

		Traffic Light Definitions			Notes	Notes
Theme	Criteria	Red	Amber	Green		
Housing	(1) Development should favour sites which would be viable for the delivery of all components of the preferred housing mix (which will include affordable housing, downsizing/bungalows, and market homes predominantly of 2-3 bed size)	There are major constraints with significant impact on viability or site configuration which would make it unlikely that all elements of the preferred housing mix (size, type, tenure, number of storeys) would be delivered. Examples of such constraints include: steep gradients on significant parts of sites, contamination requiring costly remediation, or long access route being required.	There are some constraints having moderate impact on viability or site configuration which potentially might prevent delivery of some elements of the preferred housing mix (size, type, tenure, number of storeys). Examples of such constraints include: moderate gradient on most/all of site, short access road required from adopted highway.	There are no constraints having significant impact on viability or site configuration so delivery of all elements of the preferred housing mix (size, type, tenure, number of storeys) is likely to be achieved. Such sites would typically be: mostly level, adjacent to adopted highway, have existing pavements extending to edge of site.	All sites should be viable for a mix of all elements of the preferred housing mix. Proportions of the various types will be determined later. The inclusion of affordable housing and bungalows in the preferred mix, and focus on smaller market homes means that sites with complex issues may struggle with viability.	In response to the comment entitled "Bungalows 2", these traffic light definitions have been amended to ensure that assessment against this criteria favours sites that present no significant constraints to delivery of the preferred housing mix. The initial draft only listed examples of potential constraints without explicitly addressing the underlying general principle.
Site Characteristics	(2) Development should favour sites contained within or adjoining the village envelope.	Physically separated from the existing built-up area by field(s), beck, or road.	Has common boundary with existing built-up area on one side	Has common boundaries with existing built-up area on more than one side, or is entirely within the village envelope.	Could specify % perimeter of proposed site forming common boundary rather than number of sides.	
	(3) Development should favour sites that avoid loss of prime agricultural land, high quality habitat, or other valued land.	Arable land, recreational spaces (cricket pitch etc.), high quality habitat (woodlands, ancient hedgerows, species rich grazing land), designated Green Space*	Grazing land with limited biodiversity	Brownfield land	No Green Spaces have been formally designated, but for this criteria the areas considered will be those assessed as meeting Green Space criteria as recorded in the minutes of the Settlement Character Workshop of 7/5/16	Consideration was given to extending this criteria to take into account the CPRE tranquillity index. While the Steering Group are supportive of the principle, an examination of the CPRE tranquillity map indicates that the whole village area scores well on the tranquillity index. Tranquillity map shows little differentiation between sites, and so is of limited utility as a site selection criteria for our Neighbourhood Plan.
	(4) Development should favour sites that can achieve a good access onto the adjacent road network	Only a narrow frontage onto adopted highway is available to construct site access, or access would be onto road with 60 mph speed limit, or access would be onto a single track road	Medium frontage onto adopted highway offers some flexibility in location of access point, or access would onto road with 40mph speed limit.	Long frontage onto adopted highway offering significant opportunities to vary location of access point, and access would be onto road with 30 mph (or less) speed limit.	Length of frontage could be defined as multiples of minimum splay for prevailing speed limit. Access onto lower speed roads favoured for safety reasons.	
	(5) Development should favour sites that do not result in impairment or loss of significant views from public spaces (roads or footpaths) as identified in the Settlement Character Assessment Workshops	Site is prominent in views towards the settlement, and development of site would result in significant impairment or obstruction of views towards, within or from the settlement.	Development of site would result in partial impairment or obstruction of views towards, within or from the settlement.	Site is not prominent in views towards the settlement, and development of site would result in minimal impairment or obstruction of views towards, within or from the settlement.	Only views from public spaces (including footpaths) will be considered. Are all views equal? How could a view classification be objectively defined?	A Dark Sky element would be a logical extension of this criteria which relates to impact on views. CPRE dark sky mapping provides a resource which could be used. While the Steering Group are supportive of the principle, in practice this offers little differentiation between sites as the area in and around the village is all in one of two (low illumination) bands.

Settlement Character - Built Environment	(6) Development should favour sites that will not impact detrimentally on the conservation area or other significant buildings (listed buildings or non-designated heritage assets including associated grounds) or significant frontages as identified by the Settlement Character workshops.	Site is wholly or partially located within the Conservation Area, or incorporates all of part of a significant building, or all or part of a significant frontage, or has a severely adverse impact on the setting of a significant building or frontage.	Site is immediately adjacent to the Conservation Area, or is within the buffer zone of a significant building or frontage which is located outside the Conservation Area, or would otherwise adversely impact on the setting of a significant building or frontage.	Site is separated from the Conservation Area, significant buildings or frontages, and development of the site would not have any adverse impact on their setting or significance.		There is no statutorily defined distance for size of the buffer zone around a listed building or heritage asset. Impact on setting and/or significance of listed buildings is context dependent. The following methodology will be applied 1) The boundaries of the Conservation will be assumed to incorporate the buffer zone for any buildings located within it. 2) Listed buildings or other heritage assets located outside the conservation area will be explicitly considered within site assessments where appropriate (those considered will be identified within the individual site assessments). 3) Comments on the draft assessment prepared on the basis of steps 1) and 2) will be sought from HDC's conservation officer and any appropriate adjustments made.
Settlement Character - Natural Environment	(7) Development should favour sites which present opportunities to protect or enhance Green Spaces, improve access for the public, or improve access for those with limited mobility	Development of site would result in reduction of access to a Green Space or loss of Green Space	Development of the site would have no impact on access to or size of Green Spaces.	Development of site could result in improvement in access (and especially access for disabled), an increase in Local Green Space, or link existing Green Spaces	No Green Spaces have been formally designated, but for this criteria the areas considered will be those assessed as meeting Green Space criteria as recorded in the minutes of the Settlement Character Workshop of 7/5/16	
	(8) Development should favour sites which do not result in loss of open space in the Leven Valley Character Zone as defined in Settlement Character Workshops.	Site is located wholly or partially within the Leven Valley Character Zone	Site is located immediately adjacent to the Leven Valley Character Zone	Site is not immediately adjacent to the Leven Valley Character Zone	The "Leven Valley" Character Zone is defined as the area recommended by Settlement Character Workshops	
Services & Facilities	(9) Development should favour sites that offer opportunity to sustain or enhance community services or facilities.	Development of the site would result in the loss or impairment of existing facilities, or impairment of access to them.	Development of the site would have negligible impact (other than additional population) on facilities.	Site offers opportunities to enhance or extend existing facilities (enhancement could include better parking arrangements as well as improved facilities), or provide facilities in parts of village which are not close to existing facilities		
	(10) Development should favour sites that offer a viable alternative to private cars to access services or otherwise encourage reduction in vehicle traffic within the village area.	Nearest point of site is located at a walking distance along public roads/pavements in excess of 830 metres from village centre. The distance will include a Naismith adjustment for crossing Leven Valley.	Nearest point of site is located at a walking distance along public roads/pavements of between 415 and 830 metres from village centre. The distance will include a Naismith adjustment for crossing Leven Valley.	Nearest point of site is located at a walking distance along public roads/pavements of less than 415 metres from village centre. The distance will include a Naismith adjustment for crossing Leven Valley.	Allowance for crossing the Leven Valley could be made using "Naismith's rule" - each 1m of ascent is equivalent to walking 8m on level ground. Need to define location of "village centre"	The distances of 415m and 830m are based on the 5 and 10 minute walking times at 5km/hr which is a widely accepted value for reasonable walking pace. The Naismith adjustment will be based on the difference in spot heights near Rose cottage and the top of Rudby Bank near Rudby Farm (approx. 18m). Ascent on Hutton side to Bay Horse is slightly less. Based on the consultation response, the village centre is defined as the midpoint between the War Memorial and the Village Pump (which is a position located on Southside approximately opposite the Hub).

Traffic & Transport	(11) Development should favour sites that provide opportunity to improve connectivity of footpaths and pavements within the village area.	Development of site will result in increased walking distances to services for other areas of the village, or access from the site to village centre along pavements will require crossing of roads with speed limits in excess of 30mph	Development of site will have negligible impact on walking distances to services from other parts of the village.	Development of site offers opportunities to reduce walking distances from other parts of the village to reach services by creating new and more direct footpaths or cycle routes		
	(12) Development should favour sites that can provide sufficient off-street parking spaces for the needs of the additional residents and visitors generated by the development itself	Site has size or other constraints which would make it unable to accommodate at least 11 houses with sufficient parking / garaging for residents and visitors.	Space or topography constraints would prevent adequate provision of parking for the maximum site size of 25 dwellings.	No space or topography constraints which would prevent adequate provision of parking for up to 25 dwellings	Need to define resident's parking provision - e.g. 2 bed = 2 cars, 3 bed = 3 cars, 4+ bed = 4 cars. Questionnaire evidence shows village has 1 car per adult. Need to quantify provision for visitors. Note high parking provision means 25 dph may not be achievable.	NYCC / HDC standard allowances for parking spaces will be reviewed during the preparation of site design briefs, and uplifted if necessary based on the questionnaire evidence of the level of car ownership within the Parish.
Pipeline Criteria	(13) Development should favour sites where public safety is not adversely impacted by the presence of the high pressure ethylene pipeline	The pipeline safety buffer zones cover part or all of the site and there is less than 0.5Ha of land on the settlement side of the pipeline safety buffer zones	The pipeline safety buffer zones cover part or all of the site but there is more than 0.5Ha of land on the settlement side of the pipeline safety buffer zones	The pipeline safety buffer zones do not cover any part of the site.		Sites are expected to deliver up to 25 homes at an indicative density of 25 dph. HSE guidelines are that "Developments up to and including 30 dwelling units and at a density of no more than 40 per hectare" are sensitivity level 2. HSE advice for the inner zone is "advise against", and for the middle and outer zones the advice is "don't advise against."
Flooding Criteria	(14) Development should favour sites not affected by Flood Zone 3, or Flood zone 2 or at risk of surface water flooding	The majority of the site is in flood zone 3, or the majority of the site is in flood zone 2 or the site has some areas at high risk of surface water flooding	A small part of the site is in flood zone 3 or in flood zone 2, or some parts of the site have low or medium risk of surface water flooding.	No part of the site is in flood zone 3 or 2, and there are no parts of the site at risk of surface water flooding.	Risk of surface water flooding is assessed from the Long Term Flood Risk Map for England published on gov.uk	Adapted form of HDC Criteria. None of the candidate sites are affected by river flooding. Most are affected by surface water flooding.
Biodiversity/Habitat	(15) Development should favour sites which avoid reduction in biodiversity	Site is wholly or partly in an SSSI or SINC, or there are TPOs on site, or site has high biodiversity value.	Site is within the buffer zone of an SSSI or SINC, or there are TPOs immediately adjacent to site, or site has medium biodiversity value	Site is not within buffer zone of any SSSI or SINC, and site has no on site adjacent TPOs, and site has low biodiversity value	There are no SSSI in area. Buffer zone for SINC (ancient native woodlands) is set at 100m to allow for foraging species around margins of sites. Biodiversity score of 7 or more is high, 3 or less is low. For TPOs adjacent is defined as within the root/canopy range of the tree - a TPO across a highway is not considered adjacent.	Adapted form of HDC Criteria with objective scoring system to assess biodiversity value of sites. Biodiversity assessment is based on number of distinct habitat types present with the most diverse habitats types given double weighting (see biodiversity assessment tab for details).

Dealing with ambiguity or factors not explicitly addressed in definitions	1) The criteria definitions take precedence over traffic light definitions which should be seen as aids to interpretation. Reference should be made to the criteria definitions themselves to cater for factors not explicitly set out in the definitions.	2) Where a site appears to be close to the red/amber or amber/green boundaries, the outcome should be determined as follows: i) Test against RED, if the site fails to strictly meet the definition then ii) Test against GREEN, if site also fails to explicitly meet this definition, then classify as AMBER.
--	--	---

Eligibility Screening Criteria

Definition are as approved at Steering Group Meeting of 2nd October 2017

Sites which do not meet the eligibility criteria will be eliminated from the selection process and will not be assessed against the full site selection criteria.

Biodiversity Assessment

Habitat Types Present On Site	Weight	S/073/ 001	S/073/ 023	S/073/ 003	S/073/ 005	S/073/ 006	S/073/ 009	S/073/ 010	S/073/ 011	S/073/ 012	N5 Honeymans	N6 Allotments	S/125/ 006	S/125/ 002
Individual mature native species tree (freestanding or in hedge line)	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1		1
Native species copse or woodland	2								1		1			
Orchards	1													
Native species hedges	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Water courses (water always present)	2	1	1			1			1	1	1			
Derelict buildings (Bat roosting, bird nesting, invertebrates etc.)	1										1			
Grazing Land	1		1		1	1				1			1	
Long term uncultivated land/scrubland	1										1			
Biodiversity Score		4	5	2	3	4	2	2	6	5	8	2	2	2

Green	0-3	Low Biodiversity Potential
Amber	4-6	Medium Biodiversity Potential
Red	7+	High Biodiversity Potential

Habitat Types Considered For Inclusion, But Not Present On any Assessed Site

Wetlands/Ponds

Drystone walls

Meadows

Stone outcrops / cliffs

Habitat / Biodiversity Sub-elements

	S/073/ 001	S/073/ 023	S/073/ 003	S/073/ 005	S/073/ 006	S/073/ 009	S/073/ 010	S/073/ 011	S/073/ 012	N5 Honeymans	N6 Allotments	S/125/ 006	S/125/ 002
Biodiversity	Amber	Amber	Green	Green	Amber	Green	Green	Amber	Amber	Red		Green	Green
TPOs	Green	Green	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Green	Green		Amber*	Green
SINC	Green	Green	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Green	Green		Amber	Amber
Overall Assessment	Amber	Amber	Amber	Green	Amber	Green	Green	Amber	Amber	Red		Amber	Amber

* Assessment on TPOs revised from initial draft due to relocation of access.

Biodiversity Assessment

Habitat Types Present On Site	S/125/ 003	S/125/ 005	S/134/ 001	S/134/ 002	Bluebarn Nursery	Meadow Hill West	Meadow Hill East
Individual mature native species tree (freestanding or in hedge line)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Native species copse or woodland							
Orchards					1		
Native species hedges	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Water courses (water always present)							
Derelict buildings (Bat roosting, bird nesting, invertebrates etc.)	1		1		1		
Grazing Land						1	1
Long term uncultivated land/scrubland							
Biodiversity Score	3	2	3	2	4	3	3

Habitat Types Considered For Inclusion, But Not Present

Wetlands/Ponds

Drystone walls

Meadows

Stone outcrops / cliffs

Habitat / Biodiversity Sub-elements

	S/125/ 003	S/125/ 005	S/134/ 001	S/134/ 002	Bluebarn Nursery	Meadow Hill West	Meadow Hill East
Biodiversity	Green	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Green	Green
TPOs	Green	Green	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Green
SINC	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green
Overall Assessment	Green	Green	Amber	Green	Amber	Green	Green

* Assessment on TPOs revised from initial draft due to rel

Classification of Traffic Concerns

<u>Traffic Issue</u>	<u>Who is affected most</u>	<u>Concerns</u>	<u>Pattern</u>	<u>Main Exposure Period</u>	<u>Duration Per Event</u>
School run: Langbaurgh	Langbaurgh Residents	Congestion Delays / Children's Safety / Pavement Obstruction	Twice daily in term time	Start & End of School	45 mins
School run: Doctor's Lane	Doctor's Lane Residents	Congestion Delays / Children's Safety / Pavement Obstruction	Twice daily in term time	Start & End of School	45 mins
Rat-run: Doctor's Lane	Doctor's Lane Residents	Short delays / Excessive Traffic / Safety	Intermittent / High Frequency	7am - 10pm	ca. 1 min
Bottleneck: Rudby Bank	All road users	Short Delays / Safety	Intermittent / High Frequency	7am - 10pm	ca. 1 min
Junction Complexity: Garbutts Lane	Residents in area	Safety	Intermittent / High Frequency	7am - 10pm	ca. 10 sec

Development Sites: Impact Assessment on Traffic Concerns

	School run: Langbaurgh	School run: Doctor's Lane	Rat-run: Doctor's Lane	Bottleneck: Rudby Bank	Junction Complexity: Garbutts Lane
S/073/001	Medium	Medium	Low	Low	Very High
S/073/023	Medium	Medium	Low	Low	Very High
S/073/003	Low	Low	Medium	Low	Medium
S/073/005	Very High	Low*	High	Low	Medium
S/073/006	Medium	Medium	Low	Low	Very High
S/073/009	Medium	Medium	High	Low	High
S/073/010	Medium	Medium	High	Low	High
S/073/011	Low	Low	Medium	Low	Medium
S/073/012	Medium	Medium	Low	Low	Very High
S/125/006	High	High	Low	High	High
S/125/002	High	High	Low	High	High
S/125/003	High	High	Low	High	High
S/125/005	High	High	Low	High	High
S/134/001	High	High	Low	High	High
NP11	High	High	Low	High	High
NP12	High	High	Low	High	High

Impact Rules

Very High

All journeys for any purpose originating from location interact with/contribute to problem

High

Only / most likely route from location to access all local services. Site - Services: RED distance
Only / most likely route from location to access SHOP or SCHOOL. Site - Services: RED distance

Medium

Only / most likely route from location to access local services. Site - Services at AMBER distance
Only / most likely route from location to access SHOP & SCHOOL. Site - Services: AMBER distance
Only / most likely route from location to access VILLAGE HALL or VILLAGE CENTRE. Site - Services: RED distance

Low

* Residents exiting Langbaurgh very unlikely to use Doctors Lane in school run period.
Any other case.

Sites Which Do Not Meet Eligibility Criteria

Code	Description	Comments	Reason Why Ineligible	Has Full Assessment Been Carried Out & If So Why?
NP1	Not Used	N/A	N/A	N/A
NP2	Bluebarn Nurseries	Site area > 1Ha. Verbal expression of interest in development by owner, but subsequently retracted in writing. Site is not available.	Site is not available for development.	Yes. Had been carried out prior to being withdrawn by owner, but was included within consultation.
NP3	Not Used	N/A	N/A	N/A
NP4	Land between Southview and River Leven.	Owner has confirmed in writing that their intention is to develop as a single dwelling site if permission can be obtained.	Site is not available for development.	No. The statement in the 'Comments' column was included in the consultation on draft site assessments
NP5	Honeyman's Field	Site was suggested by members of the community through the NP questionnaire, and was not submitted by the owners. Verbal contacts indicates that site is unlikely to be brought forward. Attempts to get written confirmation of intentions have been unsuccessful - no response received to emails.	Site is not available for development.	Yes. One was prepared and included in consultation on draft assessments in case owner responded that site would be available.
NP6	Allotments	Site is less than 0.5 Ha. Parish Council who control land do not support development of site.	Does not meet minimum size or availability criteria.	Yes. To provide evidence of (un)suitability. Included in consultation on draft site assessments.
NP7	Enterpen Gap Site	Owner has confirmed in writing that their intention is to develop as a single dwelling site if permission can be obtained.	Site is not available for development.	No. The statement in the 'Comments' column was included in the consultation on draft site assessments
NP8	Village School	NYCC have advised that there is no expectation that the school will relocate within the current plan cycle.	Site is not available for development.	No. The statement in the 'Comments' column was included in the consultation on draft site assessments
NP9	Cricket Club	The Cricket Club Committee have advised that they do not wish to release the land for development, and in principle support its designation as Green Space	Site is not available for development.	No. The statement in the 'Comments' column was included in the consultation on draft site assessments
NP10	Land between Hutton Grange and Garbutts Lane	Owner has confirmed in writing that their do not wish to release their land for development.	Site is not available for development.	No. The statement in the 'Comments' column was included in the consultation on draft site assessments
S/073/013	Marwin	Site of 0.25 Ha on Garbutts Lane west of village	Does not meet minimum size criteria.	No. The statement in the 'Comments' column was included in the consultation on draft site assessments
S/073/023 (West)	Embleton Farm West	One of two subdivisions of S/073/023. Area of Embleton Farm West south of pipeline red 'no build' buffer zone 0.39 Ha. Owner's intention is to submit planning application for 4 self build plots.	Site is not available for preferred housing mix.	No (assessment had been carried out for full area of S/073/023, and one has been carried out for Embleton Farm East which meets eligibility criteria).
S/134/002	Cleveland Hills View	Existing Holiday Park on Stokesley Rd outside village. Owner is seeking permanent occupation rights for site (as opposed to holiday use). A planning application (17/00858/MRC) for conversion of status was refused on 25/9/17. Owner has indicated that all units would be lodge type, and no evidence has been provided to demonstrate that development of the site would make any contribution to the Parish affordable housing need.	Site is not available for preferred housing mix.	Yes - pending decision on compliance with eligibility criteria. Included within consultation on draft site assessments.

	073-001	073-023	073-003	073-011	073-005	073-006	073-012	073-009	073-010	125-006	125-002	125-003	125-005	134-001	NP11	NP12
(1) Development should favour sites which would be viable for the delivery of all components of the preferred housing mix (which will include affordable housing, downsizing/bungalows, and market homes predominantly of 2-3 bed size)	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	1	1
(2) Development should favour sites contained within or adjoining the village envelope.	1	2	0	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	1	1	1	1	2	2
(3) Development should favour sites that avoid loss of prime agricultural land, high quality habitat, or other valued land.	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	1	1
(4) Development should favour sites that can achieve a good access onto the adjacent road network	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	2	0	2	2
(5) Development should favour sites that do not result in impairment or loss of significant views from public spaces (roads or footpaths) as identified in the Settlement Character Assessment Workshops	2	2	1	1	0	0	1	2	2	2	0	1	2	0	1	1
(6) Development should favour sites that will not impact detrimentally on the conservation area or other significant buildings (listed buildings or non-designated heritage assets including associated grounds) or frontages as identified by the Settlement Character workshops.	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1
(7) Development should favour sites which present opportunities to protect or enhance Green Spaces, improve access for the public, or improve access for those with limited mobility	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
(8) Development should favour sites which do not result in loss of open space in the Leven Valley Character Zone as defined in Settlement Character Workshops.	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
(9) Development should favour sites that offer opportunity to sustain or enhance community services or facilities.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
(10) Development should favour sites that offer a viable alternative to private cars to access services or otherwise encourage reduction in vehicle traffic within the village area.	1	1	0	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
(11) Development should favour sites that provide opportunity to improve connectivity of footpaths and pavements within the village area.	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
(12) Development should favour sites that can provide sufficient off-street parking spaces for the needs of the additional residents and visitors generated by the development itself	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
(13) Development should favour sites where public safety is not adversely impacted by the presence of the high pressure ethylene pipeline	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0
(14) Development should favour sites not affected by Flood Zone 3, Flood zone 2 or with a history of surface water flooding. [Note: No eligible site is affected by Flood Zones 2 or 3, so this is effectively a surface water flooding criteria.]	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	0	2	2	0	0	0
(15) Development should favour sites which avoid loss of biodiversity	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0

Red	3	5	2	3	1	1	1	4	4	4	3	3	6	2	3	3
Amber	6	7	7	10	7	8	6	4	3	8	8	5	5	6	7	7
Green	6	3	6	2	7	6	8	7	8	3	4	7	4	7	5	5

Site Name		S/073/001	Draft	Rev 1	Comments Considered & Justification For Any Changes
Site Description		Land to South of Garbutts Lane on Western Edge of Village (2.61Ha)			
Theme	Criteria	Observations			
Housing	(1) Development should favour sites which would be viable for the delivery of all components of the preferred housing mix (which will include affordable housing, downsizing/bungalows, and market homes predominantly of 2-3 bed size)	Level site adjacent to Garbutts Lane. No evident constraints likely to impact on viability			
Site Characteristics	(2) Development should favour sites contained within or adjoining the village envelope.	Connects with existing settlement area on East side			
	(3) Development should favour sites that avoid loss of prime agricultural land, high quality habitat, or other valued land.	Grade 3 Arable Land			
	(4) Development should favour sites that can achieve a good access onto the adjacent road network	Direct access from Garbutts Lane would be assessed as red (60mph), whereas access via Paddocks End would be Green (30 mph). HDC assessment indicates that direct access from Garbutts Lane is their preference for this site, and as an access route to S/073/006 and S/073/012. Some comments suggesting that the speed limit can be moved have been received. The option of a direct access from Paddocks End from the 30mph zone exists, therefore, the site has been reassessed as GREEN. Consents from Broadacres may be required to use this route.			#1, #4, #6. All sites are now assessed on the basis of the lowest speed limit available from technically feasible routes. Developer and/or HDC preferences and justification for using alternative routes would be examined at site design brief stage.
	(5) Development should favour sites that do not result in impairment or loss of significant views from public spaces (roads or footpaths) as identified in the Settlement Character Assessment Workshops	HDC site assessment states "site would be prominent in views towards the settlement from Garbutts Lane" , and views across site were identified in Settlement Character Workshop (these are predominantly short distance views rather than extensive views into the wider landscape.)			#2, #5
Settlement Character - Built Environment	(6) Development should favour sites that will not impact detrimentally on the conservation area or other significant buildings (listed buildings or non-designated heritage assets including associated grounds) or frontages as identified by the Settlement Character workshops.	Outside the conservation area. The only listed building in the vicinity is a Grade II building at Hutton Grange, the setting of which would be unlikely to be significantly impacted.			
Settlement Character - Natural Environment	(7) Development should favour sites which present opportunities to protect or enhance Green Spaces, improve access for the public, or improve access for those with limited mobility	The closest proposed Green Space is the Cricket Pitch, which would neither be adversely affected or improved by development of this site.			
	(8) Development should favour sites which do not result in loss of open space in the Leven Valley Character Zone as defined in Settlement Character Workshops.	Site is outside the Leven Valley Character Zone			
Services & Facilities	(9) Development should favour sites that offer opportunity to sustain or enhance community services or facilities.	No identified opportunities			
	(10) Development should favour sites that offer a viable alternative to private cars to access services or otherwise encourage reduction in vehicle traffic within the village area.	Site is approximately 700m from village centre. Major services not located around the Village Green are at the following distances: Village Hall: 730m AMBER Shop: 160m GREEN School: 580m AMBER			
Traffic & Transport	(11) Development should favour sites that provide opportunity to improve connectivity of footpaths and pavements within the village area.	Site lies at the edge of the settlement, so there are no opportunities to improve connectivity within the settlement			
	(12) Development should favour sites that can provide sufficient off-street parking spaces for the needs of the additional residents and visitors generated by the development itself	Site is large enough to allocate land for 25 homes with adequate parking.			

Pipeline	(13) Development should favour sites where public safety is not adversely impacted by the presence of the high pressure ethylene pipeline	Pipeline zone lies beyond North boundary of site		
Flood Risk	(14) Development should favour sites not affected by Flood Zone 3, Flood zone 2 or with a history of surface water flooding. [Note: No eligible site is affected by Flood Zones 2 or 3, so this is effectively a surface water flooding criteria.]	There are no flood zones 3 or 2 on the site. The Environment Agency flood map indicates a small area towards the Southern end of the site (around Hundale Gill) at high risk of surface water flooding, and areas adjacent to the site with high risk of surface water flooding.		
Habitat / Biodiversity	(15) Development should favour sites which avoid loss of biodiversity	Site has medium biodiversity value, no TPOs on or adjacent to site, and is more than 100m from any SINC.		

Comment No	Comment	Response
1	Requested Change: Criteria (4) from RED to GREEN. "Because access could be onto a road with a 60mph speed limit this has been designated RED. Speed limits can be moved so this designation should be GREEN"	Response: Change to GREEN. All sites are assessed based on the prevailing speed limit. It is possible that these would be changed if a site was developed, but there is no guarantee that it would happen. Changing speed limits is not within the control of the site promoter or the Neighbourhood Plan so use of the prevailing speed limits is considered the most appropriate basis. However, all sites are now assessed on the basis of the lowest speed limit available from technically feasible routes (in this case 30mph from Paddocks End). Developer and/or HDC preferences and justification for using alternative routes would be examined at site design brief stage.
2	Requested Change: Criteria (5) from RED to GREEN. " There is reference to a view on this site coming into the village. Wherever you come from the countryside into a built up area you see dwellings. So move these a few yards closer but same experience. NB This contrasts with 009 where the views relate to the escarpment of the NY Moors which are shared by all.	Response: No Change. A definitive list of important views was developed through community consultation and marked up on a master map. Decisions on which views to recognise was arrived at by consensus in workshops involving participants from all areas of the village. This map was then displayed at a further four consultation events during the development of criteria and traffic light definitions, during which no modifications were proposed. In the site assessments only views marked on this map are considered, and all are given equal weight.
3	Requested Change: None. "There was comment at the 24/9/17 meeting regarding a pedestrian route from Langbaugh through this location to the SPAR. This could be beneficial in reducing what already seems to be an increase in traffic volume in Doctors Lane as a result of SPAR relocation	Response: Noted. This site is not adjacent to Langbaugh Road so could only contribute to such a route in conjunction with other sites. The potential benefit of this route is attributed to S/073/012 which could deliver the entire route.
4	Requested Change: Criteria (4) from RED to AMBER. "Access onto Garbutts Lane can't be assessed as RED because of the 60mph. The speed limit could be changed by Highways."	Response: Changed to GREEN. See response to comment #1.
5	Requested Change: Criteria (5) from RED to AMBER. "Whilst views are across the site, suitable 'low' level housing would not be obtrusive, also appropriate screening as with the existing hedge would camouflage the site. "	Response: No Change. See response to comment #2. Should the site be selected size, type, tenure and form of housing would be addressed within the site design brief.
6	Requested Change: Criteria (4): None specified. "The access to sites 073/001/006/012 may involve access onto Garbutts lane in a 60mph zone. Whilst that is currently a red assessment on the draft plan, I believe that has the potential flexibility to be changed to a reduced speed limit, whereas other red assessments in the draft plan are not in that category and are fixed.	Response: Changed to GREEN. See response to comment #1.

