Settlement Barkston Ash Site Location Land east of London Road and north of Back Lane, Barkston Ash Size (Ha) 2.38 Dwelling capacity N/A Proposed Use Summary Residential Core Strategy Hierarchy Secondary Village Land Use Agricultural Field Surrounding Land Uses Residential to the North and East. Agricultural fields and farm buildings to the West. Agricultural fields to the South. Application Reference Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? **Significant Constraint Notes** Secondary Village 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre N/A 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot N/A 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification N/A 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land N/A GF / PDL / Mixed N/A % GF % PDL 2.10 Flood Risk N/A 2.11 SFRA Level 2

Site Ref

BARK-B

Site Ref BARK-B 2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints N/A 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) N/A N/A 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site N/A 2.16 Impact Protected Species N/A 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species N/A 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating N/A 2.19 Heritage Assets N/A 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps N/A 2.21 Landscape Capacity N/A 2.22 Physical Point of Access N/A 2.23 Amenity Impact N/A 2.24 Groundwater N/A 2.25 Contamination N/A

# **PLAN Selby Site Assessments** Site Ref BARK-B 2.26 Mineral Resource N/A N/A 2.27 Provision of Open Space N/A 2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement N/A 3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use 3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs 3.3 Overall Deliverability 3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes Residential - Failed Initial Sift Site Type Assessment Summary Failed Initial Sift: Residential site not within or adjacent to a settlement designated in Core Strategy policy SP2 as a Principal Town, Local Service Centre or Designated Service Village

Settlement Barlby Site Location Magazine Farm, Selby Bypass, Barlby Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity N/A Proposed Use Summary **Employment** Core Strategy Hierarchy Designated Service Village Land Use Agricultural storage Surrounding Land Uses A63 to West. Agricultural to North/East/South Application Reference N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? No **Significant Constraint Notes** 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport SCORE-6 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre N/A 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network Good sub-regional accessibility 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling A population of approx. 33,630 within 5km. 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot N/A 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification No loss of agricultural land 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land GF / PDL / Mixed GF (Mixed) % GF 95 % PDL 5 2.10 Flood Risk FZ3a - 100% 2.11 SFRA Level 2 SFRA Level 2 not required

Site Ref

**BARL-E** 

2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints (o) No known constraints 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) The effects are not likely to be significant alone, but needs to be checked for likely significant effects in combination 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) Requirement to consult with Natural England 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site 2.16 Impact Protected Species Record of barn owl from within the site area and swift from 1km away. All other PS records are older than 10 years. 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species (o) Site comprises an old poultry farm with a range of buildings on site that could support bats and various nesting birds. Also on site are scattered trees, scrub and rough grassland. There appears to be a small pond to the south. 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating (o) There is no overriding ecological constraints to prevent allocation. 2.19 Heritage Assets (o) Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps (o) Development does not occur in the SCG 2.21 Landscape Capacity Not covered by Settlement Setting Assessment 2.22 Physical Point of Access (+)Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works. 2.23 Amenity Impact (o) Compatible with nearby land uses 2.24 Groundwater (+)Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone 2.25 Contamination (-) Site is potentially contaminated but can be mitigated

Site Ref

**BARL-E** 

2.26 Mineral Resource

No impact on open space

2.27 Provision of Open Space

N/A

2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement

Site not proposed for housing

Site Ref

BARL-E

#### 3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use

No previous unimplemented residential permissions/One landowner/No impact on availability from existing land use - farm tenancy could be ended or relocated elsewhere

3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs

Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. Possible decontamination and flood mitigation measures may add to costs. Enquiries received from developers.

3.3 Overall Deliverability

0-5 years

3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes

Site Type Potential Employment

#### **Assessment Summary**

Greenfield site outside the development limits. Site is in Flood Zone 3a, and is potentially contaminated. Site has good sub-regional accessibility. Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. Possible decontamination and flood mitigation measures may add to costs. Enquiries received from developers.

Settlement Barlby Site Location Land at Turnhead Farm, Barlby Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity 157 Residential Proposed Use Summary Core Strategy Hierarchy Designated Service Village Land Use Agricultural Field Surrounding Land Uses Farm Buildings to the North/South. Agricultural fields to East/West Application Reference N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? No **Significant Constraint Notes** 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport Within 30 minutes of Selby town centre 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre Approx. 12,915 jobs within 8km. 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling Within 5km of Selby Approx. 9,558 jobs within 5km 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot No key services within 800 metres 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land GF / PDL / Mixed GF % GF 100 % PDL 0 2.10 Flood Risk FZ1 - 98%, FZ2 - 1%, FZ3a 1% 2.11 SFRA Level 2 SFRA Level 2 not required

Site Ref

BARL-H

2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints (-) Major constraints exist - multiple powerlines run through the site 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) The effects are not likely to be significant alone, but needs to be checked for likely significant effects in combination 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) Requirement to consult with Natural England 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site 2.16 Impact Protected Species (o) Record of Tansy beetle from within 500m of site and swift from within 1km. All other records are over 10 years old. 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species (+) Site comprises arable farmland with some boundary features incuding well maintained hedges and limited trees. Site is within 90m of the River Ouse. 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating (o) There is no overriding ecological constraints to prevent allocation. However, consideration to potential ecological features will need to be made including an ecological appraisal of impacts upon the river and boundary features. Also potential consultation also required with NE. 2.19 Heritage Assets (o) Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps (o) Development does not occur in the SCG 2.21 Landscape Capacity N/A 2.22 Physical Point of Access (+) Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works 2.23 Amenity Impact Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW 2.24 Groundwater (+)Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone 2.25 Contamination (o) Site is adjacent to potentially contaminated land

Site Ref

**BARL-H** 

2.26 Mineral Resource

No impact on open space

2.27 Provision of Open Space

No

2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement

Site not needed as its settlement has already met its Core Strategy housing requirement

3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use

No unimplemented residential permissions. One landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use

3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs

Expressions of interest received from developers but no formal option exists and the site has not been marketed. No viability assessment undertaken.

3.3 Overall Deliverability

0-5 years

Site Type

3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes

Assessment Summary

Residential May Not be Required

Site Ref

BARL-H

Greenfield site outside the development limits. Site in Flood Zone 1. No key services within 800 metres. Multiple powerlines run through the site. Within 800m of a WWTW. Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.

Settlement Barlby Site Location Land south of Market Weighton Road, Barlby Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity N/A Proposed Use Summary **Employment** Core Strategy Hierarchy Designated Service Village Land Use Agricultural Field Surrounding Land Uses Highway to the East/North. South/West agricultural Application Reference N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? No **Significant Constraint Notes** 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport SCORE-6 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre N/A 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network Good sub-regional accessibility 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling (+) A population of approx. 19,220 within 5km 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot N/A 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land GF / PDL / Mixed GF % GF 100 % PDL 0 2.10 Flood Risk FZ1 - 100% 2.11 SFRA Level 2 SFRA Level 2 not required

Site Ref BARL-I

2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints (o) No known constraints - minor powerline on site 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) The effects are not likely to be significant alone, but needs to be checked for likely significant effects in combination 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) Requirement to consult with Natural England 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site (o) 2.16 Impact Protected Species Record of swift and Tansy beetle within 500m of site. All other species records are over 10yrs old. 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species Site comprises arable farmland with well maintained hedge to the west and north. Site is within 250m of the River Ouse. 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating (o) There is no overriding ecological constraints to prevent allocation. However, consideration to potential ecological features will need to be made including an ecological appraisal of impacts upon the river and boundary features. Also potential consultation also required with NE. 2.19 Heritage Assets (o) Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps (o) Development does not occur in the SCG 2.21 Landscape Capacity Medium sensitivity to development 2.22 Physical Point of Access (o) Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.) 2.23 Amenity Impact (o) Compatible with nearby land uses 2.24 Groundwater (+)Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone 2.25 Contamination (+)Site is neither located on, nor adjacent to land that is likely to be contaminated

Site Ref

BARL-I

2.26 Mineral Resource

No impact on open space

2.27 Provision of Open Space

N/A

2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement

N/A

Site not proposed for housing

Site Ref

BARL-I

3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use

No unimplemented residential permissions. One landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use

3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs

Expressions of interest received from developers but no formal option exists and the site has not been marketed. No viability assessment undertaken.

3.3 Overall Deliverability

0-5 years

3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes

Site Type Potential Employment

**Assessment Summary** 

Greenfield site outside the development limits. Site in Flood Zone 1. Site has good sub-regional accessibility. Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. Possible decontamination measures may add to costs. Enquiries received from developers.

Settlement Barlby Site Location Land north of Market Weighton Road, Barlby Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity N/A Proposed Use Summary **Employment** Core Strategy Hierarchy Designated Service Village Land Use Agricultural Field Surrounding Land Uses Agricultural to North/East. Highway to West/South Application Reference N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? No **Significant Constraint Notes** 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport SCORE-6 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre N/A 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network Good sub-regional accessibility 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling (+) A population of approx. 19,220 within 5km 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot N/A 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land GF / PDL / Mixed GF % GF 100 % PDL 0 2.10 Flood Risk FZ1 - 100% 2.11 SFRA Level 2 SFRA Level 2 not required

Site Ref BARL-J

2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints (o) No known constraints - minor powerline on site 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) The effects are not likely to be significant alone, but needs to be checked for likely significant effects in combination 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) Requirement to consult with Natural England 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site (o) 2.16 Impact Protected Species Record of swift and Tansy beetle within 500m of site. All other species records are over 10yrs old. 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species Site comprises arable farmland with hedges to the west and south. Site is within 250m of the River Ouse. 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating (o) There is no overriding ecological constraints to prevent allocation. However, consideration to potential ecological features will need to be made including an ecological appraisal of impacts upon the river and boundary features. Also potential consultation also required with NE. 2.19 Heritage Assets (o) Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps Development does not occur in the SCG 2.21 Landscape Capacity N/A 2.22 Physical Point of Access (o) Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.) 2.23 Amenity Impact Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW 2.24 Groundwater (+)Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone 2.25 Contamination (+)Site is neither located on, nor adjacent to land that is likely to be contaminated

Site Ref

BARL-J

2.26 Mineral Resource

No impact on open space

2.27 Provision of Open Space

N/A

2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement

Site not proposed for housing

Site Ref

BARL-J

3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use

No unimplemented residential permissions. One landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use

3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs

Expressions of interest received from developers but no formal option exists and the site has not been marketed. No viability assessment undertaken.

3.3 Overall Deliverability

0-5 years

3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes

Site Type Potential Employment

**Assessment Summary** 

Greenfield site outside the development limits. Site in Flood Zone 1. Site has good sub-regional accessibility. Within 800m of a WWTW. Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. Existing access into the site.

Settlement Barlby Site Location Land at Turnhead Farm, Barlby Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity 24 Residential Proposed Use Summary Core Strategy Hierarchy Designated Service Village Land Use Farm Buildings Surrounding Land Uses Agricultural to North/East. River Ouse West. Residential South. Application Reference N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? No **Significant Constraint Notes** 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport Within 30 minutes of Selby town centre 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre Approx. 12,915 jobs within 8km. 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling Within 5km of Selby Approx. 9,558 jobs within 5km 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot No key services within 800 metres 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 - 80%, Grade 1 - 20% 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land GF / PDL / Mixed Mixed % GF 50 % PDL 50 2.10 Flood Risk (o) FZ1 - 90%, FZ2 - 8%, FZ3a - 2% 2.11 SFRA Level 2 SFRA Level 2 not required

Site Ref

**BARL-K** 

2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints (o) No known constraints 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) The effects are not likely to be significant alone, but needs to be checked for likely significant effects in combination 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) (o) Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site (o) 2.16 Impact Protected Species Record of swift and Tansy beetle within 500m of site. All other species records are over 10yrs old. 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species Site comprises of a farmstead with a range of buildings on site that could support bats and various nesting birds. Also on site are scattered trees and rough grassland. The site is directly adjacent to the River Ouse. 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating There is no overriding ecological constraints to prevent allocation. However, the site falls very close to the River Ouse and a full assessment of imapets will be required. In addition consideration will be needed of potential ecological features including an ecological appraisal of all the buildings, trees and grassland. Consultation also required with NE. 2.19 Heritage Assets (o) Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps (o) Development does not occur in the SCG 2.21 Landscape Capacity N/A 2.22 Physical Point of Access (+)Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works 2.23 Amenity Impact Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW 2.24 Groundwater (+)Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone 2.25 Contamination (-) Site is potentially contaminated but can be mitigated

Site Ref

**BARL-K** 

2.26 Mineral Resource

Development will adversely affect public open space - mitigation possible

2.27 Provision of Open Space

No

2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement

Site not needed as its settlement has already met its Core Strategy housing requirement

3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use

No unimplemented residential permissions. One landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use

3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs

Expressions of interest received from developers but no formal option exists and the site has not been marketed. No viability assessment undertaken.

3.3 Overall Deliverability

0-5 years

3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes

Site Type

Residential May Not be Required

Site Ref

BARL-K

Assessment Summary
Predominantly greenfield site outside of development limits. Site is in Flood Zone 1. No key services within 800 metres. Existing access into the site. Within 800m of WWTW. Potential contamination on site.

Decontamination and demolition may impact on the viability of the site.

