

RYEDALE
DISTRICT
COUNCIL



Publication Helmsley Plan

Sustainability Appraisal Report

January 2014

Helmsley Plan
Sustainability Appraisal Report

Contents

	Page
1. Non-Technical Summary	1
2. Background	5
3. Appraisal Methodology	6
4. Baseline Information	9
5. Sustainability Appraisal Framework	11
6. Assessment	13
7. Implementation and Monitoring	29

Appendices

1. Summary of Requirements of SEA Directive	30
2. Previous Sustainability Appraisals	32
3. Appraisal of Plan Objectives against Sustainability Objectives	52
4. Assessment of Policies in Publication Plan (prior to mitigation)	53
5. 'Final' Assessment of Policies in Publication Plan (with mitigation applied)	55
6. 'Final' Assessment of Sites	57

Helmsley Plan
Sustainability Appraisal Report

1. Non-Technical Summary

Introduction

1.1 Sustainability Appraisal of plans is a requirement of the planning system set out in the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Strategic Environmental Assessment is also required under the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004. Government guidance suggests that Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment can be carried out jointly and this is the approach the Authority has taken to appraising the Helmsley Plan.

1.2 The Helmsley Plan is being produced jointly by the North York Moors National Park Authority and Ryedale District Council. The purpose of the Plan is to set a planning framework for the future of the town, in particular to identify land to meet future housing and employment requirements.

Scoping Stage

1.3 The Scoping Report, which sets out the methodology for Sustainability Appraisal, was published for consultation in January 2012 and set out the context for the Sustainability Appraisal. Through an analysis of data and trends (the baseline) and the objectives of other relevant plans and programmes, the following sustainability issues were identified:

- Ensuring that the natural environment and landscape is conserved and enhanced;
- Ensuring that the built and historic environment is conserved and enhanced;
- There is a need to reduce the causes of climate change and to ensure measures are in place to adapt to its effects;
- The use of resources (particularly non-renewable resources) should be minimised;
- The production of waste should be minimised, and waste should be re-used or recycled;
- Opportunities for reducing use of the private car should be taken;
- Housing which is affordable and to meet local needs should be provided;
- People should be able to access services and facilities, including health, education and recreation facilities;
- Measures should be in place to support the growth of the local economy;
- Employment opportunities should match local needs for employment.

1.4 The Scoping Report put forward an appraisal framework, comprising of Sustainability Objectives, to be used to 'test' the sustainability of the Helmsley Plan. The framework agreed through consultation contains 21 sustainability objectives grouped according to their social, environmental or economic influence as follows:

Social Objectives

- A1 To ensure that all groups of the population have access to health, education, leisure, green infrastructure and recreation services that are required
- A2 To provide the opportunity for all people to meet their housing needs
- A3 To improve overall levels of health and reduce the disparities between different groups and different areas.
- A4 To maintain and promote the distinctiveness of identifiable communities
- A5 To reduce crime and the fear of crime
- A6 To develop a more balanced population

Economic Objectives

- B1 To maintain and enhance employment opportunities
- B2 To maintain and enhance the vitality of the countryside, villages and town centres
- B3 To retain and enhance the factors which are conducive to wealth creation, including personal creativity and attractiveness to investors
- B4 To diversify the local economy

Environmental Objectives

- C1 To protect and enhance biodiversity and geo-diversity.
- C2 To maintain and enhance the quality and character of the landscape, including the special qualities of remoteness and tranquillity
- C3 Reduce long distance commuting and congestion by reducing the need to travel.
- C4 To ensure future development is resilient to climate change such as development is not vulnerable to flooding, or will increase the risk of flooding elsewhere
- C5 To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historical and cultural environment
- C6 To reduce the emission of greenhouse gases
- C7 To encourage the use of renewable resources and the development of renewable energy sources within Ryedale
- C8 To make the most efficient use of land
- C9 To maintain a high quality environment in terms of air, soil and water quality
- C10 Ensure that fossil fuel and water consumption is as low as possible, protect productive soils and maintain the stock of minerals
- C11 To reduce the amount of waste produced and maximise the rates of re-use and recycling as locally as possible

- 1.5 **It must be noted that the Sustainability Appraisal does not consider the principle of 150 new houses and new employment development in Helmsley as this has already been considered through the Sustainability Appraisal of the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy.** The Sustainability Appraisal considers how the Plan takes forward the requirement to provide 150 houses and land for employment development in Helmsley.

Site Selection

- 1.6 Ryedale District Council's Site Selection Methodology has been used to assess the sites put forward for consideration for allocation. This has led to the selection of 5 residential and 2 employment land sites for development, to

meet the required amount of development for the town. Along with sites that were discounted due to their small size, two sites put forward for residential development were discounted due to their potential impact on the landscape and historic assets.

Assessment of Draft Helmsley Plan

1.7 A Sustainability Appraisal was undertaken in relation to the draft Helmsley Plan including site allocations in June 2013. The key significant effects of the draft Plan were assessed as being:

- Positive effects on sustainability objectives which aim to support the economy;
- Positive effects on sustainability objectives which aim to meet housing needs;
- Possible negative visual effects on the built environment and landscape from policies which promote renewable energy;
- Positive effects on the community through the protection of community and retail uses; and
- Uncertain effects from new development on the design of the built environment.

1.8 The following mitigation measures were recommended as a means of addressing the significant effects as well as addressing some more minor effects that were revealed through the assessment:

- The Development Briefs for each site set out design principles specific to each site. In conjunction with this, it should be made clear in the Plan that relevant policies of the North York Moors Core Strategy and the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy will also be considered in relation to planning applications. This will include policies relating to design of new development.
- Add to Policy H9 that in meeting BREEAM and Code for Sustainable Homes requirements consideration should be given to impact upon landscape and townscape.
- Include an explanation in the Plan that relevant policies of the North York Moors Core Strategy and Development Policies and Ryedale Local Plan Strategy will still form part of the Development Plan and be relevant when determining applications for development in Helmsley.
- It is recommended that an addition is made to the supporting text to Policy H6 which requires the provision of small scale recycling facilities alongside new retail uses where suitable to the use and where space allows.
- It was identified that, whilst the delivery of Green Infrastructure will have a range of positive effects, this will need to be carefully designed to ensure it does not result in crime-related problems. It is recommended that an addition is made to the supporting text of Policy H10 which requires Secured by Design principles to be followed in designing Green Infrastructure.
- It was identified that effect on air quality may arise from the development of employment uses. The Development Briefs could usefully include reference to the need for employment proposals to consider impacts on

air quality and amenity of surrounding uses. The relevant policies of the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy will still form part of the Development Plan and be relevant when determining applications for development in Helmsley, including policies on effects on air quality. This should be explained in the Plan.

- 1.9 The mitigation measures identified have all been incorporated in producing the Publication version of the Plan.

Publication Plan

- 1.10 A number of changes have been made to the Plan following consultation on the Draft Plan and these have been subjected to Sustainability Appraisal where they may have implications for decision taking. As a result of this assessment, further mitigation measures have been identified and incorporated within the Publication version of the Plan.

- 1.11 It is considered that residual effects of the Plan itself are minor (bearing in mind the Plan has not been assessing the principle of new housing and employment development in Helmsley) and can be managed through careful design taking into account the requirements of the Development Briefs alongside the policies contained in the North York Moors Core Strategy and Development Policies and Ryedale Local Plan Strategy.

Implementation and Monitoring

- 1.12 The Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive requires significant environmental effects of implementing the Plan to be monitored to allow for unforeseen effects to be identified at an early stage and mitigation measures to be implemented. Although no significant effects remain following the application of the mitigation measures, it is considered sensible to monitor the delivery of the Plan to ensure that the mitigation measures are being achieved. These will act alongside the indicators in the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy and the North York Moors Core Strategy and Development Policies which monitor the effects of development in these areas more generally and other indicators in the Helmsley Plan which will monitor the delivery of the Plan.

2. Background

What is Sustainability Appraisal & Strategic Environmental Assessment?

- 2.1 Sustainability Appraisal is a process of appraising the social, environmental and economic implications of all emerging strategies, policies and plans to ensure that decisions are made in accordance with the principle of sustainable development. In addition the requirements of European Union Directive 2001/42/EC must be complied with. This Directive requires a formal Strategic Environmental Assessment of all plans and programmes which are likely to have a significant effect on the environment.
- 2.2 Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment are required to be undertaken in conjunction with the preparation of Development Plan Documents to ensure that the environmental, social and economic issues are fully integrated into emerging policies and strategies prior to their formal adoption.

Compliance with the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive / Regulations

- 2.3 Government guidance on carrying out Sustainability Appraisals indicates that the report must show how the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive's requirements have been met. This should be done by indicating where the information required by the Directive is provided in the report. Appendix 1 summarises the Directive's requirements and shows where these have been dealt with in this report or at other stages of the Sustainability Appraisal process.

Helmsley Plan

- 2.4 The Ryedale Local Plan Strategy, which was adopted by Ryedale District Council in September 2013, establishes a level of house building across the district of 200 units per annum in order to deliver at least 3,000 (net) new homes over the period 2012 to 2027. The Ryedale Local Plan Strategy proposes that 5% of the total new dwellings in Ryedale should be located in Helmsley which amounts to 150 units over a 15 year period.
- 2.5 Although there is no housing requirement for the North York Moors National Park it was considered to be a logical approach to look at the town as a whole for the purposes of allocating housing and employment land to meet Ryedale's requirements as set out above. A commitment to produce a joint Plan for Helmsley has been established via the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy and via the North York Moors Core Strategy and Development Policies.
- 2.6 The Helmsley Plan is proposing to allocate land which can provide more than 150 dwellings in order to ensure that the required level is delivered.

3. Appraisal Methodology

3.1 Whilst the requirements to undertake Strategic Environmental Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal are distinct there is a level of compatibility, and it is therefore possible to satisfy both through a single appraisal process. Therefore a combined Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment framework has been developed. In doing so it is intended that this will optimise and use collated information to satisfy all appraisal requirements, ensure consistency between objectives, maximise synergies through integrated assessment, facilitate transparency in decision making through analysis techniques that generate comparable findings, and assert a consistent level of rigour throughout the appraisal process. The key requirements of the combined appraisal framework are;

- Collection and presentation of baseline information;
- Prediction of significant environmental, social and economic effects of the plan and addressing them during its preparation;
- Identifying reasonable plan options and their effects which fully consider sustainable development;
- Involving the public and Authorities with social, environmental and economic responsibilities as part of the assessment process; and
- Monitoring the actual effects of the plan during its implementation.


3.2 Appendix 1 gives a fuller summary of the requirements of the SEA Directive. The following guidance has been referred to in carrying out the Sustainability Appraisal:


- A Practical Guide to the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive (ODPM 2005)
- Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents (ODPM 2005) – informed production of Scoping Report but has now been superseded by the PAS guidance.
- Sustainability Appraisal Advice Note (Planning Advisory Service 2010)
- Local Development Frameworks Guidance on Options Generation and Appraisal (Planning Advisory Service 2009); and
- Successful Plan-Making – Advice for Practitioners (Local Government Association and Planning Advisory Service, 2013)

When the Sustainability Appraisal was carried out

3.3 The development of the Sustainability Appraisal was initiated from the outset of the work on the production of the Helmsley Plan, and has been undertaken as an integral element of the production of the document. Table 1 shows how Sustainability Appraisal is informing production of the Plan. Sustainability Appraisal has been undertaken by officers of both the North York Moors National Park Authority and Ryedale District Council.

Table 1 – Integration of Sustainability Appraisal





Scoping

3.4 The scoping stage is detailed in sections 4 and 5 of this report. The primary phase of work set out to establish an appraisal framework. This involved setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding on the scope and approach the Sustainability Appraisal would take. The Scoping Report proposed using the sustainability objectives established as part of the Sustainability Appraisal on Ryedale's Local Plan Strategy to enable the detailed criteria that Ryedale will use for other site specific assessments to also be used for appraising the Helmsley DPD. These were reviewed against the North York Moors National Park's Sustainability Objectives and found to be broadly compatible subject to a few minor amendments.

3.5 A Scoping Report was published for consultation in January 2012. The purpose of this report was to inform people of the progression of the appraisal framework and enable consultees the opportunity to inform the process early on. This enabled the Sustainability Appraisal framework to be developed with input from key stakeholders. The representations received have informed the final version of the Scoping Report which is available at www.northyorkmoors.org.uk.