Site Name		S/073/023 (Replaces S/073/002)	Draft	Rev 1	Comments Considered & Justification For Any Changes
Site Description		Land to North of Levendale. Initially assessed as resubmitted reduced area (to south of pipeline). Subsequently partitioned into 'Embleton Farm East' and 'Embleton Farm West'. A separate planning application is expected to be submitted for 4 self-build plots on Embleton Farm West. This assessment applies only to the area described by the site promoter as 'Embleton Farm East'. Site area of Embleton Farm East is 1.75 Ha of which approximately half is south of the outer pipeline buffer zone.			
Theme	Criteria	Observations			
Housing	(1) Development should favour sites which would be viable for the delivery of all components of the preferred housing mix (which will include affordable housing, downsizing/bungalows, and market homes predominantly of 2-3 bed size)	Long access road required to reach site from Garbutts Lane and moderate gradients on some parts of site. There may be some adverse cost impacts associated with development within the pipeline buffer zones.			#9
Site Characteristics	(2) Development should favour sites contained within or adjoining the village envelope.	Embleton Farm East is separated from Levendale / Hundale by Hundale Gill. The proposed access road which runs between Cricket Club and the recently approved development at The Wickets is not considered to be part of the built form of the development.			#4, #10. Embleton Farm East would only have a direct connection with the existing built form if a planning application for self build plots on Embleton Farm West is submitted and is subsequently granted.
	(3) Development should favour sites that avoid loss of prime agricultural land, high quality habitat, or other valued land.	The majority of the site is Grade 3 grazing land, but also includes richer habitat along the margins of Hundale Gill which is under consideration for a Green Space designation. Site is assessed as having medium biodiversity potential which is further support for an AMBER rating.			#11. Biodiversity level has been reassessed.
	(4) Development should favour sites that can achieve a good access onto the adjacent road network	Frontage onto Garbutts Lane is very narrow, as is the whole of the existing lane to the main part of the site. HDC assessment indicates that the access road would need widening. There is limited frontage for construction of splays, and there are several other accesses nearby.			#12
	(5) Development should favour sites that do not result in impairment or loss of significant views from public spaces (roads or footpaths) as identified in the Settlement Character Assessment Workshops	Site is not prominent in views toward the settlement from roads, but according to HDC site assessment "would be prominent in views towards the settlement from existing Public Right of Way". Development would result in some impairment of views identified in the Settlement Character Workshops. The combination of prominence and impairment of views is assessed as RED in accordance with the criteria definitions.			#13. Prominence from PROW per HDC was not taken into account in draft assessment.
Settlement Character - Built Environment	(6) Development should favour sites that will not impact detrimentally on the conservation area or other significant buildings (listed buildings or non-designated heritage assets including associated grounds) or frontages as identified by the Settlement Character workshops.	Outside the conservation area. Listed buildings at Hutton Grange and North End are at some distance and would be unlikely to be impacted by development of this site.			#14
Settlement Character - Natural Environment	(7) Development should favour sites which present opportunities to protect or enhance Green Spaces, improve access for the public, or improve access for those with limited mobility	Indicative proposals from developer suggest that there will be no change in physical access to the proposed Green Space at Hundale Gill. However, enclosure of Gill within gardens will lead to a loss of visual access. It is not considered that the loss of visual access to the Gill would justify a RED assessment, as the developers proposals would offset this loss by including landscaped green spaces located on the pipeline inner buffer zone. It is unclear whether the proposed landscaped area could qualify for Green Space designation. The developer advises that this will not be publicly accessible open space.			#3, #5, #7, #15. Originally scored GREEN due to potential improvements in access to Hundale Gill. Developer's plans indicate that this will not occur.

	(8) Development should favour sites which do not result in loss of open space in the Leven Valley Character Zone as defined in Settlement Character Workshops.	Site is outside the Leven Valley Character Zone			
Services & Facilities	(9) Development should favour sites that offer opportunity to sustain or enhance community services or facilities.	No identified opportunities			#8
	(10) Development should favour sites that offer a viable alternative to private cars to access services or otherwise encourage reduction in vehicle traffic within the village area.	Site is approximately 500m from village centre. Major services not located around the Village Green are at the following distances: Village Hall: 620m AMBER Shop: 460m AMBER School: 470m AMBER			#16
Traffic & Transport	(11) Development should favour sites that provide opportunity to improve connectivity of footpaths and pavements within the village area.	Site lies at the edge of the settlement, so there are no opportunities to improve connectivity within the settlement.			#17
	(12) Development should favour sites that can provide sufficient off-street parking spaces for the needs of the additional residents and visitors generated by the development itself	Site is large enough to allocate land for 25 homes with adequate parking.			
Pipeline	(13) Development should favour sites where public safety is not adversely impacted by the presence of the high pressure ethylene pipeline	Pipeline zone traverses Northwest portion of site. Area on settlement side of pipeline zone is fully separated from the built area by Hundale Gill.			#1, #2, #6, #18
Flood Risk	(14) Development should favour sites not affected by Flood Zone 3, Flood zone 2 or with a history of surface water flooding. [Note: No eligible site is affected by Flood Zones 2 or 3, so this is effectively a surface water flooding criteria.]	There are no flood zones 3 or 2 on the site. The Environment Agency flood map indicates areas at the South and East ends of the site (around Hundale Gill) at risk of surface water flooding, and adjacent areas with high risk of surface water flooding.			#19
Habitat / Biodiversity	(15) Development should favour sites which avoid loss of biodiversity	Site has medium biodiversity value, no TPOs on or adjacent to site, and is more than 100m from any SINC.			#20

Comment No	Comment	Response
1	Requested Change: Criteria (13) from AMBER to RED. "Whilst it could be feasible to have a small development not affected by the pipeline. It is too close and should be red."	Response: No Change. Criteria are based on HSE guidance. There are no development restrictions on areas outside the pipeline buffer zones.
2	Requested Change: Criteria (13) from AMBER to RED. "Pipeline major concern and cannot be built on therefore reducing proposed area."	Noted: See also response to comment #1
3	Requested Change: Criteria (7) from GREEN to RED. "How could public access be improved if access road is long?."	Response: Change from GREEN to AMBER. This criteria addresses the issue of public access to proposed Green Spaces, and not to the highways access to the site as a whole. At present public access to the proposed Hundale Gill Green Space is very limited (where it is crossed by a public footpath). Depending on the pattern of development there could be improved access. However, the developer's indicative proposals are to enclose the Gill within gardens so there would be no improvement in access.
4	Requested Change: Criteria (2) from AMBER to RED. "Site is separated from Levendale/Hundale by Hundale Gill".	Reassessed as RED. Site was originally assessed on the area which includes both Embleton Farm East and Embleton Farm West. Information from the site promoter indicates that the two parts of the site are to be treated separately. Therefore, Embleton Farm East is entirely separated from the settlement by Hundale Gill. The proposed access road which runs between Cricket Club and the recently approved development at The Wickets is not considered to be part of the built form of the development.
5	Requested Change: Criteria (7) from GREEN to RED. "If criteria #1 is RED due to long access road, cannot see how development can improve public access to green space."	Response: Change from GREEN to AMBER. See response to comment #3

6	Requested Change: Criteria (13) from AMBER to RED. "If whole site is considered it encroaches on the pipeline, therefore should be RED. If only smaller area is considered it is fully enclosed by Hundale Gill. Cannot have hybrid version"	Response: No Change. Criteria are based on HSE guidance. The definition of AMBER requires that at least 0.5 Ha of the site has no development restrictions so that at least 0.5 Ha could be used for any type of housing. See response to comment #4 on site boundaries and HSE guidance on pipeline red and amber zones.
7	Requested Change: Criteria (7) from GREEN to AMBER. "How will building around Hundale Gill 'protect' or 'enhance' the Green Space?".	Response: Change Agreed. See response to comment #3
8	Requested Change: Criteria (9) from AMBER to RED. "If there are no identified opps to sustain or enhance community services this should be RED"	Response: No Change. Site meets the AMBER definition which is "Development of the site would have negligible impact (other than additional population) on facilities."
9	Requested Change: Criteria (1) from RED to GREEN. The site is viable and there are no constraints which would prevent delivery of all components of the preferred housing mix. Access can be via upgrade to existing driveway as acknowledged by Hambleton District Council plan and arrangements are in place which would enable alternative or additional access from the adjoining Levendale / Hundale estate.	Response: No Change. Site is assessed on the basis of the access shown on the site drawings provided by the site promoter. A long access road, particularly one which is partially routed through the pipeline buffer zones would have significant adverse cost impacts in comparison to a direct access onto a highway.
10	Requested Change: Criteria (2) from AMBER to GREEN. The site adjoins the existing village envelope and the presence of Hundale Gill does not change this proximity nor impact on the viability of this site.	Response: Revised to RED. The assessment is in accordance with the criteria definitions. Due to the partitioning of the site East Embleton Farm itself is entirely separated from the existing built form by Hundale Gill necessitating an amendment to RED. This is not a viability issue.
11	Requested Change: Criteria (3) from RED to GREEN. The land is moderate quality agricultural land Grade 3c used for grassland and grazing sheep. It is not prime agricultural land. At present all but the very small margin on the edge of the Gill is grassland which is regularly sprayed and chemically treated. There is thus no loss of prime agricultural land or high quality habitat. The introduction of gardens will improve habitat as they have been proven to greatly enrich the quality of the habitat compared to modern day farmland. See (15) below. Additionally the planting of a new native species woodland belt to the north of the proposed site will provide new high quality habitat and enhanced landscaping to this north edge of the village through which the existing footpath right of way will pass.	Response: Revised to AMBER. Loss of grazing land from food production is rated as an amber assessment. The draft assessment stated that the site was high for biodiversity due to the presence of two habitat types. However, this has been revised to medium as it is considered that use of the scoring system is a more objective basis to assess biodiversity. Proposed landscaping and screening would be considered a positive element at the site design brief stage if the site was selected, but falls outside the scope of the site selection criteria.
12	Requested Change: Criteria (4) from RED to GREEN. Access onto Garbutts Lane can be provided by upgrading existing drive to highway standards as acknowledged by Hambleton District Council plan and by doing so good access would be achieved. Additionally arrangements are in place which would enable alternative or additional access from the adjoining Levendale / Hundale estate. The 30 mph speed limit and vehicle capacity of Garbutts Lane is adequate for the increase in vehicular movements.	Response: No Change. The site is assessed on the basis of the proposed access arrangement onto Garbutts Lane which has limited frontage offering little or no flexibility to optimise position in relation to other junctions in an area of increasing junction complexity. This is assessed as RED in accordance with the criteria definitions. The Neighbourhood Plan has evidence that traffic volumes are well within road capacity.
13	Requested Change: Criteria (5) from AMBER to GREEN. The site is not prominent in views toward the settlement and would not effect the current form and appearance of the village in any noticeable way. We would like to know what impairment of views were identified in the Settlement Character Workshops.	Response: Revised to RED. HDC's site assessment states "The site would be prominent in views towards the settlement from the existing Public Right of Way". This statement had not been taken into account in the draft assessment. Views from the Public Right of Way were identified and included in the definitive list during Settlement Character Work, and views over the site from near the entrance to Levendale were also included. This assessment is in accordance with the criteria definitions.
14	Requested Change: Criteria (6) None. Development of site would have no adverse impact on the conservation area or any significant buildings within the village	Response: Noted.

15	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (7). The provision of extensive areas of open Green Space within the development and the planting of the tree belt to the north would enhance Green Space and the existing public footpath would provide easy access. We do not believe that there is a justification for the proposed Green Space (ref ALT/S/07/022/G) especially to the south of the proposed area where low value grassland with very minimal bio diversity extends to the very edge of the Gill.</p>	<p>Response: The developers proposals would result in loss of visual access to the proposed Green Space at Hundale Gill through enclosure in gardens. It is unclear whether the proposed landscaped area could qualify for a Green Space designation. As there will be some loss at Hundale Gill, and it is understood that the offsetting gains will not be publicly accessible space, the net effect is assessed as neutral (i.e. AMBER).</p>
16	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (10). Site in close proximity to village centre. The current public footpath enables easy pedestrian access to local facilities within the village area. The site is just under 500m to the 'designated' village centre and less than that to the village shop, post office and butchers. The location of the development thus offers a very viable alternative to private car use and combined with its 'edge' of village location will minimise additional local vehicle traffic within the village area. Most commuter traffic from the development will exit the village to the west and out towards the A19 rather than passing through the village. Although the traffic light classification of 'orange' is correct according to the set parameters the site is almost 'green' and some weighting should be given to that if possible.</p>	<p>Response: No Change. The overall assessment of AMBER will stand. However, commentary is to be added to all sites indicating whether heavily used services are closer than the overall rating. For this site all main services located away from the village centre are individually AMBER.</p>
17	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (11) None. No additional connectivity but enhancement of existing footpath by presence of new native tree woodland belt.</p>	<p>Response: Noted. The drawings provided do not indicate how the footpath will exit towards the Northwest. Clarification of this would be required during the development of the site design brief if the site was selected.</p>
18	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (13) from AMBER to GREEN. The proposed area of development lies to the south of the pipeline and outside the 50m no build buffer zone and HSE advice regarding development here would be "don't advise against". The pipeline operator SABIC would only wish to be consulted should any work take place within 50m of the pipeline and none of the buildings on the development site are within 50m.</p>	<p>Response: No Change. The site has been assessed in accordance with the criteria as AMBER since the site incorporates pipeline buffer zones.</p>
19	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (14) from RED to GREEN. The proposed development site is located in Flood Zone 1; this is land with the lowest risk of flooding as estimated by the Environment Agency. The site is not located in a Flood Risk Zone. The Environment Agency Map shows that a very small part of the site in the extreme SE corner of the site has some low risk potential for surface water flooding. This area has flooded once in the last 25 years and then for only a few hours in a small corner of the field. Any potential surface water flooding on this small area can easily be dealt with by design. Ref in the HR Site Assessment summary consultation draft to adjacent areas of high risk surface water flooding should be of no relevance to this site. There can be no reason why this site can be classified as anything other than green in the traffic light definition.</p>	<p>Response: No Change. The EA maps indicate areas of the site near Hundale Gill at high risk of surface water flooding. The flood map provided marked up with the site 'redline' appears to confirm this. This is classified as RED in accordance with the criteria definitions.</p>

20 **Requested Change: Criteria (15) from AMBER to GREEN.** Development of this site will not result in the loss of biodiversity. The introduction of gardens backing onto Hundale Gill will greatly enhance the biodiversity of the Gill compared to the current monocrop of chemically treated grassland. Gardens are good for biodiversity, according to a study of intensively managed farmland in Sweden. The study has found that abundance and species richness of pollinating bees is higher near domestic gardens, with the pollination of a native plant also greater at these sites. Domestic gardens play a role in complementing 'natural' habitats for pollinators in impoverished environments. The British Trust for Ornithology state that there is plenty of scientific evidence to support the assertion that gardens have a value for wildlife and a role to play in the maintenance and conservation of biodiversity. There will also be considerable gains in biodiversity as a result of the planting of the new native species tree belt on the northern edge of this proposed site. The reality is that there will be significant gains to biodiversity rather than loss.

Response: No Change. The purpose of all site selection criteria is to differentiate between sites. The purpose of this particular criteria (all else being equal) is to favour those with low biodiversity in their undeveloped state over those with high biodiversity. The contribution to biodiversity from domestic gardens is common to all sites, therefore is not relevant within this context. Similarly, while the potential gains from the proposed landscaping are noted, biodiversity gains from appropriate landscaping would be expected on all sites.

Site Name		S/073/003	Draft	Rev 1	Comments Considered & Justification For Any Changes
Site Description		Site to South Of Enterpen (includes Flagpole field and area around farm buildings). 2.52 Ha. A single dwelling has been approved for the flagpole field (Ref 16/1771/FUL)			
Theme	Criteria	Observations			
Housing	(1) Development should favour sites which would be viable for the delivery of all components of the preferred housing mix (which will include affordable housing, downsizing/bungalows, and market homes predominantly of 2-3 bed size)	No evident constraints on viability assuming that removal of existing buildings does not involve excessive costs (e.g. due to contamination)			
Site Characteristics	(2) Development should favour sites contained within or adjoining the village envelope.	Site has a complex shaped Northern boundary which connects well with the existing settlement.			
	(3) Development should favour sites that avoid loss of prime agricultural land, high quality habitat, or other valued land.	Hybrid site - part brownfield around farm buildings, part domestic garden, and part Grade 3/3a arable land.			"Blended" value of AMBER assigned.
	(4) Development should favour sites that can achieve a good access onto the adjacent road network	There are two relatively short sections of frontage onto Enterpen (30mph) offering some flexibility in access location. Both locations are located near existing junctions.			#1
	(5) Development should favour sites that do not result in impairment or loss of significant views from public spaces (roads or footpaths) as identified in the Settlement Character Assessment Workshops	Site is not prominent in views towards the settlement. View across flagpole field from Enterpen was noted in the Village Design Statement and in the Settlement Character Workshops. Some further impairment of this view over and above that arising from the single dwelling approved for the flagpole field may arise.			#2
Settlement Character - Built Environment	(6) Development should favour sites that will not impact detrimentally on the conservation area or other significant buildings (listed buildings or non-designated heritage assets including associated grounds) or frontages as identified by the Settlement Character workshops	The flagpole field, and some of the farm buildings lie inside the conservation area. Enterpen Farm (Grade II) and Village Hall (NDHA) are adjacent to site, and Linden Grange (Grade II) is nearby. There are likely to be significant impacts.			
Settlement Character - Natural Environment	(7) Development should favour sites which present opportunities to protect or enhance Green Spaces, improve access for the public, or improve access for those with limited mobility	No opportunities as site is not immediately adjacent to any proposed Green Spaces.			
	(8) Development should favour sites which do not result in loss of open space in the Leven Valley Character Zone as defined in Settlement Character Workshops.	Site is outside the Leven Valley Character Zone.			
Services & Facilities	(9) Development should favour sites that offer opportunity to sustain or enhance community services or facilities.	No identified opportunities.			
	(10) Development should favour sites that offer a viable alternative to private cars to access services or otherwise encourage reduction in vehicle traffic within the village area.	Flagpole field edge of site is 400m from village centre. Major services not located around the Village Green are at the following distances: Village Hall: 90m GREEN Shop: 610m AMBER School: 180m GREEN			
Traffic & Transport	(11) Development should favour sites that provide opportunity to improve connectivity of footpaths and pavements within the village area.	Site lies at the edge of the settlement, so there are no opportunities to improve connectivity within the settlement.			
	(12) Development should favour sites that can provide sufficient off-street parking spaces for the needs of the additional residents and visitors generated by the development itself	Site is large enough to allocate land for 25 homes with adequate parking.			
Pipeline	(13) Development should favour sites where public safety is not adversely impacted by the presence of the high pressure ethylene pipeline	Pipeline is not in vicinity of site			

Flood Risk	(14) Development should favour sites not affected by Flood Zone 3, Flood zone 2 or with a history of surface water flooding. [Note: No eligible site is affected by Flood Zones 2 or 3, so this is effectively a surface water flooding criteria.]	There are no flood zones 3 or 2 on the site. The Environment Agency flood map indicates areas at the Northern end of the site (close to the highway at Enterpen) at high risk of surface water flooding, and some Adjacent areas with high risk of surface water flooding.			
Habitat / Biodiversity	(15) Development should favour sites which avoid loss of biodiversity	Site has low biodiversity value, has an adjacent TPO, and is within 100m of a SINC			

Comment No	Comment	Response
1	Requested Change: Criteria (4) from AMBER to GREEN. "Good site. Close to all amenities school/doc. Good access to 30mph."	Response: No Change. Criteria numbers are not identified in comment. "Close to amenities" is assumed to refer to criteria #10, which is already assessed as GREEN. "Good access to 30mph" is assumed to refer to criteria #4. Although potential access points are located in the 30mph zone, the site has only two limited lengths of frontage onto Enterpen neither of which are a preformed access for a housing development (such as a hammerhead). This offers limited flexibility for forming an access so AMBER is considered to be the appropriate assessment.
2	Requested Change: Criteria (5) from AMBER to RED. "View is noted by HDC as a rare view & could be impacted."	Response: No Change. View is taken into account in AMBER assessment ("partial impairment"). If site was selected, preservation of view could be addressed through the site design brief.

Site Name		S/073/005	Draft	Rev 1	Comments Considered & Justification For Any Changes
Site Description		Land to North of Langbaugh Road. Original site was 1.02 Ha, but sale of 15m wide strip to residents on Langbaugh to incorporate into domestic gardens (15/02694/FUL) has reduced area available for development by ca. 0.2 Ha. Developer has proposed adjusting site boundaries to compensate.			
Theme	Criteria	Observations			
Housing	(1) Development should favour sites which would be viable for the delivery of all components of the preferred housing mix (which will include affordable housing, downsizing/bungalows, and market homes predominantly of 2-3 bed size)	Level site adjacent with potential access directly from Langbaugh. No evident constraints likely to impact on viability.			
Site Characteristics	(2) Development should favour sites contained within or adjoining the village envelope.	Site connects with existing settlement along part of Southern boundary			#5, #12, #14
	(3) Development should favour sites that avoid loss of prime agricultural land, high quality habitat, or other valued land.	Grade 3 Grazing land			
	(4) Development should favour sites that can achieve a good access onto the adjacent road network	Direct access from Langbaugh road hammerhead is possible. HDC assessment indicates that highways have some concerns over extension to a cul-de-sac with no additional / secondary access. ADDITIONAL TRAFFIC INTERACTING WITH SCHOOL RUN CONGESTION IS MAJOR CONCERN FOR LOCAL RESIDENTS. Concerns about construction traffic accessing the site through Langbaugh have also been raised.			#3, #4, #6, #8, #9, #10
	(5) Development should favour sites that do not result in impairment or loss of significant views from public spaces (roads or footpaths) as identified in the Settlement Character Assessment Workshops	Site is <u>not</u> prominent in views towards the settlement. No views identified in Settlement Character Workshops would be impacted.			#7
	Settlement Character - Built Environment	(6) Development should favour sites that will not impact detrimentally on the conservation area or other significant buildings (listed buildings or non-designated heritage assets including associated grounds) or frontages as identified by the Settlement Character workshops.	No listed buildings in vicinity. Settings of NDHAs (Drumrauck Hall and Old Vicarage) would be unlikely to be significantly impacted due to screening by mature trees / existing development at Langbaugh Rd. The existing field is part of the historic field system between the village and Campion Lane, and the hedgerows are shown on the 1856 ordnance survey map of the area.		
Settlement Character - Natural Environment	(7) Development should favour sites which present opportunities to protect or enhance Green Spaces, improve access for the public, or improve access for those with limited mobility	No opportunities as site is not immediately adjacent to any proposed Green Spaces			
	(8) Development should favour sites which do not result in loss of open space in the Leven Valley Character Zone as defined in Settlement Character Workshops.	Site is outside the Leven Valley Character Zone			

Services & Facilities	(9) Development should favour sites that offer opportunity to sustain or enhance community services or facilities.	No identified opportunities			
	(10) Development should favour sites that offer a viable alternative to private cars to access services or otherwise encourage reduction in vehicle traffic within the village area.	Distance from village centre is approx. 1.3 km. (Note the pedestrian route does not go through the school grounds as it is not a public right of way). Major services not located around the Village Green are at the following distances: Village Hall: 660m AMBER Shop: 1230m RED School: 380m GREEN			#1, #2, #19
Traffic & Transport	(11) Development should favour sites that provide opportunity to improve connectivity of footpaths and pavements within the village area.	Site lies at the edge of the settlement, so there are no opportunities to improve connectivity within the settlement.			#11
	(12) Development should favour sites that can provide sufficient off-street parking spaces for the needs of the additional residents and visitors generated by the development itself	Following the sale of the 15m strip of land it is unlikely that 25 homes with adequate parking could be delivered on this site.			
Pipeline	(13) Development should favour sites where public safety is not adversely impacted by the presence of the high pressure ethylene pipeline	Pipeline is not in vicinity of site			#13, #15
Flood Risk	(14) Development should favour sites not affected by Flood Zone 3, Flood zone 2 or with a history of surface water flooding. [Note: No eligible site is affected by Flood Zones 2 or 3, so this is effectively a surface water flooding criteria.]	There are no flood zones 3 or 2 on the site. The Environment Area map shows some small areas at low risk of surface water flooding towards the West of the site.			
Habitat / Biodiversity	(15) Development should favour sites which avoid loss of biodiversity	Site has low biodiversity value, has no TPOs on or adjacent to site, and is more than 100m from any SINC			

Comment No	Comment	Response
1	Requested Change: Criteria (10) from RED to GREEN. "Accessible, close to road and school via Langbaugh Rd, single road so same criteria the Hutton Fields was chosen."	Response: No Change. Comment does not specify a criteria, but is assumed to be related to criteria #10. Intent of reference to Hutton Fields is unclear. Overall assessment is based on distance from centre of village which was defined through a consultation exercise, but notes on distances to main services located away from the village centre have been added to the commentary for all sites.
2	Requested Change: Criteria (10): None. "According to Hambleton LDF this site is only accessible from Garbutts Lane. If this occurred then it would increase traffic."	Response: Comment noted.

