additional information			
STAGE 1 Initial Assessment & Site Exclusion			
Conformity with Settlement Network (1)	Yes		Rural Service Centre. Adjacent to settlement.
Biodiversity and Geological Value (2)	No		Close to SSSI and SAC (River Derwent). Development may increase recreational pressure in the area but intervening strip of land and sufficient space within site to potentially mitigate any significant impact. Measures would be required to ensure integrity of water quality is maintained.
Flood Risk & Coastal Change (3)	No		Not in functional floodplain or affected by coastal erosion. Adjacent to flood zone 3b
Heritage Assets (4)	Yes		Site is adjacent to a Schedule Monument and an area of nationally significant archaeological importance. The extent of nationally significant archaeological remains is unknown at this time and could extend into the site.
STAGE 2 Initial Ranking			
Greenfield & Brownfield Land (5)	1		100% Greenfield land
Accessibility by Public Transport (6)	2		
Accessibility by Walking & Cycling (7)	0		
Flood Risk (8)	6		Majority of site more vulnerable use within Zone 1. Small area to western edge within zones 2, 3a and 3b.
STAGE 3 Detailed Site Specific Considerations			
Settlement Vision (9)	(--)		No settlement vision or place statement defined. Protection of River Derwent corridor referred to in Sub Area Policy SS13.
Biodiversity and Geological Value (10)	(-)		Kingfisher (2001) Water Vole (1999) Otter (2002) Bats (2005) < 500m & Adj LWS (Low Catton Road). See also Q2
Wildlife & Natural Environment (11)	(0)		No significant effect or existing features can be retained. Peripheral hedgrows.
Heritage Assets (12)	(--)		Site is adjacent to an area of nationally significant archaeological importance and development of the site could have an impact on the significance of the heritage assets. See Q4 above
Built Character (13)	(-)		Extension of the built form of development into open countryside however, relatively flat terrain and presence of existing development to east provides some mitigation as will additional planning to south and west.
Landscape Character (14)	(-)		Extension of the built form of development into open countryside and an important landscape area. However, relatively flat terrain and presence of existing development to east provides some mitigation as will additional planning to south and west.
Air Quality (15)	(0)		Air quality acceptable - development unlikely to affect quality
Agricultural Land (16)	(0)		Grade 3b land or below
Groundwater (17)	(0)		Development would not affect public drinking water supply
Neighbouring Uses (18)	(0)		Development would be compatible with adjacent uses
Contaminated Land (19)	(0)		Development is not located on land that is likely to be contaminated.
Mineral Resources (20)	(0)		Not within a relevant safeguarding or preferred area or area of search.
Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (21)	(0)		No information submitted to demonstrate use of renewable, very low carbon energy or to reduce greenhouse gas emissions
Publicly Accessible Open Space (22)	(0)		No effect on existing open space or any obvious potential/opportunity for provision of new open space above that required by the Core Strategy policy. PROW runs along western boundary but this could be incorporated into any development of the site.
School Capacity (23)	(0)		The Infrastructure Delivery Plan does not identify a need to increase the capacity of the schools serving this settlement.
Utilities Infrastructure Capacity (24)	(-)		No additional investment in the extra high voltage electricity distribution network will be required to serve developments in the area. The receiving Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity to accommodate development proposed as part of the Local Plan. Stamford Bridge is connected to a mains gas distribution network with capacity. There is unlikely to be any issue with the bulk transfer and treatment of household water supplies in the area. Yorkshire Water have identified there is no sewerage capacity south of the River Derwent due to the sewage pumping station being at capacity, therefore investment would be required.
Highway Network Capacity (25)	(-)		No significant highways issues anticipated. Strategic capacity issues identified for the A166 and the A64 Grimston Bar Interchange nearby with improvements needed.
Wider Non-Road Transport Network (26)	N/A		Housing use proposed
Community Facilities (27)	(0)		No proposed or loss of facilities
Town Centre Vitality and Viability (28)	N/A		Housing use proposed
Regeneration or Economic Benefits (29)	(0)		No effect on a recognised regeneration strategy or a deprived area
Affordable Housing (30)	(+)		Within area where ratio of average house price is under 8 times the average income.
STAGE 4 Deliverability			
Insurmountable Constraints (31)	No		No known constraints
Ownership and Market Constraints (32)	No		No known constraints
Deliverability (33)	Not considered suitable for allocation		Site is in close proximity of nationally important archaeological sites and significant remains may be present on site. Site is close to the River Derwent SAC and SSSI, and development may have an adverse impact on this. More suitable sites for allocation are available to meet the needs set out in the Strategy Document.

SMB9		Outcome	Reasoning
Question			
Basic Information			
Land bid number	658		
Site area (ha)	3.49		
Proposed use	Residential		
Date received	14/10/2004		
Additional information			
STAGE 1 Initial Assessment & Site Exclusion			
Conformity with Settlement Network (1)	Yes		Rural Service Centre. Adjacent to settlement.
Biodiversity and Geological Value (2)	Yes		Potential impact on SSSI and SAC (River Derwent) which is adjacent to site. Likley to be significant effects directly and as a result of increased recreational pressure (footpath goes through site)
Flood Risk & Coastal Change (3)	Yes		Part of site within flood zone 3b.
Heritage Assets (4)	No		No substantial harm to any nationally designated asset
STAGE 2 Initial Ranking			
Greenfield & Brownfield Land (5)	1		100% Greenfield land
Accessibility by Public Transport (6)	2		
Accessibility by Walking & Cycling (7)	0		
Flood Risk (8)	-2		Most of site within zone 3a (some within 3b).
STAGE 3 Detailed Site Specific Considerations			
Settlement Vision (9)	(---)		No settlement vision or place statement defined. Protection of River Derwent corridor referred to in Sub Area Policy A6.