Assessment

The framework established through the Scoping Report has been used to assess the objectives and policies of the Helmsley Plan as part of its production. The scope for assessing options as part of the Helmsley Plan is limited as decisions relating to the amount of housing to be developed and broadly the amount of employment land to be developed have already been taken as part of the production of the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy. Options have therefore been limited to consideration of potential sites to bring forward the levels of development set out in the Local Plan Strategy. As agreed through the Scoping stage, all sites put forward have been assessed using Ryedale District Council's Site Selection Methodology. A detailed account of the assessments that have been undertaken and the way in which they have informed the Plan is contained in Section 6 of this report.

Publication Helmsley Plan

- 3.7 This Sustainability Report relates to the Publication Helmsley Plan. The Sustainability Appraisal has been revisited to take account of any amendments made to the Plan between Draft and Publication stages. The main changes along with assessments of these is contained in Section 6 of this report.

4. Identifying Sustainability Issues

Links to other Strategies, Plans and Programmes and Sustainability Objectives

- 4.1 In fulfilling the requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive it is necessary to identify the relationship of the Helmsley Plan to other relevant plans and programmes. The Scoping Report provides a comprehensive listing of relevant plans and programmes so far identified although it remains under development and review, and has continued to evolve in light of the consultation feedback and as the Sustainability Appraisal process progresses.

Establishing the Baseline and Providing a Context

- 4.2 One of the key requirements of the Sustainability Appraisal is to predict and monitor the effects of implementing a plan. In order to do this effectively it is necessary to have an understanding of the baseline position. This forms an important starting point for ascertaining the current and likely future state of the plan area as well as helping to identify the sustainability issues that the Helmsley Plan will try to address.

- 4.3 The collection of baseline data has been closely linked with the development of the appraisal framework. The baseline information used to inform the context for the Sustainability Appraisal is included in the Scoping Report. Much of the baseline information available relates to Ryedale District as a whole, including the part within the North York Moors National Park. As much of the data relating to Ryedale District includes the part within the North York Moors National Park it was considered logical to use this data.

Summary of Key Social, Environmental and Economic Issues Arising from Baseline Information

- 4.4 The review of other relevant plans and programmes and the assessment of baseline information revealed the following key sustainability issues, which to varying degrees could be addressed via the Helmsley Plan:
- Ensuring that the natural environment and landscape is conserved and enhanced;
 - Ensuring that the built and historic environment is conserved and enhanced;
 - There is a need to reduce the causes of climate change and to ensure measures are in place to adapt to its effects;
 - The use of resources (particularly non-renewable resources) should be minimised;
 - The production of waste should be minimised, and waste should be re-used or recycled;
 - Opportunities for reducing use of the private car should be taken;
 - Housing which is affordable and to meet local needs should be provided;
 - People should be able to access services and facilities, including health, education and recreation facilities;

- Measures should be in place to support the growth of the local economy;
- Employment opportunities should match local needs for employment.

How social, environmental and economic problems were considered in developing the Plan

- 4.5 The development of the baseline undertaken early in the appraisal process was integral to understanding, as well as in many cases re-affirming understanding, of the issues relevant for the future of Helmsley.

5. Sustainability Appraisal Framework

Establishing the Sustainability Appraisal Framework

- 5.1 Central to the Sustainability Appraisal process, is the development of the appraisal framework. This provides the template for describing, analysing and comparing the sustainability implications of the Plan.
- 5.2 Set out below are the proposed sustainability objectives for the appraisal framework. Sustainability objectives were agreed as part of the Sustainability Appraisal of the North York Moors Core Strategy and Development Policies and Ryedale's Local Plan Strategy. As Ryedale District Council will be further developing their sustainability objectives to provide more detailed criteria for assessing potential housing and employment allocations it is considered appropriate to use Ryedale's objectives. These objectives have been reviewed against those agreed under the North York Moors Sustainability Appraisal and it is considered that they are compatible, in particular it is considered that the indicators provide adequate compatibility with National Park purposes. A few minor amendments have been made to ensure that indicators reflect the fact that part of Helmsley is within the National Park.

Sustainability Objectives

- 5.3 The sustainability objectives are designed purely for the purposes of the Sustainability Appraisal and are sufficiently distinct from the objectives of the Plan. The objectives were initially put forward as part of the Scoping Report and were subsequently revised to take account of the comments received. They are broadly segregated across the three facets (social, economic, environmental) of the appraisal criteria.

Social Objectives

- A1 To ensure that all groups of the population have access to health, education, leisure, green infrastructure and recreation services that are required
- A2 To provide the opportunity for all people to meet their housing needs
- A3 To improve overall levels of health and reduce the disparities between different groups and different areas.
- A4 To maintain and promote the distinctiveness of identifiable communities
- A5 To reduce crime and the fear of crime
- A6 To develop a more balanced population

Economic Objectives

- B1 To maintain and enhance employment opportunities
- B2 To maintain and enhance the vitality of the countryside, villages and town centres
- B3 To retain and enhance the factors which are conducive to wealth creation, including personal creativity and attractiveness to investors
- B4 To diversify the local economy

Environmental Objectives

- C1 To protect and enhance biodiversity and geo-diversity.
- C2 To maintain and enhance the quality and character of the landscape, including the special qualities of remoteness and tranquillity
- C3 Reduce long distance commuting and congestion by reducing the need to travel.

- C4 To ensure future development is resilient to climate change such as development is not vulnerable to flooding, or will increase the risk of flooding elsewhere
- C5 To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historical and cultural environment
- C6 To reduce the emission of greenhouse gases
- C7 To encourage the use of renewable resources and the development of renewable energy sources within Ryedale
- C8 To make the most efficient use of land
- C9 To maintain a high quality environment in terms of air, soil and water quality
- C10 Ensure that fossil fuel and water consumption is as low as possible, protect productive soils and maintain the stock of minerals
- C11 To reduce the amount of waste produced and maximise the rates of re-use and recycling as locally as possible

6. Assessment

6.1 This chapter details the continual process of Sustainability Appraisal from the outset of the production of the Helmsley Plan, as summarised in Figure 2 in Section 3.

Relevant Previous Sustainability Appraisals

6.2 Policy documents previously produced by the two Authorities have been subject to Sustainability Appraisal throughout their development and the conclusions of these in relation to Helmsley are summarised below. Full details of past Sustainability Appraisals relevant to the North York Moors Core Strategy are contained in Appendix 2 whilst the Sustainability Appraisal of the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy is available at http://extranet.ryedale.gov.uk/default.aspx?page=7158#Submission_Documents_and_Representations_Received.

North York Moors Core Strategy and Development Policies

6.3 The relevant policies of the North York Moors Core Strategy and Development Policies are Core Policy B, Core Policy H, Development Policy 10 and Core Policy J. These identify Helmsley as the only Local Service Centre in the Park and as the location where the widest range of development would take place. The Sustainability Appraisal of the Submission Core Strategy and Development Policies concluded that the approach taken towards Helmsley would be broadly in line with sustainability objectives provided that development does not have an adverse impact upon the historic environment.

Ryedale Local Plan Strategy

6.4 Sustainability Appraisal of Provision of Housing policy of the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy revealed that the proportion of housing allocated to Helmsley was the most sustainable in the fact that it best reflected the current roles of settlements in the District, would provide the most economic benefits and have least impact on the environment. However the SA did reveal potential negative effects in relation to the approach not being able to meet affordable housing needs in the Service Villages and uncertainties around flooding.

6.5 In relation to distribution of employment land, the SA revealed that option 2 (the selected option) would be more sustainable overall although uncertainties and possible negative impacts were identified in relation to impacts on biodiversity, flooding, conservation of the historic environment, impacts on air, soil and water quality and loss of good quality soils.

Assessments of the Helmsley Plan

6.6 The assessments of the Helmsley Plan have been undertaken using the framework set out in Section 5 above. The effects of have been assessed against this framework using the categories in the table below.

Category	Effect of Policy
✓ Positive impact	Policy is consistent with meeting the objective, either by having no negative impact or by positively influencing change in accordance with the objective.
✘ Negative impact	The policy will hinder achievement of this objective.
= Neutral impact	The policy will have a neither a positive nor a

	negative impact upon this objective
U Uncertain Impact	The policy may hinder achievement of this objective, but may have no negative impact. This will depend upon implementation.
O No direct link	There is no direct link between the nature of the policy and the nature of the objective.

6.7 As part of the assessment consideration was given to whether the effects on the objectives would be:

- Direct or indirect;
- Long term, short term, temporary or permanent;
- Local or wider in geographical extent.

It has not been possible to ascertain this in every circumstance. In particular it has been difficult to establish whether effects that wouldn't be permanent are likely to be long or short term as this will depend upon the exact nature of the development.

6.8 It is important to note whilst reading the assessments that the Sustainability Appraisal assesses each policy individually whilst planning applications will be considered against the Helmsley Plan as a whole, and also alongside other Local Plans produced by the two Authorities. For example a policy that on its own may lead to adverse affects would not be the only consideration in determining a planning application, and in this respect mitigation may be seen as through the consideration of other policies. In this respect, whilst impacts are dealt with at the policy and/or Helmsley Plan level where possible, it is not the aim of the Sustainability Appraisal to ensure that every policy scores positively against every Sustainability Objective, but to highlight impacts in order that mitigation can be identified. These mitigation measures may be through other policies or other documents.

6.9 It is also important to note that this Sustainability Appraisal only assesses the effects of the Helmsley Plan. Decisions which have been taken through the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy, namely the amount of housing and employment development to be provided in the town, are not being assessed again.

Assessment of Options

6.10 Strategic options in relation to development in both Ryedale District and in the North York Moors National Park have been assessed as part of the production of the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy and the North York Moors Core Strategy and Development Policies. The commitment to provide for 150 houses in Helmsley and Approx 1.85-2.25ha of employment land in Helmsley and Kirkbymoorside has already been established via the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy. It is therefore not appropriate to assess strategic options in relation to the level of new development in Helmsley.

6.11 Assessment of options in relation to the delivery of this level of development in Helmsley has therefore focused on assessment of different potential site allocations.

Assessment of potential sites

6.12 In 2009 Ryedale District Council asked developers to submit sites for development for new housing and employment as part of the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy. The call for sites led to 12 sites being submitted which were located in Helmsley. All these sites have been assessed using Ryedale's Site

Selection Methodology. The assessment involved 3 separate stages of consideration:-

- Stage 1 – an initial sift of sites which includes criteria in terms of size and significant constraints
- Stage 2 – this involves three levels of assessment, considering factors such as accessibility, social, economic and environmental considerations as well as the deliverability of the scheme.
- Stage 3 – represents the outcome of stages 1 and 2 to enable choices to be made on the results of the detailed assessment.

- 6.13 From the submitted sites, five fell below 0.3ha in size, which meant that they did not progress further than the initial sift of the Site Selection Methodology. Two of the submitted sites were subsequently divided to provide a split between residential and employment provision and were assessed through the Site Selection Methodology on this basis. A further site has now been built on.
- 6.14 A total of 9 sites have been assessed using the detailed criteria established in the Site Selection Methodology. The purpose of this assessment is to inform the selection of sites for inclusion in the Plan and determine which should not be included for allocation. Site NYMH1 has been split into two sites as there is clear evidence of medieval strip patterns to the north of the site and as the landscape is different separate assessments were considered necessary.
- 6.15 The assessment of sites was undertaken on a qualitative basis, and was undertaken by officers from both Ryedale District Council and the North York Moors National Park Authority. Much of the Site Selection Methodology, which has been developed by Ryedale District Council, relates to the Sustainability Objectives however it also covers some areas which extend beyond the scope of the Sustainability Appraisal, such as the delivery of sites. Reference to the Site Selection Methodology as part of the Sustainability Appraisal only relates to those parts which are relevant to the Sustainability Objectives. A Site Selection Methodology Assessment covering all of the criteria in the Site Selection Methodology is available as a separate document as part of the Publication stage.
- 6.16 As the Plan is only considering the allocation of sites in Helmsley, which is constrained geographically by the River Rye to the south and is a relatively small town, there are limited opportunities for locating new development. As the sites are also all located around the edges of Helmsley, they have scored the same in relation to a number of questions. A number of the criteria in the Site Selection Methodology relate to issues which cannot easily be assessed at the site allocation stage and some assumptions have had to be made in relation to the detailed design of the developments. The criteria against which two sites stood out as having particularly negative effects are in relation to landscape and the historic environment, as detailed below. Whilst parts of some of the sites are within flood risk areas, it is considered that as the extent of the flood risk covers only a small portion of the sites any risk can be avoided through the design process and is not of sufficient concern to warrant not allocating the sites.
- 6.17 The assessment concluded that two of the sites were considered less appropriate in principle for development. The assessment concluded that site NYMH2 would have an adverse impact on the Conservation Area, in particular the longer distance views of Helmsley Castle and All Saints Church

from the north of the town. Development of this site would also harm the landscape setting of the North York Moors National Park. The wider (more northern) area of Site NYMH1 would result in the loss of the last remaining strip patterns around Helmsley.