3	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (4): None. "Correspondence has been ongoing since 2011 with Bridget Fortune (HDC Ward Councillor) and (NYCC) Councillor Tim Swales regarding car parking at school times on Eden Park Road and Langbaurgh. Tim Swales suggested that he had site meeting on 13/1/11. Nothing has changed for the last six years. Any additional housing will increase this problem."</p>	<p>Response: No Change. The problems caused to Langbaurgh/Eden Park residents by school run traffic, parking, and congestion is acknowledged, and is now highlighted in the site commentary. Development of site S/073/005 with an access through Langbaurgh would increase the number of residents exposed to this problem, and increase the amount of locally generated traffic affected by it, but would be unlikely to generate additional school run traffic. Whereas other sites at greater distance from the school are more likely to generate additional school run traffic. If the site was selected, specific consideration will be given to mitigation of impact on school run traffic in the site design brief. Also noted is the data provided by this consultee which stated that 58 vehicles were recorded entering Eden Park Road between 2:50 and 3:30 pm (i.e. the school run period) on 15/4/16. A note has been added to the assessment commentary to highlight this issue.</p>
4	<p>Requested Change: Change Criteria (4) From GREEN to RED. "The additional traffic through Langbaurgh Rd would exacerbate an already congested problem in relation to parking for the school run. The council accepted this was a major problem. This would also be a major issue during construction. If site 012 was to be connected to 005 this would create a 'rat run' from Langbaurgh to Garbutts Lane. Children's safety is greatly at risk."</p>	<p>Response: No Change. The congestion issue and the inconvenience caused to residents is acknowledged in the site commentary (see also response to comment #3), but is not addressed by this criteria which is concerned with physical design. There is an existing hammerhead which provides a connection to the road network in a 30mph zone. Construction traffic issues would be dealt with during the planning stage if the site was selected, and it is common for conditions to be imposed restricting delivery times to avoid peak periods. S/073/005 could not of itself create a 'rat run', as it does not extend to Paddocks End/Garbutts Lane - the issue is considered within the context of S/073/012.</p>
5	<p>Requested Change: Change Criteria (2) From AMBER to RED. "The criteria re adjoining the village envelope has changed if you take the original plots of the village envelope. Now strips of land have been purchased and should not be considered as part of the village envelope."</p>	<p>Response: No Change. Planning approval for the incorporation of these strips of land into the domestic gardens of adjacent properties has been granted. This strip of land has, therefore, been incorporated into the village envelope.</p>
6	<p>Requested Change: Change Criteria (4) From GREEN to RED. "On the HDC assessment on traffic suggests they have reservations of access via the cul-de-sac without a secondary access."</p>	<p>Response: No Change. The point has already been noted and considered. There is a good primary access (although subject to congestion issues during the school run). The HDC assessment also states "a low yield could be considered".</p>
7	<p>Requested Change: Change Criteria (5) From GREEN to RED. "Any new development would be prominent in view from Garbutts Lane. The current houses on Langbaurgh Road are seen from Garbutts Lane."</p>	<p>Response: No Change. The site is visible, but the Neighbourhood Plan assessment is in agreement with HDC's assessment which states "site is not prominent in significant views towards the settlement". During the work on settlement character no views over this site were proposed. A definitive list of important views was developed through community consultation and marked up on a master map. Decisions on which views to recognise was arrived at by consensus in workshops involving participants from all areas of the village. This map was then displayed at a further four consultation events during the development of criteria and traffic light definitions, during which no modifications were proposed. In the site assessments only views marked on this map are considered, and all are given equal weight.</p>
8	<p>Requested Change: Change Criteria (4) From GREEN to RED. "Langbaurgh Road cannot sustain additional traffic without putting children at risk during the school run as it is the main drop off point. This applies to construction traffic as well as when the development is complete. This would be even worse if connected to site 012 as it would create a 'rat-run' from Garbutts Lane to Langbaurgh Road. Children's safety should come first. "</p>	<p>Response: No Change. See response to comments #3 and #4</p>

9	<p>Requested Change: Change Criteria (4) From GREEN to AMBER. "It may appear to meet the criteria re access to main road with 30mph limit, but the way the road is used by parents dropping children off at school cutting the corner coming into Eden Park Rd, parking inconsiderately etc. This is not a suitable road for building lorries to use to access a site and would create a very dangerous situation for children and residents leaving Langbaugh Rd during school drop off and pick up times."</p>	<p>Response: No Change. See response to comments #3 and #4</p>
10	<p>Requested Change: Change Criteria (4) From GREEN to RED. "Road access on narrow estate roads heavily used by school traffic. No alternative access."</p>	<p>Response: No Change. See response to comments #3 and #4</p>
11	<p>Requested Change: Change Criteria (11) From AMBER to RED. "Distance from village result everyone uses cars. No footpaths to village."</p>	<p>Response: No Change. The distance from services is addressed through Criteria 10 (in which the site is assessed as RED overall, although the school itself is "GREEN"). This site in combination with S/073/012 could deliver a footpath connection to the SPAR, but this is considered an opportunity only within the assessment for S/073/012, as S/073/005 could not deliver this on its own, therefore, this site is assessed as AMBER (neither gain or loss in connectivity).</p>
12	<p>Requested Change: Change Criteria (2) From AMBER to GREEN. "Level site within existing settlement"</p>	<p>Response: No Change. Site connects only along one side so is correctly assessed as AMBER</p>
13	<p>Requested Change: Change Criteria (14) From AMBER to GREEN. "Flooding is not an issue compared with other sites in question".</p>	<p>Response: No Change. A small part of the site is affected by a low risk of surface water flooding. The criteria are applied consistently across all sites to highlight where flood water management may be required. Site is correctly assessed as AMBER.</p>
14	<p>Requested Change: Change Criteria (2) From AMBER to GREEN. "A level site within existing settlement along Southern boundary."</p>	<p>Response: No Change. See response to comment #11</p>
15	<p>Requested Change: Change Criteria (14) From AMBER to GREEN. "No flood zones identified on this site."</p>	<p>Response: No Change. See response to comment #12</p>
16	<p>Requested Change: None: "Firstly I cannot see past using Sarah Websters land in say 25 homes in each of three successive five year phases. There is land aplenty to completely disguise the development from existing homes, whilst also establishing a footpath and wildlife corridor. Putting all 70 homes with one developer would enable them to afford the extensive landscaping required at the outset. It is the ideal placement for affordable homes, taking traffic away from the village and being most convenient for Teesside employment centres. It is the ideal placement for bungalows, affording level pedestrian access to most of the village. For both the above, the site is essentially convenient for the new Spar shopping, again avoiding the need to drive through the village to the shop.</p>	<p>Response: Noted. Comment does not relate to site assessments.</p>

17	<p>Requested Change: Redefine location of village centre: "Finally at a recent drop-in session, two Rudby residents made the point that the centre of the village has little meaning, because in reality, residents move to village services for daily needs, certainly not to a water pump although the Hub does attract visitors. Based on my preliminary assessment, SPAR has just under 2000 customers per week, School 1250 journeys per week (assuming 50% are picked up twice a day), GP surgery 180 visits per week plus any prescription collection, and the village hall / sports facilities around 300/400 per week. Based on this preliminary data, the distance from sites included in the draft assessment should be related to the needs of residents. The centre of gravity of services is at the west end of the village, west of Doctors Lane, which leads to new sites in that are being given credit for their location as places close to residents needs and convenience. I believe a relook is required.</p>	<p>Response: No Change. The use of a single nominal centre for the village was the subject of consultation during the development of criteria and traffic light definitions. This approach is simple to apply and transparent. The location of the village centre to be used in the assessment was also determined through consultation. Three of the options offered were located west of Doctors Lane, but these attracted very little support. The overwhelming majority of responses were for the two options located on the Village Green. Community opinion on this issue is very clear. However, notes on distances to the main services located away from the village centre have been added to the commentary for all sites.</p>
18	<p>Requested Change: Consider alternative boundaries for site. "As stated during recent developer presentations, site S/073/012 which includes S/073/005 is put forward in whole or part for development, the boundary of S/073/005 should therefore not be taken as a constraint to development on land North of Langbaugh Road. Following on from the above, the plan displayed at the developer presentations took account of the land which has been incorporated within the gardens of properties to the south and showed 20 dwellings including a mix of 3 and 4 bedroomed properties on 1.4 hectares of land."</p>	<p>Response: Noted. All sites have been assessed as presented other than by taking into account the impact of any approved planning applications, which are assumed to be delivered in accordance with approved plans. Alternative options will be considered within context of S/073/012. Explanatory note has been added to site description.</p>
19	<p>Requested Change: Change Criteria (10) From RED. "The school is readily accessible on foot from the site. This should be given particular positive weight in an assessment. In our opinion this accessibility to a key piece of infrastructure in Hutton Rudby suggests 'red' is not an appropriate classification. Following on from the above, a question was asked during the developer presentations as to whether there could be a pedestrian link through S/073/012 linking the southern and northern portions of the site. Such a link would amongst other things provide access to the Spar / Post Office and could be deliverable as part of a comprehensive development of S/073/012. Positive weight is attached to such a possibility in the assessment of S/073/012 Services and Facilities (10)."</p>	<p>Decision: No Change: See response to comment #1. While the proximity of the school to the site is positive in respect of walking to school, this is offset by the increase in locally generated traffic that would interact with school run congestion in the Eden Park/Langbaugh area. The opportunity to deliver a footpath and/or a cycleway is considered within the context of S/073/012, but as it could not be delivered by S/073/005 in isolation, it is not considered to be an opportunity for this site.</p>

Site Name		S/073/006	Draft	Rev 1	Comments Considered & Justification For Any Changes
Site Description		Land to South of Paddocks End. Original site 0.88 Ha, but a 15m wide strip on the Eastern edge has been sold to incorporate into domestic gardens (17/00208/FUL). Remaining area available for development ca. 0.8 Ha. Developer has proposed adjusting site boundaries to compensate.			
Theme	Criteria	Observations			
Housing	(1) Development should favour sites which would be viable for the delivery of all components of the preferred housing mix (which will include affordable housing, downsizing/bungalows, and market homes predominantly of 2-3 bed size)	Although there is a field gate on the NE corner of the site, Highways have advised HDC that access should be from Garbutts lane. The cost of this access may have some impact on viability. However, the developer has indicated their preferred access is through Paddocks Ends (consent from Broadacres may be required, and obtaining this could also potentially have adverse cost impacts).			Developer has advised intention to create a direct access from Paddocks End. No other viability concerns have been identified.
Site Characteristics	(2) Development should favour sites contained within or adjoining the village envelope.	Site connects with the existing settlement on North and East sides.			
	(3) Development should favour sites that avoid loss of prime agricultural land, high quality habitat, or other valued land.	Predominantly Grade 3 grazing land. There is a very small area of higher quality habitat along the margins of Hundale Gill which forms part of the Northern edge of the site. (This has not been proposed for Green Space designation)			#1
	(4) Development should favour sites that can achieve a good access onto the adjacent road network	Direct access from Garbutts Lane across S/073/001 would be assessed as "Red" as it would fall into the 60mph zone. Access via Paddocks End (30mph zone) would be assessed as Green. Developers proposal is to use Paddocks End route - consent from Broadacres may be required. Comments have been received raising concerns about impact of a potential through route on Langbaugh and traffic/junction complexity in Garbutts Lane area.			#2, #3, #6. All sites are now assessed on the basis of the lowest speed limit available from technically feasible routes. Developer and/or HDC preferences and justification for using alternative routes would be examined at site design brief stage.
	(5) Development should favour sites that do not result in impairment or loss of significant views from public spaces (roads or footpaths) as identified in the Settlement Character Assessment Workshops	Site is <u>not</u> prominent in views towards the settlement, and no views identified in Settlement Character Workshops would be impacted.			
Settlement Character - Built Environment	(6) Development should favour sites that will not impact detrimentally on the conservation area or other significant buildings (listed buildings or non-designated heritage assets including associated grounds) or frontages as identified by the Settlement Character workshops.	Outside the conservation area and no listed or NDHA buildings in vicinity. The existing field is part of the historic field system between the village and Campion Lane, and the hedgerows are shown on the 1856 ordnance survey map of the area.			
Settlement Character - Natural Environment	(7) Development should favour sites which present opportunities to protect or enhance Green Spaces, improve access for the public, or improve access for those with limited mobility	No opportunities as site is not immediately adjacent to any proposed Green Spaces			

	(8) Development should favour sites which do not result in loss of open space in the Leven Valley Character Zone as defined in Settlement Character Workshops.	Site is outside the Leven Valley Character Zone			
Services & Facilities	(9) Development should favour sites that offer opportunity to sustain or enhance community services or facilities.	No identified opportunities			
	(10) Development should favour sites that offer a viable alternative to private cars to access services or otherwise encourage reduction in vehicle traffic within the village area.	Site is approximately 600m from village centre (assumes pedestrian access from public footpath to North of site). Major services not located around the Village Green are at the following distances: Village Hall: 670m AMBER Shop: 90m GREEN School: 520m AMBER			
Traffic & Transport	(11) Development should favour sites that provide opportunity to improve connectivity of footpaths and pavements within the village area.	Site lies at the edge of the settlement, so there are no opportunities to improve connectivity within the settlement.			
	(12) Development should favour sites that can provide sufficient off-street parking spaces for the needs of the additional residents and visitors generated by the development itself	Following the sale of the 15m strip of land it is unlikely that 25 homes with adequate parking could be delivered on this site.			
Pipeline	(13) Development should favour sites where public safety is not adversely impacted by the presence of the high pressure ethylene pipeline	Pipeline is not in vicinity of site			
Flood Risk	(14) Development should favour sites not affected by Flood Zone 3, Flood zone 2 or with a history of surface water flooding. [Note: No eligible site is affected by Flood Zones 2 or 3, so this is effectively a surface water flooding criteria.]	There are no flood zones 3 or 2 on the site. The Environment Agency flood map indicates an area at the Northern end of the site (around Hundale Gill) at risk of surface water flooding, and areas adjacent to the site with high risk of surface water flooding.			#5
Habitat / Biodiversity	(15) Development should favour sites which avoid loss of biodiversity	Site has medium biodiversity value, no TPOs on or adjacent to site, and is more than 100m from any SINC.			

Comment No	Comment	Response
------------	---------	----------

1	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (3) from AMBER to RED. "The existing field is part of the historic field system between the village and Campion Lane, and the hedgerows are shown on the 1856 ordnance survey map of the area. To get access to this site will require a new road either through Paddocks End or around the western end of the Broadacres development to connect to Garbutts Lane. Either of these routes will require removal of part of the existing hedgerows</p> <p>The land itself is important as habitat for wildlife. For many years the field has been used regularly for cattle in the summer and, occasionally, for sheep in the winter. This usage, combined with the surrounding ancient hedgerows, has allowed the development of a varied flora and fauna on the site, including small mammals and a significant number of resident and migratory birds."</p>	<p>Response: No Change. A note on the presence of historic field systems has been added to the commentary on criteria 6. This is grazing land so is classified as AMBER, however, a note to highlight this feature has been added to the commentary of criteria #6 for this site and for S/073/005 and S/073/012. Habitat/biodiversity is assessed through a scoring system and this area is rated as medium due to the presence of hedgerows, a water course and grazing land. Biodiversity is considered in more detail in Criteria 15. If the site was selected, minimising loss of ancient hedgerow would be addressed at the site design brief stage.</p>
2	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (4) from UNDETERMINED to RED. "If the developer seeks to gain access via Paddocks End to the north of the proposed site, there will be some loss of existing hedgerow, and a route will need to be found that avoids the flood protection works installed when Paddocks End was developed. If these obstacles can be overcome and Hundale Beck bridged satisfactorily, then it will result in additional traffic entering and exiting through Paddocks End on to Garbutts Lane. Whilst this access point to Paddocks End is within a 30mph area, it has limited visibility because of the bends to the west and east on Garbutts Lane. Also, it is sited close to the entry/exit for the new Spar store and Shell petrol station, to the entry to The Wickets, virtually opposite to the recently approved new development to the north of Garbutts Lane behind Levendale, and to the Cricket Club. The increased usage at this point for a further 11 to 25 dwellings would add to the traffic already on this part of Garbutts Lane. All these factors mean that access to the proposed development through Paddocks End cannot be described as achieving good access onto the adjacent road network.</p> <p>If, as an alternative, the developer opts for a new access road to the west of Paddocks End, which was the route favoured by Hambleton District Council in their Local Plan Preferred Sites Consultation exercise last year, then it should be assessed as RED for the same reasons given for Site S/073/001."</p>	<p>Response: Assessed As GREEN. The developer has advised an intention to access the highway network through Paddocks End - consent from Broadacres may be required. This is assessed GREEN as indicated in the consultation draft. Concerns about traffic flows/junction complexity in the area are noted. Criteria 1 has also been reassessed to GREEN on the assumption that the Paddocks End route would be used.</p>
3	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (4) from UNDETERMINED to RED. "Sight lines are not good for traffic in this area."</p>	<p>Response: Assessed As GREEN. See comment #2 and also response to comment #2</p>
4	<p>Requested Change: Consider alternative boundaries for site. "As stated during recent developer presentations, site S/073/012 which includes S/073/006 is put forward in whole or part for development, the boundary of S/073/006 should therefore not be taken as a constraint to a development on land South of Paddocks End.</p> <p>Following on from the above, the plan displayed at the developer presentations took account of the land which has been incorporated within the gardens of properties to the east and showed 46 dwellings on 1.95 ha of land. Additional plans were displayed which showed 25 dwellings on 1.0 hectare of land and 34 dwellings on 1.5 hectares of land."</p>	<p>Response: Noted. All sites have been assessed as presented, other than by taking into account the impact of any approved planning applications which are assumed to be delivered in accordance with approved plans. Alternative options will be considered within context of S/073/012. Explanatory note has been added to site description.</p>

5	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (14) from RED. "According to the new Flood Map for Planning, site S/073/006 is within Flood Zone 1. An extract is provided below. [Not included here]. In relation to flood risk from surface water, the part of the site at risk is small as shown below. The parts of the site potentially affected are small. A planning application would likely require a Flood Risk Assessment. This would amongst other things influence the detailed design and layout of a development. In the circumstances it is requested that the assessment as 'red' be changed the issue being readily manageable."</p>	<p>Response: No Change. It is agreed that the site is within flood zone 1, and that only a small part of the site is affected by a risk of surface water flooding (including some areas at high risk). However, the criteria are applied consistently across all sites to highlight where flood water management may be required. Site is correctly assessed as RED.</p>
6	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (4): None specified. "The access to sites 073/001/006/012 may involve access onto Garbutts lane in a 60mph zone. Whilst that is currently a red assessment on the draft plan, I believe that has the potential flexibility to be changed to a reduced speed limit, whereas other red assessments in the draft plan are not in that category and are fixed."</p>	<p>Response: Noted. All sites are assessed based on the prevailing speed limit. It is possible that this could be changed if a site was developed but there is no guarantee that it would happen. Changing speed limits is not within the control of the site promoter or the Neighbourhood Plan so use of the prevailing speed limits is considered the most appropriate basis.</p>

Site Name		S/073/009	Draft	Rev 1	Comments Considered & Justification For Any Changes
Site Description		Land to South of Belbrough Lane and West of Station Lane. 1.72 Ha.			
Theme	Criteria				
Housing	(1) Development should favour sites which would be viable for the delivery of all components of the preferred housing mix (which will include affordable housing, downsizing/bungalows, and market homes predominantly of 2-3 bed size)	Land falls with modest gradient towards the South, and lies directly on highway. Pavements on opposite side of Station Lane.			#38
Site Characteristics	(2) Development should favour sites contained within or adjoining the village envelope.	Site is separated from the existing built area by Belbrough Lane and Station Lane.			#1, #10, #17, #24, #43
	(3) Development should favour sites that avoid loss of prime agricultural land, high quality habitat, or other valued land.	Grade 3 Arable land			#3, #11, #25, #44.
	(4) Development should favour sites that can achieve a good access onto the adjacent road network	The Eastern boundary fronts onto the 30mph Station Lane. There is further direct frontage onto the 40mph Belbrough lane. It is noted that the developer proposes to access the site from Belbrough Lane. All sites are now assessed on the basis of the lowest speed limit available from technically feasible routes. Developer and/or HDC preferences and justification for using alternative routes would be examined at site design brief stage. Concerns about HGV traffic, blind junction and other road safety issues (including pedestrian safety) have been raised in comments on S/073/009 & S/073/010on S/073/009 & S/073/010.			#4, #7, #15, #28, #32
	(5) Development should favour sites that do not result in impairment or loss of significant views from public spaces (roads or footpaths) as identified in the Settlement Character Assessment Workshops	Site is prominent in views towards the settlement. Development of site would result in impairment of views identified in Settlement Character workshops. The site is shown as being within an Area of Sensitivity within HDC's Settlement Character Assessment for Hutton Rudby.			#12, #26, #38, #41, #45
Settlement Character - Built Environment	(6) Development should favour sites that will not impact detrimentally on the conservation area or other significant buildings (listed buildings or non-designated heritage assets including associated grounds) or frontages as identified by the Settlement Character workshops.	Not in conservation area. Linden Grange (Grade II) lies to East of site, and Gardenstone Farm (Grade II) lies to the South. The Old Vicarage (NDHA) lies to the North and Drumrauck Hall (NDHA) to the West. There may be some adverse impact on the setting of the NDHAs and listed buildings.			#18, #21, #42, #46
Settlement Character - Natural Environment	(7) Development should favour sites which present opportunities to protect or enhance Green Spaces, improve access for the public, or improve access for those with limited mobility	The closest proposed Green Space is the recreation area, which would neither be adversely affected or improved by development of this site.			#8, #14, #30, #33, #47
	(8) Development should favour sites which do not result in loss of open space in the Leven Valley Character Zone as defined in Settlement Character Workshops.	Site is outside the Leven Valley Character Zone			

Services & Facilities	(9) Development should favour sites that offer opportunity to sustain or enhance community services or facilities.	While HDC assessment suggests that "development of the site could provide opportunity to provide [additional] off-road parking for the adjacent play area", there is no evidence that there is a need for this. Development of the site may lead to reduction in Anti-Social Behaviour and would improve access to the recreation area for residents on Belbrough Lane.			#19, #22, #40, #48 Development of this site may reduce anti-social behaviour at play area, and would provide some improvement in access to recreation area for residents on Belbrough Lane
	(10) Development should favour sites that offer a viable alternative to private cars to access services or otherwise encourage reduction in vehicle traffic within the village area.	Walking distance from village centre is approx. 1 km. Major services not located around the Village Green are at the following distances: Village Hall: 380m GREEN Shop: 950m RED School: 480m AMBER			#5, #13, #27, #49
Traffic & Transport	(11) Development should favour sites that provide opportunity to improve connectivity of footpaths and pavements within the village area.	Site lies at the edge of the settlement. Developer proposes to incorporate footpath to Drumrauck Hall, but this would have extend well beyond the boundaries of S/073/009 so cannot be delivered by this site alone.			#2, #6, #9, #16, #31, #34, #36, #50
	(12) Development should favour sites that can provide sufficient off-street parking spaces for the needs of the additional residents and visitors generated by the development itself	Site is large enough to allocate land for 25 homes with adequate parking at 25dph, but it is noted that HDC's view is that maximum yield for the site would be 20 homes.			#51. This is a large site - too much weight was attributed to HDC view on density in assessing this criteria.
Pipeline	(13) Development should favour sites where public safety is not adversely impacted by the presence of the high pressure ethylene pipeline	Pipeline is not in vicinity of site			
Flood Risk	(14) Development should favour sites not affected by Flood Zone 3, Flood zone 2 or with a history of surface water flooding. [Note: No eligible site is affected by Flood Zones 2 or 3, so this is effectively a surface water flooding criteria.]	There are no flood zones 3 or 2 on the site. The Environment Area map shows an area towards the Southern end of the site at low or medium risk of surface water flooding, and areas adjacent to the site also at risk of surface water flooding.			#20, #23, #29, #35, #39, #52
Habitat / Biodiversity	(15) Development should favour sites which avoid loss of biodiversity	Site has low biodiversity value, has no TPOs on or adjacent to site, and is more than 100m from any SINC			

Comment No	Comment	Response
1	Requested Change: Criteria (2) From RED To RED. "The way this criteria is being applied leads to strange results. This site is RED whereas site S/125/005 is rated AMBER. It is clear that site 73/009 is more within the village envelope than S/125/005".	Response: Noted. The use of physical features such as roads or becks to define development limits is a common practice. Support for use of this approach within the Neighbourhood Plan can be traced back to the Nov 2016 questionnaire where 81% of responses said such boundaries were important or very important for site selection criteria.
2	Requested Change: Criteria (11) From AMBER To RED. "As there are no opportunities to improve connectivity, in fact there's no connectivity it has to be RED".	Response: Noted. To be assessed as RED would require reduction in existing connectivity which would not occur.

3	Requested Change: Criteria (3) RED To RED. "Proposed site entails loss of good arable land and loss of significant views".	Response: Noted. These are the reasons why Criteria 3 & 5 are assessed as RED.
4	Requested Change: Criteria (4) From GREEN To RED. "Proposed dangerous access onto Belbrough Lane".	Response: Noted. Developer's presentation indicated that their preferred access would be onto the current 40mph zone of Belbrough Lane, but an access onto the 30mph Station Lane could be provided so in accordance with the criteria the site is assessed as GREEN.
5	Requested Change: Criteria (10) RED To RED. "Village amenities are beyond reasonable walking distance especially for the elderly".	Response: Noted: The overall performance on the criteria is RED, but the Village Hall and School score better as individual locations.
6	Requested Change: Criteria (11) AMBER To RED. "Footpaths either non existent or inadequate with little scope for improvement".	Response: Noted. See response to comment #2
7	Requested Change: Criteria (4) From GREEN To RED. "Road is used by many HGVs heading to Preston's yard".	Response: Noted. This does not alter the assessment.
8	Requested Change: Criteria (7) From AMBER To RED. "Will make a visual impact on the entrance to the village - detrimental".	Response: No Change. Criteria 7 relates to Green Space, but the comment would seem to be more related to criteria 5 which is assessed as RED.
9	Requested Change: Criteria (11) AMBER To RED. "Site is well outside the village - all residents would have to use cars to access village".	Response: Noted. See response to comments #2 & #5. Comment appears more related to criteria 10 which is assessed as RED.
10	Requested Change: Criteria (2) RED To RED. "Site is located on the other side of station lane."	Response: Noted.
11	Requested Change: Criteria (3) RED To RED. "Site is Grade 3 arable and would be a loss to the farming community"	Response: Noted.
12	Requested Change: Criteria (5) RED To RED. "This view is unique in the village as the vista of the Cleveland Hills is framed by vast tracts of farmland"	Response: Noted.
13	Requested Change: Criteria (10) RED To RED. "Distance from the village centre is approx. 1km which will result in traffic increasing if residents need to get to the centre of the SPAR."	Response: Noted.
14	Requested Change: Unspecified Criteria To GREEN. "Criteria weighted against Belbrough from the start. Proposed green area.	Response: Noted. This comment appears to be based on a misconception. A Green Space proposal for the arable field was submitted to HDC in the Local Plan. It is not supported by HDC or by the Neighbourhood Plan Settlement Character work so is given no weight in the site assessment. Designation of the recreation area as Green Space is supported by both HDC and the Neighbourhood Plan.
15	Requested Change: Unspecified Criteria (4?) To GREEN. "Good Access why RED."	Response: No Change. It is assessed as GREEN.
16	Requested Change: Unspecified Criteria (11?) To GREEN. "Distance same as many others but says well outside village"	Response: No Change. See response to comment #5
17	Requested Change: Unspecified Criteria (2?) To GREEN. "The site falls within the village envelope, houses on two sides so this site is prime building location, close to access roads etc. No different to extending the village boundary than Paddocks End was. Should be considered in the same way."	Response: No Change. Criteria and traffic light definitions were developed through community consultation, and the site has been assessed as RED according to the agreed definitions. The decision on Paddocks Ends was made within an entirely separate framework before the Neighbourhood Plan process was initiated.
18	Requested Change: Criteria (6) from AMBER To RED. Development would detract from the listed (Grade II) buildings. They need to stand alone	Response: No Change. The site commentary indicates the listed buildings and NDHAs where there may be impacts. Further assessment to quantify impacts would be required if the site was selected.
19	Requested Change: Criteria (9) from AMBER To RED. This site will not enhance services as no extra parking is required.	Response: Revised to GREEN. The reasons for this change are set out in the response to Comment #48, and is unconnected with car parking. To be assessed as RED the development would have to result in loss or impairment of facilities which would not occur. A change to RED is, therefore, not justified. The existing carpark provides 11 spaces which appears to be sufficient to meet demand.

20	Requested Change: Criteria (14) from AMBER To RED. The area floods every year and will not cope with extra run-off from hard surfaces after a deluge.	Response: No Change. The site has been assessed as AMBER in accordance with the criteria. Management of run-off would be addressed during the planning application stage should the site be selected. As the site exceeds 1 Ha, a site specific flood risk assessment would be required.
21	Requested Change: Criteria (6) from AMBER To RED. Development would detract from the listed building in vicinity.	Response: No Change: See response to comment #18
22	Requested Change: Criteria (9) from AMBER To RED. There is no identified need for additional parking at this site.	Response: Noted. See response to comment #19
23	Requested Change: Criteria (14) from AMBER To RED. The Environment Area map shows a clear risk of surface water flooding - as do areas adjacent to the site. Road flooding has been evident at ??? times.	Response: No Change. See response to comment #20
24	Requested Change: Criteria (2) from RED To RED. This site is <u>NOT</u> within the village envelope.	Response: Noted - Criteria is assessed as RED
25	Requested Change: Criteria (3) from RED To RED. This site would <u>NOT</u> avoid loss of prime agricultural land.	Response: Noted - Criteria is assessed as RED
26	Requested Change: Criteria (5) from RED To RED. Arguably, more than any other site, this site results in loss of views identified in SC workshops - for villagers, visitor, cyclists, rambles etc.	Response: Noted - Criteria is assessed as RED
27	Requested Change: Criteria (10) from RED To RED. Distance from village centre would mean an increase in traffic towards village in addition to HGV vehicles already prevalent (Prestons of Potto).	Response: Noted - Criteria is assessed as RED
28	Requested Change: Criteria (4) from GREEN To RED. Dangerous and blind junctions including access to children's play area.	Response: Noted. Access will have to meet highways standards if the site is selected - this would be addressed at the site design brief stage. Site meets the requirements for a GREEN assessment. A note on this concern has been added to the site commentary.
29	Requested Change: Criteria (14) from AMBER To RED. Serious flooding occurs several times per year. Flood water egresses to adjacent (east side) fields and into Linden Grange and Park houses.	Response: No Change. See response to comment #20
30	Requested Change: Criteria (7) from AMBER To RED. Development would obliterate the special and much valued view of the Cleveland Hills from Belbrough Lane.	Response: No Change. Impact on views is taken into account in Criteria 5 which is assessed as RED.
31	Requested Change: Criteria (11) from AMBER To RED. It will increase pedestrian traffic across the top of Station Lane which is a blind junction.	Response: Noted: Development of this site would not increase walking distances for other parts of the village, so a RED assessment is not justified. A note on this concern has been added to the site commentary.
32	Requested Change: Criteria (4) from GREEN To RED. The eastern boundary is a fast road and frontage onto Belbrough Lane has restricted views.	Response: No Change. See response to comment #4
33	Requested Change: Criteria (7) from AMBER To RED. Access for those with limited mobility would be dangerous where ever they chose to cross the road to access the village.	Response: No Change. This criteria is concerned with access to Green Spaces, and not with access to the village from the site.
34	Requested Change: Criteria (11) from AMBER To RED. Red as there is no opportunity to improve the connectivity here.	Response: Noted. A RED assessment would require loss of existing connectivity which would not occur.
35	Requested Change: Criteria (14) from AMBER To RED. There is a long history of serious flooding on Station Lane. Development would increase this problem.	Response: No Change. See response to comment #20
36	Requested Change: Criteria (11) from AMBER To RED. It does not make sense for Criteria 11 to be amber as this site does not provide the opportunity to improve connectivity within the village area, since it is not within the village area.	Response: Noted. A RED assessment would require loss of existing connectivity which would not occur.

