



HARROGATE DISTRICT SITES & POLICIES DPD

Selection of Preferred Site Options – A Methodology Paper

October 2010

T P Richards Dip T&RP, MRTPI, Head of Planning Services

PLANNING DIVISION

Department of Development Services, Knapping Mount, West Grove Road, Harrogate HG1 2AE.

www.harrogate.gov.uk/planning



CONTENTS

1.0	Introduction	Page 3
2.0	Site Selection Process	Page 3
3.0	Site Selection Summaries	Page 7

Appendices:

Appendix 1: Criteria for Screening Out Sites	Page 79
Appendix 2: List of Screened Out Sites	Page 82
Appendix 3: Decision Making Flowchart	Page 92

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Core Strategy was adopted by the Council in February 2009. It sets out a settlement hierarchy to guide the scale and location of new development within the district over the plan period. The settlement hierarchy ranks settlements in terms of their relative size, function and suitability to accommodate growth and development. The Sites and Policies DPD will make allocations of land for housing and employment uses that reflect this hierarchy. This document sets out the approach that has been taken to selecting the site options within each settlement.

1.2 Sites for consideration have been generated from a number of sources:

- Urban Housing Capacity Study 2005
- 'Call for Sites' in 2004 and again in 2006
- Sites generated through public consultations during 2004, 2006 and 2008
- Settlement survey work undertaken by Council officers during 2007 and 2009

1.3 In selecting sites for preferred development options for the Group B and C settlements the Council has sought to achieve the following overarching objectives:

1. To provide as many villages as possible with some housing growth in order to maintain and enhance their vitality and character.
2. To provide more land in Group B and C villages than is required and thereby provide some flexibility.
3. To broadly meet the Core Strategy housing requirement for the Group B settlements of Boroughbridge, Masham and Pateley Bridge and in Boroughbridge to meet its employment requirement

2.0 SITE SELECTION PROCESS

2.1 The approach to site selection has been as follows:

Screening

2.2 Having the benefit of an adopted Core Strategy to guide the general distribution of new homes and jobs and an approved Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) an initial screening out exercise was undertaken. Sites which were in clear conflict with the Core Strategy or were unlikely to be suitable for development or land allocation in the Sites and Policies DPD were screened out of the Council's more detailed assessment of site suitability. This was essentially a desk based exercise and looked at sites that had been suggested to the Council for consideration and other parcels of land around the edge of settlements. The criteria for screening out sites is summarised below. Appendix 1 contains more detail on why these criteria are considered appropriate for this screening exercise, with Appendix 2 providing a list of, and justification for, those sites screened out.

- The land is not immediately adjoining the development limit/proposed development limit

- The land is below the allocation threshold
- The land comprises a SSSI, SINC or LNR
- Insufficient land lies outside of Flood Zone 3b
- Site lies in the Green Belt (unless it is suitable for a rural exception site)
- Developable area is too small because the land includes open space (recreational and amenity) or landmark woodland
- Development would result in harm to the form and character of the settlement by virtue of its size and location
- The land comprises a Green Wedge (Harrogate only)
- The land falls within a Registered Historic Battlefield or would affect the setting of a Scheduled Ancient Monument
- Appropriate access can not be achieved
- Site cannot be developed without the loss of open space/key views or other aspects identified within the 2009/2010 Conservation Area Appraisal as important to protect
- In Harrogate, Knaresborough and Boroughbridge land suitable for employment use is less than the desired allocation size of 1 ha

Site Appraisal

- 2.3 Sustainability appraisal forms a key part of the assessment process for those sites remaining. This form of appraisal assesses how a sites development is likely to perform across a range of social, environmental and economic objectives (details of each site’s sustainability appraisal can be found in the Sites and Policies DPD: Sustainability Appraisal Initial Findings.
- 2.4 The outcome of the appraisal process in Group B and C settlements has highlighted that it is the performance of sites against the environmental objectives which causes most concern. This is not surprising as the majority of sites are greenfield and involve the loss of agricultural land and countryside. There is relatively little brownfield land within these settlements that is readily identifiable as having the potential for new homes and jobs. With a site’s development providing for much needed homes for local people all sites score well against social objectives. Unless a site being assessed for housing would result in the loss of employment land, a site’s development would have a neutral effect on the local economy. The loss of employment land to housing is likely to have a negative effect on the local economy.
- 2.5 In addition to the outcome of the sustainability appraisal, the site selection process includes close scrutiny of:
- the accessibility of sites to jobs, shops and services by non car modes of transport,
 - the impact on the form and character of the settlement and
 - development constraints (physical and policy)
- 2.6 Through the detailed consideration of the above, a judgement can be made on the relative severity of adverse impacts and whether mitigation of them is possible. The decision to select or reject a site option as a preferred site option is based on consideration of all the above factors and the outcome of the sustainability appraisal.