Settlement Barlby Site Location Land off York Road, Barlby Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity 67 Residential Proposed Use Summary Core Strategy Hierarchy Designated Service Village Land Use Agricultural Field Surrounding Land Uses Agricultural field and farm buildings West. Highway East. Agricultural land North/South. **Application Reference** N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? No **Significant Constraint Notes** None 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport Within 30 minutes of Selby town centre 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre (o) Approx. 12,915 jobs within 8km. 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling Within 5km of Selby Approx. 9,558 jobs within 5km 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot No key services within 800 metres 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land GF / PDL / Mixed GF % GF 100 % PDL 0 2.10 Flood Risk FZ1 - 100% 2.11 SFRA Level 2 SFRA Level 2 not required

Site Ref

BARL-L

2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints (o) No known constraints - minor powerline on site 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) The effects are not likely to be significant alone, but needs to be checked for likely significant effects in combination 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) (o) Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site (o) 2.16 Impact Protected Species Record of swift and Tansy beetle within 500m of site. All other species records are over 10yrs old. 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species Site comprises arable farmland with some boundary features incuding well maintained hedges and limited trees. Site is within 100m of the River Ouse. 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating (o) There is no overriding ecological constraints to prevent allocation. However, consideration to potential ecological features will need to be made including an ecological appraisal of impacts upon the river and boundary features. Also potential consultation also required with NE. 2.19 Heritage Assets (o) Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps (o) Development does not occur in the SCG 2.21 Landscape Capacity 2.22 Physical Point of Access (o) Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.) 2.23 Amenity Impact (-) Within incompatible area - within 800m of WWTW 2.24 Groundwater (+)Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone 2.25 Contamination Site is adjacent to potentially contaminated land

Site Ref

**BARL-L** 

2.26 Mineral Resource

No impact on open space

2.27 Provision of Open Space

No

2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement

Site not needed as its settlement has already met its Core Strategy housing requirement

#### 3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use

No unimplemented residential permissions. One landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use

#### 3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs

Expressions of interest received from developers but no formal option exists and the site has not been marketed. No viability assessment undertaken.

3.3 Overall Deliverability

0-5 years

Site Type

3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes

Assessment Summary

Residential May Not be Required

Site Ref

BARL-L

Predominantly greenfield site outside of development limits. Site is in Flood Zone 1. No key services within 800 metres. Existing access into the site. Within 800m of WWTW. Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. Existing access into the site.

Settlement Biggin Sycamore Farm, Biggin Site Location Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity 3.31 N/A Proposed Use Summary Residential Core Strategy Hierarchy Secondary Village Land Use Agricultural field and farm buildings Surrounding Land Uses Dwellings and highway to North, Dwelling / agricultural land to South. Dwellings / highway to east and agricultural land to West **Application Reference** Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? **Significant Constraint Notes** Secondary Village 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre N/A 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot N/A 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification N/A 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land N/A GF / PDL / Mixed N/A % GF % PDL 2.10 Flood Risk N/A 2.11 SFRA Level 2

Site Ref

BIGG-C

Site Ref **BIGG-C** 2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints N/A 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) N/A N/A 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site N/A 2.16 Impact Protected Species N/A 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species N/A 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating N/A 2.19 Heritage Assets N/A 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps N/A 2.21 Landscape Capacity N/A 2.22 Physical Point of Access N/A 2.23 Amenity Impact N/A 2.24 Groundwater N/A 2.25 Contamination N/A

# **PLAN Selby Site Assessments** Site Ref BIGG-C 2.26 Mineral Resource N/A N/A 2.27 Provision of Open Space N/A 2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement N/A 3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use 3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs 3.3 Overall Deliverability 3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes Residential - Failed Initial Sift Site Type Assessment Summary Failed Initial Sift: Residential site not within or adjacent to a settlement designated in Core Strategy policy SP2 as a Principal Town, Local Service Centre or Designated Service Village.

Settlement Biggin Site Location Sycamore Farm, Biggin Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity N/A Proposed Use Summary Residential Core Strategy Hierarchy Secondary Village Land Use Agricultural Field Surrounding Land Uses Agricultural to the North. Agricultural to the East. Highway to the East. Residential to the South. Residential to the West. Application Reference N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? **Significant Constraint Notes** Secondary Village 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre N/A 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot N/A 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification N/A 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land N/A GF / PDL / Mixed N/A % GF % PDL 2.10 Flood Risk N/A 2.11 SFRA Level 2

Site Ref

BIGG-D

2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints N/A 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) N/A N/A 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site N/A 2.16 Impact Protected Species N/A 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species N/A 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating N/A 2.19 Heritage Assets N/A 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps N/A 2.21 Landscape Capacity N/A 2.22 Physical Point of Access N/A 2.23 Amenity Impact N/A 2.24 Groundwater N/A 2.25 Contamination N/A

Site Ref

**BIGG-D** 

# **PLAN Selby Site Assessments** Site Ref BIGG-D 2.26 Mineral Resource N/A N/A 2.27 Provision of Open Space N/A 2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement N/A 3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use 3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs 3.3 Overall Deliverability 3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes Residential - Failed Initial Sift Site Type Assessment Summary Failed Initial Sift: Residential site not within or adjacent to a settlement designated in Core Strategy policy SP2 as a Principal Town, Local Service Centre or Designated Service Village.

Settlement Bilbrough Site Location Land at Bilbrough Top adj A64, Bilbrough Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity N/A Proposed Use Summary **Employment** Core Strategy Hierarchy Secondary Village Land Use Scrubland Surrounding Land Uses Bilborough Service Station South/East. Agriculture North/West Application Reference N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? No **Significant Constraint Notes** 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport SCORE-1 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre N/A 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network Good sub-regional accessibility 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling A population of approx. 9,173 within 5km 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot N/A 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land GF / PDL / Mixed GF % GF 99 % PDL 1 2.10 Flood Risk FZ1 - 100% 2.11 SFRA Level 2 SFRA Level 2 not required

Site Ref

BILB-C

2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints (o) No known constraints - minor powerline on site 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) The effects are not likely to be significant alone, but needs to be checked for likely significant effects in combination 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) (o) Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site 2.16 Impact Protected Species Single bat record within 500m of site. All other records are over 10yrs old. 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species (o) Site comprises rough grassland and scrub with boundary trees and a number of waterbodies within the surorunding area - some engineered and some natural. There is a small building on site. (+) 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating There is no overriding ecological constraints to prevent allocation. However, potential ecological features will need to be checked and assessed. 2.19 Heritage Assets (o) Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps (o) Development does not occur in the SCG 2.21 Landscape Capacity N/A 2.22 Physical Point of Access (+)Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works 2.23 Amenity Impact (o) Compatible with nearby land uses 2.24 Groundwater (+)Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone 2.25 Contamination (+) Site is neither located on, nor adjacent to land that is likely to be contaminated

Site Ref

BILB-C

## **PLAN Selby Site Assessments** Site Ref BILB-C 2.26 Mineral Resource (o) No impact on open space 2.27 Provision of Open Space N/A 2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement Site not proposed for housing 3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use One landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use 3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs Site has not been marketed and no viaibility assessment has been undertaken. 3.3 Overall Deliverability 0-5 years 3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes Site Type Potential Employment **Assessment Summary** Greenfield site outside the development limits. Site has poor access by public transport and cycling. Site in Flood Zone 1. Existing access into site. Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.

Settlement Brayton Site Location Land south of Mill Lane, Brayton Size (Ha) 13.29 Dwelling capacity N/A Proposed Use Summary **Employment** Core Strategy Hierarchy Designated Service Village Land Use Agricultural fields Surrounding Land Uses Residential to North/East. A63 to South. Agricultural fields to South/East/West Application Reference N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? **Significant Constraint Notes** Employment site over 5ha in a rural area 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre N/A 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot N/A 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification N/A 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land N/A GF / PDL / Mixed N/A % GF % PDL 2.10 Flood Risk N/A 2.11 SFRA Level 2

Site Ref

**BRAY-S** 

Site Ref **BRAY-S** 2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints N/A 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) N/A N/A 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site N/A 2.16 Impact Protected Species N/A 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species N/A 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating N/A 2.19 Heritage Assets N/A 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps N/A 2.21 Landscape Capacity N/A 2.22 Physical Point of Access N/A 2.23 Amenity Impact N/A 2.24 Groundwater N/A 2.25 Contamination N/A

# PLAN Selby Site Assessments 2.26 Mineral Resource N/A 2.27 Provision of Open Space N/A

N/A

3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use	

3.3 Overall Deliverability

3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes

2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement

3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs

Site Type Employment - Failed Initial Sift

Assessment Summary

Failed initial sift: Over Core Strategy policy SP13 size threshold

Settlement Brayton Site Location Land north of Mill Lane, Brayton Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity 203 Residential Proposed Use Summary Core Strategy Hierarchy Designated Service Village Land Use Agricultural Field Surrounding Land Uses Residential to the North/East. North-East agricultural. Residential and agricultural to South. **Application Reference** N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? No **Significant Constraint Notes** None 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport Within 30 minutes of Selby town centre 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre Approx. 20,677 jobs within 8km. 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling Within 3.6km of Selby. Approx. 11,658 jobs within 5km 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot Site is within 800 metres of 4 key services 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land GF / PDL / Mixed GF % GF 100 % PDL 0 2.10 Flood Risk FZ1 - 100% 2.11 SFRA Level 2 SFRA Level 2 not required

Site Ref

BRAY-X

2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints (o) No known constraints 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) The effects are not likely to be significant alone, but needs to be checked for likely significant effects in combination 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) (o) Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site (+)2.16 Impact Protected Species Single bat record within 1km of site. All other records are over 10yrs old. 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species (+)Large arable field with some limited boundary hedgerows and trees. 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating There is no over-riding ecological constraints to prevent allocation. However, an ecological appraisal will be required to support any future planning application and this should include the consideration of trees and boundary features. Large site with opportunities for biodiversity enhancements. 2.19 Heritage Assets (o) Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps (o) Development does not occur in the SCG 2.21 Landscape Capacity Medium sensitivity to development 2.22 Physical Point of Access (o) Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.) 2.23 Amenity Impact (o) Compatible with nearby land uses 2.24 Groundwater (+) Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone 2.25 Contamination (+)Site is neither located on, nor adjacent to land that is likely to be contaminated

Site Ref

**BRAY-X** 

2.26 Mineral Resource

No impact on open space

2.27 Provision of Open Space

No

2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement

Site not needed as its settlement has already met its Core Strategy housing requirement

3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use

No unimplemented residential permissions. One landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use

3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs

Developers are in advanced legal discussions with landowner, with a view to concluding a development option shortly. High level development appraisal undertaken

3.3 Overall Deliverability

0-5 years

Site Type

3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes

Assessment Summary

Residential May Not be Required

Site Ref

BRAY-X

Greenfield site outside, but adjacent to, development limits. Site is in Flood Zone 1. The site has good accessibility by public transport, good access to employment and good access to local services. Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. Interest from developers.

Settlement Brayton Site Location Land south west of A63/A19 roundabout, Brayton Size (Ha) **Dwelling capacity** Proposed Use Summary **Employment** Core Strategy Hierarchy Designated Service Village Land Use Agricultural Field Surrounding Land Uses Bypass to north with remainder of site surrounded by agrocultural land Application Reference N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? No **Significant Constraint Notes** 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport SCORE-8 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre N/A 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network Good sub-regional accessibility 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling A population of approx. 29,170 within 5km 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot N/A 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land GF / PDL / Mixed GF % GF 100 % PDL 0 2.10 Flood Risk FZ2 2.11 SFRA Level 2 SFRA Level 2 not required

Site Ref BRAY-Y

2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints (o) No known constraints 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) The effects are not likely to be significant alone, but needs to be checked for likely significant effects in combination 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) (o) Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site (o) Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site but impact insignificant or unknown 2.16 Impact Protected Species Records of swift and grass snake partly within the site, watervole, hedgehog, otter, badger, barn owl and three records of bat within 500m plus records of 11 species of bee and bluebell within 1km of the site. 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species (+) Part of a large arable field and some areas of screen planting. 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating (o) There is no overriding ecological constraints to prevent allocation. However, impacts upon the nearby SINC and any other potential ecological features will need to be checked and assessed. 2.19 Heritage Assets (o) Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps (o) Development does not occur in the SCG 2.21 Landscape Capacity Not covered by the Settlement Setting Assessment 2.22 Physical Point of Access (+)Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works 2.23 Amenity Impact (o) Compatible with nearby land uses 2.24 Groundwater (+)Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone 2.25 Contamination (+) Site is neither located on, nor adjacent to land that is likely to be contaminated

Site Ref

**BRAY-Y** 

2.26 Mineral Resource

No impact on open space

2.27 Provision of Open Space

N/A

2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement

N/A

Site not proposed for housing

Site Ref

BRAY-Y

3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use

One landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use

3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs

Developers are in advanced legal discussions with landowner, with a view to concluding a development option shortly. High level development appraisal undertaken

3.3 Overall Deliverability

0-5 years

3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes

Site Type Potential Employment

**Assessment Summary** 

Greenfield site outside the development limits. Site has good sub-regional accessibility. Good accessibility by cycling. Existing access into the site. Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. Interest from developers.