Biodiversity and Geological Value (10)	(---)		Kingfisher (2001) Water Vole (1999) Otter (2002) Bats (2005) < 500m & Adj SSSI/SAC (River Derwent). See also Q2
Wildlife & Natural Environment (11)	(0)		No significant effect or existing features can be retained. Peripheral hedgrows - some trees.
Heritage Assets (12)	(0)		Unlikely to result in harm to any heritage assets
Built Character (13)	(---)		Open and rural character of land within the narrow river corridor adjacent to the River Derwent is an important and valued feature referred to in the Landscape Character Assessment 2005. There is a low capacity for change without detriment to the character and any extension of the built form into this would be harmful.
Landscape Character (14)	(---)		Open and rural character of land within the narrow river corridor adjacent to the River Derwent is an important and valued feature referred to in the Landscape Character Assessment 2005. There is a low capacity for change without detriment to the character and any extension of the built form into this would be harmful.
Air Quality (15)	(0)		Air quality acceptable - development unlikely to affect quality
Agricultural Land (16)	(0)		Grade 3b or below
Groundwater (17)	(0)		Development would not affect public drinking water supply
Compatibility with Neighbouring Uses (18)	(-)		Within waste water treatment works consultation zone (400m)
Contaminated Land (19)	(0)		Development is not located on land that is likely to be contaminated.
Mineral Resources (20)	(0)		Not within a relevant safeguarding or preferred area or area of search.
Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (21)	(0)		No information submitted to demonstrate use of renewable, very low carbon energy or to reduce greenhouse gas emissions
Publicly Accessible Open Space (22)	(0)		No effect on existing open space or any obvious potential/opportunity for provision of new open space above that required by the Core Strategy policy.
School Capacity (23)	(0)		The Infrastructure Delivery Plan does not identify a need to increase the capacity of the schools serving this settlement.
Utilities Infrastructure Capacity (24)	(-)		No additional investment in the extra high voltage electricity distribution network will be required to serve developments in the area. The receiving Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity to accommodate development proposed as part of the Local Plan. Stamford Bridge is connected to a mains gas distribution network with capacity. There is unlikely to be any issue with the bulk transfer and treatment of household water supplies in the area. Yorkshire Water have identified there is no sewerage capacity south of the River Derwent due to the sewage pumping station being at capacity, therefore investment would be required.
Highway Network Capacity (25)	(---)		Access not possible without development to sites to north or south. Strategic capacity issues identified for the A166 and the A64 Grimston Bar interchange nearby with improvements needed.
Wider Non-Road Transport Network (26)	N/A		Housing use proposed
Community Facilities (27)	(0)		No proposed or loss of facilities
Town Centre Vitality and Viability (28)	N/A		Housing use proposed
Regeneration or Economic Benefits (29)	(0)		No effect on a recognised regeneration strategy or a deprived area
Affordable Housing (30)	(+++)		Within area where ratio of average house price is over 8 times the average income.
STAGE 4 Deliverability			
Insurmountable Constraints (31)	No		No known constraints
Ownership and Market Constraints (32)	No		No known constraints
Deliverability (33)	Not developable		Site is mostly within flood zone 3a and sequentially preferable sites are available in the settlement. and development may have a negative impact on the River Derwent SAC and SSSI. Access not possible without development to sites to north or south.

SMB10		Outcome	Reasoning
Question			
Basic Information			
Land bid number	679, 1070		
Site area (ha)	2.48		
Proposed use	Residential		
Date received	18/11/2004, 15/12/2005		
Additional Information			
STAGE 1 Initial Assessment & Site Exclusion			
Conformity with Settlement Network (1)	Yes		Rural Service Centre. Adjacent to settlement.
Biodiversity and Geological Value (2)	Yes		Potential impact on SSSI and SAC (River Derwent) which is adjacent to site. Likley to be significant effects directly and as a result of increased recreational pressure (footpath goes through site)
Flood Risk & Coastal Change (3)	Yes		Part of site within flood zone 3b.
Heritage Assets (4)	Yes		Site near Listed Building Grade II (Former Railway Viaduct). Setting of this could be harmed by development of site.
STAGE 2 Initial Ranking			
Greenfield & Brownfield Land (5)	1		100% Greenfield land
Accessibility by Public Transport (6)	2		
Accessibility by Walking & Cycling (7)	0		
Flood Risk (8)	-2		Most of site within zone 3a (some within 3b).
STAGE 3 Detailed Site Specific Considerations			
Settlement Vision (9)	(---)		No settlement vision or place statement defined. Protection of River Derwent corridor referred to in Sub Area Policy A6.
Biodiversity and Geological Value (10)	(---)		Kingfisher (2001) Water Vole (1999) Otter (2002) Bats (2005) < 500m & Adj SSSI/SAC (River Derwent). See also Q2
Wildlife & Natural Environment (11)	(0)		No significant effect or existing features can be retained. Peripheral and central hedgrows - some trees.
Heritage Assets (12)	(-)		Adjacent to conservation area and Listed Building. Open areas to west of the bridge and setting of viaduct referred to in CA appraisal.
Built Character (13)	(---)		Open and rural character of land within the narrow river corridor adjacent to the River Derwent is an important and valued feature referred to in the Landscape Character Assessment 2005. There is a low capacity for change without detriment to the character and any extension of the built form into this would be harmful.
Landscape Character (14)	(---)		Open and rural character of land within the narrow river corridor adjacent to the River Derwent is an important and valued feature referred to in the Landscape Character Assessment 2005. There is a low capacity for change without detriment to the character and any extension of the built form into this would be harmful.
Air Quality (15)	(0)		Air quality acceptable - development unlikely to affect quality
Agricultural Land (16)	(0)		Grade 3b or below
Groundwater (17)	(0)		Development would not affect public drinking water supply
Compatibility with Neighbouring Uses (18)	(-)		Within waste water treatment works consultation zone (400m)
Contaminated Land (19)	(0)		Development is not located on land that is likely to be contaminated.
Mineral Resources (20)	(0)		Not within a relevant safeguarding or preferred area or area of search.
Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (21)	(0)		No information submitted to demonstrate use of renewable, very low carbon energy or to reduce greenhouse gas emissions
Publicly Accessible Open Space (22)	(0)		No effect on existing open space or any obvious potential/opportunity for provision of new open space above that required by the Core Strategy policy.
School Capacity (23)	(0)		The Infrastructure Delivery Plan does not identify a need to increase the capacity of the schools serving this settlement.
Utilities Infrastructure Capacity (24)	(-)		No additional investment in the extra high voltage electricity distribution network will be required to serve developments in the area. The receiving Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity to accommodate development proposed as part of the Local Plan. Stamford Bridge is connected to a mains gas distribution network with capacity. There is unlikely to be any issue with the bulk transfer and treatment of household water supplies in the area. Yorkshire Water have identified there is no sewerage capacity south of the River Derwent due to the sewage pumping station being at capacity, therefore investment would be required.
Highway Network Capacity (25)	(-)		No significant highways issues anticipated. Strategic capacity issues identified for the A166 and the A64 Grimston Bar Interchange nearby with improvements needed.
Wider Non-Road Transport Network (26)	N/A		Housing use proposed
Community Facilities (27)	(0)		No proposed or loss of facilities
Town Centre Vitality and Viability (28)	N/A		Housing use proposed
Regeneration or Economic Benefits (29)	(0)		No effect on a recognised regeneration strategy or a deprived area
Affordable Housing (30)	(+++)		Within area where ratio of average house price is over 8 times the average income.
STAGE 4 Deliverability			
Insurmountable Constraints (31)	Yes		Severe gradients on part of site outside flood zone 3b.
Ownership and Market Constraints (32)	No		No known constraints
Deliverability (33)	Not developable		Site is mostly within flood zone 3a and partly in zone 3b. Severe gradients on part of site outside flood zone 3b. Development may have a negative impact on the River Derwent SAC and SSSI.

Question	Outcome	Reasoning
Basic Information		
Land bid number	1495	
Site area (ha)	3.37	
Proposed use	Residential	
Date received	11/06/2008	
Additional information		
STAGE 1 Initial Assessment & Site Exclusion		
Conformity with Settlement Network (1)	No	Rural Service Centre. Not well related to the existing settlement.
Biodiversity and Geological Value (2)	Yes	Potential impact on SSSI and SAC (River Derwent) which is adjacent to site. Likley to be significant effects directly and as a result of increased recreational pressure (footpath goes through site)
Flood Risk & Coastal Change (3)	Yes	Part of site within flood zone 3b.
Heritage Assets (4)	Yes	Part of site near Listed Building Grade II (Former Railway Viaduct). Setting of this could be harmed by development of site.
STAGE 2 Initial Ranking		
Greenfield & Brownfield Land (5)	1	100% Greenfield land
Accessibility by Public Transport (6)	2	
Accessibility by Walking & Cycling (7)	1	
Flood Risk (8)	-2	Part of site within zone 3a (some within 3b).
STAGE 3 Detailed Site Specific Considerations		
Settlement Vision (9)	(--)	No settlement vision or place statement defined. Remote from settlement. Protection of River Derwent corridor referred to in Sub Area Policy A6.
Biodiversity and Geological Value (10)	(--)	Kingfisher (2001) Water Vole (1999) Otter (2002) Bats (2005) < 500m & Adj SSSI/SAC (River Derwent). See also Q2
Wildlife & Natural Environment (11)	(0)	No significant effect or existing features can be retained. Peripheral hedgrows.
Heritage Assets (12)	(-)	Within Conservation Area. Would result in a significant change to the loose knit pattern of development on this important entrance to the town.
Built Character (13)	(-)	Site is not well related to the main settlement pattern. Remote from the main centre
Landscape Character (14)	(-)	Part of open and rural setting to this entrance to the town on a major route.
Air Quality (15)	(0)	Air quality acceptable - development unlikely to affect quality
Agricultural Land (16)	(-)	Most of site Grade 3a agricultural land
Groundwater (17)	(0)	Development would not affect public drinking water supply
Compatibility with Neighbouring Uses (18)	(-)	Within waste water treatment works consultation zone (400m)
Contaminated Land (19)	(0)	Development is not located on land that is likely to be contaminated, however there is potentially contaminated land adjacent to the site on the western boundary which is former railway land. Depending on the nature and layout of the proposed development there may be a need for appropriate planning conditions to mitigate the risk of migration from this adjacent potentially contaminated land.
Mineral Resources (20)	(0)	Not within a relevant safeguarding or preferred area or area of search.
Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (21)	(0)	No information submitted to demonstrate use of renewable, very low carbon energy or to reduce greenhouse gas emissions
Publicly Accessible Open Space (22)	(0)	No effect on existing open space or any obvious potential/opportunity for provision of new open space above that required by the Core Strategy policy.
School Capacity (23)	(0)	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan does not identify a need to increase the capacity of the schools serving this settlement.
Utilities Infrastructure Capacity (24)	(-)	No additional investment in the extra high voltage electricity distribution network will be required to serve developments in the area. The receiving Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity to accommodate development proposed as part of the Local Plan. Stamford Bridge is connected to a mains gas distribution network with capacity. There is unlikely to be any issue with the bulk transfer and treatment of household water supplies in the area. Yorkshire Water have identified there is capacity in the sewerage network to the north of the River Derwent.
Highway Network Capacity (25)	(-)	No significant highways issues anticipated. Strategic capacity issues identified for the A166 and the A64 Grimston Bar Interchange nearby with improvements needed.
Wider Non-Road Transport Network (26)	N/A	Housing use proposed
Community Facilities (27)	(0)	No proposed or loss of facilities
Town Centre Vitality and Viability (28)	N/A	Housing use proposed
Regeneration or Economic Benefits (29)	(0)	No effect on a recognised regeneration strategy or a deprived area
Affordable Housing (30)	(+++)	Within area where ratio of average house price is over 8 times the average income.