- 6.18 A number of the potential negative or uncertain effects identified for the sites which have been selected for allocation have helped in the identification of appropriate mitigation provided for in the Development Briefs, such as inclusion of the need for Sustainable Drainage Systems, the need for a buffer zone between employment and residential development and the need to retain important landscape features.
- 6.19 One change since the initial site assessment was carried out has been the proposed extension of Helmsley Conservation Area to include Elmslac Road (to the south of site NYMH3). In recognition of this a sentence has been added to the Development Brief for site NYMH3 which states 'The effect of the existing vista view into the open countryside along Elmslac Road should be retained through the design of the development.' This has been taken into account in revisiting the assessment of sites and it is considered that this measure will mitigate any effects.
- 6.20 Following the conclusions of the site assessment, and based upon the need for 150 houses in Helmsley and approx 1.85-2.25ha of employment land in Helmsley and Kirkbymoorside, the Plan identifies the following sites for allocation:

Housing sites:

- Part of Site NYMH1
- Site NYMH3
- Site NYMH8
- Site 174
- Site 183

Employment sites:

- EMP1
- EMP2

Assessment of the Draft Plan

- 6.21 Following the assessments undertaken upon potential areas of land for allocation, the Helmsley Plan was drafted. Sustainability Appraisal was undertaken on the Draft Plan and was published as part of the consultation in summer 2013. This Sustainability Appraisal included an assessment of the objectives and policies as contained in the Draft Helmsley Plan. The results of these assessments are contained in Appendices 6 and 7 and are summarised below.

Objectives

- 6.22 The objectives of the Draft Helmsley Plan were developed through consultation on the Discussion Document. It was necessary to appraise the objectives against the Sustainability Objectives to ensure that the Plan is broadly in line with sustainability objectives from the outset. The assessments of the Helmsley Plan objectives against Sustainability Objectives is contained in Appendix 4. This revealed:

- Uncertainties between plan objectives which seek to protect the environment of Helmsley and sustainability objectives which support the provision of housing and employment uses;
- Uncertainty between plan objectives which aim to provide additional housing and employment opportunities and sustainability objectives which aim to protect the natural environment, biodiversity, historic assets and landscape;
- Positive relationship between plan and sustainability objectives both supporting the provision of housing and employment opportunities;
- Positive relationship between plan and sustainability objectives which aim to protect the heritage and setting of Helmsley;
- Uncertain effects over the plan objective of increasing development in the town against the sustainability objective which aims to reduce the risk of flooding.

It was not recommended that the objectives be amended to reflect the results of the assessment as, when taken as a whole, it was considered that they are broadly consistent with the sustainability objectives. The uncertainties that arise are the same as the uncertainties which arise when the sustainability objectives are considered against each other (see Scoping Report) which suggests that the Plan objectives are along similar lines to the sustainability objectives.

Policies

- 6.23 Each draft policy in the Draft Helmsley Plan was appraised against the Sustainability Objectives in order to identify potential impacts and highlight any significant effects and ensure that mitigation measures are incorporated where there are potential adverse impacts.
- 6.24 The results of the assessment of policies is contained in Appendix 5. Separate detailed appraisal tables were prepared for each policy and these are available as a separate Annex to this Sustainability Report.
- 6.25 The assessment of the policies did not include assessment of the sites themselves. This was undertaken separately using the Site Selection Methodology as detailed above.
- 6.26 The sustainability impacts of the assessment of the policies in the Draft Helmsley Plan could be summarised as:
- Positive effects on sustainability objectives which aim to support the economy;
 - Positive effects on sustainability objectives which aim to meet housing needs;
 - Possible negative visual effects on the built environment and landscape from policies which promote renewable energy;
 - Positive effects on the community through the protection of community and retail uses

Cumulative Impacts of the Draft Plan

- 6.27 A more detailed assessment of the cumulative impacts was necessary to identify where the main adverse effects could arise to enable these to be addressed and monitored. This is provided in Table 1 below and focuses on the overall effects upon each of the objectives as reported in the Draft Plan Sustainability Appraisal Report and accompanying Annexes. For the

purposes of this table the term cumulative effects also includes any synergistic effects (effects where the overall effect is greater than the sum of the individual effects).

Table 1 – Cumulative effects at Draft Plan stage

Sustainability Objective	Cumulative Effects
A1. To ensure that all groups of the population have access to health, education, leisure, green infrastructure and recreation services that are required	The policies in the Plan will cumulatively have positive effects on this objective
A2. To provide the opportunity for all people to meet their housing needs	The policies in the Plan will cumulatively have positive effects on this objective
A3. To improve overall levels of health and reduce the disparities between different groups and different areas.	The policies in the Plan will cumulatively have positive effects on this objective
A4. To maintain and promote the distinctiveness of identifiable communities	The policies in the Plan will cumulatively have positive effects on this objective
A5. To reduce crime and the fear of crime	The policies in the Plan will cumulatively have positive effects on this objective
A6. To develop a more balanced population	The policies in the Plan will cumulatively have positive effects on this objective
B1. To maintain and enhance employment opportunities	The policies in the Plan will cumulatively have positive effects on this objective
B2. To maintain and enhance the vitality of the countryside, villages and town centres	The policies in the Plan will cumulatively have positive effects on this objective
B3. To retain and enhance the factors which are conducive to wealth creation, including personal creativity and attractiveness to investors	The policies in the Plan will cumulatively have positive effects on this objective
B4. To diversify the local economy	The policies in the Plan will cumulatively have positive effects on this objective
C1. To protect and enhance biodiversity and geo-diversity.	The policies in the Plan will cumulatively have no negative effects on this objective
C2. To maintain and enhance the quality and character of the landscape, including the special qualities of remoteness and tranquillity	The Plan as a whole may have effects on the landscape.
C3. Reduce long distance commuting and congestion by reducing the need to travel.	The policies in the Plan will cumulatively have no negative effects on this objective
C4. To ensure future development is resilient to climate change such as development is not	The Plan will largely have no negative effects on this objective, and positive effects may result from Green Infrastructure and Developer Contributions

vulnerable to flooding, or will increase the risk of flooding elsewhere	
C5. To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historical and cultural environment	The policies in the Plan will cumulatively have no negative effects on this objective
C6. To reduce the emission of greenhouse gases	The policies in the Plan will cumulatively have positive effects on this objective
C7. To encourage the use of renewable resources and the development of renewable energy sources within Ryedale	The policies in the Plan will cumulatively have positive effects on this objective
C8. To make the most efficient use of land	The Plan will not have positive effects on this objective, but there are no suitable brownfield sites on which to meet the housing requirement
C9. To maintain a high quality environment in terms of air, soil and water quality	The policies in the Plan will have uncertain effects on this objective
C10. Ensure that fossil fuel and water consumption is as low as possible, protect productive soils and maintain the stock of minerals	The Plan will not have positive effects on this objective, but there are no suitable brownfield sites on which to meet the housing requirement
C11. To reduce the amount of waste produced and maximise the rates of re-use and recycling as locally as possible	The policies in the Plan will cumulatively have positive effects on this objective

Significant Effects

- 6.28 As well as the identification of the likely effects, the assessment must also identify the *significant* effects. Each effect was assessed qualitatively on an individual basis, for example the fact that an effect is permanent will not always mean it is significant.
- 6.29 The following potential effects of the Draft Helmsley Plan were judged to be significant:
- Positive effects on sustainability objectives which aim to support the economy;
 - Positive effects on sustainability objectives which aim to meet housing needs;
 - Positive effects on the community through the protection of community and retail uses;
 - Possible negative visual effects on the built environment and landscape from development of housing and employment uses;
 - Possible negative visual effects on the built environment and landscape from policies which promote renewable energy;
 - Uncertain effects from new development on the design of the built environment.

Proposed Mitigation Measures

6.30 The SA must examine possible mitigation measures to address the potential significant effects. Mitigation in this sense can also mean avoidance of these adverse effects. Mitigation measures can also relate to the other plans which will be taken into account when determining planning applications in Helmsley. In relation to the policies, the detailed assessment tables for each policy contain more information on mitigation measures for each identified adverse effect. The mitigation measures proposed by the Sustainability Appraisal of the Draft Helmsley Plan are set out in Table 2 below.

Table 2 – Proposed Mitigation Measures of Draft Helmsley Plan

Sustainability Objective	Significant Effect	Proposed Mitigation
C2, C5	Visual impact of new development on the built environment and landscape	The Development Briefs for each site set out design principles specific to each site. In conjunction with this, it should be made clear in the Plan that relevant policies of the North York Moors Core Strategy and the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy will also be considered in relation to planning applications. This will include policies relating to design of new development.
C2, C5	Visual impact of renewable energy on the landscape and built environment	Add to Policy H9 that in meeting BREEAM and Code for Sustainable Homes requirements consideration should be given to impact upon landscape and townscape.
		Include an explanation in the Plan that relevant policies of the North York Moors Core Strategy and Development Policies and Ryedale Local Plan Strategy will still form part of the Development Plan and be relevant when determining applications for development in Helmsley.

Other recommendations

6.31 Whilst the recommendations above related to mitigating the potential significant effects, other recommendations relating to less significant issues or to opportunities were also identified through the assessment:

- It is recommended that an addition is made to the supporting text to Policy H6 which requires the provision of small scale recycling facilities alongside new retail uses where suitable to the use and where space allows.
- It was identified that, whilst the delivery of Green Infrastructure will have a range of positive effects, this will need to be carefully designed to ensure it does not result in crime-related problems. It is recommended that an addition is made to the supporting text of Policy H10 which requires

Secured by Design principles to be followed in designing Green Infrastructure.

- It was identified that effect on air quality may arise from the development of employment uses. The Development Briefs could usefully include reference to the need for employment proposals to consider impacts on air quality and amenity of surrounding uses. The relevant policies of the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy will still form part of the Development Plan and be relevant when determining applications for development in Helmsley, including policies on effects on air quality. This should be explained in the Plan.

Publication Helmsley Plan

- 6.32 A number of amendments were made to the Helmsley Plan between Draft and Publication stages. These amendments have come about mostly as a result of responses received to the Draft Plan and also in relation to the mitigation measures identified through the Sustainability Appraisal and the Habitats Regulations Assessment of the Draft Plan. All of the mitigation measures recommended in the Sustainability Report of the Draft Plan have been taken on board (as listed in paragraphs 6.30 and 6.31 of this report).
- 6.33 It is necessary to revisit the SA to ensure that any new significant effects are identified, and addressed where necessary. Table 3 below shows the main changes arising and the significance of these for Sustainability Appraisal¹. Where new assessments or revisions to assessments have been necessary the details of the detail of these is contained in the Annex to this Report. In assessing whether amendments should be subject to SA consideration has been given to whether they are likely to make a difference in the consideration of a planning application.

¹ Please note that some of the policy numbers have changed between Draft and Publication stages due to the insertion of new policies.