Settlement Burn Site Location Burn Airfield Size (Ha) 228.80 Dwelling capacity N/A Proposed Use Summary Mixed Use Core Strategy Hierarchy Secondary Village Land Use Disused Airfield Surrounding Land Uses Woodland to South-West. Residential North East. Remaining land surrounded by agricultural. Farm buildings to the East Application Reference Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? Yes **Significant Constraint Notes** Mixed use site comprising employment over 5ha in a rural area and residential in a secondary village N/A 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre N/A 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot N/A 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification N/A 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land N/A GF / PDL / Mixed N/A % GF % PDL 2.10 Flood Risk N/A 2.11 SFRA Level 2

Site Ref

**BURN-G** 

Site Ref **BURN-G** 2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints N/A 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) N/A N/A 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site N/A 2.16 Impact Protected Species N/A 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species N/A 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating N/A 2.19 Heritage Assets N/A 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps N/A 2.21 Landscape Capacity N/A 2.22 Physical Point of Access N/A 2.23 Amenity Impact N/A 2.24 Groundwater N/A 2.25 Contamination N/A

# **PLAN Selby Site Assessments** Site Ref **BURN-G** 2.26 Mineral Resource N/A 2.27 Provision of Open Space N/A N/A 2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement N/A 3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use 3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs 3.3 Overall Deliverability 3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes Mixed Use - Failed Initial Sift Site Type Assessment Summary Failed initial sift: Over Core Strategy policy SP13 size threshold & residential site not within or adjacent to a settlement designated in Core Strategy policy SP2 as a Principal Town, Local Service Centre or Designated Service Village

Settlement Carlton Site Location Land north of Mill Lane, Carlton Size (Ha) 12.58 Dwelling capacity 226 Residential Proposed Use Summary Core Strategy Hierarchy Designated Service Village Land Use Agricultural Field Surrounding Land Uses Residential to East/South. Agricultural to North/East Application Reference N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? No **Significant Constraint Notes** 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport Within 30 minutes of Selby town centre 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre Approx. 23,300 jobs within 8km. 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling (o) Over 5km to Selby. Approx. 4,527 jobs within 5km 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot (o) Site is within 800 metres of 3 key services 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land GF / PDL / Mixed GF % GF 100 % PDL 0 2.10 Flood Risk FZ1 - 100% 2.11 SFRA Level 2 SFRA Level 2 not required

Site Ref

CARL-G

2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints (o) North East of the site is within the 380m outer buffer of Allelby to Pannal Gas Pipeline 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) The effects are not likely to be significant alone, but needs to be checked for likely significant effects in combination 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) Requirement to consult with Natural England 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site 2.16 Impact Protected Species Record for bat within 50m of site plus swift and bat within 1km of site. All other records are over 10yrs old. 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species Large arable field with some boundary hedgerows and trees. 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating (o) There is no overriding ecological constraints to prevent allocation. However, consideration to potential ecological features will need to be made on boundary features. Also consultation required with NE. 2.19 Heritage Assets Development impacts on a heritage asset and mitigation measures are necessary 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps (o) Development does not occur in the SCG 2.21 Landscape Capacity Medium sensitivity to development 2.22 Physical Point of Access (o) Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.) 2.23 Amenity Impact (o) Compatible with nearby land uses 2.24 Groundwater Site partly within Groundwater Protection Zone 1 and 2 2.25 Contamination (+) Site is neither located on, nor adjacent to land that is likely to be contaminated

Site Ref CARL-G

Site Ref

CARL-G

2.26 Mineral Resource	(o)
Development will adversely affect public open space - mitigation possible	
2.27 Provision of Open Space	(-)
No	
2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement	No
Site not needed as its settlement has already met its Core Strategy housing requirement	

3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use

No unimplemented residential permissions. One landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use

3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs

The site is under option to Hallam Land Management who have confirmed they have been approached by housebuilders. The site has been identified as viable as part of the option assessment

3.3 Overall Deliverability

0-5 years

Site Type

3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes

Assessment Summary

Residential May Not be Required

Greenfield site outside, but adjacent to, development limits. Good access to employment. Development impacts on a heritage asset and mitigation measures are necessary. The surrounding landscape has medium sensitivity to development. Site partly within Groundwater Protection Zone 1 and 2. Development will adversely affect public open space - mitigation possible. Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.

Settlement Cawood Site Location Field at Broad Lane, Cawood Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity 25 Residential Proposed Use Summary Core Strategy Hierarchy Designated Service Village Land Use Agricultural field Surrounding Land Uses Agricultural fields to East/South/West. Residential to North Application Reference N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? No **Significant Constraint Notes** 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport Within 30 minutes of Selby town centre 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre Approx. 19,634 jobs within 8km. 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling Over 5km to Selby. Approx. 1,103 jobs within 5km 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot (o) Site is within 800 metres of 2 key services 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land GF / PDL / Mixed GF % GF 100 % PDL 0 2.10 Flood Risk FZ3a - 100% 2.11 SFRA Level 2 SFRA Level 2 not required

Site Ref

CAWD-I

2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints Major constraints exist - within 280m outer buffer of Pannal to Cawood gas pipeline 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) The effects are not likely to be significant alone, but needs to be checked for likely significant effects in combination 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) (o) Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site (o) Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site but impact insignificant or unknown 2.16 Impact Protected Species Records for swift, smooth newt, common frog, GCN and bat within 500m of the site, plus tansy beetle within 1km. All other records are over 10yrs old. 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species (o) Improved pasture surrounded by mature trees and hedgerows. Ponds in the area have the potential to support amphibians. 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating (+) There is no over-riding ecological constraints to prevent allocation. However, an ecological appraisal will be required to support any future planning application and this should include the consideration of trees and boundary features. Surveys will also be required for species such as amphibians. 2.19 Heritage Assets (o) Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps (o) Development does not occur in the SCG 2.21 Landscape Capacity (-) Medium sensitivity to development 2.22 Physical Point of Access (o) Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.) 2.23 Amenity Impact (o) Compatible with nearby land uses 2.24 Groundwater (+)Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone 2.25 Contamination (+) Site is neither located on, nor adjacent to land that is likely to be contaminated

Site Ref

CAWD-I

2.26 Mineral Resource

No impact on open space

2.27 Provision of Open Space

No

2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement

Site not needed as its settlement has already met its Core Strategy housing requirement

#### 3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use

No unimplemented residential permissions. Multiple ownership. No impact on availability from existing land use but tenant present on site.

3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs

Site has not been marketed and no viaibility assessment has been undertaken.

3.3 Overall Deliverability

0-5 years

3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes

Site Type
Assessment Summary

Residential May Not be Required

Site Ref

CAWD-I

Greenfield site outside of development limits. Site is in flood zone 3. The site has good accessibility by public transport, good access to employment and reasonable access to local services. Within 280m outer buffer of Pannal to Cawood gas pipeline. Landscape has medium sensitivity to development.

Settlement Cawood Site Location Land south east of Cawood off Bishop Dyke Road/Broad Lane Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity 115 Residential Proposed Use Summary Core Strategy Hierarchy Designated Service Village Land Use Agricultural Field Surrounding Land Uses Residential to the North, Agricultural to the South, Residential to the West. Residential and agricultural to the East. **Application Reference** N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? No **Significant Constraint Notes** None 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport Within 30 minutes of Selby town centre 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre Approx. 16,982 jobs within 8km. N/A 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling Over 5km to Selby. Approx. 1,103 jobs within 5km 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot (o) Site is within 800 metres of 3 key services 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land GF / PDL / Mixed GF % GF 100 % PDL 0 2.10 Flood Risk FZ3a - 100% 2.11 SFRA Level 2 SFRA Level 2 not required

Site Ref

CAWD-J

2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints Major constraints exist - within 280m outer buffer of Pannal to Cawood gas pipeline 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) The effects are not likely to be significant alone, but needs to be checked for likely significant effects in combination 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) (o) Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site (o) Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site but impact insignificant or unknown 2.16 Impact Protected Species Records for swift, smooth newt, common frog, GCN and bat within 500m of the site, plus tansy beetle within 1km. All other records are over 10yrs old. 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species (+) Part of a large arable field with gardens to the north, boundary hedges and trees to the east and west and Bishops Dyke is also along the west boundary. 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating (+) There is no over-riding ecological constraints to prevent allocation. However, an ecological appraisal will be required to support any future planning application and this should include the consideration of trees and boundary features. Surveys will also be required for species such as amphibians. 2.19 Heritage Assets (-) Development impacts on a heritage asset and mitigation measures are necessary 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps (o) Development does not occur in the SCG 2.21 Landscape Capacity (-) Medium sensitivity to development 2.22 Physical Point of Access (o) Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.) 2.23 Amenity Impact (o) Compatible with nearby land uses 2.24 Groundwater (+)Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone 2.25 Contamination (+) Site is neither located on, nor adjacent to land that is likely to be contaminated

Site Ref

CAWD-J

2.26 Mineral Resource

No impact on open space

2.27 Provision of Open Space

No

2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement

Site not needed as its settlement has already met its Core Strategy housing requirement

#### 3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use

No unimplemented residential permissions. No details on ownership. The site is in active arable farming use and would require 1 year for this use to cease

3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs

No details of marketing or viability have been submittted

3.3 Overall Deliverability

0-5 years

Site Type

3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes

Assessment Summary

Residential May Not be Required

Site Ref

CAWD-J

Greenfield site outside of development limits. Site is in flood zone 3. The site has good accessibility by public transport, good access to employment and reasonable access to local services. Development impacts on a heritage asset and mitigation measures are necessary. Within 280m outer buffer of Pannal to Cawood gas pipeline. Landscape has medium sensitivity to development.

Settlement Cawood Site Location Land south of 28 Rythergate, Cawood Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity 13 Residential Proposed Use Summary Core Strategy Hierarchy Designated Service Village Land Use Agricultural Field Surrounding Land Uses Highway to South-West and scrubland to the North-East. Dwellings to South-East Application Reference N/A Permission Started 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? No **Significant Constraint Notes** 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport Within 30 minutes of Selby town centre 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre Approx. 19,634 jobs within 8km. 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling Over 5km to Selby. Approx. 1,428 jobs within 5km 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot (o) Site is within 800 metres of 1 key service 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land GF / PDL / Mixed GF % GF 100 % PDL 0 2.10 Flood Risk FZ3a - 100% 2.11 SFRA Level 2 SFRA Level 2 not required

Site Ref CAWD-K

2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints (o) No known constraints - minor powerline on site 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) The effects are not likely to be significant alone, but needs to be checked for likely significant effects in combination 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) (o) Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site (o) Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site but impact insignificant or unknown 2.16 Impact Protected Species (o) Records for swift and GCN within 500m of site, plus tansy beetle, smooth newt, common frog and bat within 1km. All other records are over 10yrs old. 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species (+) Small arable field with limited bounary features. Sites lies within 170m of the River Ouse. 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating (+) There is no overriding ecological constraints to prevent allocation. However, potential impacts upon the river will need to be made. 2.19 Heritage Assets (o) Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps (o) Development does not occur in the SCG 2.21 Landscape Capacity (-) Medium sensitivity to development 2.22 Physical Point of Access (o) Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.) 2.23 Amenity Impact (o) Compatible with nearby land uses 2.24 Groundwater (+)Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone 2.25 Contamination (+) Site is neither located on, nor adjacent to land that is likely to be contaminated

Site Ref

CAWD-K

2.26 Mineral Resource

No impact on open space

2.27 Provision of Open Space

No

2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement

Site not needed as its settlement has already met its Core Strategy housing requirement

Site Ref

Residential May Not be Required

CAWD-K

3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use

No unimplemented residential permissions. One landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use

3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs

The site has never been promoted or marketed

3.3 Overall Deliverability

0-5 years

Site Type

3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes

Assessment Summary

Greenfield site outside of development limits. Site is in flood zone 3. The site has good accessibility by public transport, good access to employment and reasonable access to local services. Engagement with the site promoters has shown no viability issues.

Settlement Church Fenton Site Location Land South of Hall Lane, Church Fenton Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity 8 Residential Proposed Use Summary Core Strategy Hierarchy Designated Service Village Land Use Paddock Surrounding Land Uses Farm land/buildings to East/South. Residential to West/North Application Reference N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? No **Significant Constraint Notes** 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport (+) Within 45 minutes of York centre 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre (o) approx. 11,013 jobs within 8km. 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling (o) Within 5km of Sherburn in Elmet. Approx. 6,908 jobs within 5km 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot (o) Site is within 800 metres of 1 key service 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land GF / PDL / Mixed GF % GF 100 % PDL 0 2.10 Flood Risk FZ1 - 100% 2.11 SFRA Level 2 SFRA Level 2 not required

Site Ref

CFEN-R

2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints (o) No known constraints 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) The effects are not likely to be significant alone, but needs to be checked for likely significant effects in combination 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) (o) Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site (o) Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site but impact insignificant or unknown 2.16 Impact Protected Species Two bat records within 50m of site, swift and common spotted orchid within 500m of site. All other records are over 10yrs old. 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species (+) Improved pasture surrounded by mature hedgerows and trees. 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating (+) There is no over-riding ecological constraints to prevent allocation. However, an ecological appraisal will be required to support any future planning application and this should include the consideration of trees and boundary features including impacts on associated species such as birds and foraging bat. 2.19 Heritage Assets (o) Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps (o) Development does not occur in the SCG 2.21 Landscape Capacity (-) Medium sensitivity to development 2.22 Physical Point of Access (+)Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works 2.23 Amenity Impact (o) Compatible with nearby land uses 2.24 Groundwater (+)Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone 2.25 Contamination (o) Site is adjacent to potentially contaminated land

Site Ref

CFEN-R

2.26 Mineral Resource

No impact on open space

2.27 Provision of Open Space

No

2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement

Site not needed as its settlement has already met its Core Strategy housing requirement

#### 3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use

No unimplemented residential permissions. One landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use

#### 3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs

Interest has been expressed by a housebuilder, subject to planning permission. No viability assessment undertaken.

#### 3.3 Overall Deliverability

0-5 years

Site Type

#### 3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes

Assessment Summary

Residential May Not be Required

Site Ref

CFEN-R

Greenfield site which is located beyond the development limit. Site has reasonable public transport accessibility and accessibility to employment. Development would result in the loss of Grade 2 agricultural land. The site is within 500 metres of a local or regional wildlife site, but impact is insignificant or unknown. The site is located within a landscape identified as having medium sensitivity to development. The site is adjacent to potentially contaminated land. No viability work has been undertaken.