37	Requested Change: Unspecified Criteria To RED. When owners or their agents talk about the need for 'low density' development this suggests that it is the wrong site. This sort of reference should give the site a RED classification.	Response: Noted. This comment does not appear to relate to any particular criteria.
38	Requested Change: Unspecified Criteria From Green To RED. Suggestions that the fall is modest - this is incorrect. Building at the top is ?????????? Even though the owners agent suggests bungalows to overcome the problem. Yet they accept that a bungalow can be extended upwards in future. This should make the current green classification RED.	Response: No Change: The context suggests that the comment is intended to relate to criteria 1 which is concerned with economic viability, however, the points raised are more related to site design issues, or possibly views (Criteria 5 which is assessed as RED).
39	Requested Change: Unspecified Criteria (14) From AMBER To RED. Flood risk - this ??? and the road is flooded every year. In 2007 my wife's car was written off as a result.	Response: No Change. See response to comment #20
40	Requested Change: None: Unspecified Criteria (9?) From AMBER To RED. At the site owner's meeting on 24/9/17 reference was made to increased parking for the play area. I walk past this location every day (virtually) & have never seen the car park full. So extra is not required.	Response: Noted. The existing 11 space carpark appears to be sufficient.
41	Requested Change: Criteria (5). Amend the commentary. Request the following be added: "The site is shown as being within an Area of Sensitivity within HDC's Settlement Character Assessment for Hutton Rudby". That the area is within an Area of Sensitivity is a material consideration to be taken into account in site assessment.	Response: Noted. The suggested change is factually correct and provides additional support for the RED assessment.
42	Requested Change: Criteria (6). Change from AMBER to RED. Acknowledging the commentary in relation to Site Characteristics as set out above [<i>in comment 41</i>] as amplified by our comments based on HDC's Settlement Character Assessment for Hutton Rudby, it is requested that the classification be changed from 'amber' to 'red'.	Response: Noted.
43	Requested Change: Criteria (2). Change from RED to GREEN. a) As described both sites S/073/010 adjoin residential housing and the provision of a road is not grounds for arguing that the site is separated from a residential area (by definition a 'Red' score is surely intended to score isolated remote sites negatively?). b) In addition to the northern and eastern boundaries being bound by residential areas I also take the opportunity to highlight that the south western boundary is bounded by the village playing field to the south east. Further and as mentioned in my presentation building adjacent and overlooking the playing field should also receive further credit as this will provide passive surveillance and thus reduce ASB. c) I therefore request that this site is reassessed and scored 'Green.' d) Although not of our concern but in absolute fairness we note site S/125/006 also has common boundaries and should similarly be scored Green.	Response: No Change. a) The criteria and traffic light definitions which were developed through community consultation are quite clear, and the site has been scored in accordance with the definitions. The use of physical features such as roads or becks to define development limits is a common practice. Support for use of this approach within the Neighbourhood Plan can be traced back to the Nov 2016 questionnaire where 81% of responses said such boundaries were important or very important for site selection criteria. b) The definitions explicitly state built up area. The playing field is separated from the built up area by Station Lane, and does not itself form part of the built up area. Impact on anti-social behaviour is not relevant to this criteria, but claimed benefit is considered in the context of criteria 9. c) Site has been assessed as RED in accordance with the criteria definitions. d) S/125/006 satisfies the criteria for a GREEN assessment and has been rated accordingly.

44	<p><u>Requested Change: Criteria (3). Change from RED to GREEN.</u></p> <p>a) Again as explained in my presentation I have taken professional advice from local ecologist EcoSurv (Hutton Rudby) who concurs that arable land is of a lower ecological value than pasture land which is technically given the same value as a "desert" (in his own words). I believe your current scoring is therefore incorrect and all sites should be reassessed.</p> <p>b) I also note reference in the scoring criteria for the loss of hedgerows & Trees etc. as further justification to score the site negatively which would understandably offer ecological benefit. You will note however that neither sites S/073/009 & S/073/010 are not proposing the loss of either on our site but in fact the retention and protection of the few trees on the site.</p> <p>c) I respectfully suggest all sites are re-evaluated with sites S/073/009 & S/073/010 therefore being scored 'Amber,' second to brownfield land but not as important as pasture land.</p>	<p><u>Response: No Change.</u></p> <p>a) That arable land is very poor habitat is not disputed. However, habitat is not the only aspect to this criteria as can be seen from a full reading of the definitions. The criteria address the potential impacts of change from the current land use to a residential development by considering three distinct aspects: productivity for food production, recreational use, and biodiversity. For the food production aspect, the criteria follows the hierarchy of the Agricultural Land Use classification which ranks best and most versatile arable land at the top, and grazing land in the middle. This is consistent with para 112 of the NPPF which states "Local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality." For the biodiversity aspect, the assessment ranks grazing land above arable, but also makes reference to 'biodiversity potential' scoring to identify sites where there is likely to be greater biodiversity than is evident from the general land use classification. Additional aspects of biodiversity are considered within Criteria 15. This particular criteria address the impacts of change from the current land use to a residential development by considering three distinct aspects: productivity for food production, recreational use, and biodiversity. For food production, the criteria follows the hierarchy of the Agricultural Land Use classification which ranks best and most versatile arable land at the top, and grazing land in the middle. This is consistent with para 112 of the NPPF "Local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality." For the biodiversity aspect, the assessment ranks grazing land above arable, but also makes reference to</p>
45	<p><u>Requested Change: Criteria (5). Change from RED to GREEN.</u></p> <p>a) Whilst it is accepted that the site is in a prominent location within the perceived village curtilage, consideration should be given to the topography of the site as it falls away from the corner of Belbrough lane and Station road.</p> <p>b) As explained within my presentation it is proposed (and could be specifically referenced in the neighbourhood plan) that the top of the site is developed solely with bungalows to a low density. This will mitigate and prevent the loss of far reaching views out of the village.</p> <p>c) May I also take the opportunity to highlight that the site is currently bounded by a mature hedge (which we believe is to be retained and infilled in the forthcoming planting season offering enhanced ecological benefit to the site as referenced above). Further management of the hedge (and in particular its height in the case of residential development) will ensure views of the hills are therefore maintained. Alternatively if left unmanaged and undeveloped views will not be protected and could be lost.</p> <p>d) I therefore argue that both sites S/073/009 & S/073/010 should (subject to relevant design control via the neighbourhood plan) should actually be scored Green in recognition of the topography and design proposals.</p>	<p><u>Response: No Change.</u></p> <p>a) It is agreed that the site is in a prominent location. It is not agreed that it is within the village curtilage, as it is an arable field outside development limits and separated from the built form by roads. The topography of the site forms part of the vista which is valued by the community.</p> <p>b) Any development of the site would result in significant impairment or obstruction of views as a view with buildings in the foreground is fundamentally different from one over a field into the wider landscape.</p> <p>c) The assertion that a view should be protected by developing the site as the landowner may fail to maintain the hedge has no merit.</p> <p>d) The site has been correctly assessed as RED in accordance with the criteria and traffic light definitions.</p>

46	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (6). Change from AMBER to GREEN.</p> <p>a) I would disagree that any proposal has an adverse affect on the NDHA's.</p> <p>b) Protection of the NDHA via this score is surely intended to protect against inappropriate development within the grounds of or immediately adjacent to its boundary?</p> <p>c) 'Drunrauck hall is located 240M to the west of site S/073/009 and not visible at all due to the curvature of Belbrough lane and the vegetation.</p> <p>d) The Od Vicarage is 120M to the north set back from Belbrough lane in an elevated position.</p> <p>e) It would be very difficult to argue that development of either sites S/073/009 or S/073/010 which also falls away topographically would result in any effect on either NDHA's. I would therefore conclude that the separation distances are sufficient that site 9 and 10 do not represent any adverse impact on NDHA's. In my professional opinion both sites should therefore be scored Green.</p>	<p>Response: No Change.</p> <p>a) Noted. HDC opinion set out in the Local Plan consultation documents differs.</p> <p>b) The buffer zones of heritage buildings often extend well beyond their curtilage and can include views of them from within the wider landscape which forms their setting.</p> <p>c) We estimate the distance as 180m. Views of Drumrauck Hall from Station Lane and Black Horse Lane would be impacted to some extent by development of S/073/009 or 010.</p> <p>d) We estimate the distance as approximately 90m.</p> <p>e) As already stated in the response to para a) HDC's opinion differs.</p>
47	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (7). Change from AMBER to GREEN.</p> <p>a) The negative scoring of this criteria is quite frankly incorrect as the site could not be any closer to a green space as it adjoins one! Not only that but the green space in question is in fact the only playing field in the village.</p> <p>b) As highlighted at the developer presentation, development of the site will seek to improve pedestrian access to the playing field and also provide additional parking (as requested by HDC) and most importantly provide passive surveillance with family housing overlooking the field.</p> <p>c) Positioning housing overlooking public spaces is a proven urban design tactic recommended by CABE in designing housing estates which is also endorsed and referenced in 'Secured by Design' as 'good practice' to eradicate and deter Anti Social Behaviour.</p> <p>d) I feel very strongly that this site, particularly in comparison with others should actually receive the highest score possible and thus be scored Green</p>	<p>Response: No Change.</p> <p>a) An AMBER assessment on this criteria is a neutral assessment, not a negative one as is clear from the definition "Development of the site would have no impact on access to or size of Green Space". Proximity is not disputed, however, proximity in itself does not justify a green assessment.</p> <p>b) The site is already very accessible to the existing village residents by pavements, and by road with an 11 space carpark which is adequate for needs. Development of the site would not make a material difference to accessibility of the recreation area. Any improvements in access are given consideration in the context of criteria 9. Additional parking could only be considered a benefit if there is a need to satisfy, and as there is no evidence of need this can be given no weight. The claimed benefit of deterrence of anti-social behaviour is considered in the context of Criteria 9.</p> <p>c) Noted. This is considered in the context of criteria 9.</p> <p>d) The recreation area is a community facility located on a Green Space, and the function cannot be separated from the form so the same benefits cannot be attributed to both criteria 7 and criteria 9. The benefits claimed are more associated with the function as a community facility, than its form as a Green Space and are therefore given credit in criteria 9, but not in criteria 7.</p>

<p>48</p>	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (9). Change from AMBER to GREEN.</p> <p>a) As highlighted in response to previous criteria, credit should be given to the positive enhancements that could be provided by developing adjacent to the official and only playing field in the village. HDC's assessment is quite correct, that this site offers a unique opportunity to provide additional off-road parking to the play area. I do not understand the inference that there is no need for this as I understand that whenever there is a children's party or a football match at the playing field traffic, parking becomes an issue.</p> <p>b) Development here would clearly enhance and offer long term protection and sustainability for an existing community facility.</p> <p>c) As you will detect I feel very strongly that this criteria has been incorrectly scored and should be Green</p>	<p>Response: Revise AMBER to GREEN.</p> <p>a) Concerns about anti-social behaviour have not featured in Neighbourhood Plan consultations, although they have been raised at the Parish Council. There is no specific reference in the criteria definitions to ASB, and only a liberal interpretation of the definition of criteria 9 can create a link. ASB benefits can therefore only be given limited weight in site selection. There is also the possibility that development of the site might merely displace the ASB to a different location where it might be equally problematic or even worse, and so might be of no net benefit to the community. Nonetheless some credit is given for a potential improvement in the assessment of this criteria. Some improvement in access to the recreation area for ca. 20 households on Belbrough Lane would also be achieved by development on this site, and there would be good access for the residents of the site itself. With regard to additional car parking no evidence of need has been provided, and the experience of local residents is that overspill from the 11 space car park rarely if ever happens. The totality of benefits from ASB, improved access to the recreation area are considered to be taken fully into account in the reassessment of this criteria, and will be given no weight in the assessment of any other criteria.</p> <p>b) Noted. This has been taken into account in the re-assessment.</p> <p>c) Noted. The assessment has been revised.</p>
<p>49</p>	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (10). Change from RED to GREEN.</p> <p>a) To assess the village centre as an arbitrary place on the village green where no actual community facility is provided seems incorrect and quite frankly biased.</p> <p>b) The assessment criteria should surely be used to favour sustainable sites that offer a viable alternative to private cars to access services or encourage a reduction in vehicle traffic within the village?</p> <p>c) As highlighted at my developer presentation it would surely be more appropriate and sensible if all sites were scored on their proximity to services.</p> <p>d) In order to assess if a site is sustainable consideration should surely be given to all community facilities including but not limited to, the new supermarket, the school, public houses, the village hall and recreation spaces. Both sites S/073/009 & S/073/010 should be positively supported due to their proximity and easy walking distance to many of the facilities.</p> <p>e) I recall from the public consultation I led for Garbutts lane that parking at and around the school is a serious health & safety issue and thus sites that reduce dependence on cars must surely be supported and scored positively for the benefit of the wider village?</p> <p>f) In addition to its proximity to local amenities credit should also be given in scoring site S/073/010 that our client is also proposing to install a much needed public footpath to improve access to Drumrauck Hall.</p> <p>g) I understand that this has been requested by the residents around Drumrauck Hall for some time and that our client as land owner is the only viable option to provide this. Further the provision of a safe pedestrian route will further reduce traffic and congestion at the school enabling families with pushchairs and small children to finally benefit from a safe route to the village amenities.</p> <p>h) In light of above justification I would strongly recommend in my professional capacity that all sites are re-evaluated to ensure credit is given to truly sustainable</p>	<p>Response: No Change to Assessment, but add commentary to identify services located nearer to sites than village centre.</p> <p>a) There is a cluster of services and facilities located around the village green: 3 pubs, the Hub (a café/community space), Church House (a community meeting space), a place of worship, the GP, a hairdresser, the allotments are within 80m of the nominal centre, and a beauty salon will shortly open in the former Post Office. The definition of a criteria based on a nominal centre was developed through community consultation, and the location of the centre itself was chosen through a consultation exercise. There is no bias.</p> <p>b) Noted. This is both the intent and the effect of the criteria, although it is acknowledged that many other methodologies could be used.</p> <p>c) The method has been developed and agreed through community consultation. Criteria definitions are settled, and revisions to them do not form part of this consultation.</p> <p>d) As noted in the response to para c), the criteria definitions are settled. However, commentary will be added to identify heavily used services that are located closer to sites than the village centre.</p> <p>e) School run congestion is one of a number of traffic concerns in the village, albeit the one perceived as having the most severe impact on local residents. The other traffic issues frequently raised are: 'rat-running' through Doctors Lane, junction complexity/safety on Garbutts Lane in the vicinity of the new SPAR location, and the 'pinch point' at the Bay Horse. An analysis of impacts of sites on all of these is being developed.</p> <p>f) This point is considered in the context of Criteria 11 as a connectivity improvement.</p> <p>g) The criteria definitions are already settled and all sites have been assessed in accordance with them.</p>

50	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (11). Change from AMBER to GREEN.</p> <p>a) As highlighted previously, both sites S/073/009 and particularly site S/073/010 is categorically not on the edge of the settlement as it borders the village playing field and the rest of the village on 2 sides.</p> <p>b) As also highlighted and referenced previously development of the site therefore offers an opportunity to provide enhanced pedestrian access and additional parking for the playing field (as identified as being required by HDC) and also as highlighted in the previous criteria with a new footpath link improving access between Drumrauck Hall and the rest of the village.</p> <p>c) As demonstrated opportunities do exist on this site to improve connectivity between existing residents and existing facilities.</p> <p>d) Clearly both sites S/073/009 and S/073/010 should score green.</p>	<p>Response: Revise No Change.</p> <p>a) On the southern and western sides both sites border the open countryside, which makes a description of 'edge of village' entirely reasonable. The same descriptive text has been used for several other similarly positioned sites.</p> <p>b) The footpath connectivity to the recreation area has been considered and given credit in the response to Criteria 9. Additional parking (which is not needed in any case) has no relevance to Criteria 11. The primary focus of this criteria is opportunities to shorten walking distances, as is clear from the traffic light definitions, but it is agreed that a safer route is an improvement in connectivity albeit of benefit to only a small number of residents. However, the footpath would need to extend well beyond the western edge of site 009, (and also in fact slightly beyond the western edge of site 010). The majority of the safety benefit would be realised in the portion to the west of site 009 where there is a bend and a very narrow verge. The benefit is, therefore, attributable to site 010, but not to 009. This is consistent with the assessments for sites S/073/005, 006 & 012 which are also under common ownership and have an opportunity to improve connectivity - the smaller sub-sites which can only make a partial contribution are not given credit.</p> <p>c) Noted. Assessment of S/073/010 has been revised</p> <p>d) For the reasons set out in the response to para b) the benefit is attributed to S/073/010 only.</p>
51	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (12). Change from AMBER to GREEN.</p> <p>a) The site has an arbitrary boundary line identifying designation S/073/009 and S/073/010 not specifically requested by our client.</p> <p>b) I therefore highlight as per my earlier clarification that both sites can accommodate whatever density is deemed appropriate by the Neighbourhood Plan and / or allocation by HDC. Likewise parking allocation can be determined at this same time due to the relatively low density inferred.</p> <p>c) Noting that many of the other sites are scored Green it seems totally incorrect that this site is not scored green?</p>	<p>Response: Revise AMBER to GREEN</p> <p>a) Noted</p> <p>b) Although the reasons given by HDC for proposing low density are considered valid, too much weight has been attached to their suggested allocation in the draft assessment. There is sufficient land area available to justify a green assessment. Considerations of appropriate density would be addressed during the development of a site design brief if the site was selected.</p> <p>c) Noted. Site has been reassessed as Green.</p>

52 **Requested Change: Criteria (14). Change from AMBER to GREEN**

- a) The site is categorically not in any flood zones as evident on EA map: <https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/summary/446495/505610>.
- b) It is accepted that even though site is not identified by the Environment Agency local knowledge should also be used if available and thus I have taken further research having been advised that sites S/073/009 and S/073/010 the top part of the sloping field) does not, and has not flooded.
- c) I have been advised that even during periods of free weather, flash surface water flooding does occur for limited periods at the bottom of the field but again understand that this is beyond S/073/009 and S/073/010.
- d) In reality if sites S/073/009 & S/073/010 are in fact developed the site will need to comply with strict guidelines which will ensure that surface water run off is attenuated to absorb large volumes of rainfall and thus actually reduce flooding of the lower field and prevent any impact on the highway.
- e) I would therefore argue that this site should in fact be scored positively as one of the best sites that would contribute to reducing flooding of a field beyond the sites themselves.

Response: No Change.

- a) Noted. This is as stated in the commentary.
- b) There is agreement that there is flooding in the general area, but to give weight to the assertion that it occurs only outside the site boundaries which is in contradiction of the EA map, would require some suitable supporting evidence e.g. photographs showing surface water flooding beyond the site boundaries, but not on it. Should this be provided the site would be reassessed as Green.
- c) See response to para b)
- d) Noted
- e) The site has been assessed as AMBER in accordance with the criteria definitions.

Site Name		S/073/010	Draft	Rev 1	Comments Considered & Justification For Any Changes
Site Description		Land to South of Belbrough Lane and West of Station Lane. 5.02 Ha. (Includes all of S/073/009)			
Theme	Criteria				
Housing	(1) Development should favour sites which would be viable for the delivery of all components of the preferred housing mix (which will include affordable housing, downsizing/bungalows, and market homes predominantly of 2-3 bed size)	Land falls with modest gradient towards the South, and lies directly on highway. Pavements on opposite side of Station Lane.			
Site Characteristics	(2) Development should favour sites contained within or adjoining the village envelope.	Site is separated from the existing built area by Belbrough Lane and Station Lane.			#11
	(3) Development should favour sites that avoid loss of prime agricultural land, high quality habitat, or other valued land.	Grade 3 Arable land			#12
	(4) Development should favour sites that can achieve a good access onto the adjacent road network	The Eastern boundary fronts onto the 30mph Station Lane. There is further direct frontage onto the 40mph Belbrough lane. It is noted that the developer proposes to access the site from Belbrough Lane. All sites are now assessed on the basis of the lowest speed limit available from technically feasible routes. Developer and/or HDC preferences and justification for using alternative routes would be examined at site design brief stage. Concerns about HGV traffic, blind junction and other road safety issues (including pedestrian safety) have been raised in comments on S/073/009 & S/073/010 on S/073/009 & S/073/010.			#1, #5
	(5) Development should favour sites that do not result in impairment or loss of significant views from public spaces (roads or footpaths) as identified in the Settlement Character Assessment Workshops	Site is prominent in views towards the settlement. Development of site would result in impairment of views identified in Settlement Character workshops. The site is shown as being within an Area of Sensitivity within HDC's Settlement Character Assessment for Hutton Ruddy.			#13
Settlement Character - Built Environment	(6) Development should favour sites that will not impact detrimentally on the conservation area or other significant buildings (listed buildings or non-designated heritage assets including associated grounds) or frontages as identified by the Settlement Character workshops.	Not in conservation area. Linden Grange (Grade II) lies to East of site, and Gardenstone Farm (Grade II) lies to the South. The Old Vicarage (NDHA) lies to the North and Drumrauck Hall (NDHA) to the West. There may be some adverse impact on the setting of the NDHAs and listed buildings . There would be greater impact on Drumrauck Hall if the Western end of the site was developed.			#6, #9, #10, #14
Settlement Character - Natural Environment	(7) Development should favour sites which present opportunities to protect or enhance Green Spaces, improve access for the public, or improve access for those with limited mobility	The closest proposed Green Space is the recreation area, which would neither be adversely affected or improved by development of this site.			#3, #15, #16
	(8) Development should favour sites which do not result in loss of open space in the Leven Valley Character Zone as defined in Settlement Character Workshops.	Site is outside the Leven Valley Character Zone			

Services & Facilities	(9) Development should favour sites that offer opportunity to sustain or enhance community services or facilities.	While HDC assessment suggests that "development of the site could provide opportunity to provide [additional] off-road parking for the adjacent play area", there is no evidence that there is a need for this. Development of the site may lead to reduction in Anti-Social Behaviour and would improve access to the recreation area for residents on Belbrough Lane.			#15, #16 Development of this site may reduce anti-social behaviour at play area, and would provide some improvement in access to recreation area for residents on Belbrough Lane
	(10) Development should favour sites that offer a viable alternative to private cars to access services or otherwise encourage reduction in vehicle traffic within the village area.	Walking distance from village centre is approx. 1 km. Major services not located around the Village Green are at the following distances: Village Hall: 380m GREEN Shop: 950m RED School: 480m AMBER			#17
Traffic & Transport	(11) Development should favour sites that provide opportunity to improve connectivity of footpaths and pavements within the village area.	Site lies at the edge of the settlement. Developer proposes to incorporate footpath to Drumrauck Hall, this would have to extend slightly beyond the boundaries of S/073/010 to provide the full benefit. This would provide improved connectivity by providing a safer walking route.			#4, #8, #18. A safer walking route from Drumrauck Hall is considered sufficient benefit to reassess as GREEN.
	(12) Development should favour sites that can provide sufficient off-street parking spaces for the needs of the additional residents and visitors generated by the development itself	Site is large enough to allocate land for 25 homes with adequate parking at 25dph.			#19
Pipeline	(13) Development should favour sites where public safety is not adversely impacted by the presence of the high pressure ethylene pipeline	Pipeline is not in vicinity of site			
Flood Risk	(14) Development should favour sites not affected by Flood Zone 3, Flood zone 2 or with a history of surface water flooding. [Note: No eligible site is affected by Flood Zones 2 or 3, so this is effectively a surface water flooding criteria.]	There are no flood zones 3 or 2 on the site. The Environment Area map shows an area towards the Southern end of the site at medium risk of surface water flooding, and areas adjacent to the site also at risk of surface water flooding.			#2, #7, #20
Habitat / Biodiversity	(15) Development should favour sites which avoid loss of biodiversity	Site has low biodiversity value, has no TPOs on or adjacent to site, and is more than 100m from any SINC			

Comment No	Comment	Response
1	Requested Change: Criteria (4) from GREEN to RED. Dangerous and blind junction including access to children's play area.	Response: Noted. Access will have to meet highways standards if the site is selected - this would be addressed at the site design brief stage. Site meets the requirements for a GREEN assessment.
2	Requested Change: Criteria (14) from AMBER to RED. Serious flooding occurs several times per year. Flood water egresses to fields on eastern boundary and into Linden Grange and Park.	Response: No Change. The site has been assessed as AMBER in accordance with the criteria. Management of run-off would be addressed during the planning application stage should the site be selected. As the site exceeds 1 Ha, a site specific flood risk assessment would be required.
3	Requested Change: Criteria (7) from GREEN to RED. The development would obliterate the much valued view of the Cleveland Hills from Belbrough Lane.	Response: Noted. Impact on views is address by Criteria 5 which is assessed as RED

4	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (11) from AMBER to RED. Dangerous pedestrian crossing at top of Station Lane blind junction.</p>	<p>Response: Noted: Development of this site would not increase walking distances for other parts of the village, so a RED assessment is not justified. The developer proposes to install a footpath to Drumrauck Hall. Although this would not reduce walking distances, it would improve pedestrian safety and is considered of sufficient benefit to justify a GREEN assessment.</p>
5	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (4) from GREEN to RED. Development of this area would lead to massive number of vehicles entering and leaving two country roads.</p>	<p>Response: Noted. This would not justify a RED under the criteria definitions.</p>
6	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (6) from AMBER to RED. Not only impacting on Drumrauck, also Linden Grange & Gardenstone Farm.</p>	<p>Response: Noted. All these buildings are noted in the commentary as heritage buildings which may be impacted by development of this site.</p>
7	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (14) from AMBER to RED. Station Lane flood very regularly. It is wrong to state there are no flood zones in that area.</p>	<p>Response Noted. Flood Zones 2 & 3 relate to river flooding, and the commentary is correct in stating that the site is not affected by these. The site and surrounding area is at risk of surface water flooding as shown on the EA map. The site agent has stated that there is no surface water flooding risk on the site itself, but has not provided any evidence in support of the statement. The site has been assessed as AMBER in accordance with the criteria definitions and using the EA map as the data source.</p>
8	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (11) from AMBER to RED. There is no opportunity to improve the connectivity to the village with this site.</p>	<p>Response: Noted. See response to comment #4</p>
9	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (6) from AMBER to RED. Significant impact on Drumrauck Hall , also Linden Grange & Gardenstone Farm.</p>	<p>Response: Noted. See response to comment #6</p>
10	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (6) from AMBER to RED. Following on from the comments on S/073/009 based on HDC's Settlement Character Assessment for Hutton Rudby, it is requested that the classification be changed from 'amber' to 'red'. (see comments #41 & #42 on S/073/009)</p>	<p>Response: Noted. Commentary has been amended.</p>
11	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (2). Change from RED to GREEN.</p> <p>a) As described both sites S/073/010 adjoin residential housing and the provision of a road is not grounds for arguing that the site is separated from a residential area (by definition a 'Red' score is surely intended to score isolated remote sites negatively?).</p> <p>b) In addition to the northern and eastern boundaries being bound by residential areas I also take the opportunity to highlight that the south western boundary is bounded by the village playing field to the south east. Further and as mentioned in my presentation building adjacent and overlooking the playing field should also receive further credit as this will provide passive surveillance and thus reduce ASB.</p> <p>c) I therefore request that this site is reassessed and scored 'Green.'</p> <p>d) Although not of our concern but in absolute fairness we note site S/125/006 also has common boundaries and should similarly be scored Green.</p>	<p>Response: No Change.</p> <p>a) The criteria and traffic light definitions which were developed through community consultation are quite clear, and the site has been scored in accordance with the definitions. The use of physical features such as roads or becks to define development limits is a common practice. Support for use of this approach within the Neighbourhood Plan can be traced back to the Nov 2016 questionnaire where 81% of responses said such boundaries were important or very important for site selection criteria.</p> <p>b) The definitions explicitly state built up area. The playing field is separated from the built up area by Station Lane, and does not itself form part of the built up area. Impact on anti-social behaviour is not relevant to this criteria, but claimed benefit is considered in the context of criteria 9.</p> <p>c) Site has been assessed as RED in accordance with the criteria definitions.</p> <p>d) S/125/006 satisfies the criteria for a GREEN assessment and has been rated accordingly.</p>