STAGE 4 Deliverability		
Insurmountable Constraints (31)	No	No known constraints
Ownership and Market Constraints (32)	No	No known constraints
Deliverability (33)	Not considered suitable for allocation	The southern half of the site is within area of high flood risk (Flood Zone 3a), and development may have a negative impact on the River Derwent SAC and SSSI. Development would be prominent on the approach into the village and poorly related to the existing settlement pattern. More suitable sites for allocation are available to meet the needs set out in the Strategy Document.

Question	Outcome	Reasoning
Basic Information		
Land bid number	1553	
Site area (ha)	0.46	
Proposed use	Residential	
Date received	14/04/2009	
Additional information		
STAGE 1 Initial Assessment & Site Exclusion		
Conformity with Settlement Network (1)	No	Rural Service Centre. Not well related to the existing settlement.
Biodiversity and Geological Value (2)	Yes	Potential impact on SSSI and SAC (River Derwent)
Flood Risk & Coastal Change (3)	No	Not in functional floodplain or affected by coastal erosion. Adjacent to flood zone 3b
Heritage Assets (4)	No	No substantial harm to any nationally designated asset
STAGE 2 Initial Ranking		
Greenfield & Brownfield Land (5)	1	100% Greenfield land
Accessibility by Public Transport (6)	2	
Accessibility by Walking & Cycling (7)	1	
Flood Risk (8)	4	Most of site within zone 2 (some within 3a).
STAGE 3 Detailed Site Specific Considerations		
Settlement Vision (9)	(---)	No settlement vision or place statement defined. Remote from settlement. Protection of River Derwent corridor referred to in Sub Area Policy A6.
Biodiversity and Geological Value (10)	(---)	Kingfisher (2001) Water Vole (1998) Otter (2001) Badger (2004) Bats (2005) < 500m. See also Q2
Wildlife & Natural Environment (11)	(0)	No significant effect or existing features can be retained. Peripheral hedgrows.
Heritage Assets (12)	(-)	Within Conservation Area. Development of backland site would not be in character with the existing pattern of frontage development
Built Character (13)	(-)	Backland development would not be in character with the existing pattern of frontage development
Landscape Character (14)	(0)	No impact on landscape as site within urban area
Air Quality (15)	(0)	Air quality acceptable - development unlikely to affect quality
Agricultural Land (16)	(0)	Shown as urban land or below grade 3b on classification maps
Groundwater (17)	(0)	Development would not affect public drinking water supply
Compatibility with Neighbouring Uses (18)	(-)	More intensive use of the narrow access would cause amenity problems for existing dwellings on frontage.
Contaminated Land (19)	(0)	Development is not located on land that is likely to be contaminated.
Mineral Resources (20)	(0)	Not within a relevant safeguarding or preferred area or area of search.
Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (21)	(0)	No information submitted to demonstrate use of renewable, very low carbon energy or to reduce greenhouse gas emissions
Publicly Accessible Open Space (22)	(0)	No effect on existing open space or any obvious potential/opportunity for provision of new open space above that required by the Core Strategy policy.
School Capacity (23)	(0)	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan does not identify a need to increase the capacity of the schools serving this settlement.
Utilities Infrastructure Capacity (24)	(-)	No additional investment in the extra high voltage electricity distribution network will be required to serve developments in the area. The receiving Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity to accommodate development proposed as part of the Local Plan. Stamford Bridge is connected to a mains gas distribution network with capacity. There is unlikely to be any issue with the bulk transfer and treatment of household water supplies in the area. Yorkshire Water have identified there is capacity in the sewerage network to the north of the River Derwent.
Highway Network Capacity (25)	(-)	No significant highways issues anticipated. Strategic capacity issues identified for the A166 and the A64 Grimston Bar Interchange nearby with improvements needed.
Wider Non-Road Transport Network (26)	N/A	Housing use proposed
Community Facilities (27)	(0)	No proposed or loss of facilities
Town Centre Vitality and Viability (28)	N/A	Housing use proposed
Regeneration or Economic Benefits (29)	(0)	No effect on a recognised regeneration strategy or a deprived area
Affordable Housing (30)	(+++)	Within area where ratio of average house price is over 8 times the average income.
STAGE 4 Deliverability		
Insurmountable Constraints (31)	No	No known constraints
Ownership and Market Constraints (32)	No	No known constraints
Deliverability (33)	Not considered suitable for allocation	Site is mostly within flood zone 3a and sequentially preferable sites are available in the settlement. and development may have a negative impact on the River Derwent SAC and SSSI.

Question		Outcome	Reasoning
Basic Information			
Land bid number	1553		
Site area (ha)	0.21		
Proposed use	Residential		
Date received	14/04/2009		
Additional information			
STAGE 1 Initial Assessment & Site Exclusion			
Conformity with Settlement Network (1)	No		Rural Service Centre. Not well related to the existing settlement.
Biodiversity and Geological Value (2)	Yes		Potential impact on SSSI and SAC (River Derwent) which is adjacent to site. Likley to be significant effects directly and as a result of increased recreational pressure (footpath goes through site)
Flood Risk & Coastal Change (3)	No		Not in functional floodplain or affected by coastal erosion. Adjacent to flood zone 3b
Heritage Assets (4)	No		No substantial harm to any nationally designated asset. Close to Grade II* Listed Building (Bridge).
STAGE 2 Initial Ranking			
Greenfield & Brownfield Land (5)	1		100% Greenfield land
Accessibility by Public Transport (6)	2		
Accessibility by Walking & Cycling (7)	1		
Flood Risk (8)	-2		More vulnerable use within Zone 3a
STAGE 3 Detailed Site Specific Considerations			
Settlement Vision (9)	(---)		No settlement vision or place statement defined. Remote from settlement. Protection of River Derwent corridor referred to in Sub Area Policy A6.