- 2.7 The accompanying flowchart (Appendix 3) illustrates how the selection process has been undertaken. Please read the following text in conjunction with this flowchart. Part 1 of the process results in the identification of preferred site options where they score relatively well in both the outcome of the sustainability appraisal (✓/✗/✓/✓✓) and performance against the three factors of accessibility, impact and constraints (✓). Part 1 also identifies preferred site options where they perform well in the sustainability appraisal and any issues arising from accessibility, impact and constraints can be adequately mitigated. All sites performing less well (✗/✗✗) in the sustainability appraisal are placed on a reserve list.
- 2.8 Part 2 of the process starts by asking the question as to whether there is a need to identify additional housing land in a particular settlement as a preferred site option. If no preferred site options have been identified from part 1 of the process for a particular settlement then the reserve list sites for that settlement are assessed against accessibility, impact on form and character of settlement and development constraints. Where one or more preferred site options have been identified in a settlement, a judgement has been made as to whether it is appropriate to identify more land as preferred site options in that settlement.
- 2.9 This judgement is made using the following factors:
- The settlement's growth expectations in the Core Strategy i. e. - small scale growth in Group C settlements and larger scale development in Group B settlements)
 - The potential of the site option to realise community benefits (e.g. Preferred site options at Killinghall, Sicklinghall and Green Hammerton may offer the potential to enhance primary school facilities, including off street parking.
- 2.10 Sites are rejected as appropriate for identification as a preferred site option where:
- the harm a development is likely to be caused to the environment, e.g. adverse impact on the form and character of the settlement or the ecology is significant, and unable to be mitigated.
 - Significant uncertainty exists over the deliverability of development e.g. poor or inadequate access to the site.
 - another site option in the settlement is likely to cause less harm and that site provides sufficient housing to meet the growth expectations of the Core Strategy.

Assessment of accessibility, impact on the form and character of the settlement and development constraints

- 2.11 **Accessibility:** In the group B market towns of Boroughbridge, Masham and Pateley Bridge the Council's Core Strategy accessibility criteria for urban areas has been used to assess the varying degrees of accessibility to jobs, shops and services by non car modes of travel. (Policy TRA1, Appendix 7 and 8). A failure to comply with these criteria has not automatically resulted in the rejection of a site, but it highlights the need to improve accessibility.

- 2.12 This urban area accessibility criteria is not appropriate to use in the District's smaller settlements (Group B & C villages) as it relates, in part, to access to larger facilities than would be expected to be provided in each of these villages. Accessibility to a reasonable level of services for these villages has already been measured through their categorisation in the Core Strategy. Hence all site options within or adjacent to the built up areas of these villages are defined as 'accessible' for the purposes of site selection.
- 2.13 **Impact on form and character of the settlement:** An assessment has been made of the potential impact of a site's development on the form and character of the settlement. The following impacts have been assessed:
- Landscape setting of the village
 - Landscape quality and character of the area
 - Conservation area or its setting
 - Listed building or its setting
- 2.14 Where a site's development is likely to have an adverse impact, this is identified and the scope for mitigation investigated. The impact on form and character takes as the starting point advice provided by the Council's Heritage and Design team. Their detailed comments can be found in the Historic Environment Appraisal and the Landscape Assessment. Where their assessment gives a red score for a particular site, this is taken as a negative effect on form and character. Where there is a green or amber score the impact on form and character is generally taken to be acceptable (subject to appropriate mitigation). However, there may be instances where a red score is not indicated in the relevant report but there is still considered to be negative effects on form and character of a particular settlement. The reasons for this are noted in the site selection summary tables.
- 2.15 **Development constraints:** The following development constraints have also been assessed:
- Impact on designated sites and/or protected species and habitats. An assessment of impact here is again based on advice provided by the Council's Heritage and Design team and a similar approach adopted. Detailed comments can be found in the Ecological Assessment. Where the assessment gives a red score for a particular site, this indicates a negative impact on designated sites and or protected species. Where there is a green or amber score the impact on form and character is generally taken to be acceptable (subject to appropriate mitigation).
 - Site topography
 - Site access
 - Flood risk
 - Loss of employment land/community facility/recreational open space
 - Pollution/contamination/hazardous substances
 - Role and function of the settlement

3.0 SITE SELECTION SUMMARIES

3.1 The tables below summarise the outcome of the site selection process on a settlement by settlement basis.

BIRSTWITH

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
RL3	✓✓	x	O	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development of the site would result in harm to the settlement character by virtue of a high adverse impact on landscape character. The site is particularly visible on the approach to the village and development would encroach significantly into the countryside. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL3(1)	✓✓	xx	O	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition there would be a high adverse effect on landscape character due to the exposed nature of the site to the detriment of settlement character. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL3c	✓✓	✓/x	O	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	The site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development and no other constraints have been identified. The site would have limited visual impacts and would be seen as a continuation of the existing late twentieth century on the north side of the river. Provides an opportunity to develop in keeping with the local vernacular.

RL1066	✓✓	x	o	✓	✓	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development constraints have been identified. The site is steeply sloping, and the western section includes a woodland and small rock outcrop. Much of the site would be difficult to develop and the remainder would be unlikely to deliver the allocation threshold. In addition significant effects have been noted on designated sites and/or protected species. The site does not include a sufficient frontage to enable an access of acceptable standards to be formed onto the public highway.
RL1084	✓✓	x	o	✓	✓	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development constraints have been identified. The site is located centrally between the two main parts of the village and includes the school playing fields. These are protected as recreational open space under Saved Local Plan Policy R1.
RL1084a	✓✓	✓/x		✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	The site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development and no other constraints have been identified. The site is located centrally between the two main parts of the village. This gives the opportunity to develop in keeping with the local vernacular in terms of both design and density. The site is used for the annual Birstwith Show, however it is considered that an alternative location in the village can be found for this.
Additional Notes on mitigation:								
RL3c	Retention of existing trees and hedgerows. Extensive ground remodelling will be required due to steep gradient and this should not impact upon existing trees and hedgerows. Development should enhance the approach to the village.							
RL1084a	The additional 74 houses would generate 18 pupils and based on current pupil forecasts, would be likely to need an additional classroom. Capacity of waste water and sewerage network needs to be addressed. There is an opportunity to improve the character of this part of the village through careful and sensitive design. Retention of all TPO'd trees. New planting of significant individual trees.							