Settlement Church Fenton Site Location Land to north of Station Road, Church Fenton Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity 32 Residential Proposed Use Summary Core Strategy Hierarchy Designated Service Village Land Use Agricultural Field Surrounding Land Uses Agricultural to the West, Agricultural to the East, Residential South-East. Agricultural to North **Application Reference** N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? No **Significant Constraint Notes** None 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport Within 30 minutes of York centre 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre Approx. 14,887 jobs within 8km. 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling (o) Within 5km of Sherburn in Elmet. Approx. 6,899 jobs within 5km 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot Site is within 800 metres of 4 key services 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land GF / PDL / Mixed GF % GF 99 % PDL 1 2.10 Flood Risk FZ1 - 100% 2.11 SFRA Level 2 SFRA Level 2 not required

Site Ref CFEN-S

2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints (o) No known constraints 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) The effects are not likely to be significant alone, but needs to be checked for likely significant effects in combination 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) (o) Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site 2.16 Impact Protected Species Record of swift within 500m of site. All other records are over 10yrs old. 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species (+) Arable field with minimal boundary features. 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating (+)There is no overriding ecological constraints to prevent allocation. However, potential ecological features will need to be checked and assessed. 2.19 Heritage Assets (o) Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps (o) Development does not occur in the SCG 2.21 Landscape Capacity Medium sensitivity to development 2.22 Physical Point of Access (o) Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.) 2.23 Amenity Impact (o) Compatible with nearby land uses 2.24 Groundwater (+) Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone 2.25 Contamination (+) Site is neither located on, nor adjacent to land that is likely to be contaminated

Site Ref

CFEN-S

2.26 Mineral Resource

No impact on open space

2.27 Provision of Open Space

No

2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement

Site not needed as its settlement has already met its Core Strategy housing requirement

#### 3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use

No unimplemented residential permissions. One landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use

3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs

Site has not been marketed and no viaibility assessment has been undertaken. Access to site likely to require adjustment of the frontage and may require removal of the owners existing house

3.3 Overall Deliverability

0-5 years

3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes

Site Type
Assessment Summary

Residential May Not be Required

Site Ref

CFEN-S

Majority of the site is greenfield and located outside, but adjacent to the development limits. Site has good accessibility by public transport and to employment and a range of key services. The site is identified as being located in a landscape which has a medium sensitivity to development. No viability work has been undertaken.

Settlement Church Fenton Site Location South of Common Lane, Church Fenton Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity 42 Residential Proposed Use Summary Core Strategy Hierarchy Designated Service Village Land Use Agricultural Field Surrounding Land Uses Residential / Scrubland to West. Railway to South/South-West. Dwellings / Scrubland to north Application Reference N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? No **Significant Constraint Notes** None 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport Within 30 minutes of York centre 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre Approx. 14,002 jobs within 8km. 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling (o) Within 5km of Sherburn in Elmet. Approx. 6,899 jobs within 5km 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot (o) Site is within 800 metres of 3 key services 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 - 80%, Grade 3 - 20% 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land GF / PDL / Mixed GF % GF 100 % PDL 0 2.10 Flood Risk FZ1 - 100% 2.11 SFRA Level 2 SFRA Level 2 not required

Site Ref

CFEN-T

2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints (o) No known constraints 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) The effects are not likely to be significant alone, but needs to be checked for likely significant effects in combination 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) (o) Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site 2.16 Impact Protected Species Record of swift within 500m of site. All other records are over 10yrs old. 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species Improved pasture with mature trees and hedgerow to the railway line. More limited trees and hedges to the other boundaries. 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating (+) There is no overriding ecological constraints to prevent allocation. However, potential ecological features will need to be checked and assessed. 2.19 Heritage Assets (o) Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps (o) Development does not occur in the SCG 2.21 Landscape Capacity N/A 2.22 Physical Point of Access (o) Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.) 2.23 Amenity Impact (o) Compatible with nearby land uses 2.24 Groundwater (+)Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone 2.25 Contamination (o) Site is adjacent to potentially contaminated land

Site Ref

CFEN-T

2.26 Mineral Resource

No impact on open space

2.27 Provision of Open Space

No

2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement

Site not needed as its settlement has already met its Core Strategy housing requirement

3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use

No unimplemented residential permissions. One landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use

3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs

Site has not been marketed and no viability assessment has been undertaken.

3.3 Overall Deliverability

0-5 years

3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes

Site Type
Assessment Summary

Residential May Not be Required

Site Ref

CFEN-T

Greenfield site, outside the development and located in the Green Belt. The site has good public transport accessibility and accessibility to a range of key services. There is reasonable access to some key services. Development of the site would result in the loss of Grade 2 agricultural land. Site is adjacent to land that is potentially contaminated. No viability work has been undertaken.

Settlement Church Fenton Site Location The Orchards, Church Fenton Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity 39 Residential Proposed Use Summary Core Strategy Hierarchy Designated Service Village Land Use Woodland Surrounding Land Uses Residential to the North. Agricultural to West. Agricultural to East. Residential South-East. Agricultural to the South **Application Reference** N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? No **Significant Constraint Notes** None 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport Within 30 minutes of York centre 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre Approx. 13,815 jobs within 8km. 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling (o) Within 5km of Sherburn in Elmet. Approx. 6,899 jobs within 5km 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot Site is within 800 metres of 4 key services 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land GF / PDL / Mixed GF % GF 90 % PDL 10 2.10 Flood Risk FZ1 - 100% 2.11 SFRA Level 2 SFRA Level 2 not required

Site Ref

CFEN-U

2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints (o) No known constraints - minor powerline on site 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) The effects are not likely to be significant alone, but needs to be checked for likely significant effects in combination 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) (o) Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site 2.16 Impact Protected Species Record of swift within 500m of site plus records of common spotted orchid, bluebell and bat within 1km. All other records are over 10yrs old. 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species (-) Four veteran trees recorded on site. NPPF highlights these as irreplaceable habitat. Site comprises an existing dwelling with large gardens containing a number of mature trees/woodland. There also appear to be several ponds within the site and bats are li 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating (-) Presence and status of veteran trees will need assessing - avoiding the loss of these trees should be a priority. The existing buildings on site will need to be assessed for the potential to support bat and birds and ponds will need to be checked for amphibians. 2.19 Heritage Assets (o) Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps (o) Development does not occur in the SCG 2.21 Landscape Capacity Medium sensitivity to development 2.22 Physical Point of Access (+)Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works 2.23 Amenity Impact (o) Compatible with nearby land uses 2.24 Groundwater (+) Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone 2.25 Contamination (+) Site is neither located on, nor adjacent to land that is likely to be contaminated

Site Ref

CFEN-U

2.26 Mineral Resource

No impact on open space

2.27 Provision of Open Space

No

2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement

Site not needed as its settlement has already met its Core Strategy housing requirement

3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use

No unimplemented residential permissions. The site is in multiple ownership. No impact on availability from existing land use

3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs

Site has not been marketed and no viability assessment has been undertaken.

3.3 Overall Deliverability

0-5 years

Site Type

3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes

Assessment Summary

Residential May Not be Required

Site Ref

CFEN-U

Greenfield site outside the development limits. Good public transport accessibility and accessibility to a range of key services. Development of the site would result in the loss of Grade 2 agricultural land. The site is located wholly within Flood Zone 1 and is an area identified as being at medium sensitivity to development. No viability testing has been undertaken.

Settlement **Criddling Stubbs** Site Location Land to west of Criddling Stubbs Size (Ha) 156.00 Dwelling capacity N/A Proposed Use Summary **Employment** Core Strategy Hierarchy Secondary Village Land Use Quarry Surrounding Land Uses Agricultural land to the South/West. Highway to North. Railway to the East and farm buildings Application Reference N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? **Significant Constraint Notes** Employment site over 5ha in a rural area 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre N/A 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot N/A 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification N/A 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land N/A GF / PDL / Mixed N/A % GF % PDL 2.10 Flood Risk N/A 2.11 SFRA Level 2

Site Ref

CRID-A

Site Ref CRID-A 2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints N/A 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) N/A N/A 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site N/A 2.16 Impact Protected Species N/A 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species N/A 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating N/A 2.19 Heritage Assets N/A 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps N/A 2.21 Landscape Capacity N/A 2.22 Physical Point of Access N/A 2.23 Amenity Impact N/A 2.24 Groundwater N/A 2.25 Contamination N/A

# **PLAN Selby Site Assessments** Site Ref CRID-A 2.26 Mineral Resource N/A N/A 2.27 Provision of Open Space N/A 2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement N/A 3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use 3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs 3.3 Overall Deliverability 3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes Employment - Failed Initial Sift Site Type Assessment Summary Failed initial sift: Over Core Strategy policy SP13 size threshold

Settlement **Criddling Stubbs** Site Location Land to west of Criddling Stubbs Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity N/A Proposed Use Summary **Employment** Core Strategy Hierarchy Secondary Village Land Use Scrubland Surrounding Land Uses Employment and agricultural to East. Residential to West. Scrubland to North Application Reference N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? Yes **Significant Constraint Notes** Employment site over 5ha in a rural area 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre N/A 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot N/A 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification N/A 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land N/A GF / PDL / Mixed N/A % GF % PDL 2.10 Flood Risk N/A 2.11 SFRA Level 2

Site Ref

CRID-B

Site Ref CRID-B 2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints N/A 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) N/A N/A 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site N/A 2.16 Impact Protected Species N/A 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species N/A 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating N/A 2.19 Heritage Assets N/A 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps N/A 2.21 Landscape Capacity N/A 2.22 Physical Point of Access N/A 2.23 Amenity Impact N/A 2.24 Groundwater N/A 2.25 Contamination N/A

# **PLAN Selby Site Assessments** Site Ref CRID-B 2.26 Mineral Resource N/A N/A 2.27 Provision of Open Space N/A 2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement N/A 3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use 3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs 3.3 Overall Deliverability 3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes Employment - Failed Initial Sift Site Type Assessment Summary Failed initial sift: Over Core Strategy policy SP13 size threshold

Settlement Drax Site Location Land adj to former Adamson House, Drax Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity N/A Proposed Use Summary Residential Core Strategy Hierarchy Secondary Village Land Use Agricultural field Surrounding Land Uses Agricultural fields to East/West. Farm buildings to North/South Application Reference N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? **Significant Constraint Notes** Secondary Village 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre N/A 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot N/A 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification N/A 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land N/A GF / PDL / Mixed N/A % GF % PDL 2.10 Flood Risk N/A 2.11 SFRA Level 2

Site Ref

DRAX-D

2.24 Groundwater

2.25 Contamination

Site Ref DRAX-D 2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints N/A 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) N/A N/A 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site N/A 2.16 Impact Protected Species N/A 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species N/A 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating N/A 2.19 Heritage Assets N/A 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps N/A 2.21 Landscape Capacity N/A 2.22 Physical Point of Access N/A 2.23 Amenity Impact N/A

N/A

N/A

# **PLAN Selby Site Assessments** Site Ref DRAX-D 2.26 Mineral Resource N/A N/A 2.27 Provision of Open Space N/A 2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement N/A 3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use 3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs 3.3 Overall Deliverability 3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes Residential - Failed Initial Sift Site Type Assessment Summary Failed Initial Sift: Residential site not within or adjacent to a settlement designated in Core Strategy policy SP2 as a Principal Town, Local Service Centre or Designated Service Village.

Settlement Eggborough Site Location Land adjacent to 23 Tranmore Lane, Eggborough Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity 74 Residential Proposed Use Summary Core Strategy Hierarchy Designated Service Village Land Use Agricultural field and farm buildings Surrounding Land Uses Residential/agricultural fields to South. Fields to East/West. Employment to North **Application Reference** Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? No **Significant Constraint Notes** 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport Within 30 minutes of Eggborough centre 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre Approx. 12,296 jobs within 8km. 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling (o) Over 5km to Knottingley. Approx. 4,994 jobs within 5km 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot Site is within 800 metres of 4 key services 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land GF / PDL / Mixed GF % GF 100 % PDL 0 2.10 Flood Risk FZ1 - 100% 2.11 SFRA Level 2 SFRA Level 2 not required

Site Ref

EGGB-T

2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints (o) No known constraints 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) The effects are not likely to be significant alone, but needs to be checked for likely significant effects in combination 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) (o) Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site (+)2.16 Impact Protected Species All PS records are over 10yrs old. 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species Arable field with minimal boundary features, site inlcudes a number of agricultural buildings of unknown age/construction which may support bats or birds. 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating (+) There is no overriding ecological constraints to prevent allocation. However, potential ecological features (including buildings) will need to be checked and assessed. 2.19 Heritage Assets (o) Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps (o) Development does not occur in the SCG 2.21 Landscape Capacity (-) Medium sensitivity to development 2.22 Physical Point of Access (+)Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works 2.23 Amenity Impact (o) Compatible with nearby land uses 2.24 Groundwater (+)Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone 2.25 Contamination (+) Site is neither located on, nor adjacent to land that is likely to be contaminated

Site Ref

EGGB-T

2.26 Mineral Resource

No impact on open space

2.27 Provision of Open Space

No

2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement

Site not needed as its settlement has already met its Core Strategy housing requirement

3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use

No unimplemented residential permissions. One landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use

3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs

Site has not been marketed and no viability assessment has been undertaken.

3.3 Overall Deliverability

0-5 years

Site Type

3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes

Assessment Summary

Residential May Not be Required

Site Ref

**EGGB-T** 

Greenfield site, outside the development limits. The site has good accessibility by public transport, reasonable access to employment and good access to local services. The site has not been subject to any viability testing.

Settlement Fairburn Site Location Land at Pear Tree House, Rawfield Lane, Fairburn Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity N/A Proposed Use Summary Residential Core Strategy Hierarchy Secondary Village Land Use Garden land Surrounding Land Uses Residential to East/South. Residential to North. Highway to West Application Reference N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? **Significant Constraint Notes** Secondary Village 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre N/A 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot N/A 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification N/A 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land N/A GF / PDL / Mixed N/A % GF % PDL 2.10 Flood Risk N/A 2.11 SFRA Level 2

Site Ref

FAIR-K

Site Ref FAIR-K 2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints N/A 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) N/A N/A 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site N/A 2.16 Impact Protected Species N/A 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species N/A 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating N/A 2.19 Heritage Assets N/A 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps N/A 2.21 Landscape Capacity N/A 2.22 Physical Point of Access N/A 2.23 Amenity Impact N/A 2.24 Groundwater N/A 2.25 Contamination N/A

# **PLAN Selby Site Assessments** Site Ref FAIR-K 2.26 Mineral Resource N/A N/A 2.27 Provision of Open Space N/A 2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement N/A 3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use 3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs 3.3 Overall Deliverability 3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes Residential - Failed Initial Sift Site Type Assessment Summary Failed Initial Sift: Residential site not within or adjacent to a settlement designated in Core Strategy policy SP2 as a Principal Town, Local Service Centre or Designated Service Village.