Table 3 – Main changes arising between Draft and Publication stages

Amendment	Implications for SA	Conclusions of Assessment (incl. significant effects)	Recommended Mitigation
Addition of reference to the fact that decisions taken on proposals in Helmsley will need to accord with other relevant adopted policies, namely those in the North York Moors Core Strategy and Development Policies and the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy.	Recommended mitigation measure in SA of Draft Plan.	Provides additional protection (through clarification) over and above that provided in the Helmsley Plan. Positive effects have been recorded particularly in relation to Policy H10 Renewable Energy.	No further mitigation necessary
Inclusion of Policy SD1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	Policy must be subject to SA	Assessment is summarised in Appendix ? and detailed in Annex ?. This shows no likely effects in the short to medium term but possible uncertain effects in the longer term.	No mitigation measures are proposed as inclusion of the presumption in favour of sustainable development is a requirement of national policy. Without the policy it is unlikely that the Plan would be found 'sound'.
Amendments to Policy H1 New Residential Development relating to phasing of housing development	Possible relevance to the SA and site assessments. Considered against SA framework and Site Selection Methodology but no implications for the conclusions of these assessments.	n/a	n/a
Updated supporting text to Policy H1	Contextual only – no significance for SA	n/a	n/a
Amendments to Policy H2 Windfall Development to include reference to the need	Amendments must be subject to SA	Revised assessment reveals stronger positive effects against sustainability objectives A1 and C2.	n/a

Amendment	Implications for SA	Conclusions of Assessment (incl. significant effects)	Recommended Mitigation
for development to preserve other important open spaces.			
Amendment to Policy H3 Affordable Housing Provision to include requirement for financial contribution.	Amendments must be subject to SA	Revised assessment reveals stronger positive effects against sustainability objective A2.	n/a
Updates to supporting text to H3 to reflect amendment above	Contextual only – no significance for SA	n/a	n/a
Amendment to Policy H4 Employment Land to protect existing employment uses and support live work units.	Amendments must be subject to SA	Revised assessment reveals positive effects against sustainability objectives A2 and B1.	n/a
Updates to supporting text to H4 to reflect amendment above	Contextual only – no significance for SA	n/a	n/a
Amendments to Policy H5 Retail to provide tighter policy on directing retail uses to the town centre.	Amendments must be subject to SA	Revised assessment reveals positive effects in relation to sustainability objective B2.	n/a
Amendment to supporting text to H5 to require facilities for recycling where possible	Recommended mitigation measure in SA of Draft Plan.	Revised assessment reveals positive effects in relation to sustainability objective C11.	No further mitigation necessary.
Addition of supporting text to Policy H6	Contextual and procedural only – no significance for SA	n/a	n/a
Amendment to Policy H7 to include potential for alternative replacement facilities to be provided	Amendments must be subject to SA	Revised assessment reveals uncertain effects through the development of replacement facilities. Effects could be significant, depending on the nature, scale and location of any replacement facilities.	Mitigation recommended to state that any replacement facilities would need to accord with policies in the Helmsley Plan and in other relevant adopted Plans.

Amendment	Implications for SA	Conclusions of Assessment (incl. significant effects)	Recommended Mitigation
Amendment to Policy H8 to require consideration to be given to the long distance views of the town	Amendments must be subject to SA	Revised assessment reveals greater positive effects under sustainability objective C2.	n/a
Amendments to the supporting text of Policy H8	Contextual only – no significance for SA	n/a	n/a
Addition of new Policy H9 Design and accompanying supporting text	New policy must be subject to SA	Assessment reveals that positive effects are likely against sustainability objectives A3, B3, C2 and C5, although uncertain effects against A5 and C11. Effects could become significant cumulatively, for example if every new development had insufficient storage space for bins or created large areas which were conducive to crime.	Mitigation recommended to include a requirement, in the supporting text, for adequate provision for refuse and recycling receptacles and a requirement to consider the implications of the design of any new scheme in relation to crime.
Amendment to Policy H10 to require any sustainable building standards to be applied in a way which does not harm the visual character or historic buildings of Helmsley or the special qualities of the National Park.	Recommended mitigation measure in SA of Draft Plan.	Revised assessment reveals positive effects in relation to sustainability objectives C2 and C5.	No further mitigation necessary.
Amendment to Policy H10 to include policy against which proposals for renewable energy would be assessed.	Amendments must be subject to SA	Assessment reveals positive effects against most sustainability objectives with the exception of C1 due to potential impacts on biodiversity from renewable energy	It is recommended that a requirement for development under this policy to also ensure no harm to biodiversity.

Amendment	Implications for SA	Conclusions of Assessment (incl. significant effects)	Recommended Mitigation
		developments.	
Addition of reference in the supporting text to H11 Green Infrastructure to the need to ensure consideration is given to implications for crime.	Recommended mitigation measure in SA of Draft Plan. (Note – mitigation measure suggested Secured by Design be referred to but it is considered these standards may not always be appropriate in sensitive locations such as the National Park).	Revised assessment reveals a positive effect against sustainability objective A5.	No further mitigation necessary.
More details of infrastructure needed included in Policy H12 Developer Contributions and more detail on Community Infrastructure Levy included.	Amendments must be subject to SA	Whilst no changes have been made to the conclusions of the assessment, it is considered that the Plan should acknowledge that some of the infrastructure listed would need planning permission and would need to be considered against adopted policies.	It is recommended that a sentence be included in the supporting text to H12 which states that some of the infrastructure listed will require planning permission and would be considered against the relevant adopted policies.
Addition of new Policy H13 Open Space Requirements	New policy must be subject to SA	The assessment revealed uncertainties relating to sustainability objectives C1, C2, C5 and C9 in terms of the visual and environmental impact of sports and community facilities. In addition, effects were revealed under objective C4 due to the potential for areas of hard surfacing to be created which may exacerbate run-off in times of heavy rainfall.	It is recommended that this be mitigated through the inclusion of a sentence in the supporting text which states that the open space or facility to be provided should be designed in accordance with other relevant adopted policies of the relevant authority.
Addition of Policy H14	New policy must be subject to	The assessment has revealed a	It is recommended that the final

Amendment	Implications for SA	Conclusions of Assessment (incl. significant effects)	Recommended Mitigation
Telecommunications Installations	SA	number of positive effects however negative effects have been identified in relation to the impact on landscapes other than the National Park and on the historic environment other than the Conservation Area.	part instead states that effects on the landscape should be minimised and that in particular effects on the landscape of the National Park and its setting should be avoided and that impacts on the historic environment, and in particular the Conservation Area, should be minimised.
Development Brief for Site NYMH1 – Inclusion of requirement to retain the remnants of the orchard and inclusion of ‘buffer’ area in the eastern part of the site.	Amendments to be assessed against Site Selection Methodology.	Reference to these has been included but does not alter the scoring.	No mitigation necessary
Development Brief for Site NYMH3 – Inclusion of reference to the need to retain the vista north of Elmslac Road.	Amendments to be assessed against Site Selection Methodology.	Whilst there would potentially be impacts in relation to the proposed extension to Helmsley Conservation Area the developers have mitigated these through the design of the scheme.	No mitigation necessary
Development Brief for Site 183 – Inclusion of reference to three round barrows (Scheduled Monuments) 130m east of the site and requirement for development to not harm these or their setting.	This was previously identified in the site assessment therefore no revision needed	n/a	n/a
Site EMP1 – Area expanded to	Amendments to be assessed	The inclusion of the buffer between	No further mitigation necessary.

Amendment	Implications for SA	Conclusions of Assessment (incl. significant effects)	Recommended Mitigation
include an additional 0.2ha to the north and north west plus inclusion of a buffer zone between EMP1 and site 183.	against Site Selection Methodology.	EMP1 and 183 and the EMP1 and the existing Storey Close to the north will have positive effects in relation to ensuring the development does not cause nuisance to neighbours.	
Development Brief for Sites EMP 1 and EMP2 – Addition of reference for the need for all proposals to meet Environment Agency emissions requirements	Recommended mitigation measure in SA of Draft Plan.	Following the amendments it is considered that effects have been mitigated as far as is possible in the Plan.	No further mitigation necessary.
All sites – addition of requirements to use Sustainable Drainage Systems (requirement for Habitats Regulations Assessment to be undertaken where this is not possible)	Amendments to be assessed against Site Selection Methodology.	Reference to the requirement has been recorded but this does not alter the scoring.	n/a

- 6.33 As detailed in Table 3 above, all mitigation measures identified in the Sustainability Appraisal Report of the Draft Helmsley Plan have been incorporated in the Publication version and therefore no residual effects remain which could be realistically addressed through the Plan.
- 6.34 The revisited Sustainability Appraisal has however identified a number of 'new' effects brought about by the amendments to the Plan as a result of the consultation process. The assessment of the policies of the Publication Plan prior to mitigation is contained in Annex 1 to this report and summarised in Appendix 4. Mitigation measures to address uncertain and negative effects have been identified where possible, as set out in Table 3.
- 6.35 As the Publication version of the Plan is intended to be the Plan which the Authority(s) consider to be 'sound' it is logical to incorporate these mitigation measures into the Publication version of the Plan. These measures have therefore been incorporated into the Plan and the actual effects of the Publication version should be considered to be those once mitigation measures have been applied. The revisited assessments of the policies, in Annex 1, indicates what the 'score' would be should the mitigation measures be applied. This 'final' assessment is summarised in Appendix 5.
- 6.36 The assessment of the sites has been revisited in relation to the expansion of EMP1. The 'final' assessment of the sites is contained in Appendix 6 with details contained in Annex 1 – Assessment of Sites².
- 6.37 The assessment has not considered the effects of the principle of 150 new houses and additional employment land in Helmsley as this has been set by the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy. Therefore, having applied the mitigation measures, it is therefore concluded that no significant effects remain that could realistically be addressed at the Plan level.

² Note that amendments have also been made to the detailed assessment of sites between Draft and Publication stages to clarify some of the scorings.

7. Implementation and Monitoring

- 7.1 The SEA Directive requires significant environmental effects of implementing the Plan to be monitored in order to identify unforeseen adverse effects and be able to undertake remedial action. It is considered that residual effects of the Plan itself are minor (bearing in mind the Plan has not been assessing the principle of new housing and employment development in Helmsley) and can be managed through careful design taking into account the requirements of the Development Briefs alongside the policies contained in the North York Moors Core Strategy and Development Policies and Ryedale Local Plan Strategy.
- 7.2 In order to monitor that this is happening, it is proposed that the two indicators below are incorporated within the monitoring framework for the Helmsley Plan:
- Number of new developments in Helmsley undertaken in line with the requirements of the Development Brief (target of 100%);
 - Number of new developments in Helmsley incorporating Sustainable Drainage Systems (target of 100%)

Although the second indicator would be picked up under the first, as Sustainable Drainage Systems are a requirement of the Development Briefs, it is considered necessary to show this separately due to the significance of potential effects from flooding to people, properties and species in the River Derwent.

Appendix 1 – Summary of Requirements of SEA Directive

SEA Requirements	Reported in...
Where an environmental assessment is required an environmental report shall be prepared in which the likely significant effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme, and reasonable alternatives taking into account the objectives and the geographical scope of the plan or programme, are identified, described and evaluated. The information to be given is:	
a. An outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan or programme and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes;	Scoping Report / Sustainability Reports
b. The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme;	Scoping Report (summarised in Sustainability Reports)
c. The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected;	Scoping Report (summarised in Sustainability Reports)
d. Any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan or programme including, in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance, such as areas designated pursuant to Directives 79/409/EEC and 92/43/EEC;	Scoping Report (summarised in Sustainability Reports)
e. The environmental protection objectives, established at international, Community or Member State level, which are relevant to the plan or programme and the way those objectives and any environmental considerations have been taken into account during its preparation;	Scoping Report / Sustainability Reports
f. The likely significant effects (1) on the environment, including on issues such as biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors;	Sustainability Reports
g. The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme.	Sustainability Reports
h. An outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with, and a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties (such as technical deficiencies or lack of know-how) encountered in compiling the required information;	Sustainability Reports
j. A description of the measures envisaged concerning monitoring in accordance with Article 10.	Finalised in Publication Sustainability Report
k. A non-technical summary of the information provided under the above headings.	In relevant reports as above
The report shall include the information that may reasonably be required taking into account current knowledge and methods of assessment, the contents and level of detail in the plan or programme, its stage in the	

decision making process and the extent to which certain matters are more appropriately assessed at different levels in that process to avoid duplication of the assessment.	
---	--

Consultation Requirements

- Authorities with specific environmental responsibilities; shall be consulted when deciding on the scope and level of detail of information which must be included in the environmental report (Article 5.4);
- Authorities with environmental responsibility and the public shall be given an early and effective opportunity within appropriate time frames to express their opinion on the draft plan or programme and accompanying environmental report before adoption of the plan or programme or its submission to the legislative procedure. (Article 6.2)
- Other Member states, where implementation of the Plan is likely to have significant effects on the environment in another Member State (Article 7)

Provision of information on decision

When a plan or programme is adopted the Authorities with environmental responsibilities and the public are informed and the following items [shall be] made available to those so informed;

- a) The plan or programme as adopted;
- b) A statement summarising how environmental considerations have been integrated into the plan or programme... including reasons for choosing the plan or programme....or programme as adopted, in light of other reasonable alternatives dealt with...and
- c) The measures decided concerning monitoring (Article 9 (1)).