BISHOP MONKTON

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
RL13	✓✓	x	○	✓	✓	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition a development constraint has been identified. The Highway Authority would not support the development of this site as the access via Elm Tree Rise is not an adopted road.
RL27	✓✓	xx	○	✓	✓	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. No other major constraints have been identified. Site RL117 performs better in terms of the sustainability appraisal and has been selected in preference to this site.
RL117	✓✓	x	○	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. However no other constraints have been identified and this site performs better than RL27
RL1013	✓✓	✓✓	○	✓	✓	x	Rejected	This site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development. However, a development constraint has been identified as an access to Highway Authority standards cannot be formed. However, the Core Strategy does not seek to allocate sites within the built up area of Group C villages.
Additional Notes on mitigation:								
RL117	The developable area has been reduced to incorporate landscaping to the north.							

BISHOP THORNTON

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
RL1147	✓✓	xx	0	✓	✓	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. Development constraints have also been identified including a number of mature trees that run along the northern boundary that should be kept, which would reduce the developable area to below that which would be allocated and also vehicular access is possible but visibility is restricted.
RL2006	✓✓	✓/x	0	✓	✓	✓	Preferred option	Note this forms part of a larger Preferred Option RL3041.
RL3041	✓✓	✓	0	✓	✓	✓	Preferred option	Site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development and no other constraints have been identified. This site contains RL2006.
Additional Notes on mitigation:								
RL3041	Landscape mitigation to include planting on the southern boundary and within the field to the south. There should be the provision of two small woodland blocks to the southwest and southeast corners of the site as mitigation.							

BOROUGHBRIDGE

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
B2	✓✓	xx	O	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development would result in harm to the settlement character by virtue of high adverse impact on landscape character and the historic environment. Site is integral to the setting of the market town and provides a buffer from the A1. Development would harm the rural landscape setting of the settlement and affect the setting of the Devils Arrows, a Scheduled Ancient Monument. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
B4	✓✓	xx	O	x	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development would result in harm to the settlement character by virtue of high adverse impact on landscape character and the historic environment. Site is integral to the setting of the market town and provides a buffer from the A1. Development would appear uncharacteristic in this rural location and significantly impact upon the landscape setting of the Devil's Arrows, a Scheduled Ancient Monument. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
B5	✓	✓/x	O	x	✓	x	Rejected	This site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development, however other constraints have been identified. The site does not perform well in accessibility terms and in addition access to the site would be difficult to achieve, being along a narrow back lane.

B6	✓✓	✓/x	0	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development, however other constraints have been identified. Development would result in harm to the settlement character by virtue of a high adverse impact on landscape character. Development of this site would appear as an intrusion into open countryside since the site generally has a rural character. It would result in the loss of agricultural land and some hedgerows, which provide an attractive rural setting to the settlement. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
B8	✓✓	✓/x	xx	x	✓	x	Rejected	The Councils sustainability appraisal indicates that housing development on the site would perform poorly against economic objectives. In addition other constraints have been identified. The site does not meet the accessibility criteria and the site is currently in use as employment land and should be protected for that use.
B11	✓✓	✓✓	✓/x	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	The site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development and no other constraints have been identified. This site lies wholly within the Preferred Option (see further comments below)
B11(1)	✓✓	✓✓	✓/x	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	The site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development and no other constraints have been identified. This is the re-development of underused brownfield land in an accessible location. Whilst there will be some loss of employment land the existing business will remain on site.
B18	✓	xx	✓	x	✓	✓	Rejected Option	Most of this site lies within the Preferred Option B18a. See comments below.

B18a	✓	xx	✓	x	✓	✓	Preferred Option	The Council's sustainability appraisal suggests that employment development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. However, there is a need to provide for additional employment land in Boroughbridge and this is likely to be the most suitable location. Issues in terms of accessibility can be improved and this in turn will improve performance against the sustainability appraisal.
B2002	✓✓	✓✓	o	x	✓	✓	Rejected	The site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development. However, the location does not accord with the accessibility criteria and a better located site provides for the town's growth.
Additional Notes on mitigation:								
B11(1)	No specific mitigation measures identified.							
B18a	Provide a substantial landscape buffer between development and the Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation to the north and west. Explore opportunities to improve public transport provision to this site.							

BURTON LEONARD

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
RL71	✓✓	xx	0	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development would result in harm to settlement character. Burnett Close provides potential access via third party land although blocking this vista with buildings would harm the character and appearance of the conservation area. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL72	✓✓	xx	0	✓	x	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development would result in harm to settlement character. Burnett Close provides potential access via third party land although blocking this vista with buildings would harm the character and appearance of the conservation area. A development constraint has also been identified, as access via Peter Lane would be unacceptable. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL76	✓✓	✓✓	x	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	Note this forms part of a larger Preferred Option RL RL3040.
RL90	✓✓	xx	0	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development would result in harm to settlement character due to the impact of development on an adjoining listed building. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.