Settlement Fairburn Site Location Land adj Pollums Farm, Fairburn Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity N/A Proposed Use Summary Residential Core Strategy Hierarchy Secondary Village Land Use Farm building Surrounding Land Uses Residential to South. Agricultural fields to North/West/East Application Reference N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? **Significant Constraint Notes** Secondary Village 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre N/A 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot N/A 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification N/A 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land N/A GF / PDL / Mixed N/A % GF % PDL 2.10 Flood Risk N/A 2.11 SFRA Level 2

Site Ref

FAIR-L

Site Ref

FAIR-L

2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints	N/A
2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar)	N/A
2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland)	N/A
2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site	N/A
2.16 Impact Protected Species	N/A
2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species	N/A
2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating	N/A
2.19 Heritage Assets	N/A
2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps	N/A
2.21 Landscape Capacity	N/A
2.22 Physical Point of Access	N/A
2.23 Amenity Impact	N/A
2.24 Groundwater	N/A
2.25 Contamination	N/A

# **PLAN Selby Site Assessments** Site Ref FAIR-L 2.26 Mineral Resource N/A N/A 2.27 Provision of Open Space N/A 2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement N/A 3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use 3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs 3.3 Overall Deliverability 3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes Residential - Failed Initial Sift Site Type Assessment Summary Failed Initial Sift: Residential site not within or adjacent to a settlement designated in Core Strategy policy SP2 as a Principal Town, Local Service Centre or Designated Service Village.

Settlement Fairburn Site Location Land at Junction 42 of A1 (M) Size (Ha) 128.36 Dwelling capacity N/A Proposed Use Summary **Employment** Core Strategy Hierarchy Designated Service Village Land Use Agricultural Field Surrounding Land Uses Highway to the East/West. Agricultural to the West and South. Residential to the South and Highway to the North. Application Reference Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? **Significant Constraint Notes** Employment site over 5ha in a rural area 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre N/A 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot N/A 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification N/A 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land N/A GF / PDL / Mixed N/A % GF % PDL 2.10 Flood Risk N/A 2.11 SFRA Level 2

Site Ref

FAIR-M

Site Ref FAIR-M 2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints N/A 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) N/A N/A 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site N/A 2.16 Impact Protected Species N/A 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species N/A 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating N/A 2.19 Heritage Assets N/A 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps N/A 2.21 Landscape Capacity N/A 2.22 Physical Point of Access N/A 2.23 Amenity Impact N/A 2.24 Groundwater N/A 2.25 Contamination N/A

# **PLAN Selby Site Assessments** Site Ref FAIR-M 2.26 Mineral Resource N/A N/A 2.27 Provision of Open Space N/A 2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement N/A 3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use 3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs 3.3 Overall Deliverability 3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes Employment - Failed Initial Sift Site Type Assessment Summary Failed initial sift: Over Core Strategy policy SP13 size threshold

Settlement Hambleton Site Location Land East of Common Lane, Hambleton 12.35 Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity 296 Residential Proposed Use Summary Core Strategy Hierarchy Designated Service Village Land Use Agricultural fields Surrounding Land Uses Residential to East/South/West. Agriculture to North Application Reference N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? No **Significant Constraint Notes** 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport Within 30 minutes of Selby town centre 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre Approx. 21,608 jobs within 8km. 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling Over 5km to Selby. Approx. 7,392 jobs within 5km 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot Site is within 800 metres of 4 key services 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land GF / PDL / Mixed GF % GF 100 % PDL 0 2.10 Flood Risk FZ1 - 100% 2.11 SFRA Level 2 SFRA Level 2 not required

Site Ref H

HAMB-D

2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints (o) No known constraints - Minor powerline running through the site 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) The effects are not likely to be significant alone, but needs to be checked for likely significant effects in combination 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) (o) Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site (+)2.16 Impact Protected Species All PS records are over 10vrs old. 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species (+) Large arable field with minimal boundary features 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating There is no over-riding ecological constraints to prevent allocation. However, an ecological appraisal will be required to support any future planning application and this should include the consideration of the boundary features. Large site with opportunities for biodiversity enhancement. 2.19 Heritage Assets (o) Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps (o) Development does not occur in the SCG 2.21 Landscape Capacity (o) Low sensitivity to development 2.22 Physical Point of Access (+)Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works 2.23 Amenity Impact (o) Compatible with nearby land uses 2.24 Groundwater (+) Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone 2.25 Contamination (+)Site is neither located on, nor adjacent to land that is likely to be contaminated

Site Ref

HAMB-D

2.26 Mineral Resource

Development will potentially provide public open space

2.27 Provision of Open Space

No

2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement

Site not needed as its settlement has already met its Core Strategy housing requirement

#### 3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use

No previous unimplemented residential permissions/Two landowners/No impact on availability from existing land use. Council owned strip of land between field and road.

#### 3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs

Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. A possible ransom strip purchase may increase costs.

#### 3.3 Overall Deliverability

0-5 years

Site Type

#### 3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes

Assessment Summary

Residential May Not be Required

Site Ref

HAMB-D

Greenfield site outside, but adjacent to, development limits. Site is in Flood Zone 1. The site has good accessibility by public transport, good access to employment and good access to local services. Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. A possible ransom strip purchase may increase costs.

Settlement Hambleton Site Location Land east of Gateforth Lane, Hambleton 17.59 Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity 317 Residential Proposed Use Summary Core Strategy Hierarchy Designated Service Village Land Use Agricultural Field Surrounding Land Uses Residential to North-West. Agricultural to the South / West. Application Reference N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? No **Significant Constraint Notes** 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport Within 30 minutes of Sherburn in Elmet town centre 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre Approx. 22,167 jobs within 8km. N/A 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling Over 5km to Selby. Approx. 10,736 jobs within 5km 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot Site is within 800 metres of 3 key services 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land GF / PDL / Mixed GF % GF 100 % PDL 0 2.10 Flood Risk FZ1 - 100% 2.11 SFRA Level 2 SFRA Level 2 not required

Site Ref HAMB-N

2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints (-) South West corner of the site contains a Cemetery and cannot be developed, minor powerline on site 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) (-) The effects are not likely to be significant alone, but needs to be checked for likely significant effects in combination 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) (o) Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site (+)2.16 Impact Protected Species All PS records are over 10vrs old. 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species (+)Large arable field with minimal boundary features 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating There is no over-riding ecological constraints to prevent allocation. However, an ecological appraisal will be required to support any future planning application and this should include the consideration of the boundary features. Large site with opportunities for biodiversity enhancement. 2.19 Heritage Assets (o) Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps (o) Development does not occur in the SCG 2.21 Landscape Capacity Medium sensitivity to development 2.22 Physical Point of Access (+)Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works 2.23 Amenity Impact Site within incompatible area - within 800 metres of WWTW 2.24 Groundwater (o) Site partly within Groundwater Protection Zone 3 2.25 Contamination (+)Site is neither located on, nor adjacent to land that is likely to be contaminated

Site Ref

HAMB-N

2.26 Mineral Resource

No impact on open space

2.27 Provision of Open Space

No

2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement

Site not needed as its settlement has already met its Core Strategy housing requirement

#### 3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use

No unimplemented residential permissions. The site is in multiple ownership. The site is in active arable farming use and would require 1 year for this use to cease

3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs

The site is under option to Banks Property. High level viability assessments have been undertaken, along with market testing.

3.3 Overall Deliverability

0-5 years

Site Type

3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes

Assessment Summary

Residential May Not be Required

Site Ref

HAMB-N

Greenfield site outside the development limits. Good public transport accessibility and accessibility to employment provision. Reasonable access to a number of key services. The site is location within 800 metres of an incompatible use (Waste Water Treatment Works) and is located partly within Groundwater Protection Zone 3. A high level viability assessment has been undertaken, along with market testing of the site.

Settlement Hemingbrough Site Location The Coach Station, Hull Road, Hemingbrough Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity N/A Proposed Use Summary **Employment** Core Strategy Hierarchy Designated Service Village Land Use Bus and coach depot Surrounding Land Uses Residential to East/West. Agricultural fields to North/East/South/West Application Reference N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? No **Significant Constraint Notes** 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport SCORE-1 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre N/A 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network Good sub-regional accessibility 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling (+)A population of approx. 11,792 within 5km 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot N/A 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land GF / PDL / Mixed Mixed % GF 30 % PDL 70 2.10 Flood Risk (o) FZ1 - 100% 2.11 SFRA Level 2 SFRA Level 2 not required

Site Ref HEMB-Y

2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints (o) No known constraints 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) The effects are not likely to be significant alone, but needs to be checked for likely significant effects in combination 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) Requirement to consult with Natural England 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site 2.16 Impact Protected Species Record of swift within 500m of site plus records of bluebell, GCN, and starling within 1km. All other records are over 10yrs old. 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species Site currently used as a transport deport with industrial buildings and hard standing. Buildings may support bats/birds depending on their construction. There is also an area the north and east of the site which is comprised of grassland with trees and sc 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating (o) There is no over-riding ecological constraints to prevent allocation. However, an ecological appraisal will be required to support any future planning application and this should include an appraisal of all site habitats for protected species and boundary features. Indirect effects upon habitats/species within the former clay pit will be required. Site with opportunities for biodiversity enhancements. 2.19 Heritage Assets (o) Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps Development does not occur in the SCG 2.21 Landscape Capacity Medium sensitivity to development 2.22 Physical Point of Access (+)Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works 2.23 Amenity Impact (o) Compatible with nearby land uses 2.24 Groundwater (+)Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone 2.25 Contamination Site is potentially contaminated but can be mitigated

Site Ref

HEMB-Y

2.26 Mineral Resource

No impact on open space

2.27 Provision of Open Space

N/A

2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement

Site not proposed for housing

Site Ref

HEMB-Y

3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use

The site has one landowner and is leased to Thornes Independent Ltd and in current use as a bus & coach depot (estimated 2 to 3 years for existing use to cease on site)

3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs

The site has not been marketed and no viability assessment has been undertaken

3.3 Overall Deliverability

0-5 years

3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes

Site Type Potential Employment

#### **Assessment Summary**

Partly within and partly outside of the development limits. Site contains brownfield land. Site has poor access by public transport but good access from cycling. Site in flood zone 1. Potential contamination on site. 2 to 3 years for lease on site for use as coach depot to end.

Settlement Hensall Site Location Land north of Wand Lane, Hensall Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity N/A Proposed Use Summary Residential Core Strategy Hierarchy Secondary Village Land Use Scrubland Surrounding Land Uses Agricultural to the North. Residential to the West. Agricultural to the East. Residential to the South. Application Reference N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? **Significant Constraint Notes** Secondary Village & Flood Zone 3b 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre N/A 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot N/A 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification N/A 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land N/A GF / PDL / Mixed N/A % GF % PDL 2.10 Flood Risk N/A 2.11 SFRA Level 2

Site Ref

HENS-L

Site Ref HENS-L 2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints N/A 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) N/A N/A 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site N/A 2.16 Impact Protected Species N/A 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species N/A 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating N/A 2.19 Heritage Assets N/A 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps N/A 2.21 Landscape Capacity N/A 2.22 Physical Point of Access N/A 2.23 Amenity Impact N/A 2.24 Groundwater N/A 2.25 Contamination N/A

# **PLAN Selby Site Assessments** Site Ref HENS-L 2.26 Mineral Resource N/A N/A 2.27 Provision of Open Space N/A 2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement N/A 3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use 3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs 3.3 Overall Deliverability 3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes Residential - Failed Initial Sift Site Type Assessment Summary Failed Initial Sift: Residential site not within or adjacent to a settlement designated in Core Strategy policy SP2 as a Principal Town, Local Service Centre or Designated Service Village.

Settlement Hensall Site Location Land south of Field Lane, Hensall Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity N/A Proposed Use Summary Residential Core Strategy Hierarchy Secondary Village Land Use Agricultural field Surrounding Land Uses Residential to the north and west with agricultural to south and east. Application Reference N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? **Significant Constraint Notes** Secondary Village 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre N/A 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot N/A 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification N/A 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land N/A GF / PDL / Mixed N/A % GF % PDL 2.10 Flood Risk N/A 2.11 SFRA Level 2

Site Ref

HENS-M

2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints N/A 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) N/A N/A 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site N/A 2.16 Impact Protected Species N/A 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species N/A 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating N/A 2.19 Heritage Assets N/A 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps N/A 2.21 Landscape Capacity N/A 2.22 Physical Point of Access N/A 2.23 Amenity Impact N/A 2.24 Groundwater N/A 2.25 Contamination N/A

Site Ref

HENS-M

# **PLAN Selby Site Assessments** Site Ref HENS-M 2.26 Mineral Resource N/A N/A 2.27 Provision of Open Space N/A 2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement N/A 3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use 3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs 3.3 Overall Deliverability 3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes Residential - Failed Initial Sift Site Type Assessment Summary Failed Initial Sift: Residential site not within or adjacent to a settlement designated in Core Strategy policy SP2 as a Principal Town, Local Service Centre or Designated Service Village.

