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This document was prepared by East Riding of Yorkshire Council in association with Atkins for the specific purpose of providing a methodology for site assessment in the East Riding of Yorkshire Allocations DPD, incorporating the requirements of Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment. Atkins accepts no liability for any costs, liabilities or losses arising as a result of the use or reliance upon the contents of this document by any person other than East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
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Introduction
**Introduction**

This document sets out the process that East Riding of Yorkshire Council will follow to assess and compare the suitability of potential development sites. It replaces the previously adopted Housing Site Assessment Methodology (May 2007) and will be used to assess sites that have been submitted to the Council for inclusion within the Allocations Development Plan Document (Allocations Document). The Allocations Document is one of a number of documents that make up the East Riding Local Development Framework (LDF) and will allocate sites for development (such as housing, retail, or industry) or protection (e.g. open space or land for transport schemes) over the period to 2026.

The Site Assessment Methodology has updated the Housing Site Assessment Methodology to ensure it is applicable to a range of proposed land uses and takes into account new government guidance that has been published since 2007. It has been prepared to ensure that it satisfies the requirements of Sustainability Appraisal\(^1\) of the Allocations Document, which seeks to assess how potential sites perform against a range of economic, social, and environmental objectives. The need to undertake a Sustainability Appraisal is an essential part of the process in preparing the document and is set out in both European and national legislation. In addition, it takes into account relevant statements of national planning policy\(^2\).

A draft version of this Methodology was published for public consultation in May/June 2010. It was revised to take into account consultation responses, comments from various Council departments, two workshops facilitated by the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment, and a meeting with planning agents.

### Sustainability Appraisal

Sustainability Appraisal, which incorporates the requirements of the EU Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive 2001/42/EC\(^3\), is the process used by East Riding of Yorkshire Council to appraise the social, environmental and economic effects of the LDF. Government guidance\(^4\) identifies the Sustainability Appraisal as an integral part of developing the plan and that it has a key role in testing alternative options and providing a sound evidence base.

Through consultation with a number of external partners, in particular Natural England, English Heritage and the Environment Agency, twenty-one Sustainability Objectives were developed for the Allocations Document. These have been set out in the Allocations Development Plan Document Sustainability Appraisal Part II Scoping Report, which was published for consultation in May 2010 alongside the draft Site Assessment Methodology. In order to ensure that this Methodology satisfies the requirements of Sustainability Appraisal the objectives have been translated into a range of questions, which will be used to appraise the likely effects of individual development sites.

---

1. For further explanation of the Sustainability Appraisal requirements, please see ‘Allocations Development Plan Document Sustainability Appraisal Part II Scoping Report’ [link](http://www.eastriding.gov.uk/environment-and-planning/planning/forward-planning/local-development-framework/)
2. Statements of National Planning Policy are published by the Department of Communities and Local Governments [link](http://www.communities.gov.uk/planningandbuilding/planningsystem/)
Purpose

The Methodology will be used to assess all potential sites, including:

- Sites that have been suggested by the general public, including landowners, developers, and planning agents, both before and during the preparation of the Allocations Document.
- Sites that are allocated in an existing Local Plan and do not have a current planning permission.
- Sites that have been identified through other studies such as the Council’s Town Centres & Retail Study, and Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA).
- Other sites the Council believes merit consideration.

The Site Assessment Methodology provides guidance on those issues that may be considered when other potential development sites are brought to the Council’s attention unexpectedly after the Allocations Document has been finalised, for example former employment sites that become available for redevelopment. It will also assist the Council in assessing whether a site being brought forward for development by the community, for example through a Neighbourhood Development Order, would have a significant effect on the environment.

Site Assessments

A total of 33 questions and guidance notes have been set out, which will be used to assess the impact of a proposed development site. It has been split into four specific stages:

Stage 1: Initial Assessment and Site Exclusion

Stage 2: Initial Ranking

Stage 3: Detailed Site Specific Considerations

Stage 4: Deliverability

Whilst most questions apply to all the potential uses being considered in the Allocations Document, some questions relate to a specific use, for example the capacity of schools will only be relevant when assessing proposed housing sites and does not need to be considered for other types of development. Therefore, the guidance notes set out the uses that the question applies to and the scoring range that should be used.

Site assessments will be undertaken for each site using information obtained from a variety of sources, including:

- Studies and reports published by the Council and other agencies, for example the East Riding of Yorkshire Landscape Character Assessment;
- Information from site surveys, for example photos and site measurements;
- Documentation submitted by those promoting the site for inclusion in the Allocations Document; and
- Where appropriate, information gained through discussions with those promoting the site, any relevant consultee (e.g. Natural England) and the local community.
In most instances sites will be assessed individually, however, there may be cases where it is desirable to consider an alternative site boundary. This might result in larger sites being split, or a combination of two or more sites being assessed together, where it would result in substantial benefits against a number of the assessment questions. Where this approach is considered appropriate it will be discussed and agreed with the individual or organisation that is promoting the site for development.

Assessments will take account of the best available information and the key sources of evidence that will be used to appraise sites have been highlighted within the guidance notes for each question. However, it is possible that new or updated sources of information will become available following the publication of this Site Assessment Methodology and where appropriate these will also be taken into account.

Every effort has been made to include all the important issues that should be taken into account when considering the location of new development. However, other factors that are perhaps only relevant to individual sites or small groups of sites may become apparent during the assessment process. If any such issues arise as part of the site assessments they will also be taken into account and weighted accordingly.

**Contact Details**

For further information on this document or the Allocations Document please contact:

Forward Planning - East Riding of Yorkshire Council  
County Hall, Beverley, HU17 9BA  
E-mail: forward.planning@eastriding.gov.uk  
Tel: 01482 391750

The document is also available to view at: www.eastriding.gov.uk/planning/idf
Stage 1 Initial Assessment and Site Exclusion
Stage 1 Initial Assessment and Site Exclusion

Stage 1 represents an initial sieving exercise, which seeks to dismiss at an early stage all those sites that have a significant constraint to development. Sites will be assessed to determine whether they conform to the Core Strategy settlement network & strategy for locating development, which is set out in the Core Strategy, as well as a number of key environmental considerations.

Sites will only be dismissed where a constraint is identified and considered so significant that development is unlikely to be appropriate. All other sites will be carried forward for assessment against relevant questions in Stages 2, 3 and 4 of this Methodology.

Question 1 - Conformity With The Settlement Network

Would the use for the site be appropriate when considered against the settlement’s place in the Core Strategy settlement network or the strategy for locating development?

Approach to assessment for all uses:

| Yes | No |

A settlement network is included as part of the Core Strategy, which will be used to determine the scale and distribution of new development across East Riding. It identifies those settlements, in particular the towns and larger villages, where the majority of housing development is to be located as well as other uses such as offices, retail, and community facilities.

Only sites that are either within or adjacent to a settlement will be assessed\(^5\). The term adjacent refers to sites that lie immediately next to the built form of the settlement, as well as sites that lie so close to the built form that it is reasonable to consider them as a possible extension to the urban boundary. The latter may include sites that are detached from the built form by a small field boundary or an area of open space (e.g. playing field). Sites that are some distance from a settlement (for example separated by several fields) are unlikely to be considered appropriate for allocation through the methodology.

Alongside the settlement network a strategy for locating development is also outlined through the Core Strategy. This involves locating certain types of development outside of the settlement network, for example on major employment sites such as Carnaby Industrial Estate to the southwest of Bridlington.

---

\(^5\) In certain instances sites that are not directly adjacent to the settlement boundary, but still well-related to the built-up area, will be included where they have potential to deliver significant sustainability or community benefits.
Please refer to the latest version of the Core Strategy, which can be downloaded from the Council’s website (www.eastriding.gov.uk/planning/ldf), in order to access the most up to date settlement network.\(^6\)

The Core Strategy includes guidance that will be relevant when considering the distribution of development for a range of different uses. This includes new:

**Housing:**

The Core Strategy provides an indicative target for house building in East Riding and sets out the scale and distribution of housing across its settlement network. The size and number of new housing allocations required in a particular settlement will depend upon both the number of homes proposed for the settlement in the Core Strategy and the number of new homes that already have a planning permission. Delivery against this target is monitored annual through the Council’s Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment\(^7\) (SHLAA). However, any potential sites identified within the SHLAA will still need to be assessed against this methodology.

**Industrial:**

The Core Strategy seeks to strengthen and contribute to the growth of the East Riding economy by facilitating proposals that would meet wider economic objectives. This has been informed by an Employment Land Review\(^8\) which identifies the need to allocate sites for employment uses in key locations throughout East Riding. The Employment Land Review outlines the total amount of employment land required to accommodate the forecast job growth. It also considers those strategic and other employment sites that should be safeguarded for employment uses, recognising that these are important for future economic growth.

**Town Centre and Retail:**

The Core Strategy sets out a hierarchy of town centres, which provides the framework for considering the overall scale and type of new town centre development. It has been informed by the East Riding Town Centres and Retail Study\(^9\) which provides an assessment of retail provision, shopping patterns, and 'health checks' for the larger towns. In particular, it sets out an estimate of future retail spend in different towns which has been translated into a requirement for new floorspace.

**Transport:**

The Core Strategy seeks to protect and enhance the overall role and function of the Strategic Transport Network within East Riding. A number of transport schemes and interventions are identified in the Council's draft Third Local Transport Plan\(^10\) (LTP3), which covers the period 2011-2026, and it is important that these schemes are safeguarded through the Local Development Framework (LDF). In addition, there may be other appropriate schemes that have been identified.

---

\(^6\) The latest version of the Core Strategy at the publication of this methodology was the preferred approach consultation, May 2010 (http://www.eastriding.gov.uk/environment-and-planning/planning/forward-planning/local-development-framework/)

\(^7\) http://www.eastriding.gov.uk/corp-docs/forwardplanning/html/evidencebase.html

\(^8\) http://www.eastriding.gov.uk/corp-docs/forwardplanning/html/evidencebase.html


in evidence based studies, for example a feasibility study, or by neighbouring local transport authorities. These might be important in supporting the wider delivery of the Council’s aspirations, for example the potential re-opening of the Beverley to York railway.

Sites should be dismissed if their use is not appropriate to their location within the Core Strategy settlement network or if the proposed use is not appropriate against the strategy for locating development.

OR

Proposed sites for transport use will be dismissed if they are not needed for a specific transport scheme to deliver the strategy set out in the Council’s Local Transport Plan or where appropriate, a neighbouring authority’s Local Transport Plan or the wider aspirations of the Council.

Question 2 - Biodiversity and Geological Value

Would development cause a significant adverse effect on an international or national site of biodiversity or geological value?

Approach to assessment for all uses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Government has set out national policies on the protection of biodiversity and geological conservation through the planning system, which is supplemented by a government Circular and supplementary Good Practice Guide.

The key principles of this guidance are that planning policies should avoid, mitigate or compensate for harm and should seek ways to conserve, enhance and restore biodiversity and geological diversity. The guidance identifies that appropriate weight should be attached to sites that are designated as being of international and national importance.

Internationally designated sites are the most important sites for biodiversity. They are afforded significant weight and are legally protected. It is important that local planning authorities ensure that this legal protection is not prejudiced.

International sites comprise:

- Special Protection Areas (SPA)
- Special Areas of Conservation (SAC)
- Ramsar Sites
- Candidate SPAs, SACs and Ramsar sites
Habitats Regulations

Under Article 6 of the Habitats Directive, an assessment is required where a plan is likely to give rise to significant effects upon certain internationally designated sites. This includes Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) designated under the Habitats Directive for their habitats and/or species of European importance and Special Protection Areas (SPA) designated under the Conservation of Wild Birds Directive for rare migratory bird species and internationally important wetlands.

As a consequence the Council will need to prepare a Habitats Regulation Assessment Screening Report to identify the likely impacts of any preferred development site and consider whether these impacts are likely to be significant. Where deemed necessary through a screening report, a full Habitats Regulation Assessment will need to be carried out for a preferred development site. This will involve a detailed assessment of the impact that development may have to determine whether there will be adverse effects on the integrity of the designated biodiversity site.\(^{11}\)

Any site that would cause a significant adverse effect on an international designation will be dismissed at this stage.

Nationally designated sites are also legally protected. Under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) local planning authorities must take reasonable steps to further the conservation and enhancement of their special features. They comprise:

- Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)
- National Nature Reserves (NNR)

National planning policy identifies that development should not normally be allowed where it is likely to have an adverse effect on a Site of Special Scientific Interest. An exception should only be made when the benefits of the development would clearly outweigh the impacts that it is likely to have on the features of the Site.

Any site that would cause a significant adverse effect on a national designation will be dismissed at this stage.

The Council is required to consult Natural England over any site that may impact upon an international or national designation and their comments, alongside the Council’s Sustainable Development team, will be critical in considering whether or not a site should be dismissed. It is likely any proposed development site that falls within an international or nationally designated site would have a significant adverse effect. Should it appear likely that a site is to be dismissed, those promoting the site will be offered the opportunity to provide evidence to demonstrate that development will not have a detrimental effect upon the protected site. Such evidence may be provided through an ecological assessment of the site. In exceptional circumstances sites,

\(^{11}\) The requirement to consider the need for an Appropriate Assessment is set out under Article 6(3) and (4) of the EU Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC
which have a significant adverse effect, may not be discounted at this stage if it can be demonstrated the development is of an over-riding public importance and that there are no other suitable sites available.