Biodiversity and Geological Value (10)	(---)		Water Vole (1998) Otter (2002) Badger (2004) Bats (2005) < 500m. See also Q2
Wildlife & Natural Environment (11)	(-)		Group of trees in centre of site - would be difficult to retain. Within Conservation Area therefore protected.
Heritage Assets (12)	(-)		Within Conservation Area. Group of trees referred to in CA appraisal. Difficult to develop site and retain impact/value of trees.
Built Character (13)	(0)		Not suitable for more than one or two dwellings due to trees and access constraints.
Landscape Character (14)	(0)		No impact on landscape as site within urban area
Air Quality (15)	(0)		Air quality acceptable - development unlikely to affect quality
Agricultural Land (16)	(0)		Shown as urban land on classification maps
Groundwater (17)	(0)		Development would not affect public drinking water supply
Compatibility with Neighbouring Uses (18)	(0)		Development would be compatible with adjacent uses
Contaminated Land (19)	(+++)		The site contains areas of potentially contaminated land, but this is a small electricity sub station. It is likely that any development would be built around the sub station and as such there would be minimal risk to the development. However, if the sub station was to be removed and included within the development there would be a need for appropriate planning conditions and/or suitable design/layout to address the risk of contamination.
Mineral Resources (20)	(0)		Not within a relevant safeguarding or preferred area or area of search.
Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (21)	(0)		No information submitted to demonstrate use of renewable, very low carbon energy or to reduce greenhouse gas emissions
Publicly Accessible Open Space (22)	(0)		No effect on existing open space or any obvious potential/opportunity for provision of new open space above that required by the Core Strategy policy.
School Capacity (23)	(0)		The Infrastructure Delivery Plan does not identify a need to increase the capacity of the schools serving this settlement.
Utilities Infrastructure Capacity (24)	(-)		No additional investment in the extra high voltage electricity distribution network will be required to serve developments in the area. The receiving Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity to accommodate development proposed as part of the Local Plan. Stamford Bridge is connected to a mains gas distribution network with capacity. There is unlikely to be any issue with the bulk transfer and treatment of household water supplies in the area. Yorkshire Water have identified there is capacity in the sewerage network to the north of the River Derwent.
Highway Network Capacity (25)	(-)		Difficult access due to proximity to bridge and bend in road. Strategic capacity issues identified for the A166 and the A64 Grimston Bar Interchange nearby with improvements needed.
Wider Non-Road Transport Network (26)	N/A		Housing use proposed
Community Facilities (27)	(0)		No proposed or loss of facilities
Town Centre Vitality and Viability (28)	N/A		Housing use proposed
Regeneration or Economic Benefits (29)	(0)		No effect on a recognised regeneration strategy or a deprived area
Affordable Housing (30)	(+++)		Within area where ratio of average house price is over 8 times the average income.
STAGE 4 Deliverability			
Insurmountable Constraints (31)	No		No known constraints
Ownership and Market Constraints (32)	No		No known constraints
Deliverability (33)	Not considered suitable for allocation		Site is wholly within flood zone 3a and sequentially preferable sites are available in the settlement. There are access constraints difficulties. Development would be likely to harm the character of the conservation area and have a negative impact on the River Derwent SAC and SSSI.

Question	Outcome	Reasoning
Basic Information		
Land bid number	911	
Site area (ha)	2.98	
Proposed use	Residential	
Date received	05/08/2003	
Additional information		
STAGE 1 Initial Assessment & Site Exclusion		
Conformity with Settlement Network (1)	Yes	Rural Service Centre. Adjacent to settlement.
Biodiversity and Geological Value (2)	No	No effect on International or National site of biological or geological interest (subject confirmation as a result of Habitats Regulations Screening Report)
Flood Risk & Coastal Change (3)	No	Not in functional floodplain or affected by coastal erosion
Heritage Assets (4)	Yes	Most of site within Historic Battlefield Site (Stamford Bridge 1066). Small section to north west excluded but development of this would still adversely affect its setting.
STAGE 2 Initial Ranking		
Greenfield & Brownfield Land (5)	1	100% Greenfield land
Accessibility by Public Transport (6)	2	
Accessibility by Walking & Cycling (7)	0	
Flood Risk (8)	6	More vulnerable use within Zone 1
STAGE 3 Detailed Site Specific Considerations		
Settlement Vision (9)	(---)	No settlement vision or place statement defined. Would undermine sub-area policy due to impact on battlefield site.
Biodiversity and Geological Value (10)	(--)	Bats (2005) < 500m
Wildlife & Natural Environment (11)	(0)	No significant effect or existing features can be retained.
Heritage Assets (12)	(---)	Most of site within Historic Battlefield Site (Stamford Bridge 1066). Small section to north west corner is excluded from this designation but any development of this would adversely impact on its setting.
Built Character (13)	(-)	Development of whole site would be poorly related to settlement pattern and would intrude out into open countryside. Development of only north west corner however could represent a rounding off of the existing development limits with consequently reduced harm.
Landscape Character (14)	(-)	Development of whole site would be poorly related to settlement pattern and would intrude out into open countryside. Development of only north west corner however could represent a rounding off of the existing development limits with consequently reduced harm.
Air Quality (15)	(0)	Air quality acceptable - development unlikely to affect quality
Agricultural Land (16)	(0)	Grade 3b land or below
Groundwater (17)	(0)	Development would not affect public drinking water supply
Neighbouring Uses (18)	(0)	Development would be compatible with adjacent uses
Contaminated Land (19)	(+++)	The site contains areas of potentially contaminated land as the eastern portion of the site is former railway land. This potentially contaminated land is likely to be addressed through appropriate planning conditions and/or suitable design/layout.
Mineral Resources (20)	(0)	Not within a relevant safeguarding or preferred area or area of search.
Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (21)	(0)	No information submitted to demonstrate use of renewable, very low carbon energy or to reduce greenhouse gas emissions
Publicly Accessible Open Space (22)	(-)	No effect on existing open space or any obvious potential/opportunity for provision of new open space above that required by the Core Strategy policy.