Settlement Hillam Site Location Land east of Hillside Close, Hillam Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity 86 Residential Proposed Use Summary Core Strategy Hierarchy Designated Service Village Land Use Agricultural Field Surrounding Land Uses Residential to the West. Agricultural to North/South/East. Application Reference N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? No **Significant Constraint Notes** 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport Within 30 minutes of Sherburn in Elmet town centre 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre Approx. 22,133 jobs within 8km. 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling Within 5km of Sherburn in Elmet. Approx. 8,990 jobs within 5km 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot No key services within 800 metres 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land GF / PDL / Mixed GF % GF 100 % PDL 0 2.10 Flood Risk FZ1 - 100% 2.11 SFRA Level 2 SFRA Level 2 not required

Site Ref HILL-G

2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints (o) No known constrains - telephone wires run across site 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) The effects are not likely to be significant alone, but needs to be checked for likely significant effects in combination 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) (-) Requirement to consult with Natural England 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site (+)Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site but features likely to be protected 2.16 Impact Protected Species Records of swift, grass snale and bat within 500m of the site plus further bat records within 1km. All other records are over 10 yrs old. 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species (+) Agricultural field with minimal boundary features. 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating (+) There is no overriding ecological constraints to prevent allocation. However, potential ecological features will need to be checked and assessed. 2.19 Heritage Assets (-) Development impacts on a heritage asset and mitigation measures are necessary 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps (o) Development does not occur in the SCG 2.21 Landscape Capacity (-) Medium sensitivity to development 2.22 Physical Point of Access (o) Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.) 2.23 Amenity Impact (o) Compatible with nearby land uses 2.24 Groundwater (+)Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone 2.25 Contamination (+) Site is neither located on, nor adjacent to land that is likely to be contaminated

Site Ref

HILL-G

2.26 Mineral Resource

No impact on open space

2.27 Provision of Open Space

No

2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement

Site not needed as its settlement has already met its Core Strategy housing requirement

3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use

No unimplemented residential permissions. One landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use

3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs

The site has not been marketed and no viability assessment has been undertaken

3.3 Overall Deliverability

0-5 years

3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes

Site Type
Assessment Summary

Residential May Not be Required

Site Ref

HILL-G

Greenfield site which lies beyond the development limits in the Green Belt. Good public transport accessibility and good access to employment. The site has no key services within 800 metres. Potential impact on nationally protected nature sites from development would require consultation with Natural England. Potential impact on a heritage asset, which may require mitigation measures. No viability work undertaken.

Settlement Hillam Site Location Land to west of Betteras Hill Road, Hillam Size (Ha) 1.31 Dwelling capacity 31 Residential Proposed Use Summary Core Strategy Hierarchy Designated Service Village Land Use Agricultural Field Surrounding Land Uses Residential to East. Agricultural to North/South/West. **Application Reference** N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? No **Significant Constraint Notes** 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport Within 30 minutes of Sherburn in Elmet town centre 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre Approx. 26,636 jobs within 8km. 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling Within 5km of Sherburn in Elmet. Approx. 10,052 jobs within 5km 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot No key services within 800 metres 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land GF / PDL / Mixed GF % GF 100 % PDL 0 2.10 Flood Risk FZ1 - 100% 2.11 SFRA Level 2 SFRA Level 2 not required

Site Ref

HILL-H

2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints (o) No known constraints 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) The effects are not likely to be significant alone, but needs to be checked for likely significant effects in combination 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) Requirement to consult with Natural England 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site (o) Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site but impact insignificant or unknown 2.16 Impact Protected Species (o) Records for swift and bat within 500m of the site plus grass snake and further bat records within 1km. All other records are over 10yrs old. 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species (+) Part of a larger pasture with mature boundaries to the north, east and south. There is a small built feature in the centre of the site of unknown age/construction. 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating (+) There is no overriding ecological constraints to prevent allocation. However, potential ecological features will need to be checked and assessed - particularly the mature boundaries. 2.19 Heritage Assets (-) Development impacts on a heritage asset and mitigation measures are necessary 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps (o) Development does not occur in the SCG 2.21 Landscape Capacity High sensitivity to development 2.22 Physical Point of Access (o) Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.) 2.23 Amenity Impact (o) Compatible with nearby land uses 2.24 Groundwater (+)Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone 2.25 Contamination (+) Site is neither located on, nor adjacent to land that is likely to be contaminated

Site Ref

HILL-H

2.26 Mineral Resource

No impact on open space

2.27 Provision of Open Space

No

2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement

Site not needed as its settlement has already met its Core Strategy housing requirement

3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use

No unimplemented residential permissions. One landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use

3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs

The site has not been marketed and no viability assessment has been undertaken

3.3 Overall Deliverability

0-5 years

3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes

Site Type
Assessment Summary

Residential May Not be Required

Site Ref

HILL-H

Greenfield site outside, but adjacent to, the development in the Green Belt and in an landscape identified as being highly sensitive to development. Good public transport accessibility and good access to employment. The site has no key services within 800 metres. Potential impact on nationally protected nature sites from development would require consultation with Natural England. Potential impact on a heritage asset, which may require mitigation measures. No viability work has been undertaken.

Settlement Kirk Smeaton Site Location Garden to Reat, The Manor House, Pinfold Lane, Kirk Smeaton Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity N/A Proposed Use Summary Residential Core Strategy Hierarchy Secondary Village Garden land Land Use Surrounding Land Uses Residential to North/East/West. Paddocks to South Application Reference N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? **Significant Constraint Notes** Secondary Village 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre N/A 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot N/A 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification N/A 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land N/A GF / PDL / Mixed N/A % GF % PDL 2.10 Flood Risk N/A 2.11 SFRA Level 2

Site Ref

KSME-D

Site Ref KSME-D 2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints N/A 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) N/A N/A 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site N/A 2.16 Impact Protected Species N/A 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species N/A 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating N/A 2.19 Heritage Assets N/A 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps N/A 2.21 Landscape Capacity N/A 2.22 Physical Point of Access N/A 2.23 Amenity Impact N/A 2.24 Groundwater N/A 2.25 Contamination N/A

# **PLAN Selby Site Assessments** Site Ref KSME-D 2.26 Mineral Resource N/A N/A 2.27 Provision of Open Space N/A 2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement N/A 3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use 3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs 3.3 Overall Deliverability 3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes Residential - Failed Initial Sift Site Type Assessment Summary Failed Initial Sift: Residential site not within or adjacent to a settlement designated in Core Strategy policy SP2 as a Principal Town, Local Service Centre or Designated Service Village.

Settlement Newton Kyme Site Location Land east of Newton Kyme Papyrus Works Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity N/A Proposed Use Summary Mixed Use Core Strategy Hierarchy Secondary Village Land Use Agricultural Field Surrounding Land Uses Agricultural fields to East. Residential to West. River Wharfe to North Application Reference N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? **Significant Constraint Notes** Mixed use site comprising employment over 5ha in a rural area and residential in a secondary village 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre N/A 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot N/A 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification N/A 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land N/A GF / PDL / Mixed N/A % GF % PDL 2.10 Flood Risk N/A 2.11 SFRA Level 2

Site Ref

NKYM-C

Site Ref NKYM-C 2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints N/A 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) N/A N/A 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site N/A 2.16 Impact Protected Species N/A 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species N/A 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating N/A 2.19 Heritage Assets N/A 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps N/A 2.21 Landscape Capacity N/A 2.22 Physical Point of Access N/A 2.23 Amenity Impact N/A 2.24 Groundwater N/A 2.25 Contamination N/A

# **PLAN Selby Site Assessments** Site Ref NKYM-C 2.26 Mineral Resource N/A 2.27 Provision of Open Space N/A N/A 2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement N/A 3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use 3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs 3.3 Overall Deliverability 3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes Mixed Use - Failed Initial Sift Site Type Assessment Summary Failed initial sift: Over Core Strategy policy SP13 size threshold & residential site not within or adjacent to a settlement designated in Core Strategy policy SP2 as a Principal Town, Local Service Centre or Designated Service Village

Settlement Osgodby Site Location Land at Millfield Farm, Osgodby Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity 38 Residential Proposed Use Summary Core Strategy Hierarchy Designated Service Village Land Use Agricultural fields and farm buildings Surrounding Land Uses Agricultural to East/South. Residential to North. Farm building and scrubland to West **Application Reference** N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? No **Significant Constraint Notes** None 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport Within 30 minutes of Selby town centre 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre Approx. 14,690 jobs within 8km. 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling Within 3.6km of Selby. Approx. 10,917 jobs within 5km 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot Site is within 800 metres of 2 key service 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land GF / PDL / Mixed GF % GF 90 % PDL 10 2.10 Flood Risk FZ1 - 100% 2.11 SFRA Level 2 SFRA Level 2 not required

Site Ref OSGB-J

2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints (o) No known constraints - minor powerline on site 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) The effects are not likely to be significant alone, but needs to be checked for likely significant effects in combination 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) (o) Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site (o) Within 500m of a local or regional wildlife site but impact insignificant or unknown 2.16 Impact Protected Species Single record for barn owl within 500m. All other records are over 10vrs old. 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species (o) Site includes a farmstead with traditional brick buildings (which could support bats/nesting birds), modern barns, dwelling and paddock with boundary hedges and trees. (+) 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating There is no over-riding ecological constraints to prevent allocation. However, an ecological appraisal will be required to support any future planning application and this should include the consideration of the buildings in relation to bats and nesting birds and boundary features including trees. 2.19 Heritage Assets (o) Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps (o) Development does not occur in the SCG 2.21 Landscape Capacity Medium sensitivity to development 2.22 Physical Point of Access (+)Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works 2.23 Amenity Impact (o) Compatible with nearby land uses 2.24 Groundwater (+)Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone 2.25 Contamination Site is potentially contaminated but can be mitigated

Site Ref

OSGB-J

2.26 Mineral Resource

No impact on open space

2.27 Provision of Open Space

No

2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement

Site not needed as its settlement has already met its Core Strategy housing requirement

#### 3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use

No umimplemented residential permissions. One landowner. The existing use on site (agriculture) is likely to cease within the next 10 years

3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs

The site has not been marketed and no viability assessment has been undertaken

3.3 Overall Deliverability

0-5 years

Site Type

3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes

Assessment Summary

Greenfield site, outside, but adjacent to, development limits. The site has good accessibility by public transport and to employment provision. There is good accessibility to a limited selection of key services. The site is potentially contaminated, but could be mitigated. No viability work has been undertaken at this stage.

Site Ref OSGB-J

Residential May Not be Required

Settlement Osgodby Site Location Land at South Duffield Road, Osgodby Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity N/A Proposed Use Summary Leisure Core Strategy Hierarchy Designated Service Village Land Use Agriucltural Field Surrounding Land Uses Agriculture to west and north, residential to the east and south Application Reference N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? No **Significant Constraint Notes** 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport SCORE-6 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre N/A 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network Good local accessibility 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling A population of approx. 29,196 within 5km 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot N/A 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land GF / PDL / Mixed GF % GF 100 % PDL 0 2.10 Flood Risk FZ1 - 100% 2.11 SFRA Level 2 SFRA Level 2 not required

Site Ref

OSGB-K

2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints (o) No known constraints 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) The effects are not likely to be significant alone, but needs to be checked for likely significant effects in combination 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) (o) Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site (+)2.16 Impact Protected Species No PS records within 1km in last 10 years. 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species (o) Site comprises rough grassland with boundary hedges and some trees. There is a pond adjacent to the site which could potentially support amphibians. (+) 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating There is no over-riding ecological constraints to prevent allocation. However, an ecological appraisal will be required to support any future planning application and this should include the consideration of the pond and boundary features including trees. 2.19 Heritage Assets (o) Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps (o) Development does not occur in the SCG 2.21 Landscape Capacity High sensitivity to development 2.22 Physical Point of Access (+)Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works 2.23 Amenity Impact (o) Compatible with nearby land uses 2.24 Groundwater (+) Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone 2.25 Contamination (+)Site is neither located on, nor adjacent to land that is likely to be contaminated

Site Ref

OSGB-K

2.26 Mineral Resource

No impact on open space

2.27 Provision of Open Space

N/A

2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement

N/A

Site not proposed for housing

Site Ref

OSGB-K

3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use

Sole owner. Covenant on site relating to change of use from arable with NYCC. - 30 year overage on the land.

3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs

The site has not been marketed and no viability assessment has been undertaken. Some developer interest in the site.

3.3 Overall Deliverability

0-5 years

3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes

Site Type Leisure

#### **Assessment Summary**

Greenfield site, outside, but adjacent to, development limits. The site has good local accessibility. It is located in a landscape which is highly sensitive to development. Site has not been marketed and no viability assessment has been undertaken. There is an existing convenant on the site.