**Question 3 - Flood Risk & Coastal Change**

Would the development be unsuitable because of its location in the functional floodplain or an area at risk from coastal erosion?

Approach to assessment for all uses:

| Yes | No |
---|---|

National planning policy on Development and Flood Risk and an accompanying Practice Guide set out a risk-based approach, including a Sequential Test, which aims to ensure that development proposals are steered away from high flood risk areas as far as possible. Areas of flood risk have been mapped by the Environment Agency and are classified into the following Flood Zones:

- Flood Zone 1: Low Probability
- Flood Zone 2: Medium Probability
- Flood Zone 3a: High Probability
- Flood Zone 3b: The Functional Floodplain

This approach highlights that development should not be permitted in the Functional Floodplain, unless it is for ‘essential infrastructure’ or a ‘water-compatible’ use (see Table 4 on page 31 for a list uses). Therefore, inappropriate sites in the Functional Floodplain will be discounted at Stage 1.
The Council has prepared a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment \(^{12}\), which maps the extent of the Flood Zones within East Riding. This will be used to determine whether a proposed development site is located within the Functional Floodplain.

The risk from coastal erosion is also an important consideration and the Council has monitored erosion rates along the East Riding coast since 1951. As a general guide, the rate of erosion is 1 to 1.5 metres per year between Barmston and Atwick, and 1.5 to 2 metres per year between Hornsea and Kilnsea. This information has been used in preparing the Shoreline Management Plan (SMP)\(^ {13}\) to assess where the cliff is likely to be in 25, 50, and 100 years time. In line with national planning policy, the Council will use the SMP to identify Coastal Change Management Areas (CCMA), which are ‘areas likely to be affected by physical changes to the coast’.

Within CCMA\(^s\) the Core Strategy proposes that development is restricted to temporary commercial uses, provided it can be demonstrated that it would contribute to the local economy or help to improve the East Riding’s tourism offer. It also requires that the risk to the development can be mitigated throughout its intended lifespan. Therefore, sites within the CCMA will be discounted at this stage, unless they are for a temporary, commercial (tourism-related) use.

Sites in the Functional Floodplain (unless promoted for ‘essential infrastructure’ and ‘water-compatible’ uses) and in the Coastal Change Management Area (unless promoted for a temporary, commercial use) will be dismissed at this stage.

---

13 http://www.hecag-smp2.co.uk/
Question 4 - Heritage Assets

Would the development cause substantial harm to a nationally designated heritage asset?

Approach to assessment for all uses:

| Yes | No |

National planning policy on planning for the historic environment defines heritage assets as ‘those parts of the historic environment that have significance because of their historic, archaeological, architectural or artistic interest’. It highlights that the significance of any heritage asset should be considered alongside the impact that new development would have on that asset.

The aim is to conserve England’s heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance by ensuring that:

- decisions are based on the nature, extent and level of that significance, investigated to a degree proportionate to the importance of the heritage asset;
- wherever possible, heritage assets are put to an appropriate and viable use that is consistent with their conservation;
- the positive contribution of such heritage assets to local character and sense of place is recognised and valued; and
- consideration of the historic environment is integrated into planning policies, promoting place-shaping.

It seeks to ensure that policies and decisions concerning the historic environment:

- recognise that heritage assets are a non-renewable resource;
- take account of the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits of heritage conservation; and
- recognise that intelligently managed change may sometimes be necessary if heritage assets are to be maintained for the long term.

English Heritage has advised that a number of nationally important historical sites and buildings should be afforded protection at this stage of the Methodology. These as well as other heritage assets that are deemed to be of national importance are set out in Table 1.
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset type</th>
<th>Significance in the East Riding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Monuments and other sites of national</td>
<td>‘Nationally important’ archaeological site or historic building. These sites are protected under the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>archaeological significance</td>
<td>Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 and are included in the sites and monuments record.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed Buildings</td>
<td>Over 250 Grade I and Grade II* Listed Buildings (of ‘outstanding’ architectural or historic interest).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 2000 Grade II Listed Buildings. Significant numbers and groups in Beverley, Bridlington and Hedon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Gardens of Historic Interest</td>
<td>The single Grade I Historic Park and Garden (which is at Sledmere and recognised as being of international importance) and three of Grade II*.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Battlefields and Military Sites</td>
<td>Stamford Bridge (1066) (English Heritage National Register).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any site that would cause substantial harm to a nationally designated heritage asset will be dismissed at this stage.

English Heritage, the Humber Archaeological Partnership and the Councils Conservation Team will be consulted over any site that may impact upon the sites listed above and their comments will be critical in considering whether or not a site should be dismissed. Should it appear likely that a site is to be dismissed, those promoting the site will be offered the opportunity to provide evidence to demonstrate that development will not have a detrimental effect upon the protected site.

Stage 1 Outcome: To identify all potential development sites that:

- would be appropriate when considered against the settlement’s place in the Core Strategy settlement network or the strategy for locating development
- would not cause a significant adverse effect on a international or national environmental designation
- would not be unsuitable due to the site’s vulnerability to flood risk or coastal erosion
- would not cause substantial harm to a nationally designated heritage asset

Those sites that are not identified do not represent sustainable locations for development and will be excluded from further assessment.
Stage 2 Initial Ranking
**Stage 2 Initial Ranking**

Stage 2 will consider all sites that have not been dismissed through the Stage 1 assessment. It assesses sites against three issues that have been identified as key planning objectives for East Riding:

- the priority to focus development on previously developed 'brownfield' land;
- ensuring that development is easily accessible and well located; and
- avoiding development on high flood risk areas.

The aim of Stage 2 is to provide sites with an initial ranking which will highlight those sites that contribute most to the achievement of these issues. All sites will then be subject to a more detailed assessment in stage 3 and 4 which will consider a range of social, economic, environmental, and delivery issues. However, sites that are identified as being at high risk of flooding may be dismissed where it presents a significant constraint that cannot be adequately resolved. This will ensure that the Stage 2 assessments are in conformity with national planning policy on Development and Flood Risk.

**Question 5 - Greenfield and Brownfield Land**

**Does the site contain previously developed land, greenfield land or a mix of both?**

**Approach to site assessment for all uses:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wholly (100%) Previously Developed Land (PDL)</td>
<td>6 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed: &gt; 75% PDL</td>
<td>5 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed: 50 - 75% PDL</td>
<td>4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed: 25 - 49% PDL</td>
<td>3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed: &lt; 25% PDL</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholly (100%) GreenfieldLand</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Government places significant priority on the use of previously developed land (PDL or Brownfield land) over the use of undeveloped land (greenfield land). This is reflected in a number of different statements of national planning policy, including policies on both housing and economic development. These highlight that the Council should actively seek to bring vacant and underused previously developed land and buildings back into beneficial use.

This question scores sites highly where they would result in the re-use of previously developed land. However, other questions within this Methodology will help to determine whether such sites are ultimately suitable for development.
A definition of previously developed land has been set out by the government, which comprises the following uses:

- Residential land, hostels, old people’s homes etc, but excluding gardens
- Community buildings (including health, schools, religious buildings)
- Leisure and recreational buildings (sports halls, museums, cinemas, hotels)
- Employment land including offices, storage and warehousing
- Retailing (inc. shops, garages, pubs, restaurants)
- Utilities and transport (including highways, car parks, railways)
- Mineral workings, quarries and landfill waste disposal sites where provision for restoration has not been made
- Vacant and/or derelict land and buildings (except those formerly used for agriculture)
- Defence land and buildings (including airfields, barracks)

Examples of greenfield sites may include:

- Agricultural land (including orchards, nurseries)
- Agricultural buildings (including vacant buildings)
- Woodland and forestry
- Outdoor recreation (including playing fields, parks, sports grounds, golf courses)
- Allotments
- Private residential gardens in built up areas
- Urban land not previously developed (including amenity areas)

Sites will be scored according to the proportion of previously developed land that they contain. Those sites that are wholly previously developed receive the highest score (6 points) whilst those that are wholly greenfield receive the lowest (1 points). Sites that contain a mix of both previously developed and greenfield land will receive between 2 points (less than 25% previously developed) and 5 points (more than 75% previously developed).
**Question 6 - Accessibility by Public Transport**

**How accessible is the site by public transport?**

Approach to site assessment for housing and residential institution uses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Journey time to Destination by Public Transport*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within 15 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To 'Major' Centres</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Employment</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Health</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary &amp; Tertiary Education</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Only the nearest destination should be counted for each category and the points added together to obtain a total score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>27 +</th>
<th>26 - 23</th>
<th>22 - 19</th>
<th>18 - 15</th>
<th>14 - 11</th>
<th>10 - 7</th>
<th>6 - 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approach to site assessment for all non-housing uses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population within 40 minutes journey time from destination (30 minutes by bus and/or train and 10 minutes walking)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30,000+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 to 29,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 19,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National planning policy promotes accessibility to jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services by transport, as well as reducing the need to travel, especially by car. The government has set out that accessibility is the ease with which an individual can access services and facilities that he or she needs or desires. A range of factors impact upon accessibility, including:
There are several different ways of considering accessibility by public transport to housing sites. This Methodology considers accessibility using the public transport system from housing to activities and opportunities set out in table 2 (P.25), specifically:

- 'Major' centres - including Hull, Beverley, Bridlington, Driffield, Goole, York and Selby
- Employment - 130 locations (see table below in question 7 for further information)
- Shopping - (see table below in question 7 for further information)
- Secondary Health (hospitals)
- Secondary & Tertiary Education

For potential housing sites marks will be given according to a site’s accessibility against each of the destinations set out in table 2. Once added together the total score is used to determine the number of points for each site. In most cases only the nearest indicator, as identified in table 2, will be considered when determining the number of points for a particular site. However, where a number of sites receive the same overall score the relative accessibility will be determined, for example by considering the site’s proximity to:

- Two or more shopping or employment areas; and
- Out-of-centre retail provision, which provides a wide range of goods and is located outside of the retail hierarchy identified in either the Core Strategy for East Riding or Hull.

For non-housing uses, such as proposed retail or employment sites, accessibility by public transport is measured by identifying the number of people that are able to use public transport to access the proposed development site. This recognises that these uses typically act as a destination that people travel to rather than a journey origin.

The Council will use the accessibility modelling software Accession to assess the relative public transport accessibility of sites. It provides a quantified means of measuring accessibility and can map different time periods during the day, such as the morning peak period (0700-0900), the daytime inter-peak (1000-1500) and the evening peak (1600-1800). Site assessments will use the morning peak (0700 to 0900) as a standard parameter for assessing the accessibility of sites against this question. The frequency of available public transport services will also be assessed, especially where a number of sites have the same overall score, for example a site might achieve a good journey time (15 minutes) by public transport to a ‘major’ centre, but the frequency of service is poor (2 return journeys per day or no return journeys after 5pm).
The journey times are calculated using the public transport routes available, and take into account the following:

- Walking time to the nearest bus stop;
- Journey time on the bus / train;
- Any interchange time; and
- Walking to the final destination

The Council will also take into account the likely provision of new infrastructure (such as bus stops or re-routing of a bus route) that may arise as a result of a particular development.
Question 7 - Accessibility by Walking and Cycling

How accessible is the site by walking and cycling?

Approach to site assessment for housing uses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service / Facility</th>
<th>Walking Distances*</th>
<th>Cycling Distances*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within 400m</td>
<td>Within 800m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Areas (including leisure)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull City Centre</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Centres</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Employment Area</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP Premises</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only the nearest service/facility should be counted for each category and the points for both ‘Walking Distances’ and ‘Cycling Distances’ added together to obtain a total score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>42 +</th>
<th>41 - 37</th>
<th>36 - 32</th>
<th>31 - 27</th>
<th>26 - 22</th>
<th>21 - 16</th>
<th>15 - 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Approach to site assessment for all non-housing uses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population within 1200 metres of destination (maximum reasonable walking distance)</th>
<th>Points*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10,000+</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001 to 9,999</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,001 to 5,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 to 2,000</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population within 5 kilometres of destination (maximum reasonable cycling distance)</th>
<th>Points*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20,000+</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 19,999</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000 to 4,999</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The points for each should be added together to obtain the total score

National planning policy on transport identifies that walking is the most important mode of travel at the local level and offers the greatest potential to replace short car trips, particularly those under 2 kilometres. This has been supported by research\(^{(14)}\) that identifies distances of between 400m and 800m as 'easy walking distances'. At such distances people would be expected to walk rather than use the car, cycle or public transport. The Chartered Institution of Highways\(^{(15)}\) also advise that the mean average length for walking journeys is approximately 1 km.