Monitoring the significant environmental effects of the plans implementation (Article 10).

Appendix 2 – Information from Previous Sustainability Appraisals

Ryedale Local Plan Strategy

The full Sustainability Appraisal reports relating to the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy are available at

http://extranet.ryedale.gov.uk/default.aspx?page=7158#Submission_Documents_and_Representations_Received.

Extract from Local Plan Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report (May 2012)

Assessment of the Spatial Options

7.6 The appraisal of these four options is provided in Appendix 2. It sets out how the options were scored against each of the sustainability objectives and the justification for the scores. Each option has been appraised on the basis of whether it would have a positive, neutral or negative effect on the sustainability objectives. For the revised Sustainability Appraisal for the revised Core Strategy / Strategic Policy document, the summary scores for the four Options are as set out below in Figure 11:

Figure 11: Sustainability Appraisal Assessment Scores for the Four Spatial Options

	++	+	=	-	--	U	O
Option 1: Dispersed Development across all settlements in Ryedale	0	1	0	14	4	1	1
Option 2: Concentrate new housing at the Market Towns and provide for local housing needs in the villages	9	8	0	1	0	2	1
Option 3: Concentrate new housing at the Market Towns and Key “Service Villages”	4	14	0	1	0	1	1
Option 4: As Option 3 but with “Rural Ryedale Community Housing Sites” being delivered in Local Service Villages	4	12	1	1	0	2	1

7.7 The results of the SA appraisal show that Option 1 scores significantly worse than the other three options with respect to all of the sustainability objectives particularly the **environmental and economic objectives** where it mainly scores negatively. For objectives A5 and C4 all options have No direct link and Uncertain effects respectively. The only positive effect of this option is for the **social objectives** (objective A4) with respect to maintaining and promoting the distinctiveness of identifiable communities as this option may help to ensure that the character of any particular settlement does not change significantly due to the spread of housing delivery, but this will depend upon the quantity of housing to be delivered. The incremental development of all settlements may help to maintain the distinctiveness of more local

- communities because growth will be spread across the district, but it will also continue to support in-migration of the elderly into the smaller villages. With respect to the **economic objectives**, this option may not deliver sufficient development opportunities to support local services and maintain the vitality of villages. This option is particularly weak in relation to its impact on the **environmental objectives** of curbing emissions of greenhouse gases and maintaining and enhancing employment levels and would have a negative impact on the district's landscape.
- 7.8 Options 2, 3 and 4 score very similar in the sustainability assessment and will all have a more positive impact on the district than option 1. However Option 2 appears to perform better in the appraisal, as it would have more strongly positive impacts (++). Closer examination of the appraisal tables in Appendix 2 highlights a number of key differences between the three options.
- 7.9 Options 3 and 4 for example, score less well in relation to the objectives that seek to reduce long distance commuting and use land efficiently. Whilst Option 2 is considered to be weaker in other areas, for example in the support it provides for maintaining the distinctiveness of identifiable communities, option 2 appears to be the most sustainable overall as it would make the best use of land and minimise greenhouse gas emissions.
- 7.10 However, whilst Option 2 scores well in relation to the SA appraisal, this approach would constrain significantly where development could take place in the District. A weakness of Option 2 is that it would be reliant on landowners to bring forward suitable sites outside the market towns to meet the housing needs of the rural parts of the district. There is considerable uncertainty over whether these sites would be forthcoming. Option 3 would ensure that some housing including affordable housing would take place in the most sustainable rural villages. Whilst Option 4 would ensure that an even better supply of affordable housing would take place throughout the district, it is considered that this option may result in a more dispersed housing pattern closer to the current situation and similar to option 1. Therefore on balance, it is considered that Option 3 provides a much greater opportunity for spreading the benefits of development across a number of settlement types whilst still promoting sustainable development patterns. In particular, Option 3 enables the key service villages to receive some new affordable housing units to serve the wider rural area, which is one of the District's priorities.
- 7.11 Therefore, despite the scores being roughly the same for options 3 and 4, (18 positive effects for option 3, and sixteen for option 4, against 1 uncertain effect for option 3 and 2 for option 4) it is considered that on balance Option 3 does appear to be the most sustainable. It would make better use of land, minimise greenhouse gas emissions and also would be likely to generate the greatest levels of developer contributions for transport infrastructure improvements and renewable energy projects. Affordable housing would be delivered to a greater extent under option 4, but would also deliver market housing in less sustainable locations. As option 2, it would be reliant on landowners to bring forward suitable sites outside the market towns to meet the housing needs of the rural parts of the district. There is considerable uncertainty over whether these sites would be forthcoming given the reduction of income generated from such sites. It is also considered that this option could have a negative impact on the district by dispersing development along the lines of option 1, albeit to a lesser extent.
- 7.12 Bearing these factors in mind, Members of the Council agreed that option 3

should be the Council's favoured option and it was agreed that this option should form the basis of the Spatial Policy in the revised Core Strategy / Spatial Policy document. This is the same outcome as the initial Core Strategy (2007).

Appraisal of Strategic Policy - Strategic Approaches to Development Options

7.13 The following strategic approaches to development options were set out in the consultation undertaken for the development of the revised Core Strategy during the summer of 2009. The full assessment of these options is set out in Appendix 3, together with any particular comments on the assessment. A summary of the results for each approach is provided in the commentary below (figures 12-27) and a summary of the significant sustainability effects is provided at the end of this section.

7.14 The Strategic Policy needs to indicate where development should be located. The specific sites and details are not considered in this assessment. It is the type of development in principle. The detail will be considered as the Sites DPD is prepared.

Development in the Principal Town

7.15 The Strategic Policy guides where development should be located in the principal town. There are two options for the location of development:

- Option 1 – identify strategic sites
- Option 2 – rely on a number of smaller sites

Figure 12	++	+	=	-	--	U	O
Option 1 Identify strategic sites	2	10	0	4	0	4	1
Option 2 Rely on a number of smaller sites	2	11	0	1	0	6	1

7.16 The assessment presents a revised account in light of further technical and background information since the draft SA was published in 2010. Additional information is presented and in some instances the sustainability score has been amended to reflect the new information. The changes to the scores are:

Sustainability Objective	Option	Change from / to	Why Change Made
C8	1	- to U	Both approaches will require the use of Greenfield land. There are not substantial strategic differences in terms of the likelihood that previously developed land will be maximised although in detail this will depend on choice of sites.
C8	2	+ to U	

7.17 Sustainability Assessment does not look at particular individual sites, rather just the principle of identifying strategic sites or smaller sites in the principle town. A more detailed appraisal of potential sites will be undertaken as part of the Sites DPD.

7.18 In terms of performance against the **social sustainability objectives**, option 1 could lead to significant changes to the character of Malton / Norton, albeit that the scale of development reflects with the strategic role of the settlement in Ryedale. However, it could provide opportunities for provision of open space, green infrastructure and recreation facilities as part of new development. Both options would provide housing for people to meet their needs, although Option 1 would possibly provide more benefits through economies of scale eg the provision of new facilities and services and if deliverable, opportunities to provide for a full range of social infrastructure.

7.19 Performance against the **economic objectives** for both options is potentially positive although it is not dependent upon site specific factors but upon the level of development in the settlement which would remain the same under both options.

7.20 Performance against the **environmental objectives** is more uncertain, especially for option 2 which might result in more localised impacts upon the historic environment, or alternatively might provide opportunities to enhance the historic environment for example through the use of brownfield sites. The maintenance of a high quality environment in terms of air, soil and water quality would depend upon the sites selected, although the selection of fewer but larger strategic sites might have more impacts if these are greenfield. Again, there is potential for Option 2 to have fewer impacts as it is more flexible to deal with potential impacts on the Internationally protected River Derwent SAC and appropriate development in the floodplain. There is potential for more renewable energy to be provided through Option 1 provided that sufficient infrastructure can be supported by the economics of the development. Although, the provision of development on a number of smaller sites could incorporate renewable energy but this may not be as viable as that provided through a strategic site.

7.21 Whilst Option 1 has the potential for more negative environmental impacts it could deliver more benefits in terms of new facilities, infrastructure and renewable energy schemes. However, in terms of performance overall against the sustainability objectives, Option 2 scores higher. This option formed the basis for the development of the policy approach for the Strategic Policy.

Amount of Development

7.22 The Strategic Policy needs to set out the amount of development to be completed each year in the district. Two options for the amount of development were set out in the consultation undertaken during summer 2009. The results of this assessment are set out in Appendix 3.

- Option 1 – 200 homes per year
- Option 2 – 350 homes per year

Figure 13	++	+	=	-	--	U	O
Option 1 200 homes per year	1	8	1	5	0	6	0
Option 2 350 homes per year	2	4	1	7	2	5	0

7.23 The assessment presents a revised account in light of further technical and background information since the draft SA was published in 2010. Additional

information is presented and in some instances the sustainability score has been amended to reflect the new information. The changes to the scores are:

Sustainability Objective	Option	Change from / to	Why Change Made
A6	2	++ to -	Further technical work using 2008 based population statistics (published end 2010) has amended this assessment. Population projections note that the greatest housing demand is from older in-migrants. The District already has a population structure that is skewed towards an aging society.
B2	2	+ to U	The assessment has been revised in light of further technical consideration including the impact of the current economic situation. It is considered that whilst relatively more development may enhance the vitality of settlements lower down the settlement hierarchy, this will only be achieved through accompanying infrastructure and service provision, and it is considered that for much of the plan period, the ability of house builders to achieve this eg new schools, transport etc will be constrained.
C3	2	U to -	The assessment has been revised in light of further technical consideration including the impact of the current economic situation. Current national economic performance and an absence of public funding are restricting the ability of developers to deliver housing alongside wider community benefits. It is likely that homes delivered in greater numbers towards the lower end of the settlement hierarchy will not be able to provide sufficient public transport infrastructure to positively meet this objective.
C6	2	U to -	The assessment has been amended in the light of further technical consideration including the Regional Renewable and Low Carbon Potential Study. Ryedale's per capita emissions are higher than the averages for North Yorkshire and Yorkshire and the Humber. Greater amounts of housing are therefore likely to result in greater emissions even when taking into account the potential for technologies such as combined heat and

			power to support the larger sites.
C11	1 and 2	+ to U	The assessment has been amended in light of further consideration of the potential effects.

7.24 In terms of performance against the sustainability objectives, in the revised assessment Option 1 scores much better overall with more positive effects and fewer negative effects than Option 2.

7.25 In terms of performance against the **social sustainability objectives**, the scale and rate of development under option 1 could support and sustain the existing role of settlements and their distinctiveness, including the provision of services, helping to support existing communities. However, with the higher amount of housing per year under option 2, there will be more pressure to disperse development to the less sustainable locations lower down the settlement hierarchy, potentially leading to more isolation from such services.

7.26 In terms of performance against the **economic objectives**, both options are roughly equal. However, a housing level such as option 2 may cause smaller settlements to become less attractive through the potential lack of accompanying services and facilities, and as a result, lose some vitality.

7.27 In terms of **environmental objectives**, both options are similar, although option 2 has more potential for extreme negative effects, whilst those for option 1 are more uncertain. The exact nature of the adverse impact (s) will be dependent on the scale and location of the development, especially in relation to impacts upon the natural environment. The adverse impacts can be more readily mitigated against when the scale of development is influenced by the settlement hierarchy. It is also doubtful that at option 2 levels of development at the principal town could accommodate 50% of the annual housing levels without considerably more investment in infrastructure. More homes would be built in less accessible places. Increased development could exacerbate commuting trends by car (though other modes may be possible)

7.28 However, the overall outcome of the revised assessment is the same where Option 1 forms the basis for the development of the policy approach for the Strategic Policy document.

7.29 During the progression of the Ryedale Plan new household projections have been released. The most recent of these was at the end of 2010 and provided 2008 based housing forecasts. As part of an objective assessment of housing requirements various levels of housing have been appraised against the sustainability objectives. The objective assessment did not conclude a housing requirement option requiring further consultation. Details of the objective assessment using the SA objectives are included for completeness and can be found in Appendix 6.