RL110	✓✓	xx	O	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development would have high adverse landscape effects due to loss of attractive agricultural land at the edge of the village. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL1085(1)	✓✓	x	O	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development would have high adverse landscape effects that would be difficult to mitigate. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL1109	✓✓	x	O	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	Note this forms part of a larger Preferred Option RL RL3040.
RL3000	✓✓	x	O	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would, on balance, perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development would have high adverse landscape effects that would be difficult to mitigate. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL3032a	✓✓	xx	O	✓	✓	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. Site RL3040 performs well in terms of the sustainability appraisal and has been chosen in preference to this site.
RL3032b	✓✓	xx	O	✓	x	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development would result in harm to settlement character due to housing sitting awkwardly in the landscape, creating an unwanted contrast. Development constraints have also been identified due to the impact on native trees and hedgerows that should be retained. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.

RL3040	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	This site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development and no other constraints have been identified. Reuse of brownfield land and reuse of some existing buildings. Opportunity to retain element of employment land to contribute towards the rural area need.
Additional Notes on mitigation:								
RL3040	Retain sloping southern portion of site as open landscaping with quality landscaped edge. Opportunity to retain and enhance biodiversity and green links.							

CUNDALL

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
RL3043	✓✓	xx	0	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. No other constraints were identified. As there are no other options in the village and the site's development is acceptable in terms of accessibility, settlement character and constraints it is considered that this site should be identified as a preferred site option.
Additional Notes on mitigation:								
RL3043	Retention of highway boundary hedge where possible and houses should be of good design and appropriate to local vernacular.							

DACRE

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
RL3008	✓✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	The site offers the potential for sustainable development and no other constraints have been identified.
Additional Notes on mitigation:								
RL3008	Existing trees should be protected and native trees should be planted along the boundaries. Dry stone walls and road verge should be retained. Well head should be retained.							

DACRE BANKS

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
RL45a	✓✓	xx		✓	x	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development would have high adverse landscape character. There are also development constraints due to loss of historic line of the former railway, loss of trees, loss of important habitat corridor and impact on the rural character of the area. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL45b	✓✓	✓/x		✓	x	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal suggests the site offers the potential for sustainable development. However, development would result in harm to settlement character and there are development constraints as the existing access is narrow and the site does not connect to the highway. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL45c	✓✓	x	0	✓	x	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition, development would have high adverse effects on the landscape, rural setting and character of the settlement. There are also development constraints due to there being no direct connection/frontage to a highway maintainable at the public expense. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.

RL1124	✓✓	x	o	✓	x	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition, development would have high adverse effects on the historic landscape. There are also development constraints as the southeast of the site includes part of the disused railway corridor under saved Local Plan policy T22A. Development would need to be strictly limited in order to enable enhancement of the disused railway corridor. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL1125	✓✓	✓	o	✓	✓	x	Rejected	The site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development. However, development constraints have been identified because the existing access is narrow and the site does not connect to the highway.
RL1133	✓✓	✓/x	o	✓	✓	x	Rejected	The site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development. However, the site is too large for a rural exception site. RL1133(1) forms a smaller part of this site and has been identified as a preferred option.
RL1133(1)	✓✓	✓/x	o	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	The site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development and no other constraints have been identified.
Additional Notes on mitigation:								
RL1133(1)	New buildings respect scale/vernacular and providing tree planting is implemented along site boundaries as mitigation in views from Public Rights of Way.							

DARLEY

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
RL4	✓✓	x		✓	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental criteria. In addition development would result in harm to settlement character as the site is designated as an important view within the Darley Village Design Statement. Given the size of the site it would be very difficult to preserve the 'key view' (unlike on sites RL99a and RL113). Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL98	✓✓	✓		✓	✓	x	Rejected	The site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development. However development constraints have been identified due to the ransom strip affecting potential access from Meadow Lane. Vehicular access from Sheepcote Lane would be detrimental to the character of the settlement.
RL98(1)	✓✓	✓✓	0	✓	✓	x	Rejected	The site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development. However development constraints have been identified due to the ransom strip affecting potential access.
RL99	✓✓	✓/x	0	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development. However, development of the site would result in harm to settlement character. The Village Design Statement has the view across the site from the road designated as an 'Important View', and the open field contributes to the rural character of Darley. This site should in the main be kept open. The development of this site would change the character of the approach to the village. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.

RL99a	✓✓	✓/x	o	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	The site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development and no other constraints have been identified. This site includes RL99 as well as additional land to the east. By taking forward a larger site appropriate mitigation can be incorporated into the design of the site to ensure partial retention of the key view.
RL113	✓✓	✓/x	o	✓	x	✓	Preferred Option	The site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development. Whilst development would result in some harm to settlement character, the impact on a 'key view' can be mitigated through open space and planting within the site.
RL2002	✓✓	x	o	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development of the site would result in harm to settlement character. RL2002 is identified as an important gap within the Village Design Statement. Given the size of the site it would be very difficult to preserve the 'key view' (unlike on sites RL99a and RL113). This site is also in close proximity to existing properties on Stocks Lane and to the 'White House', Springfield and Meadowside. Any development would be likely to impact on the residential amenity of some of these dwellings. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
Additional Notes on mitigation:								
RL99a	The area is highly valued and lies within the AONB and any housing should be designed to the highest standards to reflect local vernacular and building distinctiveness. Retention of the stonewall field boundaries is essential and new tree planting should be provided along the south boundary to assist integration with the open countryside. Views through the site should be maintained.							
RL113	In order to mitigate impact on settlement character an agricultural style native hedgerow containing larger trees will need to be planted to form the northern boundary. Trees to the roadside frontage should be retained and development should be set in from Nidd Lane to the west and Southfield Farm to the east to retain the 'key views' through the site. A small development of well designed, vernacular terraces could be achieved without resulting in any significant harm to the landscape or the character of the village.							