12	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (3). Change from RED to GREEN.</p> <p>a) Again as explained in my presentation I have taken professional advice from local ecologist EcoSurv (Hutton Rudby) who concurs that arable land is of a lower ecological value than pasture land which is technically given the same value as a "desert" (in his own words). I believe your current scoring is therefore incorrect and all sites should be reassessed.</p> <p>b) I also note reference in the scoring criteria for the loss of hedgerows & Trees etc. as further justification to score the site negatively which would understandably offer ecological benefit. You will note however that neither sites S/073/009 & S/073/010 are not proposing the loss of either on our site but in fact the retention and protection of the few trees on the site.</p> <p>c) I respectfully suggest all sites are re-evaluated with sites S/073/009 & S/073/010 therefore being scored 'Amber,' second to brownfield land but not as important as pasture land.</p>	<p>Response: No Change.</p> <p>a) That arable land is very poor habitat is not disputed. However, habitat is not the only aspect to this criteria as can be seen from a full reading of the definitions. The criteria address the potential impacts of change from the current land use to a residential development by considering three distinct aspects: productivity for food production, recreational use, and biodiversity. For the food production aspect, the criteria follows the hierarchy of the Agricultural Land Use classification which ranks best and most versatile arable land at the top, and grazing land in the middle. This is consistent with para 112 of the NPPF which states "Local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality." For the biodiversity aspect, the assessment ranks grazing land above arable, but also makes reference to 'biodiversity potential' scoring to identify sites where there is likely to be greater biodiversity than is evident from the general land use classification. Additional aspects of biodiversity are considered within Criteria 15. This particular criteria address the impacts of change from the current land use to a residential development by considering three distinct aspects: productivity for food production, recreational use, and biodiversity. For food production, the criteria follows the hierarchy of the Agricultural Land Use classification which ranks best and most versatile arable land at the top, and grazing land in the middle. This is consistent with para 112 of the NPPF "Local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality." For the biodiversity aspect, the assessment ranks grazing land above arable, but also makes reference to</p>
13	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (5). Change from RED to GREEN.</p> <p>a) Whilst it is accepted that the site is in a prominent location within the perceived village curtilage, consideration should be given to the topography of the site as it falls away from the corner of Belbrough lane and Station road.</p> <p>b) As explained within my presentation it is proposed (and could be specifically referenced in the neighbourhood plan) that the top of the site is developed solely with bungalows to a low density. This will mitigate and prevent the loss of far reaching views out of the village.</p> <p>c) May I also take the opportunity to highlight that the site is currently bounded by a mature hedge (which we believe is to be retained and infilled in the forthcoming planting season offering enhanced ecological benefit to the site as referenced above). Further management of the hedge (and in particular its height in the case of residential development) will ensure views of the hills are therefore maintained. Alternatively if left unmanaged and undeveloped views will not be protected and could be lost.</p> <p>d) I therefore argue that both sites S/073/009 & S/073/010 should (subject to relevant design control via the neighbourhood plan) should actually be scored Green in recognition of the topography and design proposals.</p>	<p>Response: No Change.</p> <p>a) It is agreed that the site is in a prominent location. It is not agreed that it is within the village curtilage, as it is an arable field outside development limits and separated from the built form by roads. The topography of the site forms part of the vista which is valued by the community.</p> <p>b) Any development of the site would result in significant impairment or obstruction of views as a view with buildings in the foreground is fundamentally different from one over a field into the wider landscape.</p> <p>c) The assertion that a view should be protected by developing the site as the landowner may fail to maintain the hedge has no merit.</p> <p>d) The site has been correctly assessed as RED in accordance with the criteria and traffic light definitions.</p>

14	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (6). Change from AMBER to GREEN.</p> <p>a) I would disagree that any proposal has an adverse affect on the NDHA's.</p> <p>b) Protection of the NDHA via this score is surely intended to protect against inappropriate development within the grounds of or immediately adjacent to its boundary?</p> <p>c) 'Drunrauck hall is located 240M to the west of site S/073/009 and not visible at all due to the curvature of Belbrough lane and the vegetation.</p> <p>d) The Od Vicarage is 120M to the north set back from Belbrough lane in an elevated position.</p> <p>e) It would be very difficult to argue that development of either sites S/073/009 or S/073/010 which also falls away topographically would result in any effect on either NDHA's. I would therefore conclude that the separation distances are sufficient that site 9 and 10 do not represent any adverse impact on NDHA's. In my professional opinion both sites should therefore be scored Green.</p>	<p>Response: No Change.</p> <p>a) Noted. HDC opinion set out in the Local Plan consultation documents differs.</p> <p>b) The buffer zones of heritage buildings often extend well beyond their curtilage and can include views of them from within the wider landscape which forms their setting.</p> <p>c) We estimate the distance as 180m. Views of Drumrauck Hall from Station Lane and Black Horse Lane would be impacted to some extent by development of S/073/009 or 010.</p> <p>d) We estimate the distance as approximately 90m.</p> <p>e) As already stated in the response to para a) HDC's opinion differs.</p>
15	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (7). Change from AMBER to GREEN.</p> <p>a) The negative scoring of this criteria is quite frankly incorrect as the site could not be any closer to a green space as it adjoins one! Not only that but the green space in question is in fact the only playing field in the village.</p> <p>b) As highlighted at the developer presentation, development of the site will seek to improve pedestrian access to the playing field and also provide additional parking (as requested by HDC) and most importantly provide passive surveillance with family housing overlooking the field.</p> <p>c) Positioning housing overlooking public spaces is a proven urban design tactic recommended by CABE in designing housing estates which is also endorsed and referenced in 'Secured by Design' as 'good practice' to eradicate and deter Anti Social Behaviour.</p> <p>d) I feel very strongly that this site, particularly in comparison with others should actually receive the highest score possible and thus be scored Green</p>	<p>Response: No Change.</p> <p>a) An AMBER assessment on this criteria is a neutral assessment, not a negative one as is clear from the definition "Development of the site would have no impact on access to or size of Green Space". Proximity is not disputed, however, proximity in itself does not justify a green assessment.</p> <p>b) The site is already very accessible to the existing village residents by pavements, and by road with an 11 space carpark which is adequate for needs. Development of the site would not make a material difference to accessibility of the recreation area. Any improvements in access are given consideration in the context of criteria 9. Additional parking could only be considered a benefit if there is a need to satisfy, and as there is no evidence of need this can be given no weight. The claimed benefit of deterrence of anti-social behaviour is considered in the context of Criteria 9.</p> <p>c) Noted. This is considered in the context of criteria 9.</p> <p>d) The recreation area is a community facility located on a Green Space, and the function cannot be separated from the form so the same benefits cannot be attributed to both criteria 7 and criteria 9. The benefits claimed are more associated with the function as a community facility, than its form as a Green Space and are therefore given credit in criteria 9, but not in criteria 7.</p>

<p>16</p>	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (9). Change from AMBER to GREEN.</p> <p>a) As highlighted in response to previous criteria, credit should be given to the positive enhancements that could be provided by developing adjacent to the official and only playing field in the village. HDC's assessment is quite correct, that this site offers a unique opportunity to provide additional off-road parking to the play area. I do not understand the inference that there is no need for this as I understand that whenever there is a children's party or a football match at the playing field traffic, parking becomes an issue.</p> <p>b) Development here would clearly enhance and offer long term protection and sustainability for an existing community facility.</p> <p>c) As you will detect I feel very strongly that this criteria has been incorrectly scored and should be Green</p>	<p>Response: Revise AMBER to GREEN.</p> <p>a) Concerns about anti-social behaviour have not featured in Neighbourhood Plan consultations, although they have been raised at the Parish Council. There is no specific reference in the criteria definitions to ASB, and only a liberal interpretation of the definition of criteria 9 can create a link. ASB benefits can therefore only be given limited weight in site selection. There is also the possibility that development of the site might merely displace the ASB to a different location where it might be equally problematic or even worse, and so might be of no net benefit to the community. Nonetheless some credit is given for a potential improvement in the assessment of this criteria. Some improvement in access to the recreation area for ca. 20 households on Belbrough Lane would also be achieved by development on this site, and there would be good access for the residents of the site itself. With regard to additional car parking no evidence of need has been provided, and the experience of local residents is that overspill from the 11 space car park rarely if ever happens. The totality of benefits from ASB, improved access to the recreation area are considered to be taken fully into account in the reassessment of this criteria, and will be given no weight in the assessment of any other criteria.</p> <p>b) Noted. This has been taken into account in the re-assessment.</p> <p>c) Noted. The assessment has been revised.</p>
<p>17</p>	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (10). Change from RED to GREEN.</p> <p>a) To assess the village centre as an arbitrary place on the village green where no actual community facility is provided seems incorrect and quite frankly biased.</p> <p>b) The assessment criteria should surely be used to favour sustainable sites that offer a viable alternative to private cars to access services or encourage a reduction in vehicle traffic within the village?</p> <p>c) As highlighted at my developer presentation it would surely be more appropriate and sensible if all sites were scored on their proximity to services.</p> <p>d) In order to assess if a site is sustainable consideration should surely be given to all community facilities including but not limited to, the new supermarket, the school, public houses, the village hall and recreation spaces. Both sites S/073/009 & S/073/010 should be positively supported due to their proximity and easy walking distance to many of the facilities.</p> <p>e) I recall from the public consultation I led for Garbutts lane that parking at and around the school is a serious health & safety issue and thus sites that reduce dependence on cars must surely be supported and scored positively for the benefit of the wider village?</p> <p>f) In addition to its proximity to local amenities credit should also be given in scoring site S/073/010 that our client is also proposing to install a much needed public footpath to improve access to Drumrauck Hall.</p> <p>g) I understand that this has been requested by the residents around Drumrauck Hall for some time and that our client as land owner is the only viable option to provide this. Further the provision of a safe pedestrian route will further reduce traffic and congestion at the school enabling families with pushchairs and small children to finally benefit from a safe route to the village amenities.</p> <p>h) In light of above justification I would strongly recommend in my professional capacity that all sites are re-evaluated to ensure credit is given to truly sustainable</p>	<p>Response: No Change to Assessment, but add commentary to identify services located nearer to sites than village centre.</p> <p>a) There is a cluster of services and facilities located around the village green: 3 pubs, the Hub (a café/community space), Church House (a community meeting space), a place of worship, the GP, a hairdresser, the allotments are within 80m of the nominal centre, and a beauty salon will shortly open in the former Post Office. The definition of a criteria based on a nominal centre was developed through community consultation, and the location of the centre itself was chosen through a consultation exercise. There is no bias.</p> <p>b) Noted. This is both the intent and the effect of the criteria, although it is acknowledged that many other methodologies could be used.</p> <p>c) The method has been developed and agreed through community consultation. Criteria definitions are settled, and revisions to them do not form part of this consultation.</p> <p>d) As noted in the response to para c), the criteria definitions are settled. However, commentary will be added to identify heavily used services that are located closer to sites than the village centre.</p> <p>e) School run congestion is one of a number of traffic concerns in the village, albeit the one perceived as having the most severe impact on local residents. The other traffic issues frequently raised are: 'rat-running' through Doctors Lane, junction complexity/safety on Garbutts Lane in the vicinity of the new SPAR location, and the 'pinch point' at the Bay Horse. An analysis of impacts of sites on all of these is being developed.</p> <p>f) This point is considered in the context of Criteria 11 as a connectivity improvement.</p> <p>g) The criteria definitions are already settled and all sites have been assessed in accordance with them.</p>

18	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (11). Change from AMBER to GREEN.</p> <p>a) As highlighted previously, both sites S/073/009 and particularly site S/073/010 is categorically not on the edge of the settlement as it borders the village playing field and the rest of the village on 2 sides.</p> <p>b) As also highlighted and referenced previously development of the site therefore offers an opportunity to provide enhanced pedestrian access and additional parking for the playing field (as identified as being required by HDC) and also as highlighted in the previous criteria with a new footpath link improving access between Drumrauck Hall and the rest of the village.</p> <p>c) As demonstrated opportunities do exist on this site to improve connectivity between existing residents and existing facilities.</p> <p>d) Clearly both sites S/073/009 and S/073/010 should score green.</p>	<p>Response: Revise AMBER to GREEN.</p> <p>a) On the southern and western sides both sites border the open countryside, which makes a description of 'edge of village' entirely reasonable. The same descriptive text has been used for several other similarly positioned sites.</p> <p>b) The footpath connectivity to the recreation area has been considered and given credit in the response to Criteria 9. Additional parking (which is not needed in any case) has no relevance to Criteria 11. The primary focus of this criteria is opportunities to shorten walking distances, as is clear from the traffic light definitions, but it is agreed that a safer route is an improvement in connectivity albeit of benefit to only a small number of residents. However, the footpath would need to extend well beyond the western edge of site 009, (and also in fact slightly beyond the western edge of site 010). The majority of the safety benefit would be realised in the portion to the west of site 009 where there is a bend and a very narrow verge. The benefit is, therefore, attributable to site 010, but not to 009. This is consistent with the assessments for sites S/073/005, 006 & 012 which are also under common ownership and have an opportunity to improve connectivity - the smaller sub-sites which can only make a partial contribution are not given credit.</p> <p>c) Noted. Assessment has been revised.</p> <p>d) For the reasons set out in the response to para b) the benefit is attributed to S/073/010 only.</p>
19	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (12). Change from AMBER to GREEN.</p> <p>a) The site has an arbitrary boundary line identifying designation S/073/009 and S/073/010 not specifically requested by our client.</p> <p>b) I therefore highlight as per my earlier clarification that both sites can accommodate whatever density is deemed appropriate by the Neighbourhood Plan and / or allocation by HDC. Likewise parking allocation can be determined at this same time due to the relatively low density inferred.</p> <p>c) Noting that many of the other sites are scored Green it seems totally incorrect that this site is not scored green?</p>	<p>Response: Revise AMBER to GREEN</p> <p>a) Noted</p> <p>b) Although the reasons given by HDC for proposing low density are considered valid, too much weight has been attached to their suggested allocation in the draft assessment. There is sufficient land area available to justify a green assessment. Considerations of appropriate density would be addressed during the development of a site design brief if the site was selected.</p> <p>c) Noted. Site has been reassessed as Green.</p>

20 **Requested Change: Criteria (14). Change from AMBER to GREEN**

- a) The site is categorically not in any flood zones as evident on EA map: <https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/summary/446495/505610>.
- b) It is accepted that even though site is not identified by the Environment Agency local knowledge should also be used if available and thus I have taken further research having been advised that sites S/073/009 and S/073/010 the top part of the sloping field) does not, and has not flooded.
- c) I have been advised that even during periods of free weather, flash surface water flooding does occur for limited periods at the bottom of the field but again understand that this is beyond S/073/009 and S/073/010.
- d) In reality if sites S/073/009 & S/073/010 are in fact developed the site will need to comply with strict guidelines which will ensure that surface water run off is attenuated to absorb large volumes of rainfall and thus actually reduce flooding of the lower field and prevent any impact on the highway.
- e) I would therefore argue that this site should in fact be scored positively as one of the best sites that would contribute to reducing flooding of a field beyond the sites themselves.

Response: No Change.

- a) Noted. This is as stated in the commentary.
- b) There is agreement that there is flooding in the general area, but to give weight to the assertion that it occurs only outside the site boundaries which is in contradiction of the EA map, would require some suitable supporting evidence e.g. photographs showing surface water flooding beyond the site boundaries, but not on it. Should this be provided the site would be reassessed as Green.
- c) See response to para b)
- d) Noted
- e) The site has been assessed as AMBER in accordance with the criteria definitions.

Site Name		S/073/011	Draft	Rev 1	Comments Considered & Justification For Any Changes
Site Description		Land to South of Enterpen (does not include Flagpole field and land around Enterpen Farm). 39.24 Ha. A single dwelling has been approved for the flagpole field (Ref 16/1771/FUL) which will reduce the views into the site from Enterpen.			
Theme	Criteria	Observations			
Housing	(1) Development should favour sites which would be viable for the delivery of all components of the preferred housing mix (which will include affordable housing, downsizing/bungalows, and market homes predominantly of 2-3 bed size)	Does not connect directly with the Highway so short access road will be required.			
Site Characteristics	(2) Development should favour sites contained within or adjoining the village envelope.	Site connects along Northern boundary.			
	(3) Development should favour sites that avoid loss of prime agricultural land, high quality habitat, or other valued land.	Predominantly Grade 3a and 3b arable land			
	(4) Development should favour sites that can achieve a good access onto the adjacent road network	Developer has not provided any information on proposed access.			Assumed to be same access options as for S/073/003
	(5) Development should favour sites that do not result in impairment or loss of significant views from public spaces (roads or footpaths) as identified in the Settlement Character Assessment Workshops	Site is not prominent in views towards the settlement. View across flagpole field from Enterpen was noted in the Village Design Statement and in the Settlement Character Workshops. Some further impairment of this view over and above that arising from the single dwelling approved for the flagpole field may arise.			#1
	Settlement Character - Built Environment	(6) Development should favour sites that will not impact detrimentally on the conservation area or other significant buildings (listed buildings or non-designated heritage assets including associated grounds) or frontages as identified by the Settlement Character workshops.	Site is outside, but adjacent to the conservation area. However it is noted that access is likely to require construction of an access road within the conservation area through site S/073/003 which is under common ownership. Enterpen Farm (Grade II) and Village Hall (NDHA) are adjacent to site and Linden Grange (Grade II) is nearby. There are likely to be significant impacts.		
Settlement Character - Natural Environment	(7) Development should favour sites which present opportunities to protect or enhance Green Spaces, improve access for the public, or improve access for those with limited mobility	The closest proposed Green Space is the area around the village hall, which would neither be adversely affected or improved by development of this site.			
	(8) Development should favour sites which do not result in loss of open space in the Leven Valley Character Zone as defined in Settlement Character Workshops.	Site is outside the Leven Valley Character Zone, but adjoins it alongside the Public Right of Way in the Northern part of the site.			Incorrectly classified in draft assessment.

Services & Facilities	(9) Development should favour sites that offer opportunity to sustain or enhance community services or facilities.	No identified opportunities			
	(10) Development should favour sites that offer a viable alternative to private cars to access services or otherwise encourage reduction in vehicle traffic within the village area.	Walking distance to edge of site is in excess of 450m. (Note this is greater than S/073/003 as site does not include flagpole field). Major services not located around the Village Green are at the following distances: Village Hall: 140m GREEN Shop: 660m AMBER School: 230m GREEN			#3
Traffic & Transport	(11) Development should favour sites that provide opportunity to improve connectivity of footpaths and pavements within the village area.	Site lies at the edge of the settlement, so there are no opportunities to improve connectivity within the settlement.			
	(12) Development should favour sites that can provide sufficient off-street parking spaces for the needs of the additional residents and visitors generated by the development itself	Site is large enough to allocate land for 25 homes with adequate parking.			
Pipeline	(13) Development should favour sites where public safety is not adversely impacted by the presence of the high pressure ethylene pipeline	Pipeline is not in vicinity of site			
Flood Risk	(14) Development should favour sites not affected by Flood Zone 3, Flood zone 2 or with a history of surface water flooding. [Note: No eligible site is affected by Flood Zones 2 or 3, so this is effectively a surface water flooding criteria.]	There are no flood zones 3 or 2 on the site. The Environment Agency map shows areas (small proportion of the site area) in the North, centre and South of the site at risk of surface water flooding.			
Habitat / Biodiversity	(15) Development should favour sites which avoid loss of biodiversity	Site has medium biodiversity value, a TPO adjacent to site, and is within 100m of a SINC.			

Comment No	Comment	Response
1	Requested Change: Criteria (5) from AMBER to RED. "Significant views across from Enterpen to the hills would be interrupted. As noted by Hambleton there is a rare view here."	Response: No Change. As for S/073/003. View is taken into account in AMBER assessment ("partial impairment"). If site was selected, preservation of view could be addressed through the site design brief.
2	Requested Change: Criteria (6) from AMBER to RED. "Access is likely to be through Conservation area and affect Grade II listed building."	Response: Change Agreed. There does not appear to be any alternative to access through the conservation area.
3	Requested Change: Criteria (10) from AMBER to RED. "Whilst edge is 450m, further into any development would be excessive. "	Response: No Change. A consistent method of measuring the distance to the nearest point is used for all sites. The measurement is taken to the nearest edge of the site.
4	Requested Change: None. "It is not appropriate to utilise this site for this planning round BUT if in future there was a call to massively extend the village into a small 'town' then this could be considered."	Response: Noted

Site Name		S/073/012	Draft	Rev 1	Comments Considered & Justification For Any Changes
Site Description		Land between Langbaugh Rd and Paddocks End (includes part of S/073/005 and all of S/073/006). Original site size 7.38 Ha. Sale of 15m wide strip of land for conversion to domestic gardens (15/02694/FUL and 17/00208/FUL) on South and East margins of site have reduced site size by approx. 0.4 Ha. Developer has presented options for developing various parts of the site.			
Theme	Criteria				
Housing	(1) Development should favour sites which would be viable for the delivery of all components of the preferred housing mix (which will include affordable housing, downsizing/bungalows, and market homes predominantly of 2-3 bed size)	Although there is a field gate on the NE corner of the site, Highways have advised HDC that access should be from Garbutts lane. The cost of this access may have some impact on viability. However, the developer has indicated their preferred access is through Paddocks Ends (consent from Broadacres may be required).			#5, #8. Developer has advised intention to create a direct access from Paddocks End. No other viability concerns have been identified.
Site Characteristics	(2) Development should favour sites contained within or adjoining the village envelope.	Site connects with existing settlement on North, East and South boundaries			
	(3) Development should favour sites that avoid loss of prime agricultural land, high quality habitat, or other valued land.	Predominantly grade 3 grazing land, but there is a small area of higher quality habitat on Northern boundary along the margins of Hundale Gill. (This has not been proposed for Green Space designation)			#6
	(4) Development should favour sites that can achieve a good access onto the adjacent road network	Direct access from Garbutts Lane across S/073/001 would be assessed as "Red" as it would fall into the 60mph zone. HDC assessment indicates this is highways preferred option. Developer has indicated intention to obtain access from Paddocks End which is assessed as Green - consent from Broadacres may be required. Concerns have been raised about impact of a potential through route on Langbaugh, traffic/junction complexity in Garbutts Lane area, and possible SCHOOL RUN CONGESTION impacts.			#1, #2, #3, #7, #11. All sites are now assessed on the basis of the lowest speed limit available from technically feasible routes. Developer and/or HDC preferences and justification for using alternative routes would be examined at site design brief stage.
	(5) Development should favour sites that do not result in impairment or loss of significant views from public spaces (roads or footpaths) as identified in the Settlement Character Assessment Workshops	North-western portion of site is more prominent than S/073/005 and S/073/006. Development of the site would not impact on any views identified in Settlement Character Workshops.			
Settlement Character - Built Environment	(6) Development should favour sites that will not impact detrimentally on the conservation area or other significant buildings (listed buildings or non-designated heritage assets including associated grounds) or frontages as identified by the Settlement Character workshops.	Outside the conservation area and no listed or NDHA buildings in vicinity. The existing field is part of the historic field system between the village and Campion Lane, and the hedgerows are shown on the 1856 ordnance survey map of the area.			
Settlement Character - Natural Environment	(7) Development should favour sites which present opportunities to protect or enhance Green Spaces, improve access for the public, or improve access for those with limited mobility	No opportunities as site is not immediately adjacent to any proposed Green Spaces			#4

	(8) Development should favour sites which do not result in loss of open space in the Leven Valley Character Zone as defined in Settlement Character Workshops.	Site is outside the Leven Valley Character Zone			
Services & Facilities	(9) Development should favour sites that offer opportunity to sustain or enhance community services or facilities.	No identified opportunities			
	(10) Development should favour sites that offer a viable alternative to private cars to access services or otherwise encourage reduction in vehicle traffic within the village area.	Site is approximately 600m from village centre (assumes pedestrian access from public footpath to North of Site). Major services not located around the Village Green are at the following distances: Village Hall: 660m AMBER Shop: 90m GREEN School : 380m GREEN * or 520m AMBER * If pedestrian access through Langbaugh is possible.			
Traffic & Transport	(11) Development should favour sites that provide opportunity to improve connectivity of footpaths and pavements within the village area.	Development of the site offers the opportunity to create a walking route from Langbaugh Rd to Garbutts Lane			
	(12) Development should favour sites that can provide sufficient off-street parking spaces for the needs of the additional residents and visitors generated by the development itself	Site is large enough to allocate land for 25 homes with adequate parking.			
Pipeline	(13) Development should favour sites where public safety is not adversely impacted by the presence of the high pressure ethylene pipeline	Pipeline is not in vicinity of site			
Flood Risk	(14) Development should favour sites not affected by Flood Zone 3, Flood zone 2 or with a history of surface water flooding. [Note: No eligible site is affected by Flood Zones 2 or 3, so this is effectively a surface water flooding criteria.]	There are no flood zones 3 or 2 on the site. The Environment Agency flood map indicates small areas along the Northern boundary (around Hundale Gill), and a number of small areas on the Western part of the site have a history of surface water flooding. These include areas at high risk which under the criteria definitions is assessed as RED			#12
Habitat / Biodiversity	(15) Development should favour sites which avoid loss of biodiversity	Site has medium biodiversity value, no TPOs on or adjacent to site, and is more than 100m from any SINC.			