Proportion of Housing

7.37 The Strategic Policy document needs to set out the specific proportion of housing to each of the locations set out in the settlement hierarchy. From previous consultation undertaken in 2007, the proportion for Malton / Norton was determined to be at least 50% of development in this location as a strategy led approach. Specific proportions will be consulted upon further. However, the proportions set out below are those from the summer 2009 consultation.

- Option 1 – Malton / Norton 50%, Pickering 25%, Kirkbymoorside / Helmsley 15%, service villages 10%
- Option 2 – Malton / Norton 50%, Pickering 20%, Kirkbymoorside / Helmsley 15%, service villages 15%
- Option 3 – Malton / Norton 50%, Pickering 25%, Kirkbymoorside / Helmsley 10%, service villages 15%
- Option 4 – Malton / Norton 50%, Pickering 20%, Kirkbymoorside / Helmsley 10%, service villages 20%

Figure 15	++	+	=	-	--	U	O
Option 1 M/N 50%, P 25%, K/H 15%, SVs 10%	10	5	0	2	0	1	3
Option 2 M/N 50%, P 20%, K/H 15%, SVs 15%	0	15	0	2	0	1	3
Option 3 M/N 50%, P 25%, K/H 10%, SVs 15%	0	15	0	2	0	1	3
Option 4 M/N 50%, P 20%, K/H 10%, SVs 20%	0	8	0	9	0	1	3

7.38 Option 1 scores the best for strongly positive impacts with few negative impacts, although there are some 'grey' areas where the sustainability implications are not clear, as highlighted in the Comments column in appendix 3. The assessment has been amended by the addition of comments for clarification of the assumptions made, although the overall result is the same and there are no changes made to the assessment.

7.39 In terms of performance against the **social sustainability objectives**, these options are all relatively similar. However Option 1 reflects best the current roles of the settlements and therefore, enables people to access services and facilities that are required and will help to reinforce the roles of the settlements. Option 4 best reflects the housing needs of the population, although the proportion of new housing in the Service Villages is still less than the need.

7.40 In terms of performance against the **economic objectives** all options will have a positive effect but option 1 is the strongest. By focussing development primarily in the Principal Town and Local Service Centres will help to support the services and facilities of these settlements supporting the local economy and pro, whilst allowing for some development in the service villages to support the more limited range of services in these areas. Focusing development in the towns will help to preserve the countryside. It is recognised that the quality of the landscapes in Ryedale are themselves a key economic driver to investment.

7.41 In terms of impacts upon the **environmental objectives**, option 1 performs the best for directing development away from the rural areas, for the protection of natural resources including soils and minerals, biodiversity, for protecting the remoteness and tranquillity of the district, for reducing the need to travel and for preserving the roles and character of the settlements. Option 4 performs least well with negative impacts upon the environment. However, in terms of resilience to climate change and reducing the risk of flooding the effects are uncertain but option 4 may have the least impact.

7.42 Therefore, considering the above, option 1 formed the basis for the development of the policy approach for the Strategic Policy.

Location of Employment Land

7.43 The Employment Land Review sets out that a mixture of employment land types is required which addresses the current deficiencies, satisfies demand and promotes economic diversification. Where these should be located can be determined by a choice of the following two options:

- Option 1 – new employment land to be provided in the principle town and local service centres only
- Option 2 –new employment land to be provided in the principle town and local service centres and limited dispersal to service villages

Figure 16	++	+	=	-	--	U	O
Option 1 New employment land to be provided in the Principal Town and Local Service Centres only	5	10	0	2	0	3	1
Option 2 New employment land to be provided in the Principal Town and Local Service Centres and limited dispersal to Service Villages	4	11	0	2	0	3	1

7.44 The assessment has been amended by the addition of comments for clarification of the assumptions made, although the overall result is the same and there are no changes made to the assessment scores.

7.45 In terms of performance against the **social sustainability objectives**, these options are the same. The scale of economic development is commensurate with the existing role of these settlements and as such will provide employment land and opportunities for job creation, help to reduce the potential for crime and may help to bring forward green infrastructure via developer contributions. The only difference is that providing employment in a range of settlements under option 2 will potentially attract a workforce to these settlements thus creating a more balanced population across a wider range of settlements than with option 1.

7.46 In terms of performance against the **economic objectives** all options will have a positive effect but option 1 is the strongest. By focussing development primarily in the Principal Town and Local Service Centres will help to support the services and facilities of these settlements supporting the local economy and pro, whilst allowing for some development in the service villages to support the more limited range of services in these areas. Focusing development in the towns will help to preserve the countryside. There is the potential to help retain those residents who commute out of the district for employment and also to increase opportunities for attracting a workforce and investors from neighbouring authorities, the UK and beyond.

- 7.48 In terms of impacts upon the **environmental objectives**, both options direct economic development away from the rural areas, protect the remoteness and tranquillity of the district, reducing the need to travel and preserve the roles and character of the settlements. Focusing employment in Malton / Norton and other market towns under option 1 could bring forward larger sites with more potential for renewable energy development to be incorporated than if smaller sites were used in the service villages under option 2. For those objectives where the assessment is uncertain, for both options the exact nature of any adverse impact (s) on the historic and cultural environment, biodiversity and soils will be dependent on the design, scale and location of the development. There may be more opportunities to provide green infrastructure and mitigate against adverse impacts on larger employment sites. However, more development may also encourage and enable the redevelopment and reuse of the historic environment.
- 7.49 In terms of performance against the sustainability objectives the result is very balanced. However, Option 2 particularly scores better in terms of reducing travel by providing employment opportunities in a wider range of settlements and also in terms of maintaining the vitality of a wider range of settlements. Therefore Option 2 formed the basis for the development of the policy approach for the Strategic Policy.

North York Moors Core Strategy and Development Policies

The assessments presented below are those which were undertaken on the Submission version of the North York Moors Core Strategy and Development Policies. The Core Strategy and Development Policies was subsequently adopted in November 2008. The full Sustainability Appraisal can be made available upon request.

Extract from Submission Core Strategy and Development Policies January 2008

Core Policy B – Spatial Strategy

The overarching strategy to meet the needs of people in the National Park is based upon improving the sustainability of local communities by supporting, improving and consolidating existing services and facilities, providing additional housing and employment opportunities within settlements and enabling alternative modes of travel to the private car in accordance with the following settlement hierarchy:

1. Local Service Centre - Helmsley
 - a) Housing including open market and affordable housing.
 - b) Employment development to support existing or provide new employment opportunities in the town and support and diversify the rural economy.
 - c) Improve existing and provide new facilities to serve local residents, strengthen its role as a Local Service Centre and support its role as a visitor destination.

.....

Sustainability Objective		Impact on Objective	Effects and Mitigation
Environmental			
1	Maintain and enhance the special landscape, local distinctiveness and settlement character	U	The policy will have an indirect positive impact upon maintaining and enhancing the landscape by directing development towards existing settlements. Yet in doing so may have an indirect negative impact upon settlement character. Effects can be mitigated via Development Policy 3 – Design and via the Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.
2	Minimise pollution releases to levels that do not damage natural systems, human health and quality of life	○	No clear link
3	Reduce the causes and manage the effects of climate change	✓	The policy will have an indirect positive impact upon this objective as development is to be focussed upon those settlements that have a good range of services and good public transport links thus reducing the need to use the private car.

4	Reduce the risk of flooding ensuring development and land use changes are not vulnerable to flooding, or increases the risk of flooding elsewhere in a catchment / coastal zone	○	No clear link
5	Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species. Maintain and enhance where appropriate conditions for biodiversity and avoid irreversible losses	✓	By directing development towards settlements and away from the open countryside and land designated for nature conservation purposes the policy will have a direct positive impact upon this objective.
6	Encourage consumers to meet their needs with less energy input and through the use of renewable energy technologies	✓	The policy will have an indirect positive impact upon this objective as development is to be focussed upon those settlements that have a good range of services and good public transport links thus reducing the need to use the private car.
7	Preserve and enhance the archaeological and historic environment	U	By directing development towards the main settlements there may be impacts upon the historic character and features of these settlements however this will depend upon where development is located and how it is designed.
8	Promote concepts of design, orientation and aspects of development that improve energy efficiency and apply sustainability principles to resource use	○	No clear link
9	Encourage waste reduction, reuse, recovery and recycling	○	No clear link
Social			
10	Protect and enhance human health	○	No clear link
11	Protect and enhance access to key community facilities and services, leisure and recreation services and access to the countryside, by means which minimise environmental impacts on the Park and its communities.	✓	The policy will have a direct positive impact upon this objective by supporting services and facilities in settlements.
12	Ensure that local needs are met locally wherever possible.	✓	The policy will have a direct positive impact upon this objective by supporting new development in settlements to

			meet the needs of local people.
Economic			
13	Quality employment opportunities available to all that create a vibrant local economy.	✓	The policy will have a direct positive impact upon this objective by supporting employment developments.
14	Maintain and enhance the viability and vitality of local communities	✓	The policy will have a direct positive impact upon this objective by supporting the needs of existing communities.
15	Develop a tourism product that provides sustainable benefits to the local community and its economy	✓	The policy will have a direct positive impact upon this objective by supporting tourism developments.
16	Manage natural resources in a way, which sustains their environmental qualities as well as their productive (or economic) potential	○	No clear link

North York Moors Core Strategy and Development Policies – Submission Consultation

Core Policy H – Rural Economy


The rural economy will be strengthened and supported by providing local communities with a range of opportunities for entrepreneurship, education and training. This will be achieved through:

1. New employment development in the Local Service Centre of Helmsley, Whitby Business Park, Service Villages and Local Service Villages.
2. Training and education opportunities in the Local Service Centre of Helmsley, Service Villages and Local Service Villages.
3. Supporting the agricultural sector and opportunities for diversification.
4. Sustainable tourism based on recreation activities and tourism development related to the understanding and enjoyment of the Park.

	Sustainability Objective	Impact on Objective	Effects and Mitigation
Environmental			
1	Maintain and enhance the special landscape, local distinctiveness and settlement character	U	The policy will have an indirect positive impact upon this objective through directing development towards settlements and away from the open landscape. However, in doing so it may have an adverse impact upon settlement character, although this can be mitigated against through Development Policy 3

			– Design and the Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.
2	Minimise pollution releases to levels that do not damage natural systems, human health and quality of life	○	No clear link
3	Reduce the causes and manage the effects of climate change	✓	The policy will have an indirect positive effect upon this objective as directing economic development towards centres of population should reduce the need to travel.
4	Reduce the risk of flooding ensuring development and land use changes are not vulnerable to flooding, or increases the risk of flooding elsewhere in a catchment / coastal zone	○	No clear link
5	Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species. Maintain and enhance where appropriate conditions for biodiversity and avoid irreversible losses	U	As the policy supports agricultural diversification and tourism across the National Park this may have the potential to have a direct negative impact on local habitats through increased activity. The impacts could be temporary or permanent. Potential impacts upon the Natura 2000 sites have been mitigated against through the Habitats Regulations Assessment, however as biodiversity impacts may be wider than just Natura 2000 sites and although the supporting text highlights potential impacts upon the natural environment, it is considered worth flagging this up as an uncertainty.
6	Encourage consumers to meet their needs with less energy input and through the use of renewable energy technologies	✓	The policy will have an indirect positive effect upon this objective as directing economic development towards centres of population should reduce the need to travel.
7	Preserve and enhance the archaeological and historic environment	U	Directing development towards the main settlements may have an adverse impact upon the historic environment of those settlements.

			However this can be mitigated through Development Policy 3 – Design and the Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.
8	Promote concepts of design, orientation and aspects of development that improve energy efficiency and apply sustainability principles to resource use	○	No clear link
9	Encourage waste reduction, reuse, recovery and recycling	○	No clear link
Social			
10	Protect and enhance human health	○	No clear link
11	Protect and enhance access to key community facilities and services, leisure and recreation services and access to the countryside, by means which minimise environmental impacts on the Park and its communities.	✓	By locating economic developments in the main settlements the policy will have an indirect positive impact upon this objective by providing further support for existing services and facilities.
12	Ensure that local needs are met locally wherever possible.	✓	By directing economic development towards the main settlements will ensure that local employment and business needs can be met locally and will therefore have an indirect positive impact upon this policy.
Economic			
13	Quality employment opportunities available to all that create a vibrant local economy.	✓	The policy will have a direct positive impact upon this objective by providing for economic developments in centres of population.
14	Maintain and enhance the viability and vitality of local communities	✓	Providing a strong economy will help to maintain the viability and vitality of local communities thus having a direct positive impact on this objective.
15	Develop a tourism product that provides sustainable benefits to the local community and its economy	✓	The policy aims to provide for tourism which is based upon understanding and enjoyment of the Park and will therefore have direct positive impacts upon this objective.