In addition, national policy highlights that cycling has the potential to substitute for short car trips, particularly those under 5 kilometres. Similarly the Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation advises that the mean average length for cycling journeys is approximately 4 km, although journeys of up to three times these distances are not uncommon for regular commuters.

Taking into account this guidance, the site assessments will consider potential housing uses based on whether they are within a 400 metre walking (approximately 5 minutes), 800 metre walking (10 minutes) or 1200 metre walking (15 minutes) distance from the services and facilities listed in table 2 below. Distances of 1200 metres, 3600 metres and 5000 metres will be used to assess the potential for cycling. Sites within the shortest walking and cycling distances will receive the highest number of points. Marks will be given according to a site’s accessibility against each service or facility for both walking and cycling. Once added together the total score is used to determine the number of points for each housing site. In most cases only the nearest indicator, as identified in table 2, will be considered when determining the number of points for a particular site. However, where a number of sites receive the same overall score the relative accessibility will be determined by considering the site’s proximity to:

\(^{14}\) URBED on Urban Potential Studies and the Sustainable Settlements Guide (UWE/LGB, 1998)

\(^{15}\) Transportation Providing for Journeys on Foot, Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation, 2000
Two or more shopping or employment areas; and
Out-of-centre retail provision, which provides a wide range of goods and is located outside of the retail hierarchy identified in either the Core Strategy for East Riding or Hull.

For non-housing uses, such as retail or employment sites, the population within reach of the maximum reasonable walking (1200 metres) and cycling (5km) distances will be assessed. This recognises that these uses typically act as a destination that people travel to rather than a journey origin. Again marks will be awarded for both walking and cycling added together to obtain a total score.

The indicators set out below in table 2 will be used to consider the potential for residents to be able to walk, cycle, or use public transport from a potential development site to a key destination:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shopping (including leisure)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull city centre:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hull city centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other centres:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District centres within Hull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Large local centres within Hull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kingswood &amp; St Andrews Quay shopping areas (Hull)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Town Centres within East Riding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Centres within East Riding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local Centres within East Riding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull city centre: Parts of Cottingham, Anlaby and Willerby fall within a 5km cycle ride of the city centre boundary. Sites within 5km receive a comparatively high number of points to reflect the range of services and facilities that are on offer within the city. The city centre is outside the specified walking distances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other centres: The district centres within Hull comprise North Point, Hessle Road and Holderness Road. The large local centres are made up of Anlaby Road, Chanterlands Avenue, Gipsyville, NewlandPark and Spring Bank. Many of these are within cycling distance of Hessle, Anlaby, Kirk Ella, Willerby, Cottingham, Woodmansey, Dunswell, Wawne, Bilton and Saltend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other town centres within East Riding comprise Beverley, Bridlington, Driffield, and Goole. District Centres within East Riding comprise Cottingham, Brough, Hedon, Hessle, Hornsea, Howden, Market Weighton, Pocklington, and Withernsea. Local Centres within East Riding are also set out in the Core Strategy and include a number of Rural Service Centres and Supporting Villages. Where a boundary has not been defined for Local Centres site assessments will be based on the distance to the the largest identifiable concentration of shops or services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Employment

**Main employment area:**
- Industrial estates
- Employment areas / clusters
- Large employers
- Hull city centre
- Large town centres within the East Riding

Over 100 employment sites/areas have been identified within Hull and the East Riding\(^{16}\). These comprise individual large employers, industrial estates and clusters of employment uses. Also included are existing allocated employment sites that are just coming onto the market (such as Melton Park).

The large town centres within the East Riding comprise those where 300 or more jobs have been recorded (census 2001). These are Beverley, Bridlington, Cottingham, Driffield, Goole, Howden, Hornsea, Hedon, Market Weighton, Pocklington and Withernsea.

The points allocated for cycling distances is higher to reflect the fact that a higher proportion of people are likely to cycle to work.

### Education

- Primary school
- Secondary school
- College / Further education

Access to the nearest school, which will be based on the school’s catchment area. The points allocated for cycling to a primary school is lower to reflect the fact that cycling is unlikely to be realistic option for primary school pupils.

Further education does not include universities. The points allocated for walking distances to further education are generally lower, reflecting the fact that it is not compulsory so lower numbers will attend compared with primary and secondary schools. The cycling scores are higher however, as those that do attend are more likely to cycle.

### Health

- The nearest GP premises

Health centres and hospitals were not included as different facilities provide a varied range of services. It is considered that including these would lead to an inconsistent comparison of sites.

The scoring system is lower representing the fact that this service is used on a less frequent basis.

The Council will use the accessibility modelling software Accession to assess the relative accessibility of a site by walking or cycling. Accession can map the distance from a proposed development to each of the indicators in Table 2. Distances will be calculated from the nearest realistic access point into the site to the closest part of the nearest indicator (e.g. the edge of a town centre)\(^{17}\). However, a judgement will be made on the likely route taken between these two points. This will need to take account of any particular barriers, such as major roads, railways,

---

\(^{16}\) http://www.eastriding.gov.uk/environment-and-planning/planning/forward-planning/local-development-framework/ Existing employment sites are based on the Local Plans and Employment Land Reviews for East Riding and Hull, and includes any area where 300 or more jobs were recorded in the census (2001).

\(^{17}\) Distances for schools will be based on the school’s catchment area.
or watercourses, that would hinder pedestrian or cycle access from the site to a particular indicator. In some instances the nearest realistic access point will be on the border of two distances (e.g. the end of 800m and the start of 1.2km). Where this occurs a site will usually be placed within the furthest of the two distances, reflecting the fact that the vast majority of residents will be within the longer distance to the particular indicator.

**Figure 2 Accession Example - Distance from Hornsea Town Centre**

The construction of any new or proposed retail, leisure, employment, education and health facilities will also be considered as part of this Methodology, including any proposed mixed-use developments. Government guidance states that planning policies should aim to encourage a mix of land uses. Whilst it should not be assumed that a mix of different uses would automatically lead to less car dependency, mixed use development can provide significant benefits. They can reduce the need to travel, especially as there would be less need to travel between two different sites.

**Question 8 - Flood Risk**

How acceptable is the site in terms of the flood risk vulnerability of the proposed use?

Approach to site assessment for all uses is set out on the next page:
Table 3 - Site Assessment scores for each flood zone according to vulnerability classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone</th>
<th>Zone 1 - Low probability (Tidal or Fluvial)</th>
<th>Zone 2 - Medium probability (Tidal or Fluvial)</th>
<th>Zone 3a - High probability, failure &gt; 12 hours (Tidally dominated)</th>
<th>Zone 3b - Areas at risk of a breach in the defences - Fluvial or tidal dominated</th>
<th>Zone 3a - Areas in close proximity to defences - Danger to some (Tidally dominated)</th>
<th>Zone 3a - Areas in close proximity to defences - Danger to most (Tidally dominated)</th>
<th>Zone 3b - Functional floodplain (Tidal or Fluvial)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability Classification</td>
<td>Water Compatible</td>
<td>Essential Infrastructure</td>
<td>Highly vulnerable</td>
<td>More vulnerable</td>
<td>Less vulnerable</td>
<td><em>If significant other sources of flooding (e.g. Groundwater or surface water) are present.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 1 - Low probability (Tidal or Fluvial)</td>
<td>Zone 2 - Medium probability (Tidal or Fluvial)</td>
<td>Zone 3a - High probability, failure &gt; 12 hours (Tidally dominated)</td>
<td>Zone 3b - Functional floodplain (Tidal or Fluvial)</td>
<td>Zone 3a - Areas at risk of a breach in the defences - Fluvial or tidal dominated</td>
<td>Zone 3a - Areas in close proximity to defences - Danger to some (Tidally dominated)</td>
<td>Zone 3a - Areas in close proximity to defences - Danger to most (Tidally dominated)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification</td>
<td>Uses that fall under each classification according to national planning policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Essential Infrastructure**           | - Essential transport infrastructure (including mass evacuation routes) which has to cross the area at risk.  
- Essential utility infrastructure which has to be located in a flood risk area for operational reasons, including electricity generating power stations and grid and primary substations; and water treatment works that need to remain operational in times of flood.  
- Wind turbines. |
| **Highly Vulnerable**                  | Police stations, Ambulance stations and Fire stations and Command Centres and telecommunications installations required to be operational during flooding.  
Emergency dispersal points.  
Basement dwellings.  
Caravans, mobile homes and park homes intended for permanent residential use. Installations requiring hazardous substances consent. (Where there is a demonstrable need to locate such installations for bulk storage of materials with port or other similar facilities, or such installations with energy infrastructure or carbon capture and storage installations, that require coastal or water-side locations, or need to be located in other high flood risk areas, in these instances the facilities should be classified as ‘Essential Infrastructure’). |
| **More Vulnerable**                    | - Hospitals.  
- Residential institutions such as residential care homes, children’s homes, social services homes, prisons and hostels.  
- Buildings used for: dwelling houses; student halls of residence; drinking establishments; nightclubs; and hotels.  
- Non-residential uses for health services, nurseries and educational establishments.  
- Landfill and sites used for waste management facilities for hazardous waste.  
- Sites used for holiday or short-let caravans and camping, subject to a specific warning and evacuation plan. |
| **Less Vulnerable**                    | - Police, ambulance and fire stations which are not required to be operational during flooding.  
- Buildings used for: shops; financial; professional and other services; restaurants and cafes; hot food takeaways; offices; general industry; storage and distribution; non–residential institutions not included in ‘more vulnerable’; and assembly and leisure.  
- Land and buildings used for agriculture and forestry.  
- Waste treatment (except landfill and hazardous waste facilities). Minerals working and processing (except for sand and gravel working).  
- Water treatment works which do not need to remain operational during times of flood.  
- Sewage treatment works (if adequate measures to control pollution and manage sewage during flooding events are in place). |
| **Water-compatible Development**       | - Flood control infrastructure.  
- Water transmission infrastructure and pumping stations.  
- Sewage transmission infrastructure and pumping stations.  
- Sand and gravel workings.  
- Docks, marinas and wharves.  
- Navigation facilities.  
- MOD defence installations.  
- Ship building, repairing and dismantling, dockside fish processing and refrigeration and compatible activities requiring a waterside location.  
- Water-based recreation (excluding sleeping accommodation).  
- Lifeguard and coastguard stations.  
- Amenity open space, nature conservation and biodiversity, outdoor sports and recreation and essential facilities such as changing rooms.  
- Essential ancillary sleeping or residential accommodation for staff required by uses in this category, subject to a specific warning and evacuation plan. |
As outlined for Question 3, national planning policy sets out a risk-based approach based on a ‘Sequential Test’ with the aim of directing development to areas with a lower probability of flooding. This has been reflected in table 3, which will be used to assess sites against this question and awards higher scores to sites located in areas that are at lower risk of flooding.

The Council’s Flood Risk Note for the Planning Application Process (December 2010)\(^{18}\) provides a detailed explanation of how to identify which flood zone a site lies within. This will be used alongside the Environment Agency’s national Flood Map\(^{19}\) and the Council’s Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA)\(^{20}\) to identify a site’s flood risk. The various categories of flood risk that will be used to assess sites are listed in table 3.

The SFRA also identifies whether a site is potentially at risk from ‘other’ sources of flooding (e.g. surface water and groundwater). In these cases it will be necessary to assess whether this risk could be ‘significant’. The Council’s Flood Risk Note specifies the following criteria for this purpose:

- The site’s average gradient is greater than 1% (1 in 100), as this is likely to generate overland flow;
- There is a ditch(es) adjacent to the site;
- The groundwater level is high (e.g. likely to impede the natural soakage of rainwater);
- There is a large impervious area next to the site (e.g. more than 50% of an adjacent site is impervious, using a 50m band width from all boundaries of the site); or
- There is a history of surface water and/or groundwater flooding on the site (e.g. in June 2007).

The above process involves using both national and local flood risk information because the national Flood Map is reviewed more often than the Council’s SFRA. Any inconsistencies between the Flood Map and the SFRA will be discussed with the Environment Agency to determine the Flood Zone that a site would fall within. Other emerging national information, which may need to be taken into account includes a “Flood Map for Surface Water”\(^{21}\) and “Areas Susceptible to Groundwater Flooding”\(^{22}\).

A stepped approach, as outlined below, will be used to assess sites against this question:

1. Establish which Flood Zone(s) the site falls within by referring to the EA Flood Map in the first instance, and then the SFRA to gain further detail.
2. Determine which Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification is applicable by using table 4
3. Refer to table 3 to match up the site’s Flood Zone (established in step 1) with its Vulnerability Classification (established in step 2) to arrive at two possible scores that could be applied to the site against this question.
4. Establish whether the site is potentially at ‘significant’ risk from ‘other’ sources of flooding, by checking the SFRA.
5. If it is established through step 4 that the site is potentially at ‘significant’ risk from ‘other’ sources, the asterisked (*) score should be awarded to the site. If not, the non-asterisked score should be awarded.