Comment No	Comment	Response
------------	---------	----------

1	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (4): None specified. "The access to sites 073/001/006/012 may involve access onto Garbutts lane in a 60mph zone. Whilst that is currently a red assessment on the draft plan, I believe that has the potential flexibility to be changed to a reduced speed limit, whereas other red assessments in the draft plan are not in that category and are fixed.</p>	<p>Response: Noted. All sites are assessed based on the prevailing speed limit. It is possible that this could be changed if a site was developed but there is no guarantee that it would happen. Changing speed limits is not within the control of the site promoter or the Neighbourhood Plan so use of the prevailing speed limits is considered the most appropriate basis.</p>
2	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (4): Should be RED. Major concern over opening site up to Langbaugh Road via site 005. Langbaugh Road could not support the extra traffic. Children's safety would be put at risk on school runs as Langbaugh Road is the main drop off. If only an Emergency Access is created via Langbaugh Rod how would this be policed."</p>	<p>Response: Assessed as GREEN. Developer has advised intention to access site via Paddocks End through the existing hammerhead into a 30mph zone. Development of this site would not necessarily require a permanent vehicle access to Langbaugh Rd, and a pedestrian or cycleway route across the site could potentially alleviate some of the school run congestion within Langbaugh and general traffic load on Doctors Lane. These issues would be considered during the site design brief stage if the site was selected. Emergency accesses typically have bollards or other fixtures removable only by the emergency services which prevent general use.</p>
3	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (4): Should be RED. "Concern over the possible opening onto Langbaugh Rd for emergency access. How would it be policed? There is already congestion in relation to parking for the school run. This would also be a major issue during construction. If site 005 was to be connected to 012 this would create a 'rat-run' from Garbutts Lane to Langbaugh Rd. Children's safety is greatly at risk.</p>	<p>Response: Assessed as GREEN. See response to comment #2.</p>
4	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (7): From AMBER to GREEN. "The site is large enough to provide its own Green Space".</p>	<p>Response: No Change. Assessment on this criteria is based on impacts on potential Green Spaces identified through the Settlement Character work, and not on whether there is sufficient space to create new green spaces. Opportunities to create new green spaces would be addressed at the site design brief stage for sites which are selected.</p>
5	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (1): From AMBER to GREEN. "Site will accommodate all required future developments".</p>	<p>Response: Change Agreed. However, the change is not for the reason stated in the comment, but because the only identified concern related to viability was the construction cost of an access road around Paddocks End. The developer has advised an intention to create a direct access from the Paddocks End hammerhead.</p>
6	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (3) from AMBER to RED. "The existing field is part of the historic field system between the village and Campion Lane, and the hedgerows are shown on the 1856 ordnance survey map of the area. To get access to this site will require a new road either through Paddocks End or around the western end of the Broadacres development to connect to Garbutts Lane. Either of these routes will require removal of part of the existing hedgerows The land itself is important as habitat for wildlife. For many years the field has been used regularly for cattle in the summer and, occasionally, for sheep in the winter. This usage, combined with the surrounding ancient hedgerows, has allowed the development of a varied flora and fauna on the site, including small mammals and a significant number of resident and migratory birds."</p>	<p>Response: No Change. The presence of historic field systems has been added to the commentary on criteria 6. This is grazing land so is classified as AMBER. Habitat/biodiversity is assessed through a scoring system and this area is rated as medium due to the presence of hedgerows, a water course and grazing land. Biodiversity is considered in more detail in Criteria 15. If the site was selected, minimising loss of ancient hedgerow would be addressed at the site design brief stage.</p>

7	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (4) from UNDETERMINED to RED. "If the developer seeks to gain access via Paddocks End to the north of the proposed site, there will be some loss of existing hedgerow, and a route will need to be found that avoids the flood protection works installed when Paddocks End was developed. If these obstacles can be overcome and Hundale Beck bridged satisfactorily, then it will result in additional traffic entering and exiting through Paddocks End on to Garbutts Lane. Whilst this access point to Paddocks End is within a 30mph area, it has limited visibility because of the bends to the west and east on Garbutts Lane. Also, it is sited close to the entry/exit for the new Spar store and Shell petrol station, to the entry to The Wickets, virtually opposite to the recently approved new development to the north of Garbutts Lane behind Levendale, and to the Cricket Club. The increased usage at this point for a further 11 to 25 dwellings would add to the traffic already on this part of Garbutts Lane. All these factors mean that access to the proposed development through Paddocks End cannot be described as achieving good access onto the adjacent road network.</p> <p>If, as an alternative, the developer opts for a new access road to the west of Paddocks End, which was the route favoured by Hambleton District Council in their Local Plan Preferred Sites Consultation exercise last year, then it should be assessed as RED for the same reasons given for Site S/073/001."</p>	<p>Response: Assessed As GREEN. The developer has now advised an intention to access the highway network through Paddocks End. This is assessed GREEN as indicated in the consultation draft. Concerns about traffic flows/junction complexity in the area are noted.</p>
8	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (1) from AMBER to RED. " development should favour sites viable for the delivery of all components of the housing mix - should be assessed as RED for site S/073/012. The Neighbourhood Plan consultation has identified that the preferred size for developments around the village is for 11 to 25 dwellings. Site S/073/012 is capable of development for over 150 dwellings, so it would not be appropriate for the Neighbourhood Plan to identify such a large area for housing development, and this site should, therefore, be assessed as RED on this criteria."</p>	<p>Response: Now assessed As GREEN - see response to comment #5. Sites are not down weighted because they are "oversized". Large sites would not be fully allocated as proposed, but would be partitioned into one or more phases or zones. The total allocation across all sites will be based on the amount of land needed to deliver a total of 70 homes.</p>
9	<p>Requested Change: Unspecified Criteria to GREEN. "This site in conjunction with 006 & 001 is worthy of consideration. Site 005 could be left as green space to provide a barrier but the other 3 lend themselves to many possibilities."</p>	<p>Response: Noted. Comment is unrelated to site assessment.</p>

10	<p>Requested Change: Consider Alternative Configurations. "As advised during recent developer presentations, site S/073/012 is put forward in whole or part for development. There is a blank canvas as to how it could be developed. Options include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A development in the northern part of the site; • A development in the southern part of the site; • Two developments; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o one in the northern part of the site o the other in the southern part of the site • A comprehensive development of the whole site. In this respect it might be decided that S/073/012 is where the future growth of Hutton Rudby should in the current Neighbourhood Plan period and in future Neighbourhood Plan periods. <p>Including detail as to the direction of growth in future Plan periods was provided in the Adopted Richmondshire Local Plan 1998. A copy of policy 30 'Direction of Future Growth' is attached as Appendix 1. Benefits of such an approach included that it provided certainty for all as to the direction of future growth and also an indication to timing / phasing. A copy of the Proposals Map is also attached within Appendix 1. The yellow arrows show the direction of future growth in that case to the north and east of Colburn. A similar approach could be followed in the Neighbourhood Plan to site S/003/012.</p>	<p>Response: Noted. If S/073/012 is selected in part (the full site is larger than required to meet the full Neighbourhood Plan housing target), these and potentially other options would be considered during the development of a site design brief.</p>
11	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (4) Change RED to GREEN. "It is requested that the 'red' classification in relation to access be changed. In this respect as set out in the commentary in relation to site S/073/001 (Site Characteristics point 4), access to the site via Paddocks End would be green."</p>	<p>Response: Changed To GREEN. All sites have</p>
12	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (14) Change from RED. "Comments reiterated as per those made in relation to site S/073/006. It is requested that the current assessment as 'red' be changed for comparable reasons. [The parts of the site potentially affected are small. A planning application would likely require a Flood Risk Assessment. This would amongst other things influence the detailed design and layout of a development. In the circumstances it is requested that the assessment as 'red' be changed the issue being readily manageable.]"</p>	<p>Response: No Change. It is agreed that the site is within flood zone 1, and that only a small part of the site is affected by a risk of surface water flooding (including some areas at high risk). However, the criteria are applied consistently across all sites to highlight where flood water management may be required. Site is correctly assessed as RED.</p>

Site Name		S/125/006 (Replaces S/125/001)	Draft	Rev 1	Comments Considered & Justification For Any Changes
Site Description		Land to West of Rudby Bank - assessed as reduced area resubmission. 1.94 Ha. Green Space submission S/125/004/G overlaps this site. The new proposed access now lies outside the previously proposed site 'redline'.			#60
Theme	Criteria				
Housing	(1) Development should favour sites which would be viable for the delivery of all components of the preferred housing mix (which will include affordable housing, downsizing/bungalows, and market homes predominantly of 2-3 bed size)	Short access road will be required to connect site to the adopted highway at Rudby Bank. The developer has advised they will demolish Rudby Farm to create the access. In addition to the construction costs of a similar road to that envisaged in the original assessment, the destruction of value of Rudby Farmhouse and the costs of demolition itself now also have to be absorbed with consequential risks to viability of delivering the preferred housing mix. Demolition of an existing dwelling and associated costs is not proposed on any other site under consideration.			#15, #21, #29, #32, #36, #53, #61. Revised due to risks to viability from absorbing costs of demolition and destruction of value of Rudby Farm dwelling.
Site Characteristics	(2) Development should favour sites contained within or adjoining the village envelope.	Site connects to existing settlement on North and East boundaries.			#37, #54, #62
	(3) Development should favour sites that avoid loss of prime agricultural land, high quality habitat, or other valued land.	Grade 3 Grazing land which is adjacent to SINC / ancient woodland at Bank Wood.			#8, #22, #38, #55, #63
	(4) Development should favour sites that can achieve a good access onto the adjacent road network	The revised access proposal based on demolition of Rudby Farm still has limited frontage between 'The Heathers' and the group TPO. It has less available frontage than S/073/003 which is also located in the 30mph zone and is assessed as AMBER. It will still require relocation of bus stops. The developer has provided a report stating that "the proposed site access arrangement fully complies with the relevant design requirements". This has not been verified, and the assessment of AMBER is based on the assumption that the statement is correct. Should this turn out not to be the case, the assessment would revert to RED. There is some doubt whether the available frontage "offers some flexibility in location of access point" as required under the AMBER criteria definition. Arial photographs indicate that the proposed access is likely to go through the area with archaeological remains.			#4, #7, #9, #16, #30, #31 #32 #34, #39, #64. Revised to AMBER on the assumption that the proposed access meets the relevant standards.
	(5) Development should favour sites that do not result in impairment or loss of significant views from public spaces (roads or footpaths) as identified in the Settlement Character Assessment Workshops	Site is not prominent from the road , but development would result in some impairment of views identified in Settlement Character Assessment. However, HDC site assessment notes that "The site is prominent from the PROW which bounds the site to the West" , so both requirements for a RED assessment are met. Proposed new access arrangements will increase the visibility of the site from Rudby Bank. This has not been addressed in the developers Landscape and Visual Appraisal.			#10, #17, #19, #23, #40, #56, #65. Prominence from footpaths had not been taken into account in draft assessment

Settlement Character - Built Environment	(6) Development should favour sites that will not impact detrimentally on the conservation area or other significant buildings (listed buildings or non-designated heritage assets including associated grounds) or frontages as identified by the Settlement Character workshops.	Site is outside conservation area. There may be significant impact on setting of Rudby Green Farm (Grade II). The developer's Heritage Assessment assumes that Rudby Green Farm will be screened from the development by Rudby Farm which they now propose to demolish. The conclusions of the report on the impact on the setting of Rudby Green Farm cannot therefore be relied upon. There are no other listed or NDHA buildings in the vicinity. There is evidence of ridge and furrow features on the site. There are also remains of archaeological interest nearby and possibly on this site. Arial photographs indicate that the proposed access may go through the area with archaeological remains.			#1, #11 #25, #27, #41, #57, #66
Settlement Character - Natural Environment	(7) Development should favour sites which present opportunities to protect or enhance Green Spaces, improve access for the public, or improve access for those with limited mobility	Settlement Character Workshops decided that S/125/004/G met the Green Space criteria, but did not recommend it due to conflict with development option. For the purpose of this criteria this is viewed a loss of a potential Green Space (whether or not it is ultimately classified as such).			#2, #42, #67
	(8) Development should favour sites which do not result in loss of open space in the Leven Valley Character Zone as defined in Settlement Character Workshops.	Site is adjacent to Leven Valley Character Zone. Development of the site would result in loss of open space adjacent to the Leven Valley Character Zone.			#12, #26, #43, #68
Services & Facilities	(9) Development should favour sites that offer opportunity to sustain or enhance community services or facilities.	No identified opportunities			#5, #20, #24, #44, #69
	(10) Development should favour sites that offer a viable alternative to private cars to access services or otherwise encourage reduction in vehicle traffic within the village area.	Site is approximately 900m from village centre plus the Naismith adjustment of 215m (average of outward and return journey effects). For major services not located around the Green add the following to the village centre distance: Village Hall: 300m Shop: 420m School: 430m (to Doctors Lane entrance) Concerns about safety aspects of steep pavement in slippery conditions, and the road bottleneck at the top of Hutton Bank have been raised in comments.			#35, #45, #51, #52, #70
Traffic & Transport	(11) Development should favour sites that provide opportunity to improve connectivity of footpaths and pavements within the village area.	No opportunities to improve connectivity			#46, #71
	(12) Development should favour sites that can provide sufficient off-street parking spaces for the needs of the additional residents and visitors generated by the development itself	Site is large enough to allocate land for 25 homes with adequate parking.			#13, #18, #47, #72
Pipeline	(13) Development should favour sites where public safety is not adversely impacted by the presence of the high pressure ethylene pipeline	Pipeline is not in vicinity of site			#48, #73

Flood Risk	(14) Development should favour sites not affected by Flood Zone 3, Flood zone 2 or with a history of surface water flooding. [Note: No eligible site is affected by Flood Zones 2 or 3, so this is effectively a surface water flooding criteria.]	There are no flood zones 3 or 2 on the site. The Environment Agency Map indicates areas along the Southern and Eastern edges of the site are at low or medium risk of surface water flooding, and some risk of surface water flooding nearby at Woodside and Middleton Road.			#28, #49, #74
Habitat / Biodiversity	(15) Development should favour sites which avoid loss of biodiversity	Site has low biodiversity value, has no TPOs on or adjacent to site, but is within 100m of a SINC. TPO alongside Rudby Bank are (probably) not adjacent.			#3, #6, #50, #58, #75

Comment No	Comment	Response
1	Requested Change: Criteria 6 from AMBER to RED. Has consideration been given to impact on properties in conservation area looking towards development, Current green space provides a definitive separation of the village.	Response: No Change. HDC assessment of the site for the Local Plan states "The loss of this open area and its subsequent development could harm elements which contribute to the significance of the conservation area." seems consistent with an amber assessment under this criteria.
2	Requested Change: Criteria 7 should be RED. The overall area has been put forward as green space. The importance of same was recognised by the Dept. of Environment in study in 1992 & detrimental effect development would have.	Response: Noted. Site has been assessed RED for the reasons already noted.
3	Requested Change: Criteria 15 from AMBER to RED. Prior to call for sites this area was rich in wildlife which has subsequently been cynically driver off - area for wildlife need to be considered.	Response: No Change. A bio-diversity scoring system has been used to rank sites on bio-diversity. This recognises that this site consisted of grazing land with some remnants of hedgerow. Only one candidate site achieved a 'high' score for biodiversity. The proximity to the Bank Wood SINC is likely to have contributed to the variety of wildlife historically observed on the field, and the importance of land adjacent to SINC is recognised within the criteria definitions. It is the reason why this site is assessed as AMBER - regardless of the degradation of the habitat on the field itself. It is noted that under these criteria definitions, the same result would have been obtained had the assessment been performed 2 years ago.
4	Requested Change: Criteria 4 Should be RED. Issues have already been raised regarding access adjacent to Rudby Farm. Any other proposed access up Blue Barn lane would create significant logistical issues.	Response: Revised to AMBER. The developer has now proposed a different access which requires demolition of Rudby Farm. They state that it meets the relevant standards, although this has not been verified. Furthermore, there is some doubt whether the available frontage "offers some flexibility in location of access point" as required under the AMBER criteria definition. The drawings provided indicate that at best there is just sufficient room to fit the access between the boundary with 'The Heathers' and the TPO. Should the proposed access turn out to be non-compliant with standards, the assessment would revert to RED.
5	Requested Change: Criteria 9 from AMBER to RED. Apart from providing housing developing the proposed site would bring no benefit to the village. All facilities are across the valley. The site provides a mere infill of already scarce open space.	Response: No Change. A RED assessment would require "loss or impairment of existing facilities, or impairment of access to them", which would not occur. An AMBER assessment is, therefore, consistent with the criteria definitions.
6	Requested Change: Unspecified Criteria should be RED. Biodiversity would be affected in an irreversible way.	Response: No Change. Comment is assumed to be related to Criteria 15 or possibly Criteria 3. These have both been assessed as AMBER in accordance with the criteria definitions

7	Requested Change: Unspecified Criteria should be RED. Main problem is site access - as proposed it is neither safe or acceptable.	Response: Comment is assumed to be related to either Criteria 1 which is now assessed as RED, or Criteria 4 now assessed as AMBER. The developer has proposed an alternative access involving demolition of Rudby Farm - see response to comment #4.
8	Requested Change: Criteria 3 from AMBER to RED. Loss of very unique & valuable habitat for wildlife.	Response: No Change. See response to Comment #3
9	Requested Change: Criteria 4 should be RED. Access is dangerous whether or not it meets NYCC Highways criteria. 50-75 extra vehicles in and out of site + service vehicles.	Response: Noted. The developer has proposed an alternative access involving demolition of Rudby Farm - see response to comment #4.
10	Requested Change: Criteria 5 from AMBER to RED. Views from existing housing across the valley & pathways seriously compromised for worse.	Response: Changed to RED. In accordance with national planning policy, only views from public spaces are considered. Views from the footpath on the Western edge of the site were identified in the settlement character work and included in the definitive list. HDC assessment states that "the site is prominent from the PROW". The originally assessment of AMBER was not in accordance with the criteria definitions as the prominence of the site had not been taken into account.
11	Requested Change: Criteria 6 from AMBER to RED. The land was initially designated preferred green space - what has changed.	Response: Noted. This is assumed to be a reference to Criteria 7 rather than 6 which has been assessed as RED in the Neighbourhood Plan site assessment. HDC decision to change S/125/004/G from preferred to non-preferred Green Space within the Local Plan process cannot be addressed through the Neighbourhood Plan, although their decision is not binding on the Neighbourhood Plan.
12	Requested Change: Criteria 8 from AMBER to RED. Serious loss of wildlife.	Response: No Change. Comment is unrelated to Criteria 8. Loss of biodiversity is addressed through Criteria 15.
13	Requested Change: Criteria 12 from GREEN to RED. 25 houses = 50 cars + service vehicles min. No garages shown, will this become a white van car park / gypsy site.	Response: No Change. At almost 2 Ha there is room for 25 homes with adequate parking. This is an assessment of the capacity of the land, not of the developers indicative proposal. Issues such as site layout would be addressed in the site design brief if the site was selected.
14	Requested Change: Unspecified Criteria to RED. When owners agents talk about the need for bungalows to enable 'low density' this suggests this is the wrong site.	Response: Noted.
15	Requested Change: Criteria (1) from AMBER to RED. Short access road is not a feasible option. Where is the engineering drawing that says it is possible.	Response: Changed to RED. Criteria 1 addresses economic viability constraints not technical feasibility which is considered in Criteria 4. The developers newly proposed access involves demolition of Rudby Farm which creates a significantly adverse risk to viability, so Criteria 1 has been revised to RED.
16	Requested Change: Criteria (4) from RED to RED. A car coming out of proposed access road and turning left would hit Hulse car backing out of his garage. Jeff Hulse would not see it.	Response: Changed to AMBER. The developer's newly proposed access involves demolition of Rudby Farm and is located further South than the original proposal. See response to comment #4. This has adverse impact on viability (Criteria 1) which has been reassessed as RED.
17	Requested Change: Criteria (5) from AMBER to RED. The junk housing proposal would be an eyesore viewed from public paths to the South and from my house.	Response: Changed to RED. See response to comment #10
18	Requested Change: Criteria (12) from GREEN to RED. Site is not large enough for 24 houses. They are stuffed in, most without garages - with some not even accessing to side road directly and having remote parking spaces.	Response: No Change. The site is 1.94 Ha, and with an appropriate layout could accommodate 25 homes with garages/parking at the relatively low density of 13 dwellings per hectare. The criteria is assessing the site capacity, and not the developer's proposal, and has been correctly assessed as GREEN.
19	Requested Change: Criteria (5) from AMBER to RED. 1. Significant impact of neighbouring properties. 2. Significant loss of views from public footpaths.	Response: Changed to RED. See response to comment #10

20	Requested Change: Criteria (9) from AMBER to RED. Distance to local amenities are very poor, will always need transport to access and shops / doctors / school.	Response: No Change. Distance to services is addressed by Criteria 10 in which the site is assessed as RED.
21	Requested Change: Criteria (1) from AMBER to RED. Although developers are stating (dormer) bungalows how can this meet development criteria when one of the main points is older people downsizing, affordable house,	Response: Changed to RED. The criteria addresses the site capability and not the developer's housing proposal. It considers whether it is likely to be economically viable to deliver the preferred housing mix on the site. Due to the risks of adverse cost impact of the developers proposal to demolish Rudby Farm to create access the site has been reassessed as RED.
22	Requested Change: Criteria (3) from AMBER to RED. This will ??? agricultural land, until this site was put forward sheep have grazed every year in this field and which has been rented to a local farmer.	Response: No Change. The assessment of AMBER takes into account loss of land from food production. In accordance with National Planning Policy and the Agricultural Land Use Classification, arable land is considered more important for food production than grazing land.
23	Requested Change: Criteria (5) from AMBER to RED. 1. Significant impact on neighbouring properties. 2. Significant loss of views from public footpaths.	Response: Changed to RED. See response to comment #10
24	Requested Change: Criteria (9) from AMBER to RED. Distance to local amenities are very poor, will always need transport to access any.	Response: No Change. See response to comment #20
25	Requested Change: Criteria (6) from AMBER to RED. Listed buildings and trees are in the property where access is going through.	Response: No Change. The Grade II listed Rudby Green Farm is near, but not within the site boundaries, and was considered in the assessment of this criteria. Demolition of Rudby Farm creates increased risk of a severe impact on the setting of Rudby Farm. It is noted that the developer's heritage report assumes screening from Rudby Farm which will not be available. The location of the nearby TPO was considered during the biodiversity scoring, and during the assessment of Criteria 15, and this has been reviewed following the developers proposal to relocate the access. Criteria 15 is now assessed as AMBER for impact on TPO as well as AMBER for proximity to the Bank Wood SINC.
26	Requested Change: Criteria (8) from AMBER to RED. This would impact significantly the loss of open space.	Response: Noted. The site is adjacent to the Leven Valley Character zone so loss of open space is assessed as AMBER. Only loss of open space within the Character Zone would be assessed as RED.
27	Requested Change: Criteria (6) from AMBER to RED. Impact of new road access being so close to Rudby Farm.	Response: Noted. See response to comment #25.
28	Requested Change: Criteria (14) from AMBER to RED. Eastern side of field floods across into our garden. Can provide photos.	Response: Noted. This is shown on the EA map as a medium risk of surface water flooding. There was an error in the site commentary which has now been corrected, but the AMBER rating is correct.
29	Requested Change: Criteria (1) from AMBER to GREEN. Why would short access road impact on delivering the mix of housing. All sites need an access road.	Response: Changed to RED. The criteria is concerned with economic viability of delivering the preferred mix. Issues such as long access roads or steep gradients have adverse cost impacts and make it less likely that some elements of the mix such as affordable housing will be viable. The developer's proposal is now based on demolition of Rudby Farm which would have a significant adverse cost impact and the site has been reassessed as RED.
30	Requested Change: Unspecified Criteria (4?) to RED. There is no Middleton Lane, so where is the access onto Middleton Lane.	Response: Noted. This comment relates to a descriptive error in HDC's site assessment. The proposed access indicated by the developer is onto Rudby Bank adjacent to The Heathers.
31	Requested Change: Unspecified Criteria (4?) from RED to RED. Unsafe access / egress onto Rudby Bank via proposed access road next to The Heather.	Response: Changed to AMBER. Developer has proposed a new access further South involving demolition of Rudby Farm. Criteria 4 has been reassessed as AMBER subject to verification of compliance with standards, but criteria 1 has been reassessed to RED due to viability concerns.

32	Requested Change: Unspecified Criteria (4?) to RED. To make an access road it would have to be minimum width. There is a natural spring draining alongside garage at Heathers freezing in winter. Vehicles will possible end up in my garage.	Response: Changed to AMBER. See response to comment #31.
33	Requested Change: Criteria (1) from AMBER to RED. Unsuitable for low cost / elderly / disabled / family dwellings due to distance and terrain from site to village amenities and school.	Response: Changed to RED. Criteria (1) is concerned with economic viability and demolition of Rudby Farm as proposed by developer is the reason for reassessment to RED. Distance to services is taken into account in Criteria 10 which is assessed as RED.
34	Requested Change: Criteria (4?) to RED. Splays absolutely essential to any access road onto main highway. Would cut across visibility for going into/out of our garage and driveway.	Response: Changed to AMBER. See response to comment #31
35	Requested Change: Criteria (10?) to RED. Approach to site via steep bank and sharp bends is unsafe and unacceptable. Straight lines do not apply.	Response: Noted. Distance is assessed along walking routes, not as the 'crow flies'. The Naismith adjustment makes allowance for additional walking time for ascending/descending the banks of the Leven Valley. It is noted that in adverse conditions (wet leaves/snow) there are additional hazards on steep slopes which are not addressed by Naismith, and which impact disproportionately on those with limited mobility.
36	Requested Change: Criteria (1). Delivery of preferred housing mix is not mentioned. Duchy build properties at the premium end of the market. The site is difficult and will incur a large cost to develop. To achieve a satisfactory return on this for 24 homes, Duchy will have to market at high prices. These prices for their affordable homes will be out of reach for most and therefore will not be taken by local people. Similarly for local people wanting to downsize. This is NOT what the village has asked for.	Response: Noted. The criteria assess the site from a viability perspective and is not a compliance assessment of the developer's housing proposal. Following the developers revised proposal to demolish Rudby Farm to create access, Criteria 1 has been reassessed as RED
37	Requested Change: Criteria (2). This site is not within or adjoining the village envelope. Rudby remains a separate settlement.	Response: Noted. This site adjoins the existing built form of Woodside and Rudby Bank. Whether or not Rudby is considered a separate settlement does not alter this fact.
38	Requested Change: Criteria (3). Development will mean loss of high quality habitat. It would become the best site in the village if left undeveloped and properly managed. The site still portrays the medieval agricultural practice of "ridge and furrow". Independent experts agree that examples of this should be preserved. No mention has been made of this.	Response: Noted. Grazing land is not generally considered high quality habitat, but the fact the site is adjacent to the Bank Wood SINC is of significance in the assessment of Criteria 15. A note on the presence of ridge and furrow has been added to the commentary on Criteria 6, as it is considered appropriate to treat this as a heritage feature.
39	Requested Change: Criteria (4) The access onto Rudby Bank has been assessed as unacceptable by a competent company. To achieve access will require the demolition of an adjoining property. This is totally unacceptable.	Response: Changed to AMBER. See response to comment #31
40	Requested Change: Criteria (5). The site will be prominent as viewed from the conservation area. This was recognised in 1992 by the appeal's adjudicator. He judged that it will detract from the pleasure of walking in the area. It is also clear policy to protect delineation between settlements. The adjudicator also concluded that blurring would be inevitable if the site were developed.	Response: Reassessed as RED. The site was originally assessed as AMBER, due to the view along the PROW, but the prominence of the site was not taken into account. HDC's assessment states "The site is prominent from the PROW which bounds the site to the West". The site, therefore, satisfies both requirements for a RED assessment
41	Requested Change: Criteria (6). No mention has been made of the historic village remains on this site. These will be bulldozed away by development. Duchy have used an archaeological survey done in 1991 that was sponsored by a developer and is clearly heavily biased in their favour. This survey should not be considered and an independent one commissioned.	Response: Noted. It is understood that the remains probably lie to the South of proposed site. A note will be added to the commentary indicating there is some uncertainty about the exact position.