16	Manage natural resources in a way which sustains their environmental qualities as well as their productive (or economic) potential		No clear link
----	---	---	---------------





North York Moors Core Strategy and Development Policies – Submission Consultation

Development Policy 10 – New Employment and Training Development

A. Within or adjacent to the main built up area of the Local Service Centre of Helmsley, the Service Villages and Local Service Villages the following types of development for employment and training purposes will be appropriate:

1. The re-use of existing buildings where the building has sufficient land and storage space attached for the functional needs of the proposed use and it does not adversely affect the character of the area.
2. The expansion of an existing facility or business.
3. New buildings where there is no other suitable accommodation available in the locality.

.....

Sustainability Objective		Impact on Objective	Effects and Mitigation
Environmental			
1	Maintain and enhance the special landscape, local distinctiveness and settlement character		The policy will have an indirect positive impact upon this objective through directing development towards settlements and away from the open landscape. However, in doing so it may have an adverse impact upon settlement character, although this can be mitigated against through Development Policy 3 – Design and the Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.
2	Minimise pollution releases to levels that do not damage natural systems, human health and quality of life		No clear link
3	Reduce the causes and manage the effects of climate change		The policy will have an indirect positive effect upon this objective as directing employment development towards centres of population should reduce the need to travel.
4	Reduce the risk of flooding ensuring development and land use changes are not		No clear link

	vulnerable to flooding, or increases the risk of flooding elsewhere in a catchment / coastal zone		
5	Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species. Maintain and enhance where appropriate conditions for biodiversity and avoid irreversible losses	U	As the policy supports re-use of existing buildings in the countryside for employment purposes this may have the potential to have a direct negative impact on local habitats through increased activity. The impacts could be temporary or permanent. Potential impacts upon the Natura 2000 sites have been mitigated against through the Habitats Regulations Assessment, however as biodiversity impacts may be wider than just Natura 2000 sites and although the supporting text highlights potential impacts upon the natural environment, it is considered worth flagging this up as an uncertainty.
6	Encourage consumers to meet their needs with less energy input and through the use of renewable energy technologies	✓	The policy will have an indirect positive effect upon this objective as directing employment development towards centres of population should reduce the need to travel.
7	Preserve and enhance the archaeological and historic environment	U	Directing development towards the main settlements may have an adverse impact upon the historic environment of those settlements. However this can be mitigated through Development Policy 3 – Design and the Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.
8	Promote concepts of design, orientation and aspects of development that improve energy efficiency and apply sustainability principles to resource use	○	No clear link
9	Encourage waste reduction, reuse, recovery and recycling	○	No clear link
Social			

10	Protect and enhance human health	○	No clear link
11	Protect and enhance access to key community facilities and services, leisure and recreation services and access to the countryside, by means which minimise environmental impacts on the Park and its communities.	✓	By locating employment developments in the main settlements the policy will have an indirect positive impact upon this objective by providing further support for existing services and facilities.
12	Ensure that local needs are met locally wherever possible.	✓	By directing employment development towards the main settlements will ensure that local employment and business needs can be met locally and will therefore have an indirect positive impact upon this policy.
Economic			
13	Quality employment opportunities available to all that create a vibrant local economy.	✓	The policy will have a direct positive impact upon this objective by providing for economic developments in centres of population.
14	Maintain and enhance the viability and vitality of local communities	✓	Providing a strong economy will help to maintain the viability and vitality of local communities thus having a direct positive impact on this objective.
15	Develop a tourism product that provides sustainable benefits to the local community and its economy	✓	The policy aims to provide employment uses which will help to retain businesses which provide tourist facilities therefore having an indirect positive impact on this objective.
16	Manage natural resources in a way, which sustains their environmental qualities as well as their productive (or economic) potential	○	No clear link

North York Moors Core Strategy and Development Policies – Submission Consultation

Core Policy J – Housing

A mix of housing types and tenures will be sought to maintain the vitality of local communities, consolidate support for services and facilities and support the delivery of more affordable housing. This will be delivered through:

Locating all open market housing, including new build and converted units, in the main built up area of the Local Service Centre of Helmsley and the Service Villages. On larger sites of more than 0.1 hectares or where 2 or more residential units are

proposed, at least 50% of the resulting units must be affordable including conversion schemes. Sites of less than 0.1 hectare must meet the definition of a small infill gap.

.....

Sustainability Objective		Impact on Objective	Effects and Mitigation
Environmental			
1	Maintain and enhance the special landscape, local distinctiveness and settlement character	U	The policy is aiming to direct housing development away from the wider countryside, thus maintaining the wider landscape. However, this may have detrimental effects on preserving the character of these settlements, and it is therefore concluded that the effects on this objective are uncertain. Any impacts would be direct and long term but potentially reversible. Mitigation can be achieved through Development Policy 3 – Design, Development Policy 4 – Conservation Areas and the Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.
2	Minimise pollution releases to levels that do not damage natural systems, human health and quality of life	○	No clear link
3	Reduce the causes and manage the effects of climate change	✓	The policy will have an indirect positive impact upon this objective by locating development in places where there are services and facilities and good public transport links thus reducing the need to travel.
4	Reduce the risk of flooding ensuring development and land use changes are not vulnerable to flooding, or increases the risk of flooding elsewhere in a catchment / coastal zone	○	No clear link
5	Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species. Maintain and enhance where appropriate conditions for biodiversity and avoid irreversible losses	✓	The policy will have an indirect positive impact upon this objective by locating development in places where there are services and facilities and good public transport links thus reducing the need to travel.

6	Encourage consumers to meet their needs with less energy input and through the use of renewable energy technologies	○	No clear link
7	Preserve and enhance the archaeological and historic environment	U	Providing new housing within these settlements could potentially have detrimental effects on preserving the historic character of these settlements. The impacts would be direct and long term but potentially reversible. Mitigation can be achieved through Development Policy 3 - Design, Development Policy 4 - Conservation Areas and through the Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.
8	Promote concepts of design, orientation and aspects of development that improve energy efficiency and apply sustainability principles to resource use	○	No clear link
9	Encourage waste reduction, reuse, recovery and recycling	○	No clear link
Social			
10	Protect and enhance human health	✓	The policy will have an indirect positive impact upon this objective as enabling housing to meet local needs can contribute to good health.
11	Protect and enhance access to key community facilities and services, leisure and recreation services and access to the countryside, by means which minimise environmental impacts on the Park and its communities.	✓	The policy will have an indirect positive benefit as housing development is to be directed towards those settlements which have been identified as having a certain level of service provision and locating further housing in these will therefore help to support these services, thus the policy has an indirect positive impact on the objective.
12	Ensure that local needs are met locally wherever possible.	✓	The policy will have a direct positive impact upon this objective by providing for housing to meet local needs.
Economic			

13	Quality employment opportunities available to all that create a vibrant local economy.	○	No clear link
14	Maintain and enhance the viability and vitality of local communities	✓	Locating further housing development in the main settlements will help to retain a workforce and thus retain businesses thus retaining the viability and vitality of the community, and the policy will therefore have an indirect positive impact upon this objective.
15	Develop a tourism product that provides sustainable benefits to the local community and its economy	○	No clear link
16	Manage natural resources in a way, which sustains their environmental qualities as well as their productive (or economic) potential	○	No clear link

Appendix 3 – Appraisal of Plan Objectives against Sustainability Objectives

✓ = positive impact X = negative impact = = neutral impact U = uncertain impact O = no link / not relevant		Sustainability Objectives																				
		A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6	B1	B2	B3	B4	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11
Plan Objectives	1	✓	✓	✓	U	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	U	U	✓	U	U	✓	O	U	U	U	O
	2	✓	✓	✓	U	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	U	U	✓	U	U	✓	O	U	U	U	O
	3	✓	U	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	U	✓	✓	O	O	✓	O	U	O	✓	O	O
	4	✓	U	✓	✓	O	U	O	O	✓	U	O	✓	O	O	✓	O	U	O	✓	O	O

1. To provide sufficient land to provide a mix of housing which meets the future needs of the existing population, providing opportunities for managed growth of the town over the next 15 years whilst safeguarding and enhancing the landscape of the National Park.
2. To support the existing economy by ensuring there is further land available for the expansion of local businesses and to provide a range of employment opportunities for local people.
3. To conserve and enhance the special qualities of the town so that it remains a popular destination for visitors and maintains the role of Helmsley as a market town serving a wide hinterland of rural communities including those within the National Park.
4. Retain the historic character of the town including the setting of the Duncombe Park Estate, Helmsley Castle and the North York Moors National Park.

Appendix 4: Assessment of Policies in Publication Plan (Prior to Mitigation)³

Detailed assessment forms for each policy are available separately in Annex 1.

✓ = positive impact X = negative impact = = neutral impact U = uncertain impact O = no link / not relevant		Sustainability Objectives																				
		A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6	B1	B2	B3	B4	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11
Plan Policies	SD1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	O	O/✓	O	O/U	O	O/U	O/✓	O	O/✓	O/✓	O/U	O/U	O	O	O/U	O	O/✓	O	O	O	O
	H1 – New Residential Development	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	O	✓	✓	✓	O	✓	O	=	✓	O	O	U	✓	X	✓
	H2 – Windfall Development	✓	✓	✓	✓	O	✓	O	✓	✓	O	✓	✓	O	O	✓	O	O	✓	✓	✓	✓
	H3 – Affordable Housing Provision	✓	✓	✓	=	O	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	O	=	✓	O	✓	O	O	=	O	O	O
	H4 – Employment Land ⁴	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	O	✓	U	O	✓	✓	✓	O
	H5 – New Town Centre Uses including Retail	✓	O	✓	✓	✓	O	✓	✓	✓	✓	O	✓	✓	O	✓	✓	O	✓	✓	✓	✓
	H6 – Protection of Retail Uses	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	O	✓	✓	✓	✓	O	✓	✓	O	✓	✓	O	✓	✓	✓	O
	H7 – Loss of Community Facilities and Employment Uses	✓	O	✓	✓	✓	O	✓	✓	✓	✓	U	U	✓	U	✓/ U	✓	O	✓	✓/ U	✓	O
	H8 – Important Open Views	O	O	O	✓	O	O	O	O	✓	O	O	✓	O	O	✓	O	O	O	O	O	O

³

✓ = positive impact X = negative impact = = neutral impact U = uncertain impact O = no link / not relevant	Sustainability Objectives																				
	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6	B1	B2	B3	B4	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11
H9 - Design	O	O	✓	✓	U	O	O	✓	✓	O	O	✓	✓	O	✓	✓	O	O	O	O	U
H10 – Renewable Energy	O	O	✓	✓	O	O	O	✓	✓	O	U	✓	O	O	✓	✓	✓	O	✓	✓	✓
H11 – Green Infrastructure	✓	O	✓	✓	✓	O	O	✓	✓	O	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	O	✓	✓	U	O
H12 – Developer Contributions	✓	✓	✓	O	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	O	✓	O	O	✓	✓	O	O	O	O	O	✓
H13 – Open Space Requirements	✓	O	✓	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	✓/ U	✓/ U	✓	U	U	✓	O	O	U	O	O
H14 – Telecommunications Installations	✓	O	✓	O	O	O	✓	✓	✓	✓	O	U	✓	O	U	✓	O	O	O	O	O

Appendix 5: 'Final' Assessment of Policies in Publication Plan (With Mitigation Incorporated)

Detailed assessment forms for each policy are available separately in Annex 1.