DISHFORTH

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
RL42	✓✓	✓/x	○	✓	✓	x	Rejected	The site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development and no other constraints have been identified. However this is a large site that extends well back from the existing built form of the village. Development of the site in its entirety would not be consistent with the function of a Group C settlement where only small scale releases for affordable housing would be compliant with the adopted Core Strategy.
RL42(1)	✓✓	xx	○	✓	✓	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. The site is partly contained within Site RL42. Site RL1153 performs better than this site and has been selected as this settlements preferred site option.
RL48	✓✓	✓/x	○	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development. However development of the site would result in harm to landscape character through the closing off of the views out to the open countryside from Back Lane. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL1040	✓✓	x	○	✓	✓	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development constraints have been identified. Access is difficult to achieve along the narrow track.
RL1153	✓✓	x	○	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site is likely to result in some harm to the environment and/or the economy, however no other constraints have been identified. The site is well related to the existing built form of the village and vehicular access can be achieved.
Additional Notes on mitigation:								
RL1153	The site is well screened and it is located adjacent to existing residential development. The site is well related to the existing built form of the village.							

FOLLIFOOT

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
RL25a	✓✓	xx	○	✓	✓	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. The site is too large for a rural exception site and making the site smaller would be detrimental to the character of the village.
RL1017	✓✓	xx	○	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition there would be a high adverse effect on landscape character and the historic environment due to the exposed nature of the site to the detriment of settlement character. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL1093	✓✓	xx	○	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition there would be a high adverse effect on landscape character and the historic environment due to the exposed nature of the site to the detriment of settlement character. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL1093(1)	✓✓	xx	○	✓	x	✓	Preferred Option	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. However, whilst development would result in some harm to settlement character and have an adverse landscape impact, substantial additional planting as part of the development offers the potential to enhance the visual separation of the village from further sporadic development to the west. This potential enhancement suggests the site should be put forward as a preferred site option, alongside Site RL1101.

RL1101	✓✓	✓/x	○	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	The site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development and no other constraints have been identified. The site is well located in terms of screening by woodland, topography and surrounding residential development.
Additional Notes on mitigation:								
RL1093(1)	The developable area of the site has been reduced significantly. This allows for the provision of substantial woodland planting to the west to enhance separation between the village edge and Oak House. Access should be at the east end of the site and the loss of the hedgerow minimised.							
RL1101	Development should be designed to positively enhance the setting of the conservation area and respect the setting of the listed building.							

GLASSHOUSES

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
RL93	✓✓	✓	xx	✓	✓	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development of housing on this site would perform poorly against economic objectives. Development of the site as a rural exception site will result in the loss of a site in employment use. The site lies within the development limit and can come forward through the normal development control process. A development constraint has been identified as the Highway Authority require a traffic assessment before the impact of development on the highway network can be assessed.
RL129	✓✓	x	o	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition there would be a high adverse effect on landscape character and significant harm to the settlement character. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL560	✓✓	xx	o	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition there would be a high adverse effect on landscape character and significant harm to the settlement character. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL1069	✓✓	x	o	✓	x	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development would result in harm to settlement character affecting the setting of the conservation area and listed buildings as well as compromising views of the right of way along the west end of the site. Development would also have a significant impact on the landscape. Development constraints have also been identified due to the topography of the site. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.

GOLDSBOROUGH

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
RL102	✓✓	xx	0	✓	✓	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. Site RL 1046 performs better than this site and would provide sufficient growth for the village.
RL1046	✓✓	x	0	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. However no other significant constraints have been identified. Site chosen as preferred site option due to the likelihood of less environmental impact than RL102.
RL1047	✓✓	xx	0	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition there would harm to settlement character as development would be viewed as detached from the built form and encroach into open countryside. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
Additional Notes on mitigation:								
RL1046	Well screened to the northwest by mature trees. Agricultural buildings previously on site have now been demolished.							

GREAT OUSEBURN

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
RL100	✓✓	xx	O	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development would result in harm to the settlement character by virtue of high adverse impact on landscape character and the historic environment. Forms attractive entrance to the village with open countryside character important to the setting of the Conservation Area. The site contains a double avenue of protected trees along Branton Lane, which create an attractive approach to the village with views to open countryside. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL1050	✓✓	xx	O	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development would result in harm to the settlement character by virtue of high adverse impact on landscape character and the historic environment. There would be high adverse effects through loss of woodland, effects on the walled boundaries of the site and harm to the rural character of Back Lane/Church Field Lane. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL1050a	✓✓	xx	O	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development would result in harm to the settlement character by virtue of high adverse impact on landscape character and the historic environment. There would be high adverse effects through loss of woodland, effects on the walled boundaries of the site and harm to the rural character of Back Lane/Church Field Lane. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL1064	✓✓	✓/x	O	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	Note: this forms part of a larger Preferred Option RL RL1064b