42	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (7). It is gratifying that this assessment judges that this will be a loss of green space. The assessment of this site for a green space has been very badly treated by all concerned. It does meet ALL the criteria for a green space and therefore must be considered. It is outrageous to argue that because it has a development option it cannot be a green space. It should be the reverse. So since it does meet the requirements for a green space, then every effort should be made to maintain it.</p>	<p>Response: Noted. The workshop was not the appropriate forum to decide whether a Green Space designation or a development allocation should have priority.</p>
43	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (8). No mention is made of the loss of open space. The appeal's adjudicator in 1992 was clear that the loss of this site as open space is not in the interests of the village.</p>	<p>Response: Noted. Loss of open space is implicit in the AMBER assessment, but has now been made explicit in the commentary.</p>
44	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (9). Rudby has no services or facilities and will not have any in the foreseeable future. This is itself should rule out development of this site.</p>	<p>Response: Noted. Rudby is considered a sustainable location under national and district planning policy as it has access to services nearby (see for example planning officer's report on 16/01351/OUT). Distance to services is taken into account in Criteria 10 in which the site is assessed as RED.</p>
45	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (10). No mention has been made of the very steep climbs of Rudby Bank or the pinch-point of traffic at the Hutton Rudby end of it. Safety should be No.1 priority. The site proposed access and more particularly the pinch-point, must result in more traffic and hence increased risk of accident. It is difficult to understand why this has not been recognised in the assessment. Once again, it should be an over-riding reason not to develop in Rudby.</p>	<p>Response: Noted. This criteria deals with distance to services and is assessed as RED. The Naismith adjustment makes allowance for gradients (although there are other aspects - see response to comment #35). Site access is considered in Criteria 4 where the site is assessed as RED.</p>
46	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (11). This is clearly correct and will remain as such for the foreseeable future.</p>	<p>Response: Noted.</p>
47	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (12). The clear risk is that the site will be developed further for more housing in the future. Duchy has refused to deny this option when repeatedly questioned on the issue. This has not been recognised and cannot be in the villages' interests.</p>	<p>Response: Noted. The assessment considers the site as submitted.</p>
48	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (13). This is correct.</p>	<p>Response: Noted.</p>
49	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (14). Parts of this site flood on a regular basis and have done for centuries. This is why the "ridge and furrow" practice was adopted. Flooding at Woodside does occur. These are facts and cannot be refuted. Duchy should be required to address these issues adding to their costs and reinforcing the arguments that the prices of the properties they intend to build will not be attractive for affordable homes or local residents wishing to downsize.</p>	<p>Response: Noted. The site is assessed as AMBER due to the medium risk of surface water flooding identified on the EA maps. Management of run-off / surface water flooding would be addressed at the planning application stage if the site was selected.</p>
50	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (15). This is simply untrue. A resident has evidence of an abundance of wildlife biodiversity, which he recorded and sent to HDC last year. Despite the cynical attempts by the landowner in the last 2 summers to drive away wildlife, the site's potential is the best in the village. It could be a fantastic green space for the village to enjoy if only it were given the chance. Nobody seems prepared to do this at present. The assessment should address this before it is too late.</p>	<p>Response: Noted. The site scores low on the biodiversity screening scoring system because there are only two habitat types present on the site itself (grazing land, and remnants of hedgerow). It is adjacent to the SINC at Bank Wood and this is also taken into account. The site has been assessed as AMBER in accordance with the criteria definitions.</p>

51	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (10). Include the Naismith corrections for all Rudby sites. As well as the rise to the pub, there is another 10m rise from the pub up to the Hub, making the total rise 28m from the church. Include a correction for the downhill part (>10 deg.) for the drop to the valley bottom (very slippery in autumn/winter with deep fallen leaves, which adds another 50m. Total distance from Rudby Farm site would be about 1170m (currently 900m) and further for the other sites in Rudby. This correction then gives a true measure of the degree of 'redness' of the issue of access to services in the village from Rudby.</p>	<p>Response: Noted. It is agreed that the assessment basis will include the adjustment. However, the commentary lists the uncorrected distance to illustrate that the effect of Naismith is to increase the "redness" rather than causing an AMBER to turn RED. The average adjustment for the outbound and inbound trips (inclusive of the downhill effect) is 215m based on reaching the top of the bank (level with the GP, two pubs and the village hall). Although a case for various alternative calculations can be made, they are not materially different from the basis originally proposed and agreed through consultation. It is accepted that Naismith does not take into account all impacts of steep slopes, but slippery conditions are a safety consideration rather than something that can be translated into an equivalent distance.</p>
52	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (10). Given that people are probably going to drive if walking time is more than 5 minutes, then there should be recognition in the site assessment of the hazards associated with driving through a narrow bottleneck (virtually one way) at the bank top from all Rudby sites accessing services in Hutton Rudby.</p>	<p>Response: Noted. Consultation work indicates that the community consensus is that at 10 minutes walking time 'most people would drive'. Within the site assessment process it is assumed that most trips to services from sites assessed as RED will be by car (all sites in Rudby fall into this category). Additional commentary is being added to the assessments where heavily used services are located closer to a site than the nominal village centre. The bottleneck at the bank top is one of a number of traffic concerns, of which the most severe is school run congestion at Langbaugh / Doctors Lane.</p>
53	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (1) To RED: The site S/125/006 has major constraints which have significant impact on viability for delivering the preferred housing mix. The site itself will be subject to a steep gradient to get access (as demonstrated by the access to the adjoining property to the proposed access road to the site). However more fundamentally the location simply doesn't support the majority of the proposed housing mix, given the distance (2.4 mile round trip to Post Office/SPAR) from priority services for e.g. elderly downsizing to bungalows. For parents of young children interested in affordable housing, also a 2.4 mile round trip to the School, will simply undermine further one of the single biggest challenges for the village of traffic congestion generally but specifically at the start and end of the school day, and as already shown, congestion at the new SPAR/Post Office. Recommendation; On this basis this Criteria should be RED, and not GREEN.</p>	<p>Response: No Change. The site was assessed as AMBER (not GREEN) in recognition that the cost of creating an access would have adverse impact. However, following the developer's revised proposal to demolish Rudby Farm to create access the criteria has been reassessed as RED. Criteria 1 deals purely with economic viability (i.e. could the preferred mix be delivered here, and not should it be delivered here). Distance from services is dealt with in Criteria 10 which is assessed as RED.</p>
54	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (2) To RED. This site is separated from the existing built area, it's remote and isolated to the extent that in order to get access to the site, a new road will need to be created some 100 metres in length, likely carving its way through an existing dwelling to get access. Recommendation; On the basis of the above this criteria should be AMBER and not GREEN.</p>	<p>Response: No Change. The criteria are very explicitly defined. The site is directly connected on two sides to the built up area of Woodside and Rudby Bank without any intervening roads, becks or field. It is assessed as GREEN in accordance with the criteria definitions.</p>
55	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (3) Reassessment. As already highlighted in other feedback, all sites should be reassessed given professional advice from a local ecologist who concurs that arable land is of lower ecological value than pasture. Why do we wish to preserve agricultural land when we have farmers actively looking to sell it off? Recommendation; Sites need to be reassessed</p>	<p>Response: No Change. That arable land has lower biodiversity than grazing land is an accepted norm. Preservation of the agricultural land (particularly arable land) originates from national policy. See para 112 of the NPPF.</p>

56	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (5) Reassessment. Attached are photos taken from the public footpath, in fact the only footpath other than on the road that connects Rudy to Hutton Rudby.</p> <p>Recommendation; In particular if you take comparative analysis on other sites in to account this criteria should be marked RED, and not Amber, or other sites switched from RED to AMBER for consistency.</p>	<p>Response: Change to RED. The presence of significant views overlooking the site were identified in the Settlement Character Workshops and is recorded on the definitive map. These include a view from the PROW looking towards the South East. To achieve a RED under the criteria the site must also be prominent. HDC's assessment states "The site is prominent from the PROW which bounds the site to the West." The site, therefore satisfies both elements and should be assessed as RED. Consistency and objectivity is very important, and the consultation process is an aid to achieving both.</p>
57	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (6). There is no mention of the historic village remains on this site.</p>	<p>Response: Noted. This has now been added to the commentary along with a note on 'Ridge & Furrow' landscape features.</p>
58	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (15). Consistent with other feedback on this site low biodiversity in this instance simply isn't true; photos attached show until this process started what this site looked like, and also photos attached (birds of prey, Deer and a Fox) show additional examples of biodiversity in addition to that already submitted on more than one occasion which included white owls and a believe the resident Heron. Additionally TPO's are as good as adjacent to the site, to the extent that it is impacting the options for access to the site, to ignore the TPO's is inappropriate as long as access to the proposed site isn't clear. On this basis there is a strong argument that supports that the criteria should be RED, and not AMBER</p>	<p>Response: Noted. The biodiversity scoring is an objective, easy to use, and easy to verify screening process. It is acknowledged that it has limitations, as do all screening processes. The Steering Group consider a screening process 'fit for purpose' since the cost of detailed ecological surveys for every site would be prohibitive. All sites are assessed based on the 'redlines' supplied by the developer, and the nearby TPO was not ignored, but was explicitly considered. It is thought to be at sufficient distance that it would be unaffected by the originally proposed access. It is considered to be adjacent to the access now proposed which is located further South, and criteria 15 is assessed as AMBER for TPO and for proximity to the SINC.</p>
59	<p>Requested Change: None. The notional "centre of the village" as part of the criteria has no bearing to reality in terms of needs of the community in terms of access to essential services, or the issues of congestion and parking constraints around the location of key services in the village at certain times of the day. Instead the notional "centre of the village" better reflects a central point between all the potential sites in both Rudby and Hutton Rudby, simply creating a level playing field for site selection, ignoring the needs of the community.</p>	<p>Response: Noted. The methodology of using a nominal centre (and its location) was developed through community consultation. Many (but not all) of the village services and facilities are clustered around the notional centre including: the GP, 3 pubs, a hairdresser, the Hub (cafe, community space & place of worship), Church house, a butchery counter at Kitson's, the allotments, and a beauty salon is about to open in the former post-office. Additional narrative is being added to the site commentaries to identify distance to heavily used services outside the central cluster.</p>
60	<p>Requested Change: Amend Descriptive Text. Unsure why Green Space submission reference is relevant? This has been discounted by Hambleton District Council and, if green space is to come forward to the south, this would be covered through a separate document.</p>	<p>Response: These are factual statements on the history of the site area within the Local Plan Process. HDC's non-preferred status of the Green Space is neither a final determination within the Local Plan process nor a binding decision on the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
61	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (1) From AMBER To GREEN. Duchy Homes have confirmed that the preferred housing mix can be achieved – the proposals are for 24 bungalows including a policy compliant level of Affordable Housing. The highway access to the site will not impact the development's ability to meet the preferred housing mix. There are no other viability constraints which would prevent the delivery of the preferred housing mix.</p>	<p>Response: Revised to RED. The site was originally assessed as AMBER due to potential viability impacts arising from the costs of constructing an access road as proposed by the developer running between Rudby Farmhouse and 'The Heathers' of ca. 100m with steep gradients to overcome. This would be an adverse cost in comparison to level site immediately adjacent to an adopted highway. However, the revised proposal is to demolish Rudby Farm to create the access. In addition to the construction costs of a similar road to that envisaged in the original assessment, the destruction of value of Rudby Farmhouse and the costs of demolition itself now also have to be absorbed. These are considered to significantly increase the risks to viability of the preferred housing mix.</p>
62	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (2) None: Agree</p>	<p>Response: Noted</p>

63	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (3) From AMBER To GREEN. The criterion is clear that this relates to loss of the types of land listed. The Rudby Farm site does not constitute any of these typologies.</p> <p>A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal has been undertaken and concludes that the site is of low ecological value and that the proposed development would strengthen existing wildlife corridors close to the site.</p>	<p>Response: No Change. It is clear from the traffic light definitions that only brownfield sites are assessed as GREEN. This is not a brownfield site.</p>
64	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (4) From RED To GREEN. The proposed access to the site meets standards set out in North Yorkshire County Council's Residential Design Guide. This includes the appropriately sized access road, footpaths and visibility splays.</p> <p>The access is onto a 30mph road, as required in the 'green' criteria.</p> <p>The access is deliverable and compliant with technical standards.</p>	<p>Response: Changed to AMBER. It is noted that the access is different to the one proposed at the time of the draft assessment, and that the new proposed access requires demolition of a house to create space to relocate the access further south. It is further noted that the newly proposed access road extends beyond the site redlines and may now impact on a TPO to the south. The highways report by Fore Consulting is noted. For the purposes of this assessment only, the report's conclusion that "The appraisal presented in this Technical Note clearly demonstrates that the proposed site access arrangement fully complies with the relevant design requirements set out within North Yorkshire County Council's own Residential Design Guide." is accepted. However, it is also noted that the proposed access will still require relocation of bus stops. It is agreed that the access is located within the 30mph zone, but due to the limited frontage available there is little opportunity to optimise the location of the connection to the existing highway so it meets only part of the requirement for a GREEN assessment. The new access proposal has been assessed as AMBER in accordance with the traffic light definitions, which is consistent with the treatment of site S/073/003, the closest comparable.</p>
65	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (5) From AMBER To GREEN. Any impact on views from public spaces within the Settlement Character Areas will be limited to the public footpath running along the south western extremity of the site. The topography of the area and the scale of existing screening (which will be retained and enhanced through future development) result in a negligible visual impact from elsewhere in the Leven Valley character zone.</p> <p>Any negligible visual impact from the character area will be set against the backdrop of existing properties and mitigated through the landscaping and low scale of dwelling types proposed, i.e. bungalows.</p> <p>Views towards, within or from the settlement are minimal given the contained location of the site and the topography and existing vegetation.</p> <p>Based on this negligible impact from a small part of the Character Area, and the fact that the site is not prominent in views towards the settlement, the site should fall within the 'green' category.</p>	<p>Response: Changed to RED. It is agreed that, as stated in the comment, there will be impact on views from the Public Right of Way running along the south western extremity of the site. This is an important view overlooking the site identified in Settlement Character Workshops. However, important views are not only located within the Settlement Character Areas, and the criteria definition does not contain any such restriction. HDC's site assessment states "The site is prominent from the PROW which bounds the site to the west." The prominence of the site from the PROW had not been taken into account in the draft assessment. In accordance with the traffic light definitions, the site should originally have been assessed as RED, and has been amended for this reason. It is further noted that the creation of the new proposed access will increase visibility of the site from Rudby Bank compared to the original proposed access. The new proposed access will increase visibility of the site from Rudby Bank and might make the site prominent from there also. As a determination has not been made, no weight is being attached to this possibility. It is noted this has not been considered in the Wardell Armstrong Report either.</p>

<p>66 Requested Change: Criteria (6) From AMBER To GREEN. The site is separated from the Conservation Area and any heritage assets – in this respect it is consistent with the ‘green’ assessment criteria.</p> <p>The impact of development on Rudby Farm is minor. The development would result in the disassociation of former farmland from its historic use, as is the case with all sites being promoted, however this has already occurred as a result of changes to the layout of the farm and relatively recent residential development. Views of the development will be minimal due to existing screening and there will be no impact on the Grade II* listed Church of All Saints nor the Grade II listed Hutton Bridge. Any impact on Rudby Farm cannot be considered ‘adverse’.</p>		<p>Response: No Change. The comment acknowledges that there would be some impact on Rudby Green Farm. However, this is based on the assessment in the Heritage Statement by NAA Ltd which states at para 6.6 "The proposed access will be positioned to the north of the Grade II listed building. The modern farmhouse at Rudby Farm, and associated farmyard, will screen the asset from the new access way." Clearly the assessment of impact on Rudby Green Farm has been based on the original proposed access, and has not taken into account the loss of screening from the demolition of Rudby Farm, and the relocation of the access further South. It is also noted that the Parish Church is Grade I, and not Grade II* as stated in the comment. The report is inconsistent in usage, so it is unclear on which basis it has been assessed. The statements in relation to impact on the Church, therefore cannot be considered reliable. Finally it is noted that the HDC site assessment states that "The loss of this open area could harm elements which contribute to the significance of the conservation area." In the light of the above (individually and collectively) it would not be correct to assess the site as GREEN which requires that the "Site is separated from the Conservation Area, significant buildings or frontages, and development of the site would not have any adverse impact on their setting or significance. "</p>
<p>67 Requested Change: Criteria (7) From RED To GREEN. The site is not Green Space, nor will it become Green Space if not brought forward for development. It is private land with a public footpath running along a defined route to the south west. In this context the current assessment is incorrect as the site cannot be considered to represent a green space in any way.</p> <p>As set out at the developer presentations, development of the site represents the opportunity to connect existing footpath links to the surrounding residential areas and potentially to provide a new area of green space to the south of the development site. This would accord with the ‘green’ assessment criteria and introduce new green space to the village as a direct result of new development only. These improved connections would not be a possibility without development at the Rudby Farm</p>		<p>Response: No Change. There are currently no designated Green Spaces in the Parish, although it is anticipated that some will be designated either through the Neighbourhood Plan or Local Plan, which could potentially include this site. As no designations have yet been made, and as is clearly stated in the note alongside the criteria definition, the assessment considers the areas proposed by the community for Green Space designation which are thought to meet the tests set out in the NPPF at para 77. "The designation should only be used:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves •where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife •where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land" <p>These areas are listed in the minutes of a workshop held on 7/5/17 which are available on the Neighbourhood Plan website. It is also noted that the PPG states "land could be considered for designation even if there is no public access (e.g. green areas which are valued because of their wildlife, historic significance and/or beauty)." An assessment of RED is consistent with the definition of the criteria.</p>
<p>68 Requested Change: Criteria (8) From AMBER To GREEN. Development at this site would not result in loss of open space from the Leven Valley Character area as it lies outside of the defined zone.</p> <p>The site is not currently open space nor will it be brought forward for accessible open space.</p> <p>The traffic light definitions relate poorly to the criterion on this topic – we suggest that a site which doesn’t result in the loss of open space in the Leven Valley Character Zone should be assessed as ‘green’.</p>		<p>Response: No Change. Had the development resulted in loss of open space from the Leven Valley Character zone, it would have been assessed as RED. As the loss of open space is adjacent it is assessed as AMBER in accordance with the criteria definition.</p>

69	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (9) From AMBER To GREEN. The development at Rudby Farm would provide an opportunity to increase the amount of accessible, functional open space in the village. This would be located directly to the south of the proposed development site with connections to existing public rights of way. This is a tangible and deliverable enhancement to the existing community facilities.</p>	<p>Response: No Change. This is outside the redline of the site, and although it is acknowledged that the land is under common ownership so could be offered, any associated benefit cannot be delivered by the site itself. Furthermore as there is already public access and benefit from recreational walking on Public Rights of Way in this area, any gains from conversion to public open space would be marginal.</p>
70	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (10) From RED to AMBER. Based on the criteria the site can only be assessed as 'red'. However there should be recognition that whilst 415m and 830m are a preference of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, walking distances above this level should not be considered unacceptable. Research into acceptable walking distances acknowledges that, particularly in non-urban areas, acceptable walking distances are higher. The Department for Transport (LTN 1/04) notes that the mean average length for walking journeys is 1km whilst the Institution of Highways and Transportation (Providing for Journeys on Foot) note a preferred maximum walking distance of between 800m and 1200m depending upon the destination. Hambleton District Council's site assessment, within the Alternative Sites Consultation, confirm that the site is sustainably located and a suitable location for residential development. This is confirmed through the site's status as a preferred housing site.</p>	<p>Response: No Change. It is agreed that the site is in a sustainable location. A RED assessment does not mean that the location is unsustainable. It simply means that the site is further from services than one assessed as AMBER or GREEN, and therefore people are less likely to walk to services. The distances of 415m and 830m are not preferences of the Neighbourhood Plan steering group, but are community preferences arising out of consultation, as is the use of the 'Naismith' adjustment. All other things being equal, the criteria would favour a site closer to services than one further away i.e. it would favour the most sustainable location.</p>
71	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (11) From AMBER To GREEN. The proposed development at Rudby Farm would provide a new east-west link from the Public Right of Way along the eastern edge of the site through to Rudby Bank. An opportunity to provide a link from Rudby Bank to Leven Valley would be provided through development at the site.</p>	<p>Response: No Change. There is already an East-West link from the top of Rudby Bank to the PROW approximately 80m South of the site access. The PROW is a recreational footpath which does not provide a more direct route to services, than walking along the roadside pavement. Therefore, provision of this link appears to fit the definition of AMBER perfectly, which is "Development of site will have negligible impact on walking distances to services from other parts of the village." It is noted that credit was given to another site (S/073/010) for the potential to achieve a tangible safety improvement without reducing walking distances through the provision of a pavement. However, no equivalent benefit applies here.</p>
72	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (12) None. Any car parking provision defined within the Neighbourhood Plan should refer to NYCC's standards and be fully evidenced to accord with paragraph 39 of the NPPF.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
73	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (13) None. No further comments</p>	<p>Noted</p>
74	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (14) From AMBER To GREEN. The Environment Agency mapping categorises the flood risk to the site from surface water as 'very low'. The proposed development would incorporate sustainable urban drainage, which would remove even the 'very low' risk at the site and provide betterment in terms of water quality and flood risk in the local area. The risk of surface water flooding outside of the site at Woodside and Middleton Road should not be considered when assessing the Rudby Farm site.</p>	<p>Response: No Change. The EA map shows small areas at low and medium risk of surface water flooding. The site has been assessed correctly in accordance with the criteria definitions which have been applied consistently across all sites. The criteria is intended to favour sites with least flood risk. The reference to flooding in adjacent areas is an informational comment, and does not influence the rating.</p>

75 Requested Change: Criteria (15) From AMBER To GREEN. The proposed development will avoid reduction in biodiversity, in line with the criterion. The site is of low biodiversity value and new development, in particular the sustainable urban drainage features, will represent a net increase in biodiversity as a result of new development.

Whilst the site does lie near to a SINC, there is a significant change in levels from the riverside to the site which should be taken into consideration when assessing proximity – in much the same way level differences are accounted for in criterion 10.

Response: No Change. While topography may have some influence on the size of buffer zones, it would not eliminate them entirely. The development site is immediately adjacent to the SINC at the Northern and Southern ends of the footpath and there can be no reasonable doubt that those parts of the site would be within the buffer zones, so the site is correctly scored AMBER on that basis. Furthermore it is noted that drawings of the proposed new access appear to show that the pavement and splays are located within the canopy range of the TPO. The site is now considered to be adjacent to the TPO, and is assessed as AMBER on that basis also.

Site Name		S/125/002	Draft	Rev 1	Comments Considered & Justification For Any Changes
Site Description		Land to South of Blue Barn Lane. 6.55 Ha			
Theme	Criteria				
Housing	(1) Development should favour sites which would be viable for the delivery of all components of the preferred housing mix (which will include affordable housing, downsizing/bungalows, and market homes predominantly of 2-3 bed size)	Construction costs of an access road traversing the pipeline buffer zones are likely to be higher than for an equivalent road outside the pipeline buffer. Overhead power line either present a constraint on layout, or would incur cost for re-routing.			#1, #2, #3 The draft assessment had not taken the power lines into account or the potential cost impact of routing access road over pipeline buffer zones.
Site Characteristics	(2) Development should favour sites contained within or adjoining the village envelope.	Site connects to existing settlement on East boundary			
	(3) Development should favour sites that avoid loss of prime agricultural land, high quality habitat, or other valued land.	Predominantly Grade 3 arable land			
	(4) Development should favour sites that can achieve a good access onto the adjacent road network	Site has a long frontage onto Blue Barn Lane but it narrows to a single track width close to the NE corner of the site. HDC assessment states "Bluebarn Lane is single track and would need significant improvement."			
	(5) Development should favour sites that do not result in impairment or loss of significant views from public spaces (roads or footpaths) as identified in the Settlement Character Assessment Workshops	Development of site would not result in impairment of view identified in Settlement Character Workshops			
Settlement Character - Built Environment	(6) Development should favour sites that will not impact detrimentally on the conservation area or other significant buildings (listed buildings or non-designated heritage assets including associated grounds) or frontages as identified by the Settlement Character workshops.	Site is outside Conservation Area and there are no listed buildings or NDHAs in the vicinity.			
Settlement Character - Natural Environment	(7) Development should favour sites which present opportunities to protect or enhance Green Spaces, improve access for the public, or improve access for those with limited mobility	The closest proposed Green Space is at Rudby Farm and would neither be adversely affected or improved by development of this site.			
	(8) Development should favour sites which do not result in loss of open space in the Leven Valley Character Zone as defined in Settlement Character Workshops.	Site is adjacent to Leven Valley Character Zone			#4
Services & Facilities	(9) Development should favour sites that offer opportunity to sustain or enhance community services or facilities.	No identified opportunities			

	(10) Development should favour sites that offer a viable alternative to private cars to access services or otherwise encourage reduction in vehicle traffic within the village area.	Site is approximately 1.4 km from village centre plus the Naismith adjustment of 215m (average of outward and return journey effects). For major services not located around the Green add the following to the village centre distance: Village Hall: 300m Shop: 420m School: 430m (to Doctors Lane entrance) Concerns about safety aspects of steep pavement in slippery conditions, and the road bottleneck at the top of Hutton Bank have been raised in comments.			
Traffic & Transport	(11) Development should favour sites that provide opportunity to improve connectivity of footpaths and pavements within the village area.	No opportunities to improve connectivity			
	(12) Development should favour sites that can provide sufficient off-street parking spaces for the needs of the additional residents and visitors generated by the development itself	Site is large enough to allocate land for 25 homes with adequate parking.			#6
Pipeline	(13) Development should favour sites where public safety is not adversely impacted by the presence of the high pressure ethylene pipeline	Pipeline zone covers approximately 2/3 of site. Unaffected area is adjacent to existing built area, and considering this portion only would give the same amber assessment under Criteria 2 as for the full site.			#1, #2, #3, #7
Flood Risk	(14) Development should favour sites not affected by Flood Zone 3, Flood zone 2 or with a history of surface water flooding. [Note: No eligible site is affected by Flood Zones 2 or 3, so this is effectively a surface water flooding criteria.]	There are no flood zones 3 or 2 on the site. The Environment Agency map shows no areas on the site are at risk of surface water flooding.			
Habitat / Biodiversity	(15) Development should favour sites which avoid loss of biodiversity	Site has low biodiversity value, has no TPOs on or adjacent to site, but is within 100m of a SINC			#5

Comment No	Comment	Response
1	Requested Change: Criteria 13 from AMBER to RED. No space for houses given overhead power lines and gas pipeline. Cost would be outrageous and not economically viable.	Response: No Change to Criteria #13, but amend Criteria #1 from GREEN to AMBER. There is in excess of 0.5 Ha entirely outside the pipeline buffer zones where there are no development restrictions or special working practices required. An access road onto this part of the site would have to cross the pipeline buffer zone which would have some impact on cost of developing the site. Furthermore, the overhead powerlines bisect the area outside the pipeline buffer zone, and this would either present a constraint on layout or incur additional cost to reroute the powerline. Consequently Criteria #1 as been amended to AMBER in recognition of these constraints which would impact on viability.

2	<p>Requested Change: Criteria 13 from AMBER to RED. Too close to gas pipeline for houses or any development which disturbs soil i.e. road.</p>	<p>Response: No Change: HSE guidance permits some types of housing over the amber and green buffer zones, and roads to be constructed over the red zone. Special working practices are required in the vicinity of the pipeline which impact on development costs. Criteria #1 has been amended from GREEN to AMBER in recognition of this. (see response to comment #1)</p>
3	<p>Requested Change: Criteria 13 from AMBER to RED. The existence of the ethylene pipeline constrains the possible development area and makes access very difficult and probably expensive.</p>	<p>Response: Noted. See response to comments #1 & #2</p>
4	<p>Requested Change: Criteria 8 from AMBER to RED. Bluebarn lane and the site generally provides leisure activities i.e. walkers, dog walking etc. which should be preserved. Existing houses too close to pipeline.</p>	<p>Response: No Change. The boundaries of the Leven Valley Character Zone and the definition of the criteria relating to it were developed in community workshops. The site is correctly assessed as AMBER under this criteria definitions.</p>
5	<p>Requested Change: Criteria 15 from AMBER to RED. There is mature hedgerow either side of the existing small road and one or both would need to be removed.</p>	<p>Response: No Change: A section of hedgerow sufficient to form an access would need to be removed, but most of it could be retained if the site was to be developed.</p>
6	<p>Requested Change: Criteria 12 from GREEN to AMBER/RED. With only 1/3 of site available due to pipeline, can 25 homes really be built with adequate parking.</p>	<p>Response: No Change. There is around 2 Ha outside the pipeline buffer zone. This could accommodate 25 homes at a density similar to the adjacent Woodside/Greenlands.</p>
7	<p>Requested Change: Criteria 13 from AMBER to RED. Pipeline is too close to residential properties for safety.</p>	<p>Response: Noted. See response to comments #1 & #2</p>
8	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (10). Include the Naismith corrections for all Rudby sites. As well as the rise to the pub, there is another 10m rise from the pub up to the Hub, making the total rise 28m from the church. Include a correction for the downhill part (>10 deg.) for the drop to the valley bottom (very slippery in autumn/winter with deep fallen leaves, which adds another 50m. Total distance from Rudby Farm site would be about 1170m (currently 900m) and further for the other sites in Rudby. This correction then gives a true measure of the degree of 'redness' of the issue of access to services in the village from Rudby.</p>	<p>Response: Noted. It is agreed that the assessment basis will include the adjustment. However, the commentary lists the uncorrected distance to illustrate that the effect of Naismith is to increase the "redness" rather than causing an AMBER to turn RED. The average adjustment for the outbound and inbound trips (inclusive of the downhill effect) would be 215m based on the Bay Horse, or 255m based on reaching the highest point on the Green near the Hub. A case could be made for either, but as it doesn't affect the rating it is not considered a material consideration. It is agreed that Naismith does not take into account all impacts, and slippery conditions are a safety consideration rather than something that can be translated into an equivalent distance.</p>
9	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (10). Given that people are probably going to drive if walking time is more than 5 minutes, then there should be recognition in the site assessment of the hazards associated with driving through a narrow bottleneck (virtually one way) at the bank top from all Rudby sites accessing services in Hutton Rudby.</p>	<p>Response: Noted. Consultation work indicates that opinion in the community is that at 10 minutes walking time 'most people would drive'. Therefore, within the site assessment process it is assumed that most trips to services from sites assessed as RED will be by car (all sites in Rudby fall into this category). Additional commentary is being added to the assessments where heavily used services are located closer to a site than the nominal village centre. The bottleneck at the bank top is one of a number of traffic concerns, of which the most severe is school run congestion at Langbaugh / Doctors Lane.</p>

Site Name		S/125/003	Draft	Rev 1	Comments Considered & Justification For Any Changes
Site Description		Land to North of Stokesley Rd. 2.26 Ha. A planning application for 5 self build plots has been submitted for the part of the site immediately adjacent to Stokesley Rd. The assessment is based on the current state of the site.			
Theme	Criteria				
Housing	(1) Development should favour sites which would be viable for the delivery of all components of the preferred housing mix (which will include affordable housing, downsizing/bungalows, and market homes predominantly of 2-3 bed size)	Land falls with modest gradient towards SW corner. Flooding issues with under another criteria			
Site Characteristics	(2) Development should favour sites contained within or adjoining the village envelope.	Site connects to existing settlement along West boundary			
	(3) Development should favour sites that avoid loss of prime agricultural land, high quality habitat, or other valued land.	Predominantly Grade 3 arable land			
	(4) Development should favour sites that can achieve a good access onto the adjacent road network	Site has a long frontage onto Stokesley Rd - partly in 30mph zone and partly in 60mph zone.			#4. All sites are now assessed on the basis of the lowest speed limit available from technically feasible routes. Developer and/or HDC preferences and justification for using alternative routes would be examined at site design brief stage.
	(5) Development should favour sites that do not result in impairment or loss of significant views from public spaces (roads or footpaths) as identified in the Settlement Character Assessment Workshops	Although site is prominent on approach to village from Stokesley, development would <u>not</u> result in significant impairment of any views identified in the Settlement Character Workshops			#1, #3, #6, #7, #8
Settlement Character - Built Environment	(6) Development should favour sites that will not impact detrimentally on the conservation area or other significant buildings (listed buildings or non-designated heritage assets including associated grounds) or frontages as identified by the Settlement Character workshops.	Site is outside Conservation Area and there are no listed buildings or NDHAs in the vicinity.			
Settlement Character - Natural Environment	(7) Development should favour sites which present opportunities to protect or enhance Green Spaces, improve access for the public, or improve access for those with limited mobility	No proposed Green Spaces in vicinity of the site			

	(8) Development should favour sites which do not result in loss of open space in the Leven Valley Character Zone as defined in Settlement Character Workshops.	Site is outside the Leven Valley Character Zone			
Services & Facilities	(9) Development should favour sites that offer opportunity to sustain or enhance community services or facilities.	No identified opportunities			
	(10) Development should favour sites that offer a viable alternative to private cars to access services or otherwise encourage reduction in vehicle traffic within the village area.	Site is approximately 1.2 km from village centre plus the Naismith adjustment of 215m (average of outward and return journey effects). For major services not located around the Green add the following to the village centre distance: Village Hall: 300m Shop: 420m School: 430m (to Doctors Lane entrance) Concerns about safety aspects of steep pavement in slippery conditions, and the road bottleneck at the top of Hutton Bank have been raised in comments.			
Traffic & Transport	(11) Development should favour sites that provide opportunity to improve connectivity of footpaths and pavements within the village area.	No opportunities to improve connectivity			
	(12) Development should favour sites that can provide sufficient off-street parking spaces for the needs of the additional residents and visitors generated by the development itself	Site is large enough to allocate land for 25 homes with adequate parking.			
Pipeline	(13) Development should favour sites where public safety is not adversely impacted by the presence of the high pressure ethylene pipeline	Pipeline is not in vicinity of site			
Flood Risk	(14) Development should favour sites not affected by Flood Zone 3, Flood zone 2 or with a history of surface water flooding. [Note: No eligible site is affected by Flood Zones 2 or 3, so this is effectively a surface water flooding criteria.]	There are no flood zones 3 or 2 on the site. The Environment Agency map shows the Southwest corner is at high risk of surface water flooding as are adjacent area on the North side of Stokesley Road, and nearby at Rudby Lea.			#2
Habitat / Biodiversity	(15) Development should favour sites which avoid loss of biodiversity	Site has low biodiversity value, has no TPOs on or adjacent to site, and is more than 100m from any SINC			

Comment No	Comment	Response
1	Requested Change: Criteria 5 from AMBER to RED. Site is prominent on approach to village from Stokesley Rd even though view has not been identified. It is one of the main ways into the village.	Response: No Change. Prominence of site is already taken into account in AMBER assessment. A RED assessment requires a prominent site and an identified view.