19 [http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk](http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk)
21 Environment Agency 2010. Available from Datashare
22 Environment Agency 2010. Available from Datashare
The Environment Agency will be consulted on potential development sites that are identified at high risk from flooding. Where sites are proposed for allocation for development, additional evidence may be required to ensure that flood risk would not present a significant constraint. This should follow guidance in the SFRA and relevant national planning policy guidance and, where appropriate, include a detailed breach assessment to ensure that the potential risk to life can be safely managed over the lifetime of the development.

**Sites at high risk of flooding may be inappropriate for development.**

National planning policy also introduces an 'Exception Test', which is required for certain uses. This has been reflected in table 3, which identifies where the Exception Test would need to be passed. In these cases it must be demonstrated that:

1. The development provides wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk. These may relate the need to avoid social and economic blight or because of restrictive national designations such as landscape, heritage or nature conservation designations which prevent development on lower risk sites;
2. The development is on previously developed land or if not that there are no developable previously developed sites available; and
3. Development will be safe, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible will reduce flood risk overall. This must be demonstrated through a site flood risk assessment.

Whilst all sites will be considered through Stage 3 and 4 of this Methodology, additional evidence would be required to demonstrate the Exception Test has been satisfied for any relevant site that is proposed for allocation for development. As outlined above, this should follow guidance in the SFRA and relevant national planning policy guidance and, where appropriate, include a detailed breach assessment to ensure that the potential risk to life can be safely managed over the lifetime of the development.

**Sites requiring an exception test may be inappropriate for development.**

**Stage 2 Outcome:** Sites that are deemed acceptable under stage 1 will be prioritised according to whether they comprise previously developed land or greenfield land and their accessibility to a range of services and facilities or population by public transport, walking and cycling, and how acceptable the development is in view of the vulnerability of the use to flood risk. Previously developed sites that are accessible to a range of services and facilities or greater population, and are located in lower flood risk zones will receive the highest scores.
Stage 3 Detailed Site Specific Considerations
Stage 3 Detailed Site Specific Considerations

The aim of this stage is to assess all the sites that were not dismissed in Stage 1 or 2 against a number of detailed site-specific factors. These relate to a variety of social, economic and environmental issues that, alongside the Stage 2 questions, will be relevant to achieving sustainable development within East Riding.

Each question sets out an approach to assessment that identifies how a site should be scored based on the following broad range:

- **(+++)** Significant positive benefits would result from the development of the site.
- **(+)** Minor positive benefit.
- **(0)** Neutral / no effects can be identified, or existing features could be retained on-site.
- **(-)** Minor negative effect.
- **(---)** Significant negative effects would result from the development of the site.

The result of the Stage 3 assessment will be a series of positive or negative marks recorded against each question for all sites, which will enable comparisons to be made between sites. Sites that are assessed as having a positive impact across a large number of questions will, in general, be the most suitable for development. However, where a significant adverse effect (---) is identified, and there is no reasonable opportunity for this impact to be reduced, then it is possible that the site may be considered inappropriate for development. A site will only be dismissed if the constraint is deemed so significant that it could prevent development from taking place. Where it is proposed to dismiss a site those promoting the site, as well as any relevant consultee(s), will be notified to enable potential mitigation or alternative measures to be considered. Any measures identified will be assessed to determine whether they would have an impact against other questions in the SAM. This will include the Stage 4 assessment to determine if it would affect the viability of a potential development site. Where mitigation measures are required and a number of sites are identified as having the same impact against a particular question, greater weight may be given to those sites that require no mitigation or alternative measures.

The results of the Stage 3 assessment will be combined with those from Stage 2 to provide an overall assessment of the site.
**Question 9 - Settlement Vision**

**Would the development help achieve the vision for the settlement as set out in the Core Strategy?**

Approach to site assessment for all uses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(+++)</th>
<th>(0)</th>
<th>(---)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development would support the delivery of the Core Strategy vision and sub-area policies</td>
<td>Development is likely to have no impact on the delivery of the Core Strategy vision and sub-area policies</td>
<td>Development would undermine the delivery of the Core Strategy vision and sub-area policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Site may be inappropriate for development</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Core Strategy incorporates a vision for East Riding and its main settlements, which highlights the type of changes that will have taken place by 2026. It also sets out a number of sub-area and settlement policies that will be used to guide development in particular parts of the district. This includes a description of the special character of East Riding and how it effects the distribution of new development, such as specific regeneration priorities, important environmental assets, and economic opportunities. These set out the strategic direction for growth within different parts of East Riding.

It is important that new development sites would actively contribute to the delivery of this Core Strategy vision and sub-area policies. Therefore, a positive weighting will be applied where a potential development site can be seen to support the relevant vision, sub-area and settlement policies. This might reflect a particular policy objective that has been developed for the settlement in the Core Strategy, for example a large greenfield site that would be poorly connected to the town centre could potentially have a detrimental impact if the settlement’s vision focuses on the regeneration of key town centre sites.
Environmental Factors

Question 10 - Biodiversity and Geological Value

Would development affect a site of biodiversity or geological value or affect legally protected species?

Approach to site assessment for all uses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(+++)</th>
<th>(+)</th>
<th>(0)</th>
<th>(-)</th>
<th>(--)</th>
<th>(---)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing features and species could be conserved / retained and are likely to be enhanced or new features can be incorporated into the proposal. Effects are associated with national and regional sites and BAP species.</td>
<td>Existing features and species could be conserved / retained and are likely to be enhanced or new features can be incorporated into the proposal.</td>
<td>No effect / existing features could be conserved or retained</td>
<td>Features and species unlikely to be retained in their entirety. Any significant impacts can be mitigated. Effects are associated with local sites and species that are not afforded legal protection</td>
<td>Features and species unlikely to be retained in their entirety. Any significant impacts can be mitigated (e.g. by translocation of a legally protected species). Effects are associated with protected species, regional or national sites.</td>
<td>Features and species unlikely to be retained. No satisfactory mitigation measures possible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site may be inappropriate for development.

Sites of biodiversity and geological interest have a fundamental role to play in meeting overall national biodiversity targets, contributing to the quality of life, well-being of the community, and sustainability objectives. National planning policy identifies that these sites, which can be greenfield or previously developed, should be conserved and enhanced. Where development does take place it should seek to retain and incorporate features into the development of a site.

Question 2 identifies those sites that are of international or national biodiversity or geological value, which will be considered by this question alongside other local sites. Whilst local sites do not have the same level of protection as nationally or internationally designated sites, they are important to ensure the impacts of a potential development site are fully considered.
These local sites include:

- Local Nature Reserves (LNR)
- Regionally Important Geological Sites (RIGS), which are gradually being replaced with Local Geological Sites
- Local Wildlife Sites, formerly known as Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCS)
- Priority Habitats, as designated in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan (23)

In addition, sites may have populations of internationally or nationally protected species that receive statutory protection under a range of legislative provisions (24). This could include sites that are not currently designated for their biodiversity or geological value. The two main pieces of legislation protecting wildlife species are Part I of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and the Habitats Regulations. Furthermore, some animals are protected under their own legislation (for example the Protection of Badgers Act, 1992). The ‘Nature on the Map’ website (www.natureonthemap.org.uk) provides information on protected sites, including Biodiversity Action Plan habitats. Information on locally designated sites and protected species is held by the North and East Yorkshire Ecological Data Centre (www.neyedc.org.uk). Examples of sites that may contain protected species are those containing woodland (badgers, bats), old buildings (bats), ponds (great crested newts and other amphibians) and ditches, rivers and canals (otters and water voles).

The UK Biodiversity Action Plan provides the starting point for identifying local biodiversity priorities, which are set out in the East Riding of Yorkshire Biodiversity Action Plan (25). This sets out the vision & aims for biodiversity in East Riding, and describes the important biodiversity assets in the area. Priority areas for landscape scale biodiversity delivery, which looks at improving the wider habitat linkages between individual sites, have also been identified at a Yorkshire and local level through the Yorkshire and Humber Biodiversity Forum (YHBF) in conjunction with Natural England. This mapping has gone through several consultation and data gathering exercises and identifies broad areas that are intended to be the focus for priority biodiversity action. There are twenty priority landscape scale biodiversity areas identified with East Riding.

A negative weighting will be applied where there is a reasonable likelihood of protected species being present and affected by the development of a site. Natural England and the Council’s biodiversity officer will be consulted in cases where potential impact on a protected site/species is likely. Where relevant additional evidence, for example an ecological survey, would be required to demonstrate that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on these species.

23 http://www.ukbap.org.uk/
24 http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/circularbiodiversity
25 http://www.eastriding.gov.uk/biodiversity/
Question 11 - Wildlife and Natural Environment

Would development affect natural features that are important for wildlife or landscape character such as trees or hedgerows, or areas of ancient woodland not subject to statutory protection?

Approach to site assessment for all uses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(+++)</th>
<th>(0)</th>
<th>(-)</th>
<th>(---)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing features can be conserved / retained and there is opportunity for their enhancement or new features can be incorporated into the proposal</td>
<td>No effect / existing features can be retained</td>
<td>Features unlikely to be retained in their entirety. Any significant impacts can be mitigated (e.g. by providing new/replacement features)</td>
<td>Features unlikely to be retained. No satisfactory mitigation measures agreed or possible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site may be inappropriate for development

The presence of existing trees and hedgerows can create a positive benefit by helping to integrate new development into the surrounding landscape. In assessing sites, the potential to retain existing features, where possible, will be considered alongside the impact that the preservation of these features would have on the developable area of a site.

A significant number of trees across East Riding are protected by Tree Preservation Orders. These have been used to protect trees and woodlands where their removal would have a significant impact on the local environment and its enjoyment by the public. Trees may be identified for their intrinsic beauty, contribution to the landscape, or because they screen an eyesore or help integrate the urban area into the surrounding landscape. All trees are subject to protection if they are located within a designated Conservation Area\(^ {26}\).

Ancient woodland is a valuable biodiversity resource both for its diversity of species and for its longevity as woodland. Much of East Riding's Ancient Woodland has statutory protection as a designated Site of Special Scientific Interest, although some areas are not currently protected. Government guidance advises that development resulting in a loss, or deterioration of Ancient Woodland should only be allowed if benefits would outweigh the loss of the habitat. Therefore, a negative weighting will be applied where a proposed development site would have an adverse impact on a protected tree or an area of Ancient Woodland.

Since 1997, English Local Authorities have had a duty to protect hedgerows in the countryside under the Hedgerow Regulations\(^ {27}\). Hedgerows can be important where they provide valuable natural habitats and help link sites of biodiversity importance by providing routes for the migration of species.

---

\(^{26}\) Trees within a Conservation Area are protected if they are at least 75mm in trunk diameter when measured at 1.5m above ground level.

of species. They may also be valuable from an archaeological, historical and landscape perspective, especially where they reflect historic field patterns. When considering the impact that a site may have on a hedgerow, site assessments will take into account whether it would be possible to maintain the hedgerow. A negative weighting will be applied if the development would lead to the loss, fragmentation or isolation of an existing hedgerow.

The Council’s Landscape and Conservation Unit, and where necessary Natural England, will be consulted if there is a possibility that a potential development site could affect trees, hedgerows or an ancient woodland, including those that are not currently subject to any statutory control.

**Question 12 - Heritage Assets**

**Would development affect a heritage asset?**

**Approach to site assessment for all uses:**

| (+++) Development would result in a significant enhancement of an existing heritage asset | (+) Development would result in minor enhancement (e.g. existing features of significance can be retained and there are some opportunities for their enhancement) | (0) Development unlikely to have a harmful impact upon a heritage asset. Existing features can be retained | (-) Development likely to have a harmful impact upon those elements which contribute to the significance of a heritage asset. Features unlikely to be retained in their entirety. Any significant impacts can be mitigated | (---) Development likely to have a harmful impact upon those elements which contribute to the significance of a heritage asset. Features unlikely to be retained. No satisfactory mitigation measures possible. Site may be inappropriate for development |

As outlined in question 4, national planning policy highlights that heritage assets can contribute to the sustainability of an area and promote a sense of place. It highlights that the significance of a heritage asset should be considered alongside the impact that new development would have on that asset.