RL1064a	✓✓	✓/x	o	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	Note this forms part of a larger Preferred Option RL RL1064b
RL1064b	✓✓	x	o	✓	x (see mitigation)	✓	Preferred Option	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. Development of the whole site would result in harm to the settlement character by virtue of the high adverse impact on landscape character. However development of a smaller part of the site can avoid this adverse effect. (see mitigation measures below). Through planting and design, there is scope to provide a more attractive approach to the village. This site provides the only parcel of land where growth could occur without harm to the form and character of the village.
RL1115	✓✓	xx	o	✓	x	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development would result in harm to the settlement character by virtue of high adverse impact on landscape character. There are also development constraints in the form of impact on ecology. Development would result in a loss of woodland, wetland and scrub that provide an attractive rural setting to the village. This site supports similar biodiversity action plan priority habitats and should probably be considered for inclusion in the SINC. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
Additional Notes on mitigation:								
RL1064b	The developable area of the site has been reduced significantly to allow for appropriate landscaping to keep the western edge of the site open. This area to comprise a mix of grazed areas with park land trees and areas of habitat reflecting the woodland carr on the opposite side of Carr Side Road. Be planted with an avenue of trees along Branton Lane along the northern edge of the site to enhance the entrance to the village. Provision of traditional village housing designed to reflect the vernacular. New dwellings should generally overlook the open area to the west in order to enhance the rural setting of the settlement and to provide a 'village green' character.							

GREEN HAMMERTON

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
RL12	✓✓	x	O	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	Note this forms part of a larger Preferred Option RL3039.
RL1029	✓✓	✓✓	xx	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site for housing would perform poorly against economic objectives. Development would result in harm to the settlement character by virtue of high adverse impact on landscape character. The site is clearly beyond the built up edge of the village. Its lies on the opposite side of the B6265, which provides a definitive edge to the built up part of the village. Built development will encroach on the countryside, well beyond the villages built up area. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL1079	✓✓	✓✓	O	✓	✓	x	Rejected	This site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development. The site is currently in use as agricultural sales business. This supports the vitality of the village the site should be retained in that use.
RL1102	✓✓	✓/x	O	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	Note this forms part of a larger Preferred Option RL3039.
RL3002	✓✓	x	O	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development would result in harm to the settlement character by virtue of high adverse impact on landscape character. Development of the site would extend the urban edge and appear as significant encroachment into open countryside. Development would result in high adverse effects that would be difficult to mitigate because of the exposed nature of the site and its tranquil, unspoilt qualities. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.

RL3039	✓✓	x	o	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. However, no other constraints have been identified. This site represents the only parcel of land around the village where growth could take place without harm to the settlement character.
Additional Notes on mitigation:								
RL3039	Retain the planting to the southern boundary and enhance it with further planting along the boundary with the B6265 to improve the entrance to the village. The development of this site could require the provision of an additional classroom at the local school and opportunities to provide for this within the preferred option site should be explored. Bernard Lane which is rural in character should be retained for cycle and pedestrian access.							

HAMPSTHWAITE

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
RL37b	✓✓	x	○	✓	✓	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. No other constraints have been identified. Site RL3036 chosen in preference to this site (see below for reasons).
RL37c	✓✓	xx	○	✓	x	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development would result in high adverse effects on the landscape pattern. There are also development constraints as a result of the presence of so many very significant mature and veteran trees. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL1141	✓✓	x	○	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	Note this forms part of a larger Preferred Option RL RL3036.
RL1141(1)	✓✓	x	○	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	Note this forms part of a larger Preferred Option RL RL3036.
RL2061	✓✓	✓	○	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	Note this forms part of a larger Preferred Option RL RL3036.
RL3036	✓✓	x	○	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. However, no other constraints have been identified. Hampsthwaite is a Group B village with good access to a range of facilities. The site is easily accessed from various points on the 'Brookfield' estate. Site identified in preference to RL37b due to the opportunity here to provide an attractive landscape setting to the village and the need for a reasonable scale of growth for Hampsthwaite. It is considered that there is no other reason to identify a site in addition to RL3036.

Additional Notes on mitigation:

RL3036

Connections to the existing open space network in the adjacent housing areas must be maintained and respected. Retention of all hedgerows and trees, particularly in the northern part of the site and along the boundaries - this can help to assimilate the development into the landscape and soften the edges of the built form. Small watercourse to the NW boundary known as Cockhill Beck should be protected from encroachment. Impact on setting of the Conservation Area and Listed Building will need to be mitigated. Opportunity to expand/enhance existing Public Open Space to the NE. The ecological value of the pond, watercourse, mature trees and hedgerows should be safeguarded. Opportunities should be sought to restore trees, hedges and wetlands to the landscape. There is an opportunity to improve the landscape setting of the village and building in this location may bring some benefits in terms of a better-screened and integrated edge here. The additional 104 houses would generate 26 pupils and based on current pupil forecasts, would be likely to require an additional classroom.

KILLINGHALL

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
RL118a	✓✓	xx	○	✓	x	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development of the site would have a significant impact on the setting of listed buildings and a high adverse impact on landscape character and quality. There are also development constraints. This site occupies a prominent position on the approach to the village and development would encroach on the open countryside. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL118a(1)	✓✓	xx	○	✓	x	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development of the site would have a significant impact on the setting of listed buildings and a high adverse impact on landscape character and quality. There are also development constraints. This site occupies a prominent position on the approach to the village and development would encroach on the open countryside. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL118a(2)	✓✓	xx	○	✓	x	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development of the site would have a significant impact on the setting of listed buildings and a high adverse impact on landscape character and quality. There are also development constraints. This site occupies a prominent position on the approach to the village and development would encroach on the open countryside. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.