		Sustainability Objectives																				
		A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6	B1	B2	B3	B4	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11
Plan Policies	SD1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	O	O/✓	O	O/U	O	O/U	O/✓	O	O/✓	O/✓	O/U	O/U	O	O	O/U	O	O/✓	O	O	O	O
	H1 – New Residential Development	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	O	✓	✓	✓	O	✓	O	=	✓	O	O	U	✓	X	✓
	H2 – Windfall Development	✓	✓	✓	✓	O	✓	O	✓	✓	O	✓	✓	O	O	✓	O	O	✓	✓	✓	✓
	H3 – Affordable Housing Provision	✓	✓	✓	=	O	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	O	=	✓	O	✓	O	O	=	O	O	O
	H4 – Employment Land ⁵	✓	O	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	O	✓	U	O	✓	✓	✓	O
	H5 – New Town Centre Uses including Retail	✓	O	✓	✓	✓	O	✓	✓	✓	✓	O	✓	✓	O	✓	✓	O	✓	✓	✓	✓
	H6 – Protection of Retail Uses	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	O	✓	✓	✓	✓	O	✓	✓	O	✓	✓	O	✓	✓	✓	O
	H7 – Loss of Community Facilities and Employment Uses	✓	O	✓	✓	✓	O	✓	✓	✓	✓	O	O	✓	O	✓/ O	✓	O	✓	✓/ O	✓	O

	Sustainability Objectives																				
	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6	B1	B2	B3	B4	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11
✓ = positive impact X = negative impact = = neutral impact U = uncertain impact O = no link / not relevant																					
H8 – Important Open Views	O	O	O	✓	O	O	O	O	✓	O	O	✓	O	O	✓	O	O	O	O	O	O
H9 - Design	O	O	✓	O	✓	O	O	O	✓	O	O	✓	O	O	✓	O	O	O	O	O	✓
H10 – Renewable Energy	O	O	✓	✓	O	O	O	✓	✓	O	✓	✓	O	O	✓	✓	✓	O	✓	✓	✓
H11 – Green Infrastructure	✓	O	✓	✓	✓	O	O	✓	✓	O	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	O	✓	✓	U	O
H12 – Developer Contributions	✓	✓	✓	O	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	O	✓	O	O	✓	✓	O	O	O	O	O	✓
H13 – Open Space Requirements	✓	O	✓	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	✓/ U	✓	✓	O	O	✓	O	O	O	O	O
H14 – Telecommunications Installations	✓	O	✓	O	O	O	✓	✓	✓	✓	O	✓	O	O	✓	O	O	O	O	O	O

Appendix 6 – ‘Final’ Assessment of Sites

Sustainability Objective	Assessment Criteria	Site NYMH1	Wider NYMH1	Site NYMH2	Site NYMH3	Site 174	Site 183	Site NYMH8	Site EMP1	Site EMP2	
Social Objectives											
A1	To ensure that all groups of the population have access to health, education, leisure, green infrastructure and recreation services that are required.	SSM Q1A. How accessible is the site to a bus stop, commercial limit, employment area, primary school and doctors surgery?	++	++	+	+	+	+	++	+	+
		SSM Q 6. Would the development provide opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure, including linking in with existing green infrastructure corridors?	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++
		SSMQ49. Would the development on its own, have an impact on an existing community facility and has mitigation of this impact been proposed as part of the development?	++	++	++	+	++	++	++	++	++

Sustainability Objective		Assessment Criteria	Site NYMH1	Wider NYMH1	Site NYMH2	Site NYMH3	Site 174	Site 183	Site NYMH8	Site EMP1	Site EMP2
A2	To provide the opportunity for all people to meet their housing needs.	SSMQ40. Does the type and mix of development proposed meet the needs identified in the SHMA/ELR?	+	+	U	+	+	U	+	U	+
		SSMQ41. What level and type of affordable housing is provided on site?	++	++	U	++	++	U	++	U	U
		SSMQ42. What provision has been made for Ryedale's elderly population?	++	++	U	++	++	U	++	O	O
		SSMQ39. Will the proposed development attract a balanced living and/or working population, reducing inequality of opportunity?	+	+	U	+	+	U	+	U	+
A3	To improve overall levels of health and reduce the disparities between different groups and different areas.	SSMQ38A. Does the design of the development encourage people to walk and cycle, rather than travel by car?	++	++	U	++	++	U	++	U	++
A4	To maintain and promote overall levels of health and reduce the distinctiveness of	SSMQ11. Will the site lead to the coalescence of settlements which will impact on their character and setting?	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

Sustainability Objective		Assessment Criteria	Site NYMH1	Wider NYMH1	Site NYMH2	Site NYMH3	Site 174	Site 183	Site NYMH8	Site EMP1	Site EMP2
	identified communities.	SSMQ37. Would the development of the site lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of the settlement?	++	++	++	+	++	++	++	++	++
		SSMQ47. Does the proposal involve new public realm or enhancements to the existing public realm as part of its development?	+	+	U	+	+	U	+	U	+
A5	To reduce crime and the fear of crime.	SSMQ38. Can the site potentially incorporate the principles of Secure By Design?	++	++	U	++	++	U	++	U	++
A6	To develop a more balanced population.	SSMQ39. Will the proposed development attract a balanced living and/or working population, reducing inequality of opportunity?	+	+	U	+	+	U	+	U	+
Economic Objectives											
B1	To maintain and enhance employment opportunities.	SSMQ52. How does the site perform against the ELR/SHLAA in terms of its ability to come forward	++	++	++	++	++	--	++	++	++

Sustainability Objective		Assessment Criteria	Site NYMH1	Wider NYMH1	Site NYMH2	Site NYMH3	Site 174	Site 183	Site NYMH8	Site EMP1	Site EMP2
		and its suitability for development?									
B2	To maintain and enhance the vitality of the countryside, villages and town centres	SSMQ50. Will the site promote the viability and vitality of Helmsley?	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++
B3	To retain and enhance the factors which are conducive to wealth creation, including personal creativity and attractiveness to investors	SSMQ51. Does the proposal involve the creation of additional jobs in Ryedale?	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	++	++
		SSMQ54. Will the development provide appropriate levels of developer contributions?	++	++	U	+	++	U	++	U	++
		SSMQ55. Can the development support developer contributions of £5k, £10k and £15k per dwelling as set out in the Affordable Housing Viability Study?	++	++	U	U	++	U	++	U	++
B4	To diversify the local economy	SSMQ50A. Will the mix of employment uses proposed by the development assist in diversifying the Ryedale economy as set out in the ELR?	0	0	0	++	0	0	0	++	++

Sustainability Objective		Assessment Criteria	Site NYMH1	Wider NYMH1	Site NYMH2	Site NYMH3	Site 174	Site 183	Site NYMH8	Site EMP1	Site EMP2
Environmental Objectives											
C1	To protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity.	SSMQ5. Would the development affect a regional or local site of biodiversity (including SINC, LNRs and RIGs) or affect UK or Ryedale Biodiversity Plan protected species?	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
		SSMQ7. Would the development impact on protected and unprotected trees, hedgerows and ancient woodland?	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
		SSMQ6. Would the development provide opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure, including linking in with existing green infrastructure?	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++
C2	To maintain and enhance the quality and character of the landscape, including the special qualities of remoteness and tranquillity.	SSM Q8. What is the capacity of the landscape to accommodate the site according to the Landscape Character Assessments and Special Qualities study?	++	--	--	++	++	++	++	++	++
		SSMQ10. Is the site capable of utilising existing landscape features or providing	+	--	--	++	++	++	++	++	++

Sustainability Objective		Assessment Criteria	Site NYMH1	Wider NYMH1	Site NYMH2	Site NYMH3	Site 174	Site 183	Site NYMH8	Site EMP1	Site EMP2
		adequate landscape mitigation measures?									
		SSM Q9A. What impact would the site have on the Howardian Hills AONB?	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++
		What impact would the site have on the North York Moors National Park?	+	--	--	+	++	++	+	++	++
C3	Reduce long distance commuting and congestion by reducing the need to travel.	SSMQ4. What are the conclusions of the Highways Authority's initial highways assessment?	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-
		SSMQ44. Is mitigation required as part of the development?	+	+	U	+	+	U	+	U	+
		SSM38A. Would the site help to promote forms of travel other than the private car?	++	++	U	++	++	U	++	U	++
		SSMQ38B. Has a travel plan been produced which assesses these options?	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
		SSMQ45. Can the site accommodate adequate parking and servicing facilities?	U	U	U	++	++	U	++	U	++

Sustainability Objective		Assessment Criteria	Site NYMH1	Wider NYMH1	Site NYMH2	Site NYMH3	Site 174	Site 183	Site NYMH8	Site EMP1	Site EMP2	
		SSMQ46. Will the proposal provide, enable or improve access to public rights of way?	++	++	U	++	++	U	++	U	++	
C4	To ensure future development is resilient to climate change such as development is not vulnerable to flooding, or will increase the risk of flooding elsewhere.	SSM Q2. How does the site perform against the flooding sequential test as set out in PPS25 in terms of what flood zone the site falls in?	++	++	++	++	+	+	+	+	+	
		SSM Q3. What level of vulnerability is the site based on its proposed use?	More vul	More vul	More vul	More vul.	More vul	More vul	More vul	Less vul	Less vul	
		SSMQ32. Is the site potentially affected by groundwater?										
		SSMQ33. Is the site potentially affected by surface water flooding and is this site considered to be within a critical drainage area?										
		SSMQ34. Is the site potentially affected by sewer flooding?										
		SSMQ35. Have Sustainable Drainage Systems been proposed?	+	+	U	+	+	U	+	U	+	
		SSMQ36. What other measures have been considered which ensure the development is	++	++	U	++	++	U	++	U	++	

Sustainability Objective		Assessment Criteria	Site NYMH1	Wider NYMH1	Site NYMH2	Site NYMH3	Site 174	Site 183	Site NYMH8	Site EMP1	Site EMP2
		resilient to climate change?									
		SSMQ31. Has a flood risk assessment been undertaken?									
C5	To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historical and cultural environment.	SSMQ12. Will the site affect a designated heritage asset, either directly or indirectly through its setting?	+	+	--	+	+	+	+	+	+
		SSMQ13. Will the proposal affect a non-designated heritage asset which the Council identifies as having a degree of significance that is worthy of consideration?	+	--	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
C6	To reduce the emission of greenhouse gases.	SSMQ14. Is the site capable of utilising on-site renewable energy or other low carbon energy sources?	++	++	U	++	++	U	++	U	++
		SSMQ17. Can the site accommodate higher sustainable building standards?	-	-	U	-	-	U	-	U	-
C7	To encourage the use of renewable resources and the development of renewable energy	SSMQ15. Is the site capable of linking in or supporting off site renewable energy schemes?	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=

Sustainability Objective		Assessment Criteria	Site NYMH1	Wider NYMH1	Site NYMH2	Site NYMH3	Site 174	Site 183	Site NYMH8	Site EMP1	Site EMP2
	sources within Ryedale	SSMQ16. Can the site link in to existing heat or power sources available in the District?	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=
C8	To make the most efficient use of land.	SSMQ20. Is the site or any part of the site considered previously developed land?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
		SSMQ21. Can the site achieve appropriate density to achieve the most efficient use of the land?	++	++	U	++	++	U	++	U	++
C9	To maintain a high quality environment in terms of air, soil and water quality.	SSMQ25. Would the development have an adverse impact on a Groundwater Source Protection Zone?	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++
		SSMQ29. Is the development in an area where noise, light or dust is likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to generate noise, light or dust which will affect existing users?	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-
		SSMQ30. Is the development in an area where other factors are likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-

Sustainability Objective		Assessment Criteria	Site NYMH1	Wider NYMH1	Site NYMH2	Site NYMH3	Site 174	Site 183	Site NYMH8	Site EMP1	Site EMP2
		generate forms of nuisance which may affect the amenity of existing users?									
		SSMQ22. Would the development of the site lead to remediation of contaminated land?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		SMMQ27. Is any part of the development on suspected unstable land?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
C10	Ensure that fossil fuel and water consumption is as low as possible, protect productive soils and maintain the stock of minerals.	SSMQ23. What agricultural land classification is the site? Would development of this site involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		SSMQ28. Will the site impact on major hazard sites and pipelines?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		SSMQ24. Would the development lead to the sterilisation of mineral resources?	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
C11	To reduce the amount of waste produced and maximise the rates of re-use and recycling as locally	SSMQ18. Does the development contain proposals for waste reduction in both its construction and when in operation?	++	++	U	++	++	U	++	U	++

Sustainability Objective		Assessment Criteria	Site NYMH1	Wider NYMH1	Site NYMH2	Site NYMH3	Site 174	Site 183	Site NYMH8	Site EMP1	Site EMP2
	as possible.	SSMQ19. Does the development contain individual/communal recycling facilities/infrastructure?	+	+	U	+	+	U	+	U	+