The potential of impact of a proposed development site upon a range of heritage assets, which includes all assets listed in both Tables 1 (p. 15) and 5, will be assessed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset type</th>
<th>Significance in the East Riding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Areas</td>
<td>• 103 Conservation Areas – Others are continually being considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Parks and Gardens of Historic Interest        | • A number of parks and gardens of historic interest on English Heritage's Register of Parks and Gardens including Sledmere House, Burton Constable, Dalton Hall, Houghton Hall, Londesborough Park, Thwaite Hall, Risby Hall Manor House and Leconfield Castle and Park.  
• Melbourne Hall Park and SaltmarshePark in Laxton.  
• Other important parks, historic estates and parkland landscapes make an important contribution to the rural character and cultural heritage.  
• Over 30 medieval deer parks - some containing important archaeological remains. |
| Urban Public Parks, Gardens and Cemeteries    | • Public parks, gardens and cemeteries of historic or strategic significance include West Park in Goole, Bridlington Cemetery, HallGarthPark in Hornsea, and Burnby Hall in Pocklington.                                                                                                                                                     |
| Historic Battlefields and Military Sites      | • Number of Battlefield and Skirmish sites in the English Civil War.  
• Significant number of sites associated with the two World Wars and the Cold War.                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| Locally significant assets                    | • Many assets (including unscheduled archaeological sites) are significant locally but are not designated or listed. They include individual features and groups of features that give a place its special character. These include assets that:  
• Have archaeological importance,  
• Promote a sense of place,  
• Are a focal point,  
• Are locally distinctive,  
• Use local vernacular,  
• Are of cultural or historic interest for a particular use e.g. railways,  
• Have links to important/historic people,  
• Are of a standard of similar assets which have a higher status, or  
• Are newly appreciated e.g. that are not old enough to list or are of a style yet to be seen as important by the masses. |
Conservation Areas are ‘areas of special architectural or historic interest the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance’\textsuperscript{(28)}. The assessment of potential development sites will consider the impact that the development could have on a Conservation Area, as well as its setting. Therefore, the impact of sites that fall within the designated Conservation Area boundary, and those that lie outside the Conservation Area but may affect its setting, will be assessed.

Assessments will take account of the reasons why the particular Conservation Area has been designated, as well as information on the character and appearance of the area that has been set out in a Conservation Area Appraisal\textsuperscript{(29)}. These have been prepared for a number of Conservation Areas within East Riding and identify important features, for example:

- topography (e.g. thoroughfares and property boundaries) and its historical development;
- archaeological significance and potential;
- prevalent building materials;
- character and hierarchy of spaces; and
- quality and relationship of buildings and green features.

The Council’s Landscape and Conservation Team, and where relevant the Humber Archaeological Partnership and/or English Heritage, will be consulted on any proposed site that would affect a heritage asset. A positive weighting will be considered where development would enhance a heritage assets, which could include opportunities for enhancing the setting of a heritage asset, for example where it would better reveal a feature that contributes to the significance of the asset.

\textsuperscript{28} Section 69 of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990
\textsuperscript{29} \url{http://www.eastriding.gov.uk/cs/planning-and-development-control/planning--development-control/conservation/area-appraisals/}
Question 13 - Built Character

Would development affect the existing built character of the settlement?

Approach to site assessment for all uses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(+++)</th>
<th>(+)</th>
<th>(0)</th>
<th>(-)</th>
<th>(---)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development will result in significant enhancement (e.g. through redevelopment of a derelict or rundown area)</td>
<td>Development could result in an enhancement (e.g. through the sensitive development of an infill site or vacant building)</td>
<td>Development unlikely to have an effect / effect very minor</td>
<td>Development could detract from the existing built character. Existing, important features unlikely to be retained in their entirety. Any significant impacts can be mitigated</td>
<td>Development could cause a significant detraction from the existing built character (e.g. development would result in the coalescence of two separate settlements). Features unlikely to be retained. No satisfactory mitigation measures possible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site may be inappropriate for development

It is important that potential sites for development would support the built character, appearance and quality of all settlements within East Riding. Assessments will consider the current role and function of a site, for example amenity space or a vacant plot, and whether or not this would be affected by new development. This will take account of a site’s existing quality (e.g. is it well maintained or derelict) and function (e.g. is it a valuable amenity space or a plot which is screened by existing development and has no public access). The impact could take a variety of forms and a positive weighting will be applied where developments would lead to an improvement in the overall quality of the streetscape, for example through the:

- Removal or conversion of a derelict/vacant site or building; or
- Removal of an existing eyesore or unsightly building.

A negative weighting will be considered where development would detract from the existing built character of a settlement, for example where it would result in:
The loss of open areas, amenity space or green areas, either public or private, where they are providing an important break in an otherwise built up area or soften the transition between built up and rural areas.

- Over development in areas of lower density development.
- Development in gardens, or the grounds of houses with a large curtilage or paddock, where it would detract from the existing character and amenity of the area.

East Riding contains a number of settlements with distinct identities that are in close proximity to each other. In a number of cases the maintenance of their separate identities will depend on limiting the extent of urban sprawl that would result in the coalescence of the two settlements. In these cases large development that would result in the further coalescence of two separate settlements is likely to have a significant negative impact on the character of both settlements.

Whilst specific heritage assets are covered by question 12, it will be necessary to consider whether the site would affect the historic development pattern of a settlement, for example a village may have historically grown in a largely linear fashion along a main road. In this instance development that conflicts with the linear form of the village, for example by significantly extending the built up area away from the main road, is unlikely to complement the existing built character of the settlement.

The assessment of potential development sites will not consider very detailed matters, such as specifying new building heights or car parking spaces, unless these issues are considered so significant that they may prevent future development on the site.
**Question 14 - Landscape Character**

**Would the development impact on the visual amenity or character of the natural landscape?**

Approach to site assessment for all uses:

| (+++) Low Sensitivity: Characteristics of landscape are robust and are able to accommodate development without significant character change; thresholds for significant change are very high. The development would relate well to the landscape character | (+) Low-medium sensitivity: Characteristics of landscape are resilient to change and are able to absorb development in many situations without significant character change; thresholds for significant change are high. Many aspects of the development would relate to landscape character | (0) Development is not located within the natural landscape, by being within a built up area or an area which consists entirely of man-made landscape features. The development would not affect the natural landscape | (-) Medium-high sensitivity: Characteristics of landscape are vulnerable to change and development can be absorbed only in limited situations without significant character change; thresholds for significant change are low. Few aspects of the development would relate to landscape character | (---) High sensitivity: Characteristics of landscape are very vulnerable to change and are unable to accommodate development without significant character change; thresholds for significant change are very low. The development conflicts directly with landscape character |

Site may be inappropriate for development

National planning policy highlights the importance of maintaining and improving landscape diversity and identifies the need to protect the intrinsic character and quality of the countryside. The Council has prepared a Landscape Character Assessment[^30] to help inform judgements on the possible impact that development may have on the landscape. This describes and classifies the landscapes of East Riding into 23 different landscape types. It also makes judgements on the quality and value of the landscape, as well as its sensitivity and capacity to accommodate new development.

development. The Landscape Character Assessment, which has been supplemented by a more detailed analysis of the landscape and townscape surrounding the larger settlements, will be used to assess the impacts of potential development sites.

**Figure 3 Area of High Landscape value**

Nationally designated areas, such as National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. Whilst East Riding does not contain any national landscape designations, a number of areas have been proposed in the Core Strategy as being of local importance and should be protected. These include:
- Heritage Coasts - are non-statutory designations that have been agreed with Natural England and cover Flamborough Head and Spurn Point. They represent stretches of the most beautiful, undeveloped coastline, which are managed to conserve their natural beauty and, where appropriate, to improve accessibility for visitors.

- Local Landscape Designations - the Council has identified certain landscapes as being highly valued locally. These include a large part of the Yorkshire Wolds, which has been identified as an Area of High Landscape Value, and various open areas between settlements.

Therefore, a negative weighting will be applied where a potential development site would have a detrimental impact on the landscape quality of either a 'HeritageCoast' or a 'Local Landscape Designation'.

To assess the capability of a site to accommodate development from a landscape perspective the factors set out below will be considered:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of the existing landscape</th>
<th>Consider:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- existing local landscape designations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the intactness of landscape characteristics, important views, distinctiveness, integration with the existing urban edge, diversity of characteristics and presence of any detractors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low quality landscapes are usually fragmented and already have detractors present.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Sensitivity of the landscape to further change | Based on the effect that a particular type of development might have on the characteristics and landscape features. Sensitivity is assessed against visibility, including the impact on views from public rights of way, tree and vegetation cover, loss of characteristics and landscape quality. High sensitivity would mean that a development would adversely affect the key characteristics of the landscape or a significant detractor would be introduced to the landscape resulting in significant change of views, scale, character or quality. |

| Capacity of the landscape to take further development | Related to sensitivity. Where a landscape has a low sensitivity to a particular type of development it would have a high capacity to accept change. |

The assessment of potential development sites will not consider very detailed matters, such as specifying new building heights or car parking spaces, unless these issues are considered so significant that they may prevent future development on the site.
Question 15 - Air Quality

Does the site lie within an area of, or in close proximity to, any significant source(s) of air pollution, or would development affect air quality?

Approach to site assessment for all uses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(+++)</th>
<th>(0)</th>
<th>(-)</th>
<th>(-)</th>
<th>(---)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development would remove an existing source of air pollution</td>
<td>Site lies within an area where air quality is currently acceptable and not approaching prescribed levels. Development is unlikely to result in a significant reduction in air quality</td>
<td>Site lies within an area where air quality is currently acceptable but approaching prescribed levels. Development is unlikely to result in the prescribed levels being exceeded</td>
<td>Site lies within an area where air quality is over prescribed levels, but mitigation measures would prevent a further decrease in quality or would result in a partial improvement</td>
<td>Site lies within an area where air quality is over prescribed levels, or development may push air quality over prescribed levels. No satisfactory mitigation measures possible. Site may be inappropriate for development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The government has defined national air quality standards and objectives and requires the Council to review and assess ambient air quality within East Riding. If there is a risk that levels of particular pollutants will be higher than a nationally prescribed level\(^{31}\), the Council is required to designate an Air Quality Management Area. The Council’s review and assessment process is continuous and monitoring is undertaken at a number of locations with relevant pollutant exposure. Whilst there are currently no Air Quality Management Areas in East Riding, this situation is continuously reviewed.

A negative weighting will be applied for potential development sites that lie within areas where pollutant concentrations are known to be elevated. The assessment of larger sites, which would add a significant number vehicle trips to the road network, will also consider whether they would result in an increased level of pollutants in other parts of the road network where levels are already elevated. In these instances it may be necessary to restrict development that would introduce additional pollution sources or receptors. Where relevant additional evidence will be

\(^{31}\) Air Quality (England) Regulations 2000 and Amending Regulations 2002
required to demonstrate that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on air quality, or to identify mitigation measures that would result in an improvement in air quality, for example through the preparation of an air quality assessment.

**Question 16 - Agricultural Land**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(0)</th>
<th>(−)</th>
<th>(---)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Development would not affect land classified as being the best and most versatile agricultural land | Minor loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land | Significant loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land  
*Site may be inappropriate for development*

National planning policy identifies that the presence of the best and most versatile agricultural land should be taken into account when determining proposals for new development. It states that where significant development of agricultural land is unavoidable, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of higher quality, except where this would be inconsistent with other sustainability considerations.

The best and most versatile agricultural land is defined as land that falls within grades 1, 2, and 3a of the Agricultural Land Classification, which has been mapped at a strategic level. This is considered to be the most flexible, productive and efficient land, which can best deliver future crops for food and non-food uses. Sites that would involve the development of land in these grades will be weighted negatively and any involving the loss of 20ha or more would be considered significant. This threshold is the same as the one used when referring planning applications to the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra). Smaller sites that would result in the loss of land in the highest grade (1) may also be assessed as being significant if there is land available within lower grades.

Potential development sites that would affect areas of poorer quality agricultural land, as identified by grades 3b, 4 and 5 of the Agricultural Land Classification, would be considered to have a neutral impact against this question.
Question 17 - Groundwater

Could development potentially affect any abstraction of groundwater intended for human consumption?

Approach to site assessment for all uses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(+++)</th>
<th>(0)</th>
<th>(-)</th>
<th>(---)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development does not affect the abstraction of groundwater intended for human consumption and would remove an existing source of pollution</td>
<td>Development would not affect the public drinking water supply</td>
<td>Development has the potential to affect the public drinking water supply. Any significant impacts can be mitigated</td>
<td>Development has the potential to cause pollution of groundwater and affect a public drinking water supply. No satisfactory mitigation measure possible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site may be inappropriate for development

National planning policy highlights that new development can have a significant impact on the water quality and therefore affect the environment. It sets out that the possible adverse impacts on water quality should be considered when assessing potential development sites, including any discharge that may pose a threat to surface or underground water resources.

The Environment Agency is responsible for protecting and enhancing water quality and has identified around 13 Groundwater Source Protection Zones within East Riding. These have been defined to protect aquifers and groundwater flows including wells, boreholes and springs used for the public drinking water supply. They show the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution, which recognises that the risk, and therefore the constraint to development, decreases with distance.

Source Protection Zones have been split into three main zones, although a fourth zone of special interest is also occasionally applied:

- Zone 1 (inner protection zone)
- Zone 2 (outer protection zone)
- Zone 3 (total catchment)
In addition to the Source Protection Zones, other potable water supplies will need to be taken into consideration. These include private domestic supplies and abstractions used in commercial food and drink production and will have a default Source Protection Zone of 50 metres radius from the source location.

The Environment Agency’s Groundwater Protection Policy (GP3, 2008)\(^{(32)}\) outlines those types of development that are unacceptable within a Source Protection Zone. Therefore, a negative weighting will be applied to any proposed development site that is located within a Source Protection Zone. The Environment Agency will be consulted on any site that may affect a Groundwater Source Protection Zone. Where relevant additional evidence will be required to demonstrate that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on water quality. The extent, and possible cost, of any mitigation measures will be discussed with the Environment Agency and those promoting the site.