RL118a(3)	✓✓	xx	O	✓	x	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development of the site would have a significant impact on the setting of listed buildings and a high adverse impact on landscape character and quality. There are also development constraints. This site occupies a prominent position on the approach to the village and development would encroach on the open countryside. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL118b	✓✓	xx	O	✓	x	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development of the site would have a high adverse impact on landscape character and quality. There are also development constraints. This site occupies a prominent position on the approach to the village and development would encroach on the open countryside. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL118b(1)	✓✓	xx	O	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development of the site would have a significant impact on the setting of listed buildings and a high adverse impact on landscape character and quality. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL551	✓✓	✓/x	O	✓	x	x	Rejected	The site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development. However development of the site would have an adverse impact on the landscape character and quality. Development constraints have also been identified in the form of access. Measures to mitigate the environmental and/or economic harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.

RL570	✓✓	x	O	✓	x	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition, development of the site would adversely impact on the historic environment and local character. Development constraints have also been identified in the form of access. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL1009	✓✓	x	O	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. However, no other significant constraints have been identified.
RL1015	✓✓	x	O	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition, development of the site would have a high adverse impact on the surrounding landscape and would encroach into open countryside. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL1015a	✓✓	✓/x	O	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	The site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development and no other significant constraints have been identified.
RL1037	✓	✓/x	O	✓	✓	x	Rejected	The site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development. However development constraints have been identified as the site is presently protected as recreation open space (Cricket Ground).
RL1043	✓✓	x	O	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development of the site would have a high adverse impact on the landscape character and quality. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL1132	✓✓	✓✓	O	✓	✓	x	Rejected	The site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development. However, a development constraint has been identified and the site is not available.

RL2025	✓✓	✓/x	O	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development. However development of the site would have a high adverse impact on the landscape character and quality. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL3019	✓✓	x	O	✓	x	✓	Preferred Option	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. There are landscape concerns about development on the site. Appropriate mitigation could reduce the negative effects and this site offers the potential to integrate the growth of the village with extensions to the facilities of the primary school.
RL3037	✓✓	✓/x	O	✓	✓	x	Rejected	The site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development. However, a development constraint has been identified - the site is not available.
RL3038	✓✓	✓	O	✓	✓	x	Rejected	The site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development. However, a development constraint has been identified - the site is not available.
Additional Notes on mitigation:								
RL1009	Green Wedge should be maintained, linking the open countryside to the south, to the playing fields and churchyard. Screen planting on southern boundary to mitigate any impacts on the Special Landscape Area.							
RL1015a	No specific mitigation measures identified.							
RL3019	Appropriate planting as mitigation and well designed low density housing to reduce the negative effects. Set buildings away from the western and southern edges of the site.							

KIRBY HILL

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
RL55	✓✓	xx		✓	x	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development would result in harm to the settlement character by virtue of high adverse impact on landscape character and the historic environment. Further more development on parts of the site (around the Church Yard) would have significant ecological effects. In addition development of the site in its entirety would not be consistent with the function of a Group C settlement where only small scale releases for affordable housing are allowed by the adopted Core Strategy. However development of a smaller part of the site would be appropriate (See RL3045 below) Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL1134	✓✓	✓		✓	✓	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site for housing would perform poorly against economic objectives. This site offers the potential for sustainable development, however other development constraints have been identified. The majority of the site lies within the development limit and is in employment use the retention of which is desirable in this Group C village. The existing access is unsuitable and is severely constrained. Improvements may potentially require the demolition of residential property.
RL3034	✓✓	x	o	✓	✓	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. Development would result in the loss of traditional pasture land. and it is considered preferable to put forward Site RL3045 as a preferred site option.
RL3045	✓✓	x	o	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	The Council's sustainability appraisal suggests that development of this site is likely to result in some harm to the environment and/or the economy, however no other constraints have been identified.
Additional Notes on mitigation:								
RL3045	Provide rural setting to the settlement with new tree planting particularly along northern and western boundaries.							

KIRK DEIGHTON

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
RL81	✓✓	✓	xx	✓	✓	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site for housing would perform poorly against economic objectives. The site is in employment use (The Crofts Business Park) and is being advertised for employment / office use. The retention of employment use is desirable in this Group C village.
RL1054	✓✓	xx	0	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development of the site would result in harm to the settlement character by virtue of a high adverse impact on landscape character and the adverse effect on historic environment and/or local character. The site is prominent on the approach to the village and forms an integral part of open land that serves to delineate the edge of both Kirk Deighton and Wetherby, preventing coalescence. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL1104	✓✓	x	0	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development of this site would adversely impact on the historic environment and/or local character. Development would significantly extend the linear development pattern of the village, be highly visible, affect views and lead to coalescence. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL1146	✓✓	xx	0	✓	✓	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. This site has an unspoilt, rural character. The mature hedgerow and hedgerow trees augment the wealth of trees in the vicinity, providing an important backdrop to the village. Site RL3042 chosen in preference to this site.