2	<p>Requested Change: Criteria 14 from RED to AMBER. Following severe flooding ca. 10 years ago, significant work was done to alleviate flood risk. Question whether this is reflected in EA flood assessment.</p>	<p>Response: Noted. It is known that flood prevention works have been carried out, and is it possible that the EA Map over states the flood risk for this site. However, the assessment could only be amended if positive evidence of a reduction in risk (such as a site specific flood risk assessment) was available.</p>
3	<p>Requested Change: Criteria 5 from AMBER to GREEN. Impact on neighbours is less.</p>	<p>Response: No Change: Impact on neighbours is not addressed by any of the criteria. It would be addressed in site design briefs for the selected sites.</p>
4	<p>Requested Change: Criteria 4 None Specified. Good access onto road</p>	<p>Response: No Change: Site is assessed as GREEN on this criteria.</p>
5	<p>Requested Change: Unspecified Criteria to GREEN. Low impact on neighbours an current neighbours are supporting development.</p>	<p>Response: No Change: Impact on neighbours is not addressed by any of the criteria. It would be addressed in site design briefs for the selected sites.</p>
6	<p>Requested Change: Criteria 5 from AMBER to AMBER. Site is prominent as green open space on approach to village. Views no worse/no better than other views classified as amber or red. Too subjective.</p>	<p>Response: No Change: Site is already assessed as AMBER on this criteria due to it's prominent location. A definitive list of important views was developed through community consultation and marked up on a master map. Decisions on which views to recognise was arrived at by consensus in workshops involving participants from all areas of the village. This map was then displayed at a further four consultation events during the development of criteria and traffic light definitions, during which no modifications were proposed. In the site assessments only views marked on this map are considered, and all are given equal weight.</p>
7	<p>Requested Change: Criteria 5 from AMBER to GREEN. This site is a good option if the owner was to produce a proposal to match the community requirements and not push for 5 large detached houses.</p>	<p>Response: No Change: This comment does not relate to Criteria 5. The site design briefs for the selected sites will define how allocated sites would be developed.</p>
8	<p>Requested Change: Criteria 5. Add view from Stokesley Rd to Settlement Character Assessment. View approaching village along Garbutts Lane less (or equal) significance to approach from Stokesley Road (which is shown as Green).</p>	<p>Response: No Change To Assessment: This was submitted with Site Reference S/073/001 (Garbutts Lane), but as the requested change relates to site S/125/003, it has been considered here. Both sites are recognised as prominent locations, and this is reflected in the assessment of AMBER for S/125/003 under criteria 5. Adding any views to the 'definitive list' (see response to comment #6) used in the site selection process would require re-opening of the consultation phase on Settlement Character which the steering group do not believe is justified. Additional views proposed at this stage would, however, be considered within the site design briefs for selected sites.</p>
9	<p>Requested Change: Criteria (10). Include the Naismith corrections for all Rudby sites. As well as the rise to the pub, there is another 10m rise from the pub up to the Hub, making the total rise 28m from the church. Include a correction for the downhill part (>10 deg.) for the drop to the valley bottom (very slippery in autumn/winter with deep fallen leaves, which adds another 50m. Total distance from Rudby Farm site would be about 1170m (currently 900m) and further for the other sites in Rudby. This correction then gives a true measure of the degree of 'redness' of the issue of access to services in the village from Rudby.</p>	<p>Response: Noted. It is agreed that the assessment basis will include the adjustment. However, the commentary lists the uncorrected distance to illustrate that the effect of Naismith is to increase the "redness" rather than causing an AMBER to turn RED. The average adjustment for the outbound and inbound trips (inclusive of the downhill effect) would be 215m based on the Bay Horse, or 255m based on reaching the highest point on the Green near the Hub. A case could be made for either, but as it doesn't affect the rating it is not considered a material consideration. It is agreed that Naismith does not take into account all impacts, and slippery conditions are a safety consideration rather than something that can be translated into an equivalent distance.</p>

10 Requested Change: Criteria (10). Given that people are probably going to drive if walking time is more than 5 minutes, then there should be recognition in the site assessment of the hazards associated with driving through a narrow bottleneck (virtually one way) at the bank top from all Rudby sites accessing services in Hutton Rudby.

Response: Noted. Consultation work indicates that opinion in the community is that at 10 minutes walking time 'most people would drive'. Therefore, within the site assessment process it is assumed that most trips to services from sites assessed as RED will be by car (all sites in Rudby fall into this category). Additional commentary is being added to the assessments where heavily used services are located closer to a site than the nominal village centre. The bottleneck at the bank top is one of a number of traffic concerns, of which the most severe is school run congestion at Langbaugh / Doctors Lane.

Site Name		S/125/005	Draft	Rev 1	Comments Considered & Justification For Any Changes
Site Description		Land to East of Middleton Rd. 6.4 Ha			
Theme	Criteria				
Housing	(1) Development should favour sites which would be viable for the delivery of all components of the preferred housing mix (which will include affordable housing, downsizing/bungalows, and market homes predominantly of 2-3 bed size)	Pavements do not extend to edge of site			
Site Characteristics	(2) Development should favour sites contained within or adjoining the village envelope.	Site connects to existing settlement along small part of Southern boundary.			
	(3) Development should favour sites that avoid loss of prime agricultural land, high quality habitat, or other valued land.	Predominantly Grade 3 arable land			
	(4) Development should favour sites that can achieve a good access onto the adjacent road network	Site has long frontage onto 60mph zone of Middleton Rd.			
	(5) Development should favour sites that do not result in impairment or loss of significant views from public spaces (roads or footpaths) as identified in the Settlement Character Assessment Workshops	Site is prominent on approach to village along Middleton Rd and there would be impairment of view identified in Settlement Character Workshop.			
Settlement Character - Built Environment	(6) Development should favour sites that will not impact detrimentally on the conservation area or other significant buildings (listed buildings or non-designated heritage assets including associated grounds) or frontages as identified by the Settlement Character workshops.	Site is outside Conservation Area and there are no listed buildings or NDHAs in the vicinity.			
Settlement Character - Natural Environment	(7) Development should favour sites which present opportunities to protect or enhance Green Spaces, improve access for the public, or improve access for those with limited mobility	No proposed Green Spaces in vicinity of the site			
	(8) Development should favour sites which do not result in loss of open space in the Leven Valley Character Zone as defined in Settlement Character Workshops.	Site is outside the Leven Valley Character Zone			
Services & Facilities	(9) Development should favour sites that offer opportunity to sustain or enhance community services or facilities.	No identified opportunities			

	(10) Development should favour sites that offer a viable alternative to private cars to access services or otherwise encourage reduction in vehicle traffic within the village area.	Site is approximately 1.2 km from village centre plus the Naismith adjustment of 215m (average of outward and return journey effects). For major services not located around the Green add the following to the village centre distance: Village Hall: 300m Shop: 420m School: 430m (to Doctors Lane entrance) Concerns about safety aspects of steep pavement in slippery conditions, and the road bottleneck at the top of Hutton Bank have been raised in comments.			
Traffic & Transport	(11) Development should favour sites that provide opportunity to improve connectivity of footpaths and pavements within the village area.	No opportunities to improve connectivity			
	(12) Development should favour sites that can provide sufficient off-street parking spaces for the needs of the additional residents and visitors generated by the development itself	Site is large enough to allocate land for 25 homes with adequate parking.			
Pipeline	(13) Development should favour sites where public safety is not adversely impacted by the presence of the high pressure ethylene pipeline	Pipeline zone covers approximately 3/4 of site. Unaffected areas are detached from existing built area, and these areas would be assessed as RED under Criteria 2. It is now considered that none of the land unaffected by the pipeline safety buffer zones lies on the settlement side. The settlement side is considered to be the Southwest portion of the site, and this is entirely covered by pipeline buffer zones.			Reclassified for as the unaffected land does not lie on the settlement side as required by the criteria.
Flood Risk	(14) Development should favour sites not affected by Flood Zone 3, Flood zone 2 or with a history of surface water flooding. [Note: No eligible site is affected by Flood Zones 2 or 3, so this is effectively a surface water flooding criteria.]	There are no flood zones 3 or 2 on the site. The Environment Agency map shows a sizeable area towards the Southeast of the site is at high risk of surface water flooding.			
Habitat / Biodiversity	(15) Development should favour sites which avoid loss of biodiversity	Site has low biodiversity value, has no TPOs on or adjacent to site, and is more than 100m from any SINC			

Comment No	Comment	Response
1	Requested Change: Criteria (10). Include the Naismith corrections for all Rudby sites. As well as the rise to the pub, there is another 10m rise from the pub up to the Hub, making the total rise 28m from the church. Include a correction for the downhill part (>10 deg.) for the drop to the valley bottom (very slippery in autumn/winter with deep fallen leaves, which adds another 50m. Total distance from Rudby Farm site would be about 1170m (currently 900m) and further for the other sites in Rudby. This correction then gives a true measure of the degree of 'redness' of the issue of access to services in the village from Rudby.	Response: Noted. It is agreed that the assessment basis will include the adjustment. However, the commentary lists the uncorrected distance to illustrate that the effect of Naismith is to increase the "redness" rather than causing an AMBER to turn RED. The average adjustment for the outbound and inbound trips (inclusive of the downhill effect) would be 215m based on the Bay Horse, or 255m based on reaching the highest point on the Green near the Hub. A case could be made for either, but as it doesn't affect the rating it is not considered a material consideration. It is agreed that Naismith does not take into account all impacts, and slippery conditions are a safety consideration rather than something that can be translated into an equivalent distance.

2 Requested Change: Criteria (10). Given that people are probably going to drive if walking time is more than 5 minutes, then there should be recognition in the site assessment of the hazards associated with driving through a narrow bottleneck (virtually one way) at the bank top from all Rudby sites accessing services in Hutton Rudby.

Response: Noted. Consultation work indicates that opinion in the community is that at 10 minutes walking time 'most people would drive'. Therefore, within the site assessment process it is assumed that most trips to services from sites assessed as RED will be by car (all sites in Rudby fall into this category). Additional commentary is being added to the assessments where heavily used services are located closer to a site than the nominal village centre. The bottleneck at the bank top is one of a number of traffic concerns, of which the most severe is school run congestion at Langbaugh / Doctors Lane.

Site Name		S/134/001	Draft	Rev 1	Comments Considered & Justification For Any Changes
Site Description		Land to East of Rudby Lea. 2.42 Ha			
Theme	Criteria				
Housing	(1) Development should favour sites which would be viable for the delivery of all components of the preferred housing mix (which will include affordable housing, downsizing/bungalows, and market homes predominantly of 2-3 bed size)	Level/gentle gradients over most of site. Footpath within short distance of site and site is adjacent to highway.			
Site Characteristics	(2) Development should favour sites contained within or adjoining the village envelope.	Site adjoins built area on West side only. Meadow Hill Farm which lies to the East is considered to be outside the village envelope.			
	(3) Development should favour sites that avoid loss of prime agricultural land, high quality habitat, or other valued land.	Grade 3 arable land			
	(4) Development should favour sites that can achieve a good access onto the adjacent road network	There appear to be two options for access a) direct to 60mph zone of Stokesley Road (RED assessment), or b) via 30mph zone in Rudby Lea (GREEN assessment)			All sites are now assessed on the basis of the lowest speed limit available from technically feasible routes. Developer and/or HDC preferences and
	(5) Development should favour sites that do not result in impairment or loss of significant views from public spaces (roads or footpaths) as identified in the Settlement Character Assessment Workshops	According to HDC assessment site is <u>not</u> prominent in any significant views toward the settlement, and no views over site were identified in Settlement Character Workshop.			#1, #2, #5
Settlement Character - Built Environment	(6) Development should favour sites that will not impact detrimentally on the conservation area or other significant buildings (listed buildings or non-designated heritage assets including associated grounds) or frontages as identified by the Settlement Character workshops.	Adjacent to Conservation area on Southern Boundary. Grade 1 listed Parish church lies to the Southwest. There may be adverse impacts.			
Settlement Character - Natural Environment	(7) Development should favour sites which present opportunities to protect or enhance Green Spaces, improve access for the public, or improve access for those with limited mobility	No proposed Green Spaces in vicinity of the site			
	(8) Development should favour sites which do not result in loss of open space in the Leven Valley Character Zone as defined in Settlement Character Workshops.	Site is outside the Leven Valley Character Zone			
Services & Facilities	(9) Development should favour sites that offer opportunity to sustain or enhance community services or facilities.	No identified opportunities			

	(10) Development should favour sites that offer a viable alternative to private cars to access services or otherwise encourage reduction in vehicle traffic within the village area.	Site is approximately 1.2 km from village centre plus the Naismith adjustment of 215m (average of outward and return journey effects) . For major services not located around the Green add the following to the village centre distance: Village Hall: 300m Shop: 420m School: 430m (to Doctors Lane entrance) Concerns about safety aspects of steep pavement in slippery conditions, and the road bottleneck at the top of Hutton Bank have been raised in comments.			
Traffic & Transport	(11) Development should favour sites that provide opportunity to improve connectivity of footpaths and pavements within the village area.	No opportunities to improve connectivity			
	(12) Development should favour sites that can provide sufficient off-street parking spaces for the needs of the additional residents and visitors generated by the development itself	Site is large enough to allocate land for 25 homes with adequate parking.			
Pipeline	(13) Development should favour sites where public safety is not adversely impacted by the presence of the high pressure ethylene pipeline	Pipeline is not in vicinity of site			
Flood Risk	(14) Development should favour sites not affected by Flood Zone 3, Flood zone 2 or with a history of surface water flooding. [Note: No eligible site is affected by Flood Zones 2 or 3, so this is effectively a surface water flooding criteria.]	There are no flood zones 3 or 2 on the site. There are no areas on the site itself at risk of surface water flooding, but there are adjacent areas at high risk at Rudby Lea.			#3, #4
Habitat / Biodiversity	(15) Development should favour sites which avoid loss of biodiversity	Site has low biodiversity value, has TPOs adjacent to site, and is more than 100m from any SINC			

Comment No	Comment	Response
1	Requested Change: Criteria 5 from GREEN to GREEN. This site location was always a possibility as it is adjacent to a relatively recent development.	Response: Noted.
2	Requested Change: Criteria 5 from GREEN to AMBER. This site is a green site. If the site was developed it would spoil the arable characteristic of this part of the village.	Response: No Change. The site is not considered to be in a prominent location, and no views over the site were identified during the Settlement Character work. The assessment under the criteria definition is, therefore, green. A definitive list of important views was developed through community consultation and marked up on a master map. Decisions on which views to recognise was arrived at by consensus in workshops involving participants from all areas of the village. This map was then displayed at a further four consultation events during the development of criteria and traffic light definitions, during which no modifications were proposed. In the site assessments only views marked on this map are considered, and all are given equal weight.

	<p>3 Requested Change: Criteria 14 from GREEN to AMBER. The site would be adjacent to areas that have been flooded, therefore, it is reasonable to be wary of the impact a development here would have.</p>	<p>Response: No Change. The site itself is not identified as having any flood risk on the EA map, but adjacent areas of Rudby Lea are shown at high risk of flooding. Should the site be selected with an allocation of at least 1Ha, site specific flood risk assessments would be a mandatory requirement within the planning process. It is noted that drainage improvements have been carried out in the area, which are likely to have reduced flood risks, but the impact of these improvement is unknown.</p>
	<p>4 Requested Change: Criteria 14 from GREEN to AMBER/RED. Flood risk shown as green. Should be yellow or red for surface flooding (based on experience of flooding of Rudby Lea and surrounding house in past 10 years. i.e. potential impact on adjacent housing.</p>	<p>Response: No Change. See response to comment #3</p>
	<p>5 Requested Change: Criteria 5 from GREEN to AMBER. Site is prominent as green open space on approach to village. Views no ??? / no better than other views classified as amber or red. Too subjective.</p>	<p>Response: No Change. Site has only a narrow frontage onto Stokesley Rd, and it sits between buildings at Meadow Hill and Rudby Lea offering only limited sight lines from Stokesley Road onto site. It is, therefore, considered not prominent from the road. It could be argued that the site is prominent from the footpath that descends from Meadow Hill, however, the treatment is consistent with that for other sites with footpath approaches (e.g. S/073/002 - Levendale). See also response to comment #2</p>

Site Name		NP11	Draft	Rev 1	Comments Considered & Justification For Any Changes
Site Description		Land West of Meadow Hill. Owner has confirmed interest in writing and provided map of site boundaries. Site assumed > 1Ha			
Theme	Criteria				
Housing	(1) Development should favour sites which would be viable for the delivery of all components of the preferred housing mix (which will include affordable housing, downsizing/bungalows, and market homes predominantly of 2-3 bed size)	Moderate slopes over part of site. Pavement stops at Rudby Lea. Close to but not immediately adjacent to highway			
Site Characteristics	(2) Development should favour sites contained within or adjoining the village envelope.	Site does not connect to existing built area			
	(3) Development should favour sites that avoid loss of prime agricultural land, high quality habitat, or other valued land.	Grazing land			#4
	(4) Development should favour sites that can achieve a good access onto the adjacent road network	Access would be onto 60 mph zone			
	(5) Development should favour sites that do not result in impairment or loss of significant views from public spaces (roads or footpaths) as identified in the Settlement Character Assessment Workshops	Site could be considered prominent, but no views over site were identified in Settlement Character Workshops.			#1, #2
	Settlement Character - Built Environment	(6) Development should favour sites that will not impact detrimentally on the conservation area or other significant buildings (listed buildings or non-designated heritage assets including associated grounds) or frontages as identified by the Settlement Character workshops.	Site is near walled parkland associated with Rudby Hall. There may be some adverse impacts.		
Settlement Character - Natural Environment	(7) Development should favour sites which present opportunities to protect or enhance Green Spaces, improve access for the public, or improve access for those with limited mobility	No proposed Green Spaces in vicinity of the site			
	(8) Development should favour sites which do not result in loss of open space in the Leven Valley Character Zone as defined in Settlement Character Workshops.	Site is outside the Leven Valley Character Zone			
Services & Facilities	(9) Development should favour sites that offer opportunity to sustain or enhance community services or facilities.	No identified opportunities			

	(10) Development should favour sites that offer a viable alternative to private cars to access services or otherwise encourage reduction in vehicle traffic within the village area.	Site is approximately 1.3 km from village centre plus the Naismith adjustment of 215m (average of outward and return journey effects) . For major services not located around the Green add the following to the village centre distance: Village Hall: 300m Shop: 420m School: 430m (to Doctors Lane entrance) Concerns about safety aspects of steep pavement in slippery conditions, and the road bottleneck at the top of Hutton Bank have been raised in comments.			
Traffic & Transport	(11) Development should favour sites that provide opportunity to improve connectivity of footpaths and pavements within the village area.	No opportunities to improve connectivity			
	(12) Development should favour sites that can provide sufficient off-street parking spaces for the needs of the additional residents and visitors generated by the development itself	Site is large enough to allocate land for 25 homes with adequate parking.			
Pipeline	(13) Development should favour sites where public safety is not adversely impacted by the presence of the high pressure ethylene pipeline	Pipeline is not in vicinity of site			
Flood Risk	(14) Development should favour sites not affected by Flood Zone 3, Flood zone 2 or with a history of surface water flooding	There are no flood zones 3 or 2 on the site. The Environment Agency map shows no areas of the site itself at risk of surface water flooding.			
Habitat / Biodiversity	(15) Development should favour sites which avoid loss of biodiversity	Site has low biodiversity value, has no TPOs on or adjacent to site, and is more than 100m from any SINC			

Comment No	Comment	Response
1	Requested Change: Criteria 5 from RED to GREEN. Minimal impact on neighbours, no significant loss of views.	Response: Noted. Impact on Neighbours is not an issue considered in the site selection criteria. Site is in a prominent location and is correctly assessed as AMBER in accordance with the criteria definitions
2	Requested Change: Criteria 5: Unspecified Change: Minimal impact on neighbours.	Response: Noted. See response to comment #1
3	Requested Change: Unspecified Criteria to GREEN: A more sustainable site than say Rudby Farm.	Response: Noted.

4 **Requested Change: Criteria 3 from AMBER to RED.** I disagree that grazing land is any more desirable than arable land. It should be green - brownfield land, red agricultural / SSST. Probably artificial to have 3 categories.

Response: No Change. The criteria and traffic light definitions have been developed through consultation. This particular criteria address the impacts of change from the current land use to a residential development by considering three distinct aspects: productivity for food production, recreational use, and biodiversity. For food production, the criteria follows the hierarchy of the Agricultural Land Use classification which ranks best and most versatile arable land at the top, and grazing land in the middle. This is consistent with para 112 of the NPPF "Local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality." For the biodiversity aspect, the assessment ranks grazing land above arable, but also makes reference to 'biodiversity potential' scoring to identify sites where there is likely to be greater biodiversity than is evident from the general land use classification. Additional aspects of biodiversity are considered within Criteria 15.

Site Name		N12	Draft	Rev 1	Comments Considered & Justification For Any Changes
Site Description		Land East of Meadow Hill. Owner has confirmed interest in writing and provided map of site boundaries. Site assumed > 1Ha			
Theme	Criteria				
Housing	(1) Development should favour sites which would be viable for the delivery of all components of the preferred housing mix (which will include affordable housing, downsizing/bungalows, and market homes predominantly of 2-3 bed size)	Moderate slopes over part of site. Pavement stops at Rudby Lea. Directly adjacent to highway			
Site Characteristics	(2) Development should favour sites contained within or adjoining the village envelope.	Site does not connect to existing built area			
	(3) Development should favour sites that avoid loss of prime agricultural land, high quality habitat, or other valued land.	Grazing land			#4
	(4) Development should favour sites that can achieve a good access onto the adjacent road network	Access would be onto 60 mph zone			
	(5) Development should favour sites that do not result in impairment or loss of significant views from public spaces (roads or footpaths) as identified in the Settlement Character Assessment Workshops	Site could be considered prominent, but no views over site were identified in Settlement Character Workshops.			#1, #2
	Settlement Character - Built Environment	(6) Development should favour sites that will not impact detrimentally on the conservation area or other significant buildings (listed buildings or non-designated heritage assets including associated grounds) or frontages as identified by the Settlement Character workshops.	Site is adjacent to walled parkland associated with Rudby Hall. There may be some adverse impacts.		
Settlement Character - Natural Environment	(7) Development should favour sites which present opportunities to protect or enhance Green Spaces, improve access for the public, or improve access for those with limited mobility	No proposed Green Spaces in vicinity of the site			
	(8) Development should favour sites which do not result in loss of open space in the Leven Valley Character Zone as defined in Settlement Character Workshops.	Site is outside the Leven Valley Character Zone			
Services & Facilities	(9) Development should favour sites that offer opportunity to sustain or enhance community services or facilities.	No identified opportunities			

	(10) Development should favour sites that offer a viable alternative to private cars to access services or otherwise encourage reduction in vehicle traffic within the village area.	Site is approximately 1.3 km from village centre plus the Naismith adjustment of 215m (average of outward and return journey effects). For major services not located around the Green add the following to the village centre distance: Village Hall: 300m Shop: 420m School: 430m (to Doctors Lane entrance) Concerns about safety aspects of steep pavement in slippery conditions, and the road bottleneck at the top of Hutton Bank have been raised in comments.			
Traffic & Transport	(11) Development should favour sites that provide opportunity to improve connectivity of footpaths and pavements within the village area.	No opportunities to improve connectivity			
	(12) Development should favour sites that can provide sufficient off-street parking spaces for the needs of the additional residents and visitors generated by the development itself	Site is large enough to allocate land for 25 homes with adequate parking.			
Pipeline	(13) Development should favour sites where public safety is not adversely impacted by the presence of the high pressure ethylene pipeline	Pipeline is not in vicinity of site			
Flood Risk	(14) Development should favour sites not affected by Flood Zone 3, Flood zone 2 or with a history of surface water flooding	There are no flood zones 3 or 2 on the site. The Environment Agency map shows no areas of the site itself at risk of surface water flooding.			
Habitat / Biodiversity	(15) Development should favour sites which avoid loss of biodiversity	Site has low biodiversity value, has no TPOs on or adjacent to site, and is more than 100m from any SINC			

Comment No	Comment	Response
1	Requested Change: Criteria 5 from AMBER to GREEN. Minimal impact on neighbours, no significant loss of views.	Response: Noted. Impact on Neighbours is not an issue considered in the site selection criteria. Site is in a prominent location and is correctly assessed as AMBER in accordance with the criteria definitions
2	Requested Change: Criteria 5: Unspecified Change: Minimal impact on neighbours.	Response: Noted. See response to comment #1
3	Requested Change: Unspecified Criteria to GREEN: A more sustainable site than say Rudby Farm.	Response: Noted.

4 **Requested Change: Criteria 3 from AMBER to RED.** I disagree that grazing land is any more desirable than arable land. It should be green - brownfield land, red agricultural / SSSI. Probably artificial to have 3 categories.

Response: No Change. The criteria and traffic light definitions have been developed through consultation. This particular criteria address the impacts of change from the current land use to a residential development by considering three distinct aspects: productivity for food production, recreational use, and biodiversity. For food production, the criteria follows the hierarchy of the Agricultural Land Use classification which ranks best and most versatile arable land at the top, and grazing land in the middle. This is consistent with para 112 of the NPPF "Local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality." For the biodiversity aspect, the assessment ranks grazing land above arable, but also makes reference to 'biodiversity potential' scoring to identify sites where there is likely to be greater biodiversity than is evident from the general land use classification. Additional aspects of biodiversity are considered within Criteria 15.