**Question 18 - Compatibility with Neighbouring Uses**

Is the development compatible with existing or proposed neighbouring uses, or would it create a nuisance that will affect existing residents?

Approach to site assessment for all uses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(+++)</th>
<th>(0)</th>
<th>(-)</th>
<th>(---)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development would remove an existing use that creates a nuisance (e.g. noise, dust, light or pollution)</td>
<td>Development would be compatible with existing or proposed neighbouring uses</td>
<td>Development would not be compatible with existing or proposed neighbouring uses. Any significant impacts can be mitigated</td>
<td>Significant issues mean that development would not be compatible with existing or proposed neighbouring uses. No satisfactory mitigation measures possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site may be inappropriate for development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to consider whether new development would actually be compatible with existing or other proposed developments. This will include developments that already have a planning consent but have not yet been built, as well as sites that have been safeguarded for a certain use, for example:

\[\text{www.environment-agency.gov.uk/research/library/publications/40741.aspx}\]
Intensive livestock units – protective distances around existing intensive livestock units have previously been set to help minimise future conflict. Therefore, any sites that fall within 800m of an Intensive Livestock Unit will be assessed in terms of any potential adverse impacts. This will be reduced to 400m for rural locations and villages.

Uses that are subject to a Health and Safety Executive defined consultation distance – the Health and Safety Executive has identified over 70 sites (and consultation distances) involving hazardous installations within East Riding. Therefore, advice will be sought from the Executive on the suitability of any proposed development site that falls within a defined consultation distance.

Electricity pylons – guidance (33) has been published by the National Grid on the development of sites that are crossed by high voltage overhead lines. It identifies that whilst overhead lines present a constraint to development, they do not in the majority of cases prevent it.

Ministry of Defence sites – two safeguarding zones, where the Ministry of Defence expects to be consulted on certain applications, have been identified within East Riding. These are:

1. Cowden (South of Hornsea) – no need to consult on residential proposals
2. Leconfield (North of Beverley) – need to consult on proposals involving the erection of buildings exceeding 15.2m (34) or 45.7m (depending upon the location within the safeguarding zone).

The potential risks posed by identified hazardous installations, such as pipelines and Liquified Petroleum Gas (LPG) facilities, will also be considered.

In addition to the compatibility of different uses, site assessments will take account of any localised nuisance or amenity impacts, for example noise, light, dust or odour, which would result from the proposed development. In particular, national planning policy has identified noise and light as a type of pollution, which can affect a resident’s quality of life. These are particularly important for rural areas, such as East Riding, which are relatively tranquil. Therefore, site assessments will consider if a proposed development site is located close to an existing use(s) that would create a nuisance or amenity impact. This is particularly important for sensitive developments such as housing, hospitals or schools. The types of uses that may create a nuisance or amenity impact includes:

- Sewage treatment works can cause both a smell and noise nuisance and Yorkshire Water will be consulted on any sites that lie near to a sewage treatment works.
- Main roads or motorway corridors can result in both noise and light pollution.
- Waste transfer or household recycling facilities can create an odour nuisance.
- Industrial units, especially general industry, can result in noise, vibration, smell, fumes, smoke, soot, ash, dust or grit, which creates a detrimental impact on the amenity of an area.

33 A Sense of Place: design guidelines for development near high voltage overhead lines, 2005
34 The average 2 storey residential property is approximately 9m high.
The potential amenity impacts of a proposed development site on the wider settlement will also be considered. This could include instances where development would significantly increase the levels of traffic through a town or village centre in order to access a particular service or facility, for example an industrial estate, or a part of the strategic road network.

A negative weighting will be applied if:

- There are existing or proposed sensitive uses adjacent to the site and the development will generate an adverse impacts; or
- The proposed development consists of sensitive uses and adjacent existing or proposed uses will generate an adverse impact; or
- The development would result in an identifiable nuisance that would affect the quality of life of new or existing residents.

Where relevant additional evidence may be required in instances where a concern has been highlighted, which would need to demonstrate that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact. The extent, and possible cost, of any mitigation measures will be discussed with any relevant consultation body and those promoting the site.

**Question 19 - Contaminated Land**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(+++)</th>
<th>(0)</th>
<th>(---)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated and will remediate the site</td>
<td>Development is not located on land that is likely to be contaminated</td>
<td>Development is located on land that is highly likely to be contaminated which, due to physical constraints or economic viability cannot be remediated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National planning policy recognises that the presence of contamination, which results from the nature of previous on-site activities, can affect or restrict the beneficial use of land. It highlights that contamination can create a number of risks to human health, property and the wider environment, including long-term limitations on the use of soils. In some instances this can be a significant constraint.
The Council is required to identify contaminated sites within East Riding and bring certain sites back into beneficial use via appropriate redmediation. This process, and the approach to the management of other land contamination issues, is set out in the Council’s Contaminated Land Inspection Strategy 2001 and subsequent reviews in 2003 and 2005. This was revised and updated in 2010 and over 15,500 potential contaminated land sites have so far been identified.

The development process is often the most effective way of achieving action to remove unacceptable risks arising from the contaminated state of land. Therefore, a positive weighting will be applied where a potential development site would tackle an environmental pollution problem. These sites would provide the opportunity to address an existing problem, such as a former industrial site that has left a legacy of contamination, for the benefit of the wider community and bring contaminated land back into productive use where practicable. A negative weighting will be considered where there is a source of contamination that cannot be realistically remediated to the extent that all unacceptable risks are removed.

**Question 20 - Mineral Resources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would development lead to the sterilisation of viable mineral resources?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approach to site assessment for all uses except open space:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0) Site is not within a mineral safeguarding area, area of search, preferred area or specific site with planning permission for mineral extraction, or pre-extraction is possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-) Site falls within a location where there are potentially viable mineral deposits that could be worked in the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(---) Site falls within an area of search, preferred area, or specific site with planning permission for mineral extraction, and pre-extraction is not possible (or possible later)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site may be inappropriate for development

National planning policy on minerals highlights that mineral deposits should be safeguarded against other types of development where they are, or may become, of economic importance. Whilst this Site Assessment Methodology will not be used to assess potential minerals development sites, it recognises that new developments could affect the supply of locally important minerals.

35 http://www.contaminatedland.eastriding.gov.uk/ccm/navigation/home/
There are a wide variety of valuable mineral reserves within East Riding, including sand, gravel, chalk, oil, gas, clay, peat and limestone, which can only be worked where they naturally occur. A Joint Minerals Development Plan Document\(^{(36)}\) is being prepared and seeks to promote the most appropriate use of all mineral resources in the interests of the community, the local economy, and the environment. This includes preventing the unnecessary sterilisation of certain minerals, as well as ensuring that there is an adequate and steady supply of aggregates. To support these objectives it identifies the number of locations where minerals development would be commercially viable or there is an intention for minerals development to take place, including:

- Preferred areas for mineral extraction;
- Active dormant sites with planning permission;
- Sites with planning permission but not yet commenced; and
- ‘Areas of Search’ where there is a reasonable expectation of minerals being present in viable quantities.

The Joint Minerals Development Plan Document and Core Strategy seek to conserve mineral resources by safeguarding deposits. Therefore, site assessments will also take account of the value of safeguarding mineral deposits. This will take account of mineral safeguarding areas identified for deposits of sand and gravel, crushed rock, limestone, industrial chalk, clay and silica sand, which are or may become of economic importance.

A negative weighting will be applied where a potential development site is located within a mineralsafeguarding area, area of search for mineral extraction, preferred area or a specific site with planning permission for mineral extraction. Sites would be assessed as having no impact where they are located outside of these areas, or where relevant additional evidence demonstrates that:

- The mineral is of no commercial value and is unlikely to be so in the future;
- The non-mineral development is temporary and can be completed and the site restored to a condition that does not inhibit extraction within the timescale that the underlying mineral is likely to be needed; or
- In the case of sand and gravel, there is potential for the mineral deposits to be extracted prior to the non mineral development proceeding.

**Question 21 - Renewable and Low Carbon Energy**

Would the development make provision for on-site renewable or very low carbon energy generation, or contribute to reducing greenhouse gas emissions?

Approach to site assessment for all uses except open space and transport:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(+++)</th>
<th>(+)</th>
<th>(0)</th>
<th>(---)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development would deliver significant additional grid-connected low carbon/ renewable energy capacity, or significantly contribute to reducing greenhouse gas emissions</td>
<td>Development would exceed energy efficiency standards and/or meet an additional proportion of its energy requirements from decentralised and renewable or very low carbon technologies</td>
<td>Development would not exceed energy efficient standards or contribute to the delivery of additional renewable or low carbon energy</td>
<td>Development would result in the loss of grid-connected renewable energy capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site may be inappropriate for development

National planning policy seeks to reduce dependency on non-renewable energy sources and reduce emissions of greenhouse gases. At a local level, the Core Strategy seeks to promote sustainable construction within new developments where this would help to reduce carbon emission and make prudent and efficient use of natural resources. This could include the use of renewable or low carbon technologies to secure a proportion of a development’s energy requirements, or the use of national ratings such as the Code for Sustainable Homes.

It will be assumed that all sites will, as a minimum, be required to meet the energy efficiency standards set by building regulations that are in force at the time of the site assessment, as well as any targets that are referred to in the Core Strategy. A positive weighting will only be considered where it is proposed to reduce carbon emissions, for example through the delivery of additional low carbon-renewable energy capacity that would exceed any standard that has
been adopted either nationally or locally. This will take into account proposals where a developer or landowner is able to demonstrate that they would be able to exceed the adopted target, for example through the installation of grid-connected renewable energy capacity.

In exceptional circumstances potential development sites might affect existing renewable energy infrastructure. A negative weighting will be applied for any site that would result in the loss of this existing grid connected renewable energy capacity.

**Social and Economic Factors**

**Question 22 - Publicly Accessible Open Space**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>++++</td>
<td>Development would deliver significant new open space, green infrastructure, recreation facilities or a public right of way is created and public accessibility improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Development would create minor opportunities for open space, green infrastructure, recreation facilities or a public right of way to be created / improved, or public accessibility improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Existing open space, green infrastructure, recreation facilities or a public right of way would be conserved / retained and access is maintained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Existing open space, green infrastructure, recreation facilities or a public right of way are lost and public accessibility is diminished. Loss is not significant and/or any significant impacts can be mitigated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>Existing open space, green infrastructure, recreation facilities or a public right of way are lost, or adversely affected, and public accessibility is diminished. No satisfactory mitigation measures possible. Site may be inappropriate for development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The provision of publicly accessible open space, green infrastructure, recreational facilities and public rights of way (PROW) can bring about a range of benefits for existing and new residents, including improved health, social inclusion and the potential to reduce carbon emissions.
National planning policy states that open space and sports and recreational facilities that are of high quality, or of particular value to a local community, should be recognised and given protection. Therefore, a negative weighting will be applied where development of a site would result in the loss of an existing facility. The Core Strategy, which takes account of the Council’s Playing Pitch Strategy and Open Space Review, will set out when open space would need to be provided as part of new housing developments. It will be assumed that all potential housing sites would, as a minimum, provide the required level of new open space. A positive weighting will be considered where a potential development site presents the opportunity to improve public accessibility or remedy an existing deficiency in provision.

In assessing sites, account will also be taken of PROW and a positive weighting identified where the proposed development site would improve the existing network. This could be through the creation of a new PROW, improving access to an existing PROW, or other recognised improvements such as:

- Upgrade to a bridleway;
- Diversion of a PROW which would help better connect people to the wider settlement, important facilities, the town/village centre, or reduce walking distance to a particular destination;
- Visual amenity improvements, for example through considering the location of public open space and/or green infrastructure in relation to the PROW; or
- Improvement of the route in its wider setting, for example through the removal of a noise source close to the route, or improved lighting.

A negative weighting will result where the proposed development site would adversely affect the network, for example, by diverting, severing or removing an existing PROW. Adverse impacts could include:

- Reduced amenity, convenience, or enjoyment; for example if the PROW would be un-sympathetically incorporated into a housing development through enclosure between back gardens;
- Increased walking distance to get to a destination;
- Reduced width creating narrow routes and blind spots; or
- Increased use of PROW by vehicles and conflict between vehicular movement and pedestrian usage.

Open space and PROW are both identified in the Core Strategy as Green Infrastructure assets. Green Infrastructure incorporates a wide range of features, which also includes river and wildlife corridors, woodlands, nature conservation sites, parks and gardens, village greens, and certain tourism assets. These have been mapped at a strategic level across East Riding and the Core Strategy seeks to protect and enhance any existing asset, as well as support proposals that would address a local deficiency. Therefore, site assessments will consider if a proposed development site has the potential to enhance the Green Infrastructure network.
Question 23 - School Capacity

What is the capacity of existing schools to cope with the level of development proposed for the settlement?