Selby Settlement Site Location Land between Flaxley Road and Cross Hills Lane, Selby Size (Ha) 32.32 Dwelling capacity 679 Proposed Use Summary Residential Core Strategy Hierarchy **Principal Town** Land Use Agricultural fields Surrounding Land Uses Agricultural land to the North, West, residential to the East and dwelling to the South **Application Reference** N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? No **Significant Constraint Notes** None 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport Within 30 minutes of Selby town centre 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre Approx. 22,183 jobs within 8km. 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling Within 1.2km of Selby. Approx. 10,285 jobs within 5km 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot Site is within 800 metres of 5 key services 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land GF / PDL / Mixed GF % GF 100 % PDL 0 2.10 Flood Risk FZ3a - 90%, FZ2 - 10% Benefits from flood defences 2.11 SFRA Level 2 A sequential approach to site layout should be used. The majoroty of the site is located in Flood Zone 3a, with small areas of Flood Zone 2 to the North and South. The potential development site is not covered by the Selby Dam (2008) or the Holmes Dike mo

Site Ref SELB-W

2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints (o) No known constraints 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) The effects are not likely to be significant alone, but needs to be checked for likely significant effects in combination 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) (o) Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site (+)2.16 Impact Protected Species No PS records within 1km in last 10 years. 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species Within 50m of S41 Mixed Broadleaved Woodland. Trees present on Site. 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating There is no over-riding ecological constraints to prevent allocation. However, Selby housing sites have the potential for cumulative impacts on Skipwith Common SAC in terms of increased recreational/visitor pressure and perhaps other impact pathways. The HRA has recommended mitigation measures to address this. An ecological appraisal will be required to support any future planning application and this should include the consideration of the off Site waterbodies. 2.19 Heritage Assets (o) Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps (o) Development does not occur in the SCG 2.21 Landscape Capacity (o) Low sensitivity to development 2.22 Physical Point of Access (o) Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.) 2.23 Amenity Impact (o) Compatible with nearby land uses 2.24 Groundwater (+)Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone 2.25 Contamination Site is potentially contaminated but can be mitigated

Site Ref

SELB-W

2.26 Mineral Resource (o)

No impact on open space

2.27 Provision of Open Space (o)

Yes

2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement Yes

The Principal Town of Selby has not met its Core Strategy housing requirement

Site Ref

SELB-W

#### 3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use

Site in multiple Ownership The Cook's farm their own land so is available immediately. We understand that NYCC rent the land out on a short term lease so vacant possession will be available immediately on receipt of planning permission. A detailed and ext

#### 3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs

Yes – there will be abnormal costs associated with flood management but the site is viable. In December 2016, Hallam Land marketed land to the North of Flaxley Road at Hempbridge Farm which has the benefit of planning permission for circa 200 units and i

#### 3.3 Overall Deliverability

0-5 years

3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes

Site Type Potential Residential

#### **Assessment Summary**

Greenfield site outside, but adjacent to, development limits. Good access by public transport and to employment areas and key services. Site is mostly within Flood Zone 3a. A detailed and extensive Flood Risk Assessment was carried out on a larger area of land to the North West of Selby as part of an informal promotion by the land promoter acting for the multiple owners of the site. Site has been marketed and has had developer interest.

Settlement Sherburn Site Location Fenton Lane, Sherburn in Elmet Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity N/A Proposed Use Summary Residential Core Strategy Hierarchy Local Service Centre - Sherburn Land Use Agricultural Field Surrounding Land Uses Agricultural fields on all sides Application Reference N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? Significant Constraint Notes Disconnected from settlement hierarchy 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre N/A 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot N/A 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification N/A 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land N/A GF / PDL / Mixed N/A % GF % PDL 2.10 Flood Risk N/A 2.11 SFRA Level 2

Site Ref

SHER-AS

2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints N/A 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) N/A N/A 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site N/A 2.16 Impact Protected Species N/A 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species N/A 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating N/A 2.19 Heritage Assets N/A 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps N/A 2.21 Landscape Capacity N/A 2.22 Physical Point of Access N/A 2.23 Amenity Impact N/A 2.24 Groundwater N/A 2.25 Contamination N/A

Site Ref

SHER-AS

2.26 Mineral Resource N/A 2.27 Provision of Open Space N/A N/A 2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement N/A 3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use 3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs 3.3 Overall Deliverability 3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes Residential - Failed Initial Sift Site Type Assessment Summary Failed Initial Sift: Residential site not within or adjacent to a settlement designated in Core Strategy policy SP2 as a Principal Town, Local Service Centre or Designated Service Village.

Site Ref

SHER-AU

Settlement Sherburn Site Location Land between Coldhill Lane and Finkle Hill, Sherburn in Elmet Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity 185 Residential Proposed Use Summary Core Strategy Hierarchy Local Service Centre - Sherburn Land Use Agricultural Field Surrounding Land Uses Residential to South and East. Agricultural to North and West. Application Reference N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? No **Significant Constraint Notes** 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport Within 30 minutes of Sherburn in Elmet town centre 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre Approx. 16,145 jobs within 8km. 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling Within 1.2km of Sherburn in Elmet. Approx. 8,735 jobs within 5km 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot Site is within 800 metres of 6 key services 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land GF / PDL / Mixed GF % GF 100 % PDL 0 2.10 Flood Risk FZ1 - 100% 2.11 SFRA Level 2 SFRA Level 2 not required

Site Ref

SHER-AT

2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints (o) No known constraints 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) The effects are not likely to be significant alone, but needs to be checked for likely significant effects in combination 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) Requirement to consult with Natural England 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site (o) 2.16 Impact Protected Species Record of swift within 500m and records of bat within 1km. All other records are over 10 yrs old. 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species (+) Part of a large arable field with limited boundary features. 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating There is no over-riding ecological constraints to prevent allocation. However, an ecological appraisal will be required to support any future planning application and this should include consideration of farmland species. Large site with opportunities for biodiversity enhancement. 2.19 Heritage Assets (-) Development impacts on a heritage asset and mitigation measures are necessary 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps Development does not occur in the SCG 2.21 Landscape Capacity Medium sensitivity to development 2.22 Physical Point of Access (o) Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.) 2.23 Amenity Impact (o) Compatible with nearby land uses 2.24 Groundwater (+) Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone 2.25 Contamination (+)Site is neither located on, nor adjacent to land that is likely to be contaminated

Site Ref

SHER-AT

2.26 Mineral Resource

No impact on open space

2.27 Provision of Open Space

No

2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement

Site not needed as its settlement has already met its Core Strategy housing requirement

3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use

No unimplemented residential permissions. One landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use

3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs

The site has not been marketed and no viability assessment has been undertaken

3.3 Overall Deliverability

0-5 years

3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes

Site Type
Assessment Summary

Residential May Not be Required

Site Ref

SHER-AT

Greenfield site outside the development limits in the Green Belt and located within a designated Locally Important Landscape Area as defined by the SDLP. Good accessibility to a range of key services, employment areas and with good public transport accessibility. Potential impact on nationally protected nature sites from development would require consultation with Natural England. Potential impact on heritage asset which may require mitigation. The site has not been subject to any viability testing.

Settlement Sherburn Site Location Land between Coldhill Lane and Finkle Hill, Sherburn in Elmet Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity 262 Residential Proposed Use Summary Core Strategy Hierarchy Local Service Centre - Sherburn Land Use Agricultural Field Surrounding Land Uses Agricultural to West/South/North. Dwelling South-East. Agricultural North-East. Application Reference Permission Started N/A N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? No **Significant Constraint Notes** 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport Within 30 minutes of Sherburn in Elmet town centre 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre Approx. 16,145 jobs within 8km. 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling Within 1.2km of Sherburn in Elmet. Approx. 8,735 jobs within 5km 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot Site is within 800 metres of 6 key services 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land GF / PDL / Mixed GF % GF 100 % PDL 0 2.10 Flood Risk FZ1 - 90%. FZ3a - 10% 2.11 SFRA Level 2 SFRA Level 2 not required

Site Ref

SHER-AU

2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints (o) No known constraints - minor powerline on site 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) The effects are not likely to be significant alone, but needs to be checked for likely significant effects in combination 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) Requirement to consult with Natural England 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site 2.16 Impact Protected Species Record of swift within 500m of site. All other records are over 10yrs old. 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species Large arable field with a drainage ditch to the north of the site which make support water vole. Site has limited boundary features with some trees along the northern boundary. (+) 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating There is no over-riding ecological constraints to prevent allocation. However, an ecological appraisal will be required to support any future planning application and this should include the consideration of the boundary features - in particular the watercourse. Large site with opportunities for biodiversity enhancement. 2.19 Heritage Assets (-) Development impacts on a heritage asset and mitigation measures are necessary 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps Development does not occur in the SCG 2.21 Landscape Capacity Medium sensitivity to development 2.22 Physical Point of Access (o) Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.) 2.23 Amenity Impact (o) Compatible with nearby land uses 2.24 Groundwater (+)Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone 2.25 Contamination (+)Site is neither located on, nor adjacent to land that is likely to be contaminated

Site Ref

SHER-AU

2.26 Mineral Resource

No impact on open space

2.27 Provision of Open Space

No

2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement

Site not needed as its settlement has already met its Core Strategy housing requirement

3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use

No unimplemented residential permissions. One landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use

3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs

The site has not been marketed and no viability assessment has been undertaken

3.3 Overall Deliverability

0-5 years

3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes

Site Type
Assessment Summary

Residential May Not be Required

Site Ref

SHER-AU

Greenfield site outside the development limits in the Green Belt and located within a designated Locally Important Landscape Area as defined by the SDLP. Good accessibility to a range of key services, employment areas and with good public transport accessibility. A small section of the site is located within Flood Zone 3a (with the remainder in Flood Zone 1). Potential impact on nationally protected nature sites from development may require consultation with Natural England. Development is likely to impact on a heritage asset and would require mitigation measures. The site has not been subject to any viability testing.

Settlement South Duffield Site Location Land west of Main Street, South Duffield Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity N/A Proposed Use Summary Residential Core Strategy Hierarchy Secondary Village Land Use Overgrown field Surrounding Land Uses Residential to North/South/East. Agricultural fields to West/East Application Reference N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? **Significant Constraint Notes** Secondary Village 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre N/A 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot N/A 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification N/A 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land N/A GF / PDL / Mixed N/A % GF % PDL 2.10 Flood Risk N/A 2.11 SFRA Level 2

Site Ref

SDUF-D

2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints N/A 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) N/A N/A 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site N/A 2.16 Impact Protected Species N/A 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species N/A 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating N/A 2.19 Heritage Assets N/A 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps N/A 2.21 Landscape Capacity N/A 2.22 Physical Point of Access N/A 2.23 Amenity Impact N/A 2.24 Groundwater N/A 2.25 Contamination N/A

Site Ref

SDUF-D

# **PLAN Selby Site Assessments** Site Ref THBY-C 2.26 Mineral Resource N/A N/A 2.27 Provision of Open Space N/A 2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement N/A 3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use 3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs 3.3 Overall Deliverability 3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes Residential - Failed Initial Sift Site Type Assessment Summary Failed Initial Sift: Residential site not within or adjacent to a settlement designated in Core Strategy policy SP2 as a Principal Town, Local Service Centre or Designated Service Village.

Settlement **Tadcaster** Site Location Land north of Edgerton Drive, Tadcaster Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity 112 Residential Proposed Use Summary Local Service Centre - Tadcaster Core Strategy Hierarchy Land Use Agricultural Surrounding Land Uses Residential to the North/North-East. Residential to the South. Agricultural to the West Application Reference N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? No **Significant Constraint Notes** None 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport Within 30 minutes of Tadcaster town centre 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre Approx. 14,743 jobs within 8km. 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling Within 1.2km of Tadcaster. Approx. 8,274 jobs within 5km 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot Site is within 800 metres of 4 key services 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land GF / PDL / Mixed GF % GF 100 % PDL 0 2.10 Flood Risk FZ1 - 100% 2.11 SFRA Level 2 SFRA Level 2 not required

Site Ref

TADC-AG

2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints (o) No known constraints 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) There are no internationally protected sites within 5km 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) Requirement to consult with Natural England 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site 2.16 Impact Protected Species Record of bat within 50m and swift within 500m, plus further bat records within 1km. All other records are over 10yrs old. 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species (+) Number of improved pasture fields with hedgerows and mature trees along field boundaries. There is a linear band of bradleaved woodland along the disused railway line to the north. Site likely to support nesting birds and foraging bats. 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating (+) There is no overriding ecological constraints to prevent allocation. However, potential ecological features will need to be checked and assessed - particularly the mature boundaries. 2.19 Heritage Assets (o) Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps (o) Development does not occur in the SCG 2.21 Landscape Capacity High sensitivity to development 2.22 Physical Point of Access (o) Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.) 2.23 Amenity Impact Compatible with nearby land uses 2.24 Groundwater Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 1 and 2 2.25 Contamination Site is adjacent to potentially contaminated land

Site Ref

TADC-AG

2.26 Mineral Resource

No impact on open space

2.27 Provision of Open Space

(o)

Yes

2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement

The Local Service Centre of Tadcaster has not met its Core Strategy housing requirement

Site Ref

TADC-AG

3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use

No unimplemented residential permissions. One landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use

3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs

The site has not been marketed and no viability assessment has been undertaken

3.3 Overall Deliverability

0-5 years

3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes

Site Type Potential Residential

#### **Assessment Summary**

Greenfield site which lies beyond the development limits in the Green Belt and within a landscape highly sensitive to development. Site has good accessibility to public transport, employment and key services. Potential impact on nationally protected nature sites from development would require consultation with Natural England. The site is within Groundwater Protection Zone 1 and 2 and adjacent to land which is potentially contaminated.

Settlement Thorganby Site Location Land off Main Street, Thorganby Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity N/A Proposed Use Summary Residential Core Strategy Hierarchy Secondary Village Land Use Field Surrounding Land Uses Residential to East/South. Agriculturla fields to North/West/South Application Reference N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? **Significant Constraint Notes** Secondary Village 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre N/A 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot N/A 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification N/A 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land N/A GF / PDL / Mixed N/A % GF % PDL 2.10 Flood Risk N/A 2.11 SFRA Level 2

Site Ref

THBY-C

Site Ref THBY-C 2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints N/A 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) N/A N/A 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site N/A 2.16 Impact Protected Species N/A 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species N/A 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating N/A 2.19 Heritage Assets N/A 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps N/A 2.21 Landscape Capacity N/A 2.22 Physical Point of Access N/A 2.23 Amenity Impact N/A 2.24 Groundwater N/A 2.25 Contamination N/A

# **PLAN Selby Site Assessments** Site Ref THBY-C 2.26 Mineral Resource N/A N/A 2.27 Provision of Open Space N/A 2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement N/A 3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use 3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs 3.3 Overall Deliverability 3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes Residential - Failed Initial Sift Site Type Assessment Summary Failed Initial Sift: Residential site not within or adjacent to a settlement designated in Core Strategy policy SP2 as a Principal Town, Local Service Centre or Designated Service Village.