School Capacity (23)	(0)	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan does not identify a need to increase the capacity of the schools serving this settlement.
Utilities Infrastructure Capacity (24)	(-)	No additional investment in the extra high voltage electricity distribution network will be required to serve developments in the area. The receiving Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity to accommodate development proposed as part of the Local Plan. Stamford Bridge is connected to a mains gas distribution network with capacity. There is unlikely to be any issue with the bulk transfer and treatment of household water supplies in the area. Yorkshire Water have identified there is no sewerage capacity south of the River Derwent due to the sewage pumping station being at capacity, therefore investment would be required.
Highway Network Capacity (25)	(-)	No significant highways issues anticipated. Strategic capacity issues identified for the A166 and the A64 Grimston Bar Interchange nearby with improvements needed.
Wider Non-Road Transport Network (26)	N/A	Housing use proposed
Community Facilities (27)	(0)	No proposed or loss of facilities
Town Centre Vitality and Viability (28)	N/A	Housing use proposed
Regeneration or Economic Benefits (29)	(0)	No effect on a recognised regeneration strategy or a deprived area
Affordable Housing (30)	(+++)	Within area where ratio of average house price is over 8 times the average income.
STAGE 4 Deliverability		
Insurmountable Constraints (31)	No	No known constraints
Ownership and Market Constraints (32)	No	No known constraints
Deliverability (33)	Not developable	Site is situated within an internationally recognised and Registered Historic Battlefield.

Question	Outcome	Reasoning
Basic Information		
Land bid number	678, 1070	
Site area (ha)	6.17	
Proposed use	Residential	
Date received	18/11/2004, 15/12/2005	
Additional information		
STAGE 1 Initial Assessment & Site Exclusion		
Conformity with Settlement Network (1)	Yes	Rural Service Centre. Adjacent to settlement.
Biodiversity and Geological Value (2)	No	No effect on International or National site of biological or geological interest (subject confirmation as a result of Habitats Regulations Screening Report)
Flood Risk & Coastal Change (3)	No	Not in functional floodplain or affected by coastal erosion
Heritage Assets (4)	Yes	Within Historic Battlefield Site (Stamford Bridge 1066).
STAGE 2 Initial Ranking		
Greenfield & Brownfield Land (5)	1	100% Greenfield land
Accessibility by Public Transport (6)	2	
Accessibility by Walking & Cycling (7)	1	
Flood Risk (8)	6	More vulnerable use within Zone 1
STAGE 3 Detailed Site Specific Considerations		
Settlement Vision (9)	(---)	No settlement vision or place statement defined. Would undermine sub-area policy due to impact on battlefield site.
Biodiversity and Geological Value (10)	(--)	Bats (2005) < 500m
Wildlife & Natural Environment (11)	(0)	No significant effect or existing features can be retained. Peripheral hedgrows.
Heritage Assets (12)	(---)	Within Historic Battlefield Site (Stamford Bridge 1066).
Built Character (13)	(-)	Development of site would be poorly related to settlement pattern and would intrude out into open countryside.
Landscape Character (14)	(-)	Development of site would be poorly related to settlement pattern and would intrude out into open countryside. Open and rural character of area would be harmed by such an intrusion.
Air Quality (15)	(0)	Air quality acceptable - development unlikely to affect quality
Agricultural Land (16)	(0)	Grade 3b land or below
Groundwater (17)	(0)	Development would not affect public drinking water supply
Compatibility with Neighbouring Uses (18)	(0)	Development would be compatible with adjacent uses
Contaminated Land (19)	(0)	Development is not located on land that is likely to be contaminated, however there is potentially contaminated land adjacent to the site on the southern boundary which is former railway land. Depending on the nature and layout of the proposed development there may be a need for appropriate planning conditions to mitigate the risk of migration from this adjacent potentially contaminated land.
Mineral Resources (20)	(0)	Not within a relevant safeguarding or preferred area or area of search.
Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (21)	(0)	No information submitted to demonstrate use of renewable, very low carbon energy or to reduce greenhouse gas emissions
Publicly Accessible Open Space (22)	(0)	No effect on existing open space or any obvious potential/opportunity for provision of new open space above that required by the Core Strategy policy.
School Capacity (23)	(0)	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan does not identify a need to increase the capacity of the schools serving this settlement.
Utilities Infrastructure Capacity (24)	(-)	No additional investment in the extra high voltage electricity distribution network will be required to serve developments in the area. The receiving Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity to accommodate development proposed as part of the Local Plan. Stamford Bridge is connected to a mains gas distribution network with capacity. There is unlikely to be any issue with the bulk transfer and treatment of household water supplies in the area. Yorkshire Water have identified there is no sewerage capacity south of the River Derwent due to the sewage pumping station being at capacity, therefore investment would be required.
Highway Network Capacity (25)	(-)	No significant highways issues anticipated. Strategic capacity issues identified for the A166 and the A64 Grimston Bar Interchange nearby with improvements needed.
Wider Non-Road Transport Network (26)	N/A	Housing use proposed
Community Facilities (27)	(0)	No proposed or loss of facilities
Town Centre Vitality and Viability (28)	N/A	Housing use proposed
Regeneration or Economic Benefits (29)	(0)	No effect on a recognised regeneration strategy or a deprived area
Affordable Housing (30)	(+++)	Within area where ratio of average house price is over 8 times the average income.
STAGE 4 Deliverability		
Insurmountable Constraints (31)	No	No known constraints
Ownership and Market Constraints (32)	No	No known constraints
Deliverability (33)	Not developable	Site is situated within an internationally recognised and Registered Historic Battlefield.

Question	Outcome	Reasoning
Basic Information		
Land bid number	678, 1070	
Site area (ha)	3.76	
Proposed use	Residential	
Date received	18/11/2004, 15/12/2005	
Additional information		
STAGE 1 Initial Assessment & Site Exclusion		
Conformity with Settlement Network (1)	Yes	Rural Service Centre. Adjacent to settlement.