Approach to site assessment for housing uses only:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(+++)</th>
<th>(+)</th>
<th>(0)</th>
<th>(-)</th>
<th>(---)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No capacity constraints identified and development would result in a significant improvement to an existing school</td>
<td>No capacity constraints identified and development would involve minor improvements to an existing school</td>
<td>Sufficient surplus places available / no effect on school places (e.g. development will not increase demand for school places)</td>
<td>Capacity not sufficient but most impacts, including any significant constraints, can be overcome</td>
<td>Insufficient capacity and constraints cannot be overcome</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site may be inappropriate for development

All areas of East Riding fall within a school catchment area for both primary and secondary education and for most children their catchment area school is the nearest school. Every year the Council monitors the current number of children attending primary and secondary schools throughout East Riding, which can be used to highlight any instances where there is already insufficient capacity within a particular school. The Council also anticipates the number of children that are likely to be attending a school in the future. This is based on a formula, which is used to establish how many additional pupils are likely to be generated by a new home. It will be used to provide an indication of where capacity issues, either surplus places or a lack of school places, would arise from the proposed development.

Only the capacity of the nearest school, based on the school's catchment area, to accommodate the level of development proposed will be assessed. It will take into account any programme of school expansion and refurbishment, as well as any programmed closures. A negative weighting will be applied where insufficient school capacity exists to accommodate the projected additional pupils arising from any new development. However, the ability of a developer to fund the works required or to suggest an alternative solution will also be considered. Any solutions must be to the satisfaction of the Council, otherwise a site may be considered inappropriate for development. In exceptional circumstances it is possible that a proposed development site may present an opportunity to improve facilities, for example through the provision of new playing pitches. In these instances a positive weighting will be considered in those instances where there would be sufficient school capacity for the proposed development. Additionally where a need has been identified, the potential for a proposed development site to make provision for a new school will also be considered.
Any proposed housing development that does not create a requirement for new school places, for example retirement homes and specialist care homes for the elderly, will be assessed as having no effect against this question.

**Question 24 - Utilities Infrastructure Capacity**

What is the capacity of existing utilities infrastructure to cope with the level of development proposed for the settlement?

Approach to site assessment for all uses except transport:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(+++)</th>
<th>(+)</th>
<th>(0)</th>
<th>(-)</th>
<th>(---)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No capacity constraints identified and development would significantly improve the capacity of existing utilities services and infrastructure</td>
<td>No capacity constraints identified and development would involve minor improvements to existing utilities services and infrastructure</td>
<td>Sufficient capacity and no infrastructure constraints identified</td>
<td>Capacity limited or insufficient capacity but most impacts, including any significant constraints, can be overcome</td>
<td>Insufficient capacity and constraints cannot be overcome</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The capacity of the utilities services and existing infrastructure is an important factor in determining the suitability of a site for development. This question focuses on utilities services and infrastructure, which includes water supply, wastewater treatment, drainage, gas, and electricity provision. In many instances an individual development site would not necessarily generate the need for significant new utilities infrastructure, such as a new electricity sub-station. However, there may not be sufficient capacity within the existing network to support the overall scale of development proposed for the whole settlement. Therefore, the capacity of utilities infrastructure will be assessed for the entire settlement and not for a specific development site, unless there are specific site circumstances that have been identified, for example where there would be a difficulty connecting a specific site to a utility network.

Information concerning capacity issues and provision will be sought from the service providers such as Yorkshire Water, CE Electric (YEDL), and Northern Gas Networks. In addition, the Council is preparing an infrastructure study that assesses the capacity of utilities infrastructure within East Riding to serve proposed future development. A negative weighting will be applied where an infrastructure study identifies that the proposed development site would be located in an area where the utilities infrastructure is limited or insufficient.

Additional evidence will be required to demonstrate that any limited or insufficient infrastructure capacity can be addressed, which should include the likely mitigation measures required. The extent, and possible cost, of any mitigation measures will be discussed with the relevant service providers.
provider and those promoting the site. Any planned replacement or upgrading of existing infrastructure will also be taken into account. However, a site may not be suitable for development until the required infrastructure is in place.

**Question 25 - Highway Network Capacity**

**What is the capacity of the highway network to cope with the development of the site?**

Approach to site assessment for all uses except open space:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(+++)</th>
<th>(+)</th>
<th>(0)</th>
<th>(-)</th>
<th>(---)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No capacity constraints identified and development would result in a significant improvement to the capacity of the highway network or an existing access</td>
<td>No capacity constraints identified and development would result in a minor improvement to the capacity of the highway network or an existing access</td>
<td>Sufficient capacity and no infrastructure or access constraints identified</td>
<td>Limited / insufficient capacity, or access constraints, but most impacts, including any significant constraints, can be overcome</td>
<td>Insufficient capacity or access constraints cannot be overcome</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Core Strategy seeks to reduce congestion by bringing forward necessary transport infrastructure to facilitate new development. It also identifies that a transport assessment and travel plan would be required where a significant transport impact is likely. This supports the Council’s draft Third Local Transport Plan (LTP3)(37), which includes an objective that seeks to minimise congestion, particularly in urban areas. The draft LTP3 recognises that there are some routes that experience significant levels of congestion, particularly during peak hours, which creates delays and unreliability. Therefore, the Council’s Transport Policy and Highway Control Teams will be consulted over proposals affecting the highway network to determine whether there would be an impact on the capacity of the highway network.

An infrastructure study is also being prepared by the Council, which will help to determine the extent to which the existing local strategic highway network can accommodate the additional traffic generated by a proposed development. A negative weighting will result where there is evidence to suggest that the development would exacerbate or create a highway capacity constraint. Relevant additional evidence will be required in these cases to demonstrate that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on the network. This would need to and take account of the Department for Transport’s ‘Guidance on Transport Assessment’(38).

38 http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/regional/transportassessments/guidanceonta
The Highways Agency will be consulted where a site might affect the trunk road network which they manage. Their main interest in the East Riding is the A63/M62 corridor, including the A1033 to Saltend, and they will review any transport statement or assessment to determine the impact the development would have on their strategic road network.

Where highway capacity is likely to be an issue the Council will consider the mitigation measures that are likely to be required. The extent, and possible cost, of any mitigation measures will be discussed with the relevant highway authority and those promoting the site. Any planned replacement or upgrading of existing infrastructure will also be taken in to account. However, a site may not be suitable for development until the required infrastructure is in place.

**Question 26 - Wider Non-Road Transport Network**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the development make use of the waterway and rail network?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach to site assessment for industrial and distribution uses only:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(+ + +)</strong> Development can make use of the rail or waterway network to reduce the transportation of freight or goods by road and is likely to rely on type of transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(+)</strong> Development can make limited use of the rail or waterway network to reduce the transportation of goods by road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(0)</strong> Development cannot make use of the rail or waterway network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(---)</strong> Development leads to loss of or damage to the rail or waterway network, or precludes future use of such infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site may be inappropriate for development

The accessibility of a site not only relates to car, public transport, cycling and walking, which are considered in questions 6 and 7, but also to the use of the wider waterway and rail networks. In particular, these can be important for the sustainable movement of freight and have the potential to reduce the need for transportation by road. National planning policy highlights the importance of promoting more sustainable transport choices for the movement of freight and seeks to protect sites and routes that could be critical to widening transport choices for both passengers and freight. It also states that realistic opportunities for rail or waterways connections to manufacturing, distribution and warehousing sites should be protected.
There may be opportunities, principally for employment sites, to make use of the network of waterways (e.g. ports) and rail (e.g. freight). In assessing sites, account will be taken, and positive weighting identified, where there is evidence that the development can connect and make use of non-road transport networks. Conversely, proposed development sites will receive a negative weighting where existing networks would be lost, damaged or precluded from future use.

**Question 27 - Community Facilities**

Would development result in the loss of any existing or proposed community facility or would it contribute to the construction of a new facility?

Approach to site assessment for all uses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(+++)</th>
<th>(0)</th>
<th>(-)</th>
<th>(---)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New community facility, or an improved existing facility, is proposed and is viable and sustainable</td>
<td>New community facility is proposed but is not viable or sustainable, no new facility is proposed or no facilities would be lost</td>
<td>Development would involve loss of an existing community facility or proposed (e.g. allocated) facility that may still be required. Any significant impacts can be mitigated</td>
<td>Development would involve loss of an existing well used community facility or proposed (e.g. allocated) facility that is still required. No satisfactory mitigation (e.g. a suitable and viable replacement facility) measures possible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The importance of retaining community facilities, especially within rural areas, is highlighted within national planning policy. Site assessments will consider whether a suggested development site would affect any existing or proposed community services or facilities. It focuses on local community facilities, or social infrastructure, and does not consider infrastructure issues relating to open space, schools, utilities or highways which are considered separately in questions 22, 23, 24 and 25.
In certain instances proposals for new development may include the provision of a new facility, for example a new community hall or health facility, or make provision to enhance an existing facility. Proposed development sites will receive a positive weighting where the facility proposed is of a suitable scale and viable in the long-term for the settlement. Sites will not be weighted positively where evidence suggests that the new proposed facility would not help to meet the needs of the settlement, or, it is not suitable in scale and viable in the long-term for the settlement.

Sites will receive a negative weighting where their development would result in the loss of an existing facility, for example allotments or a community building, and no replacement facility has been agreed. In such circumstances the Council will take into account the current usage of the facility, for example, the loss of a well used and valued facility will be considered less favourably than the loss of an underused or unused facility. The loss of an undeveloped site, which has previously been allocated for a community use or facility, will also be negatively weighted if the allocation is still required to meet the needs of the settlement and no suitable alternative site has been agreed.

**Question 28 - Town Centre Vitality and Viability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(+++)</th>
<th>(+)</th>
<th>(0)</th>
<th>(-)</th>
<th>(---)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development would significantly support the vitality and viability of an existing town or district centre</td>
<td>Development may contribute to the vitality and viability of an existing town centre</td>
<td>Development would have no effect on the vitality and viability of an existing town or district centre</td>
<td>Development may have a negative effect on an existing town or district centre. Any significant impacts can be mitigated</td>
<td>Development would have an unacceptable impact on an existing town or district centre, or there are other sites available that are better connected to the existing centre. No satisfactory mitigation measures possible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Would the development support the vitality and viability of an existing town or district centre?**

Approach to site assessment for retail, offices, leisure, arts and culture uses only:
National planning policy sets out the process that the Council should follow in selecting sites for the main town centre uses, which includes new retail, office leisure, arts and cultural uses. This highlights that they should be considered by adopting a sequential approach, which prioritises sites in the following order:

- Locations in appropriate existing centres
- Edge-of-centre locations (within 300 metres of the primary shopping area), with preference given to sites that are or will be well-connected to the centre
- Out-of-centre sites (more than 300 meters from the primary shopping centre), with preference given to sites which are or will be well served by a choice of means of transport and which are closest to the centre and have a higher likelihood of forming links with the centre

This approach will be taken into account when assessing sites and a negative weighting applied if there are other more suitable sites available. For example proposed sites in an out-of-centre location may be considered inappropriate for development if there is sufficient available land within the existing centre or in an edge-of-centre location.

National planning policy also identifies that the impacts of proposed locations for development should be considered. It highlights that the Council should ensure that any proposed edge-of-centre or out-of-centre sites would not have an unacceptable impact on an existing town or district centre, or any other centres that fall within the catchment of the potential development.

The Council’s Town Centres and Retail Study\(^{39}\) will provide the basis for assessing the potential impact of proposed development sites. It sets out a hierarchy of centres in East Riding, as well as outlining the need for new retail development within each of these centre. Where relevant additional evidence would be required to demonstrate that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on an existing town or district centre.

**Question 29 - Regeneration or Economic Benefits**

Would development of the site have a recognised regeneration or economic benefit?

Approach to site assessment for all uses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(+++)</th>
<th>(+)</th>
<th>(0)</th>
<th>(-)</th>
<th>(---)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development would significantly help achieve the aims of a recognised regeneration strategy / plan and would have a significant benefit for the most deprived areas</td>
<td>Development would contribute to achieving the aims of a recognised regeneration strategy / plan, and would have an identifiable benefit for a deprived area</td>
<td>Development would not affect the aims of a recognised regeneration strategy / plan, would not provide a benefit to a deprived area, or create new economic opportunities</td>
<td>Development may conflict with an existing or emerging regeneration strategy, have a detrimental impact on a deprived area, or result in the loss of employment land. Any significant impacts can be mitigated</td>
<td>Development would directly conflict with an existing or emerging regeneration strategy, have a significant detrimental impact on a deprived area, or result in the loss of safeguarded employment land. No satisfactory mitigation measures possible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site may be inappropriate for development

In accordance with the government’s aim of ‘building sustainable communities’ this question considers whether the proposed development would help support the regeneration of a particular area. It is also recognised in national planning policy that where sites have similar location characteristics, preference should be given to those that best serve the needs of deprived communities.
Depending on the type of development it does not always need to be located within an area of high deprivation to benefit these areas. For example, the provision of a significant number of jobs in locations that have good walking, cycling, or public transport links connecting the site to an area of high deprivation may also provide a recognised regeneration benefit. Therefore, a positive weighting will be considered where developments would provide significant benefits for the most deprived neighbourhoods, which are classified as being in the 10% most deprived areas in the country.