Settlement Thorpe Willoughby Site Location Linkside Mill, Gateforth Size (Ha) 17.63 Dwelling capacity N/A Proposed Use Summary Residential Core Strategy Hierarchy Designated Service Village Land Use Disused Mushroom Farm Surrounding Land Uses Golf Course to East. Woodland to North. Agricultural to South and West. Application Reference N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? Significant Constraint Notes Disconnected from settlement hierarchy 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre N/A 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot N/A 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification N/A 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land N/A GF / PDL / Mixed N/A % GF % PDL 2.10 Flood Risk N/A 2.11 SFRA Level 2

Site Ref

THRP-R

2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints N/A 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) N/A N/A 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site N/A 2.16 Impact Protected Species N/A 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species N/A 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating N/A 2.19 Heritage Assets N/A 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps N/A 2.21 Landscape Capacity N/A 2.22 Physical Point of Access N/A 2.23 Amenity Impact N/A 2.24 Groundwater N/A 2.25 Contamination N/A

Site Ref

THRP-R

# **PLAN Selby Site Assessments** Site Ref THRP-R 2.26 Mineral Resource N/A N/A 2.27 Provision of Open Space N/A 2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement N/A 3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use 3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs 3.3 Overall Deliverability 3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes Residential - Failed Initial Sift Site Type Assessment Summary Failed Initial Sift: Disconnected from settlement hierarchy.

Settlement Ulleskelf Site Location Land South of New Road, Ulleskelf Size (Ha) 2.13 Dwelling capacity 51 Residential Proposed Use Summary Core Strategy Hierarchy Designated Service Village Land Use Agricultural field Surrounding Land Uses Residential to North. Railway Station to East. Agricultural field to South. Sports facilities to West Application Reference N/A Permission Started 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? No **Significant Constraint Notes** None 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport Within 30 minutes of York centre 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre Approx. 12,051 jobs within 8km. 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling Over 5km to Tadcaster, Approx. 3,325 jobs within 5km. 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot (o) Site is within 800 metres of 3 key services 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land GF / PDL / Mixed GF % GF 100 % PDL 0 2.10 Flood Risk FZ1 - 100% 2.11 SFRA Level 2 SFRA Level 2 not required

Site Ref

ULLE-H

2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints (o) No known constraints 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) The effects are not likely to be significant alone, but needs to be checked for likely significant effects in combination 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) Requirement to consult with Natural England 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site 2.16 Impact Protected Species Record of brown hare and four records of bat within 50m and swift within 500m. All other records are over 10yrs old. 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species (+) Part of an arable field and also part of a sports field - with some hedgerows and trees to the north. 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating (+) There is no overriding ecological constraints to prevent allocation. However, potential ecological features will need to be checked and assessed - particularly the boundaries. 2.19 Heritage Assets (o) Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps (o) Development does not occur in the SCG 2.21 Landscape Capacity (-) Medium sensitivity to development 2.22 Physical Point of Access (+)Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works 2.23 Amenity Impact Within incompatible area - adjacent to railway station and railway line 2.24 Groundwater (+)Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone 2.25 Contamination (+) Site is neither located on, nor adjacent to land that is likely to be contaminated

Site Ref ULLE-H

2.26 Mineral Resource

No impact on open space

2.27 Provision of Open Space

No

2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement

Site not needed as its settlement has already met its Core Strategy housing requirement

3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use

No unimplemented residential permissions. One landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use

3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs

Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.

3.3 Overall Deliverability

0-5 years

Site Type

3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes

Assessment Summary

Residential May Not be Required

Site Ref

ULLE-H

Greenfield site which lies outside the development limits. Good accessibility by public transport and some access to key local services and employment areas. Site is wholly within Flood Zone 1. Potential impact on nationally protected nature sites from development would require consultation with Natural England. The site is located close to potentially incompatible uses - adjacent to a railway station and railway line.

Settlement Ulleskelf Site Location Land off Bell Lane, Ulleskelf Size (Ha) 6.91 Dwelling capacity 166 Residential Proposed Use Summary Core Strategy Hierarchy Designated Service Village Land Use Agricultural Field Surrounding Land Uses Residential to West/North. Agricultural fields to South/East Application Reference N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? No **Significant Constraint Notes** 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport Within 30 minutes of York centre 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre (o) Approx. 12,424 jobs within 8km. 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling Over 5km to Tadcaster, Approx. 3,352 jobs within 5km 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot (o) Site is within 800 metres of 3 key services 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land GF / PDL / Mixed GF % GF 100 % PDL 0 2.10 Flood Risk FZ1 - 100% 2.11 SFRA Level 2 SFRA Level 2 not required

Site Ref ULLE-I

2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints (o) No known constraints 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) The effects are not likely to be significant alone, but needs to be checked for likely significant effects in combination 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) Requirement to consult with Natural England 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site 2.16 Impact Protected Species Records for swift, brown hare and four records of bat within 500m. All other records are over 10yrs old. 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species (o) Large site with a variety of agricultural fields with hedges, in field and boundary trees (some mature). 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating There is no over-riding ecological constraints to prevent allocation. However, an ecological appraisal will be required to support any future planning application and this should include the consideration of the boundary features. Large site with opportunities for biodiversity enhancement. 2.19 Heritage Assets (-) Development impacts on a heritage asset and mitigation measures are necessary 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps Development does not occur in the SCG 2.21 Landscape Capacity Medium sensitivity to development 2.22 Physical Point of Access (o) Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.) 2.23 Amenity Impact (o) Compatible with nearby land uses 2.24 Groundwater (+) Site not within a Groundwater Protection Zone 2.25 Contamination (o) Site is adjacent to potentially contaminated land

Site Ref

ULLE-I

(o)

ULLE-I

Site Ref

Development will adversely affect public open space - mitigation possible

2.27 Provision of Open Space

2.26 Mineral Resource

No

2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement

Site not needed as its settlement has already met its Core Strategy housing requirement

3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use

No unimplemented residential permissions. One landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use

3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs

The site is under option to a developer. No viability assessment has been undertaken

3.3 Overall Deliverability

0-5 years

3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes

Site Type
Assessment Summary

Residential May Not be Required

Greenfield site which lies outside the development limits. Good accessibility by public transport and some access to key local services and employment areas. Site is wholly within Flood Zone 1. Potential impact on nationally protected nature sites from development would require consultation with Natural England. Potential impact t on a heritage asset and mitigation measures may be necessary. Development will adversely affect public open space, although mitigation is possible. The site is under option to a developer and no viability assessment has been undertaken.

Settlement Whitley Site Location Land east of Selby Road, Whitley Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity 31 Residential Proposed Use Summary Core Strategy Hierarchy Designated Service Village Land Use Agricultural Field Surrounding Land Uses Forest to the North. Residential to the West. Agricultural to the South/East. Application Reference N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? No **Significant Constraint Notes** 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport Within 30 minutes of Eggborough centre 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre (o) Approx. 11,635 jobs within 8km. 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling (o) Over 5km to Knottingley. Approx. 4,484 jobs within 5km. 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot No key services within 800 metres 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land GF / PDL / Mixed GF % GF 100 % PDL 0 2.10 Flood Risk FZ1 - 100% 2.11 SFRA Level 2 SFRA Level 2 not required

Site Ref

WHIT-S

2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints (o) No known constraints - minor powerline on site 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) The effects are not likely to be significant alone, but needs to be checked for likely significant effects in combination 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) (o) Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site (++)More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site 2.16 Impact Protected Species One bat record from within the site and a further record from within 50m of the site. All other records are over 10yrs old. 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species (+) Part of an arable field with some boundary hedges and a field drain to the north. 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating (+) There is no overriding ecological constraints to prevent allocation. However, potential ecological features will need to be checked and assessed - particularly the boundaries. 2.19 Heritage Assets (o) Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps (o) Development does not occur in the SCG 2.21 Landscape Capacity (-) Medium sensitivity to development 2.22 Physical Point of Access Access can be achieved through third party land but an agreement is not in place. 2.23 Amenity Impact (o) Compatible with nearby land uses 2.24 Groundwater (o) Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3 2.25 Contamination (+) Site is neither located on, nor adjacent to land that is likely to be contaminated

Site Ref

WHIT-S

2.26 Mineral Resource

No impact on open space

2.27 Provision of Open Space

No

2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement

Site not needed as its settlement has already met its Core Strategy housing requirement

3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use

No unimplemented residential permissions. One landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use

3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs

Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues.

3.3 Overall Deliverability

0-5 years

Site Type

3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes

Assessment Summary

Residential May Not be Required

Site Ref

WHIT-S

Greenfield site which is located outside the development limits in the Green Belt. Site has good access to the road and rail network and public transport but limited access to key services and employment areas. The site is wholly within Flood Zone 1 and is within a Groundwater Protection Zone (zone 3). Access can only be achieved to the site through third party land, but an agreement is not in place.

Settlement Whitley Site Location Land to rear of Copper Beech Drive, Whitley Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity 35 Residential Proposed Use Summary Core Strategy Hierarchy Designated Service Village Land Use Agricultural Field Surrounding Land Uses Recreation to the North. Agriculture to the East and Residential to the South/West. **Application Reference** N/A Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? No **Significant Constraint Notes** None 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport Within 30 minutes of Eggborough centre 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre (o) Approx. 10,994 jobs within 8km. 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling (o) Over 5km to Knottingley. Approx. 4,484 jobs within 5km. 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot (o) Site is within 800 metres of 1 key service 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land GF / PDL / Mixed GF % GF 90 % PDL 10 2.10 Flood Risk FZ1 - 100% 2.11 SFRA Level 2 SFRA Level 2 not required

Site Ref

WHIT-T

2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints (o) No known constraints 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) The effects are not likely to be significant alone, but needs to be checked for likely significant effects in combination 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) (o) Unlikely to propose a risk to protected sites 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site More than 500m from a local or regional wildlife site 2.16 Impact Protected Species One bat record within 500m of site and further bat record within 1km. All other records are over 10yrs old. 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species Site comprises hard standing with large buildings of unknown age/construction that may support bats and nesting birds. The site also includes part of a large arable field. 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating (+) There is no overriding ecological constraints to prevent allocation. However, potential ecological features will need to be checked and assessed - particularly the buildings. 2.19 Heritage Assets (o) Development would not impact a heritage asset or its setting 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps (o) Development does not occur in the SCG 2.21 Landscape Capacity (-) Medium sensitivity to development 2.22 Physical Point of Access (+)Existing access into the site that is either adequate or requires upgrade works 2.23 Amenity Impact (o) Compatible with nearby land uses 2.24 Groundwater (o) Site within Groundwater Protection Zone 3 2.25 Contamination (+) Site is neither located on, nor adjacent to land that is likely to be contaminated

Site Ref

WHIT-T

## **PLAN Selby Site Assessments** Site Ref WHIT-T 2.26 Mineral Resource (o) No impact on open space 2.27 Provision of Open Space No 2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement Site not needed as its settlement has already met its Core Strategy housing requirement 3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use No unimplemented residential permissions. One landowner. No impact on availability from existing land use 3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs Engagement with site promoters has shown no viability issues. 3.3 Overall Deliverability 0-5 years 3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes Site Type Residential May Not be Required **Assessment Summary** Greenfield site which is located outside the development limits in the Green Belt. Site has good access to the road and rail network and public transport but limited access to key services and employment areas. The site is wholly within Flood Zone 1 and is within a Groundwater Protection Zone (zone 3).

Settlement Wistow Site Location Land at Cawood Road, Wistow Size (Ha) Dwelling capacity N/A Proposed Use Summary Residential Core Strategy Hierarchy Secondary Village Land Use Agricultural Field Surrounding Land Uses Employment and woodland to South-East. Dwellings to North-East/South-East. Rest of the land is surrounded by agricultural land Application Reference Permission Started N/A 1. Does the site have a Significant Constraint? **Significant Constraint Notes** Secondary Village 2.1 HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.2 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by public transport N/A 2.3 Proximity to Employment centre N/A 2.4 Proximity to the Road & Rail Network N/A 2.5 HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.6 NON-HOUSING - Accessibility by Cycling N/A 2.7 HOUSING - Proximity to Key Services by foot N/A 2.8 Agricultural Land Classification N/A 2.9 Greenfield and Previously Developed Land N/A GF / PDL / Mixed N/A % GF % PDL 2.10 Flood Risk N/A 2.11 SFRA Level 2

Site Ref

WIST-K

2.12 Physical / Infrastructure constraints N/A 2.13 Impact on internationally protected Sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar) N/A N/A 2.14 Impact on Nationally protected sites (SSSI and Ancient Woodland) 2.15 Impact on Local or Regional Wildlife Site N/A 2.16 Impact Protected Species N/A 2.17 Impact on Priority Habitat or habitats suitable for Protected Species N/A 2.18 Overall Ecology Risk Rating N/A 2.19 Heritage Assets N/A 2.20 Strategic Countryside Gaps N/A 2.21 Landscape Capacity N/A 2.22 Physical Point of Access N/A 2.23 Amenity Impact N/A 2.24 Groundwater N/A 2.25 Contamination N/A

Site Ref

WIST-K

# **PLAN Selby Site Assessments** Site Ref WIST-K 2.26 Mineral Resource N/A N/A 2.27 Provision of Open Space N/A 2.28 Core Strategy Housing Requirement N/A 3.1 Availability considerations and impact of active use 3.2 Site viability and abnormal costs 3.3 Overall Deliverability 3.3 Overall Deliverability Notes Residential - Failed Initial Sift Site Type Assessment Summary Failed Initial Sift: Residential site not within or adjacent to a settlement designated in Core Strategy policy SP2 as a Principal Town, Local Service Centre or Designated Service Village.