Biodiversity and Geological Value (2)	No	No effect on International or National site of biological or geological interest (subject confirmation as a result of Habitats Regulations Screening Report)
Flood Risk & Coastal Change (3)	No	Not in functional floodplain or affected by coastal erosion
Heritage Assets (4)	Yes	Within Historic Battlefield Site (Stamford Bridge 1066).
STAGE 2 Initial Ranking		
Greenfield & Brownfield Land (5)	1	100% Greenfield land
Accessibility by Public Transport (6)	2	
Accessibility by Walking & Cycling (7)	0	
Flood Risk (8)	6	More vulnerable use within Zone 1
STAGE 3 Detailed Site Specific Considerations		
Settlement Vision (9)	(--)	No settlement vision or place statement defined. Would undermine sub-area policy due to impact on battlefield site.
Biodiversity and Geological Value (10)	(-)	Bats (2005) < 500m
Wildlife & Natural Environment (11)	(0)	No significant effect or existing features can be retained. Peripheral hedgrows.
Heritage Assets (12)	(--)	Within Historic Battlefield Site (Stamford Bridge 1066).
Built Character (13)	(-)	Development of site would be poorly related to settlement pattern and would intrude out into open countryside.
Landscape Character (14)	(-)	Development of site would be poorly related to settlement pattern and would intrude out into open countryside. Open and rural character of area would be harmed by such an intrusion.
Air Quality (15)	(0)	Air quality acceptable - development unlikely to affect quality
Agricultural Land (16)	(0)	Grade 3b land or below
Groundwater (17)	(0)	Development would not affect public drinking water supply
Compatibility with Neighbouring Uses (18)	(0)	Development would be compatible with adjacent uses
Contaminated Land (19)	(0)	Development is not located on land that is likely to be contaminated.
Mineral Resources (20)	(0)	Not within a relevant safeguarding or preferred area or area of search.
Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (21)	(0)	No information submitted to demonstrate use of renewable, very low carbon energy or to reduce greenhouse gas emissions
Publicly Accessible Open Space (22)	(0)	No effect on existing open space or any obvious potential/opportunity for provision of new open space above that required by the Core Strategy policy.
School Capacity (23)	(0)	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan does not identify a need to increase the capacity of the schools serving this settlement
Utilities Infrastructure Capacity (24)	(-)	No additional investment in the extra high voltage electricity distribution network will be required to serve developments in the area. The receiving Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity to accommodate development proposed as part of the Local Plan. Stamford Bridge is connected to a mains gas distribution network with capacity. There is unlikely to be any issue with the bulk transfer and treatment of household water supplies in the area. Yorkshire Water have identified there is no sewerage capacity south of the River Derwent due to the sewage pumping station being at capacity, therefore investment would be required.
Highway Network Capacity (25)	(-)	No significant highways issues anticipated. Strategic capacity issues identified for the A166 and the A64 Grimston Bar Interchange nearby with improvements needed.
Wider Non-Road Transport Network (26)	N/A	Housing use proposed
Community Facilities (27)	(0)	No proposed or loss of facilities
Town Centre Vitality and Viability (28)	N/A	Housing use proposed
Regeneration or Economic Benefits (29)	(0)	No effect on a recognised regeneration strategy or a deprived area
Affordable Housing (30)	(+++)	Within area where ratio of average house price is over 8 times the average income.
STAGE 4 Deliverability		
Insurmountable Constraints (31)	No	No known constraints
Ownership and Market Constraints (32)	No	No known constraints
Deliverability (33)	Not developable	Site is situated within an internationally recognised and Registered Historic Battlefield.

Question	Outcome	Reasoning
Basic Information		
Land bid number	38, 980	
Site area (ha)	4.22	
Proposed use	Residential	
Date received		
Additional information		
STAGE 1 Initial Assessment & Site Exclusion		
Conformity with Settlement Network (1)	Yes	Rural Service Centre. Adjacent to settlement.
Biodiversity and Geological Value (2)	No	No effect on International or National site of biological or geological interest (subject confirmation as a result of Habitats Regulations Screening Report)
Flood Risk & Coastal Change (3)	No	Not in functional floodplain or affected by coastal erosion
Heritage Assets (4)	Yes	Within Historic Battlefield Site (Stamford Bridge 1066).
STAGE 2 Initial Ranking		
Greenfield & Brownfield Land (5)	1	100% Greenfield land
Accessibility by Public Transport (6)	2	
Accessibility by Walking & Cycling (7)	0	
Flood Risk (8)	6	More vulnerable use within Zone 1
STAGE 3 Detailed Site Specific Considerations		
Settlement Vision (9)	(--)	No settlement vision or place statement defined. Would undermine sub-area policy due to impact on battlefield site.
Biodiversity and Geological Value (10)	(--)	Other (2002) Bats (2003) < 500m
Wildlife & Natural Environment (11)	(0)	No significant effect or existing features can be retained. Peripheral hedgrows.
Heritage Assets (12)	(--)	Within Historic Battlefield Site (Stamford Bridge 1066).
Built Character (13)	(-)	Development of site would be poorly related to settlement pattern and would intrude out into open countryside.
Landscape Character (14)	(-)	Development of site would be poorly related to settlement pattern and would intrude out into open countryside. Open and rural character of area would be harmed by such an intrusion.
Air Quality (15)	(0)	Air quality acceptable - development unlikely to affect quality
Agricultural Land (16)	(0)	Grade 3b land or below
Groundwater (17)	(0)	Development would not affect public drinking water supply
Compatibility with Neighbouring Uses (18)	(0)	Development would be compatible with adjacent uses
Contaminated Land (19)	(0)	Development is not located on land that is likely to be contaminated.
Mineral Resources (20)	(0)	Not within a relevant safeguarding or preferred area or area of search.
Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (21)	(0)	No information submitted to demonstrate use of renewable, very low carbon energy or to reduce greenhouse gas emissions
Publicly Accessible Open Space (22)	(0)	No effect on existing open space or any obvious potential/opportunity for provision of new open space above that required by the Core Strategy policy.
School Capacity (23)	(0)	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan does not identify a need to increase the capacity of the schools serving this settlement
Utilities Infrastructure Capacity (24)	(-)	No additional investment in the extra high voltage electricity distribution network will be required to serve developments in the area. The receiving Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity to accommodate development proposed as part of the Local Plan. Stamford Bridge is connected to a mains gas distribution network with capacity. There is unlikely to be any issue with the bulk transfer and treatment of household water supplies in the area. Yorkshire Water have identified there is no sewerage capacity south of the River Derwent due to the sewage pumping station being at capacity, therefore investment would be required.
Highway Network Capacity (25)	(-)	No significant highways issues anticipated. Strategic capacity issues identified for the A166 and the A64 Grimston Bar Interchange nearby with improvements needed.
Wider Non-Road Transport Network (26)	N/A	Housing use proposed
Community Facilities (27)	(0)	No proposed or loss of facilities
Town Centre Vitality and Viability (28)	N/A	Housing use proposed
Regeneration or Economic Benefits (29)	(0)	No effect on a recognised regeneration strategy or a deprived area
Affordable Housing (30)	(+++)	Within area where ratio of average house price is over 8 times the average income.
STAGE 4 Deliverability		
Insurmountable Constraints (31)	No	No known constraints
Ownership and Market Constraints (32)	No	No known constraints
Deliverability (33)	Not developable	Site is situated within an internationally recognised and Registered Historic Battlefield.

Question	Outcome	Reasoning
Basic Information		
Land bid number		
Site area (ha)		
Proposed use		
Date received		
Additional information		
STAGE 1 Initial Assessment & Site Exclusion		
Conformity with Settlement Network (1)	Yes	Rural Service Centre. Adjacent to settlement.
Biodiversity and Geological Value (2)	No	No effect on International or National site of biological or geological interest (subject confirmation as a result of Habitats Regulations Screening Report)
Flood Risk & Coastal Change (3)	No	Not in functional floodplain or affected by coastal erosion
Heritage Assets (4)	Yes	Within Historic Battlefield Site (Stamford Bridge 1066).
STAGE 2 Initial Ranking		
Greenfield & Brownfield Land (5)	1	100% Greenfield land
Accessibility by Public Transport (6)	2	
Accessibility by Walking & Cycling (7)	1	
Flood Risk (8)	6	More vulnerable use within Zone 1
STAGE 3 Detailed Site Specific Considerations		
Settlement Vision (9)	(--)	No settlement vision or place statement defined. Would undermine sub-area policy due to impact on battlefield site.
Biodiversity and Geological Value (10)	(--)	Bats (2005) < 500m
Wildlife & Natural Environment (11)	(0)	No significant effect or existing features can be retained. Peripheral hedgrows.
Heritage Assets (12)	(--)	Within Historic Battlefield Site (Stamford Bridge 1066).
Built Character (13)	(-)	Development of site would be poorly related to settlement pattern and would intrude out into open countryside.
Landscape Character (14)	(-)	Development of site would be poorly related to settlement pattern and would intrude out into open countryside. Open and rural character of area would be harmed by such an intrusion.
Air Quality (15)	(0)	Air quality acceptable - development unlikely to affect quality
Agricultural Land (16)	(0)	Grade 3b land or below
Groundwater (17)	(0)	Development would not affect public drinking water supply
Compatibility with Neighbouring Uses (18)	(0)	Development would be compatible with adjacent uses
Contaminated Land (19)	(0)	Development is not located on land that is likely to be contaminated, however there is potentially contaminated land adjacent to the site on the southern boundary which is former railway land. Depending on the nature and layout of the proposed development there may be a need for appropriate planning conditions to mitigate the risk of migration from this adjacent potentially contaminated land.
Mineral Resources (20)	(0)	Not within a relevant safeguarding or preferred area or area of search.
Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (21)	(0)	No information submitted to demonstrate use of renewable, very low carbon energy or to reduce greenhouse gas emissions
Publicly Accessible Open Space (22)	(0)	No effect on existing open space or any obvious potential/opportunity for provision of new open space above that required by the Core Strategy policy.
School Capacity (23)	(0)	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan does not identify a need to increase the capacity of the schools serving this settlement.
Utilities Infrastructure Capacity (24)	(-)	No additional investment in the extra high voltage electricity distribution network will be required to serve developments in the area. The receiving Waste Water Treatment Works has sufficient capacity to accommodate development proposed as part of the Local Plan. Stamford Bridge is connected to a mains gas distribution network with capacity. There is unlikely to be any issue with the bulk transfer and treatment of household water supplies in the area. Yorkshire Water have identified there is no sewerage capacity south of the River Derwent due to the sewage pumping station being at capacity, therefore investment would be required.
Highway Network Capacity (25)	(-)	No significant highways issues anticipated. Strategic capacity issues identified for the A166 and the A64 Grimston Bar Interchange nearby with improvements needed.
Wider Non-Road Transport Network (26)	N/A	Housing use proposed
Community Facilities (27)	(0)	No proposed or loss of facilities
Town Centre Vitality and Viability (28)	N/A	The bid discusses a possible retail or commercial centre within the site (out of town centre retail could impact on the Town Centre Vitality and Viability)
Regeneration or Economic Benefits (29)	(0)	No effect on a recognised regeneration strategy or a deprived area
Affordable Housing (30)	(+++)	Within area where ratio of average house price is over 8 times the average income.
STAGE 4 Deliverability		
Insurmountable Constraints (31)	No	No known constraints
Ownership and Market Constraints (32)	No	No known constraints
Deliverability (33)	Not developable	Site is situated within an internationally recognised and Registered Historic Battlefield.