The Council has adopted an Economic Development Strategy and various regeneration strategies have also being produced for specific parts of East Riding, such as the Goole Renaissance Plan and the Hornsea Masterplan, following significant public consultation. The aims and actions set out in these strategies will be considered to assess whether a proposed development site would create a regeneration benefit. Where appropriate, the Council’s regeneration and economic development sections will be consulted on how the proposal relates to wider regeneration and economic development objectives.

Alongside these regeneration strategies an Employment Land Review has been prepared and assesses the range and quality of existing employment sites throughout East Riding. It highlights that there are a number of industrial estates that should be retained for employment uses. These are considered important for continued economic growth in East Riding and should be safeguarded from non-economic development uses. Proposed development sites will be weighted negatively where they would result in the loss of an existing employment site that has been identified for retention within the Employment Land Review.

## Question 30 - Affordable Housing

**Would the site help meet affordable housing needs?**

Approach to site assessment for housing uses only:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(+++)</th>
<th>(+)</th>
<th>(0)</th>
<th>(---)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, the proposal will make provision for affordable housing on-site and is located in an area where the ratio of household income to house price is particularly high</td>
<td>Yes, the proposal will make provision for affordable housing but is NOT located in an area where the ratio of household income to house price is particularly high</td>
<td>The site would not contribute to the delivery of affordable housing as it is below the required site size threshold</td>
<td>Development would result in the loss of existing affordable housing stock</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site may be inappropriate for development

National planning policy sets out strategic objectives that seek to improve the affordability of housing, as well as address the needs of communities for affordable housing. Improving housing affordability is a key objective for the Council and is also an important sustainability objective.

This question seeks to give a positive weighting to those sites that make provision for affordable housing, especially in those locations where there are significant affordability issues. The Council monitors average house prices, which can be compared to the average household income to give a ratio of household incomes to house prices. Where the average house price is over 8 times the average income this ratio is considered to be particularly high and the delivery of affordable housing is a significant concern.

The Core Strategy will set out a site size threshold, above which affordable housing would be required as part of a proposed development. It will be assumed for the purposes of the site assessment that all sites that are required by the relevant Core Strategy policy to provide affordable housing would do so. Where a proposed development site falls below this threshold it will be assumed that it would not contribute towards the delivery of affordable housing.

**Stage 3 Outcome:** To assess and weight all the sites that have progressed from Stage 1 and 2 against a detailed range of social, environmental and economic indicators. Those sites that are subject to a significant constraint may be identified. If mitigation is not possible or practicable these sites will be deemed inappropriate for development at this time. The weighting from Stage 3 will be assessed alongside the sites score from Stage 2.
Stage 4 Deliverability
Stage 4 Deliverability

Any site proposed for development must be genuinely available and likely to be developed during the plan period of the Allocations Document. To be considered developable a site should be in a suitable location, there should be a reasonable prospect that it is available for development and could be developed at the point in time envisaged. For housing development national planning policy outlines that to be deliverable a site must be:

- available (the site is available now)
- suitable (the site offers a suitable location for development now and would contribute to the creation of mixed and balanced communities) and
- achievable (there is a reasonable prospect that the development will be delivered on the site within five years).

These issues have been initially considered through the Council’s Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment\(^\text{(42)}\) and will also need to be assessed for other types of uses (e.g. employment and retail) that are proposed for development.

**Question 31 - Insumountable Constraints**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there any other insurmountable physical, environmental or legal constraints that may prejudice the development of the site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach to site assessment for all uses:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No constraints</td>
<td>Constraint(s) identified but mitigation unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Site may be inappropriate for development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constraints identified but mitigation is possible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of other physical or environmental factors may restrict the availability of a site. The list below is not exhaustive but the most common issues may revolve around:

- Ransom strip (e.g. the site could only be developed if an additional piece of land was also available)
- Access into the site (e.g. the only available access would be through residential roads or private drives)
- Site topography/gradient (e.g. there are steep gradients)
- Site conditions (e.g. there are any ground instability problems)

Legal constraints may arise, for example, if residential development is restricted by a covenant or another form of legal agreement. Other environmental constraints may include licensing arrangements for development proposals where they would affect European protected species.

---

In cases where it becomes apparent that a site may be constrained, the issue will be discussed with those promoting the site and any relevant consultee, which include other departments in the Council such as the Public Protection or Highway Control units. The extent of possible mitigation measures will be considered.

**Question 32 - Ownership and Market Constraints**

Is the site subject to any ownership constraints and is it likely to be attractive to the market?

Approach to site assessment for all uses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No known constraints: owner(s) willing to sell</td>
<td>Constraints likely: known ownership constraints or evidence of no developer interest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two important issues in relation to whether a site is developable relate to ownership and the likely level of developer interest.

Where an owner has expressed willingness to release or sell the site within the time period of the Allocations Document it will be assumed that there are no constraints. Constraints may occur where the owner is unknown, not contactable, unwilling to release the land or where the site is owned by a number of different (and possibly competing) interests. Information relating to the ownership of a site will be obtained from those people who have submitted details of the site and where appropriate the knowledge of Council Officers.

Knowledge of developer interest will be obtained from the house building industry. A site will only be deemed constrained by developer interest if this has been brought to the Council’s attention by the industry. For employment sites, the Council’s Employment Land Review\(^{(43)}\) assesses market demand for employment land, such as office, industry, and storage and distribution uses, in different areas of East Riding. In addition, the Town Centres and Retail Study\(^{(44)}\) considers the need for new retail development in the larger East Riding settlements and in some cases it recommends specific sites for town centre uses.

---


Question 33 - Deliverability

In the light of the answers to all preceding questions, is the site likely to be developable within 15 years of the adoption of the Allocations Document? If the answer is yes, is the site deliverable within 5 years of adoption?

Approach to site assessment for all uses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable within 5 years</th>
<th>Developable within 6 - 15 years</th>
<th>Not developable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No known constraints or constraints can be overcome within 5 years</td>
<td>Constraints identified and unlikely to be overcome within 5 years, but achievable within the lifetime of the Allocations Document</td>
<td>Constraints so significant that development unlikely within the lifetime of the Allocations Document. <strong>Site not considered for allocation.</strong> Re-assess position on subsequent review of Allocations Document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The assessment of sites under questions 1 - 32 help to confirm whether a site could be developed. This question considers whether a site is likely to be deliverable (ready to build) within 5 years from the adoption of the Allocations Document, or whether or not it may be deliverable later in the plan period (i.e. within 6 - 15 years). This may be because of the likely time that it would take for an identified constraint to be overcome.

In terms of housing development, the Council’s Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)\(^{45}\) will inform the approach used to assess sites against this question. This considers the capacity of developers to build out sites over a 15-year period, alongside other possible constraints. A timescale is given for each housing site, which considers build rates and the time it will take before a particular development commences. The SHLAA methodology is agreed upon each year by a working group, which includes housing developers, to ensure it is consistent with current market conditions.

Sites that are deemed suitable under questions 1 - 32 and have no constraints will be considered as potential allocations within the first 5 years. For those sites that are considered suitable but have constraints, an assessment will be made to determine whether or not the site falls within 5 years or within 6 - 15 years depending upon the nature of the constraint. Some constraints are likely to take longer than 5 years to overcome and in these cases the site will be considered as a potential allocation in the 6 - 15 years category. Where a site has a significant constraint that is unlikely to be overcome within the lifetime of the Allocations Document (i.e. within 15 years), or would make the site unviable, it will not be considered for allocation. Such sites will be reconsidered in future reviews of the Allocations Document.

**Stage 4 Outcome:** To identify all sites that are suitable for development and state whether development would be achievable within 5 years or 6 - 15 years of adoption of the Allocations Document.

Using The Site Assessment Methodology
Using The Site Assessment Methodology

The Site Assessment Methodology will be used by the Council to assess all proposed development sites, but could also be used by the local community, landowners, agents and other interested parties to assess a specific site. It will help to identify those proposed development sites that have the greatest potential to deliver environmental, economic and social benefits for the local community.

Tables 6 and 7 outline how a site assessment would be reported both as part of a settlement summary and as an individual assessment. These will be used to provide an explanation why a particular outcome has been identified against each question. However, it is important to note that the Methodology is a tool to help identify those factors that may influence the allocation of a site for new development. As such it does not produce a final definitive score for an individual site.

The site assessments will also inform the preparation of a Sustainability Appraisal report for the Allocations Document, which will identify each site’s performance against a range of environmental, social and economic objectives. Both the site assessments and Sustainability Appraisal report are important sources of evidence that will help to identify whether a site should be included in the Allocations Document.
### Table 5: Example Assessment Settlement Summary Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Site 1</th>
<th>Site 2</th>
<th>Site 3</th>
<th>Site 4</th>
<th>Site 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Conformity with Settlement Network</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Biodiversity &amp; Geological Value</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Flood Risk &amp; Coastal Change</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Heritage Assets</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Greenfield &amp; Brownfield Land</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Accessibility by Public Transport</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Accessibility by Walking &amp; Cycling</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Flood Risk</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Settlement Vision</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(+++)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Biodiversity &amp; Geological Value</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(--)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) Wildlife &amp; Natural Environment</td>
<td>(+++)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) Heritage Assets</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) Built Character</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) Landscape Character</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(--)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15) Air Quality</td>
<td>(+++)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16) Agricultural Land</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17) Groundwater</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18) Compatibility with neighbouring uses</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19) Contaminated land</td>
<td>(+++)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20) Mineral Resources</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21) Renewable &amp; Low Carbon Energy</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22) Publicly Accessible Open Space</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(+++)</td>
<td>(++)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23) School Capacity</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24) Utilities Infrastructure Capacity</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25) Highway Network Capacity</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(++)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(26) Waterway &amp; Rail Network</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(27) Community Facilities</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28) Town Centre Vitality &amp; Viability</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(29) Regeneration &amp; Economic Benefits</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30) Affordable housing</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31) Insurmountable Constraints</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32) Ownership &amp; Market Constraints</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33) Deliverability</td>
<td>6-15 years</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>6-15 years</td>
<td>6-15 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6: Example of an Individual Site Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land bid number</td>
<td>9999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area</td>
<td>5.5ha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed use</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date received</td>
<td>January 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional information received</td>
<td>March 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Assessment Methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Conformity with Settlement Network</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Site is adjacent to a Local Service Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Biodiversity &amp; Geological Value</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No (inter)national site affected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Flood Risk &amp; Coastal Change</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Flood Zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Heritage Assets</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No nationally important assets affected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Greenfield &amp; Brownfield Land</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50% Greenfield / 50% Brownfield Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Accessibility by Public Transport</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Within 30min travelling distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Accessibility by Walking &amp; Cycling</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Within 800m travelling distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Flood Risk</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>More vulnerable use and in flood zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Settlement Vision</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>Unlikely to impact on the delivery of the town vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Biodiversity &amp; Geological Value</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>Existing features could be conserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) Wildlife &amp; Natural Environment</td>
<td>(+++)</td>
<td>Opportunity to enhance existing features through additional planting etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) Heritage Assets</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>No effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) Built Character</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>Includes the redevelopment of a vacant industrial unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) Landscape Character</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>Low-medium sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15) Air Quality</td>
<td>(+++)</td>
<td>Development would remove an existing source of air pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16) Agricultural Land</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>Minor loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grade 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17) Groundwater</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>No affect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18) Compatibility with neighbouring uses</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>B road runs along the southern boundary not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19) Contaminated land</td>
<td>(+++)</td>
<td>Contaminated Land, former industrial site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20) Mineral Resources</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>Sand and Gravel Safeguarding Area bounds the western side of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21) Renewable and Low Carbon Energy</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>Development would provide on-site renewable energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22) Publicly Accessible Open Space</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>Open space would be required with a housing development of this size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23) School Capacity</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>Sufficient school capacity exists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24) Utilities Infrastructure Capacity</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>Existing capacity is sufficient and can be improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25) Highway Network Capacity</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>Sufficient capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(26) Waterway &amp; Rail Network</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Question is not relevant for this use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(27) Community Facilities</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>No facility lost and no new facility proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28) Town Centre Vitality &amp; Viability</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Question is not relevant for this use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(29) Regeneration &amp; Economic Benefits</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>Site does not affect a regeneration strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30) Affordable housing</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>The proposal will make provision for affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31) Insurmountable Constraints</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Land remediation required but mitigation is possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32) Ownership &amp; Market Constraints</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33) Deliverability</td>
<td>6-15 years</td>
<td>Deliverable in 6-15 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
East Riding of Yorkshire Council will, on request, provide this document in Braille, large print or in audio. Please call 0800 849 5060 if you require this.

Jesteśmy tu, by Tobie pomóc. Naszym celem jest udzielenie każdej osobie dostępu do naszych usług. Jeśli życzyś sobie tłumacza, prosimy zadzwonić na ten numer: 0121 377 2880