RL3042	✓✓	✓✓	x	✓	✓	✓	Preferred option	<p>The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against economic objectives.</p> <p>Development of the site as a rural exception site will result in the loss of a site formerly used as petrol filling station. However the site has naturalised into the landscape and it is not considered appropriate to seek a commercial use of the site. No other constraints have been identified. Development would improve the appearance of the redundant site on the approach to the settlement.</p>
--------	----	----	---	---	---	---	------------------	---

KIRK HAMMERTON

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
RL10	✓✓	✓✓	○	✓	✓	✘	Rejected	This site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development, however development constraints have been identified. The site is currently in employment use and should be retained for this purpose. Furthermore visibility to the left is restricted for access.
RL120	✓✓	✘	○	✓	✓	✓	Rejected (but development potential if included within the development limit)	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. A proposed new development limit has been drawn around this area of the village. This site is proposed for inclusion within the village development limit and if confirmed could offer opportunities for infill housing and station car parking and improvements to the street scene.
RL1011(1)	✓✓	✓✓	○	✓	✓	✘	Rejected	This site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development. However development constraints have been identified. The site is currently in employment use. This supports the vitality of the village the site should be retained in that use.
RL1011	✓✓	✓✓	○	✓	✓	✘	Rejected	This site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development, however development constraints have been identified. The site is currently in employment use. This supports the vitality of the village the site should be retained in that use.
RL1034(1)	✓✓	✘	○	✓	✓	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. The rural character of the site should be retained. Village growth opportunities would be provided through proposed changes to the development limit at Site RL120. No further need to identify additional housing land in the village.
RL1034	✓✓	✘✘	○	✓	✓	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. Village growth opportunities would be provided through proposed changes to the development limit at Site RL120. No further need to identify additional housing land in a the village.

RL1034a	✓✓	xx	O	✓	✓	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. The rural character of the site should be retained. Village growth opportunities would be provided through proposed changes to the development limit at Site RL120. No further need to identify additional housing land in a Group C village.
RL1142	✓✓	xx	O	✓	✓	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition a development constraint has been identified. The site does not include a sufficient frontage to enable an access of acceptable standards to be formed onto the public highway.
RL2034	✓✓	xx	O	✓	✓	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition, significant effects have been noted on designated sites for protected species.
RL2035a	✓✓	✓/x	O	✓	✓	x	Rejected	The site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development, however a development constraint has been identified. The site is currently used as a playing field therefore the development of the site would involve the loss of existing public recreational open space, currently protected by Saved Policy R1 of the Harrogate District Local Plan.
RL2036a	✓✓	xx	O	✓	✓	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. The rural character of the site should be retained. Village growth opportunities would be provided through proposed changes to the development limit at Site RL120. No further need to identify additional housing land in the village.

KIRKBY MALZEARD

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
RL1035	✓✓	xx	○	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition, development would result in harm to settlement character as the site is poorly related to the very linear built form of the village. Development of the site would also affect the rural character of the approach to the village from the south. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL1063	✓✓	xx	○	✓	x	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition, development would result in harm to settlement character due to the amount of projection away from the linear form of the settlement. Development constraints have also been identified due to the impact this would have on the surrounding Nidderdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL1063(1)	✓✓	xx	○	✓	x	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition, development would be detrimental to settlement character of Back Lane. Development constraints have also been identified due to the narrowness of Back Lane, especially at the eastern end of the site, and the issues this would cause for access. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.

RL1063a	✓✓	x	○	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. The site includes parts of sites RL1063 and RL1063(1). No other constraints have been identified (due to the reduced site size and relationship with the linear form of the village). This is a Group B village with good access to jobs, shops and services and given no other constraints it is considered that this site should be selected as a preferred option.
RL1091	✓✓	✓/x	○	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	The site offers potential to deliver sustainable development. The site is well related to the form of the village. Access to the road network can be gained on to Ringbeck Road.
RL2022	✓✓	xx	○	✓	x	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development would result in harm to settlement character and have a high adverse impact on landscape character. Development constraints have also been identified due to the impact on the network of well-treed toft fields. Gaining access to the site would also be difficult as back Lane to the north is a very narrow one-way lane. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL2022a	✓✓	xx	○	✓	x	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development would result in harm to settlement character and have a high adverse impact on landscape character. Development constraints have also been identified due to the impact on the network of well-treed toft fields. Gaining access to the site would also be difficult as back Lane to the north is a very narrow one-way lane. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.

RL2022b	✓✓	xx	o	✓	x	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development would result in harm to settlement character and have a high adverse impact on landscape character. Development constraints have also been identified due to the impact on the network of well-treed toft fields. Gaining access to the site would also be difficult as back Lane to the north is a very narrow one-way lane. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
Additional Notes on mitigation:								
RL1063a	The formation of an 'agricultural' hedgerow to demark the southern boundary of the site, and the repair/supplementation of the existing hedgerows to the south of the site would provide screening.							
RL1091	Suitable design could improve the approach to the village which is currently characterised by non-vernacular properties.							

LOFTHOUSE

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
RL1122	✓✓	xx	○	✓	x	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development would result in harm to settlement character, as development of the whole site would completely change the shape and character of the village. There would be high adverse landscape impact. Development constraints have also been identified, as development would impact on an SSSI (development of a smaller area of the site that buffers the SSSI may be acceptable, see comments below). Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL3046	✓✓	x	○	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. However, there are positive scores for accessibility, settlement character and development constraints. This site forms a smaller part of site RL1122.
Additional Notes on mitigation:								
RL3046	It is suggested that a new access road be formed across the car park to retain the view from the main street past the side of the Village Hall, set away from the northern boundary to allow parking. The remainder of the car park should be turned into a positive space by building a semi-detached pair of cottages behind very small front gardens against the western boundary of the site. These should also allow a view from in front of the Crown through to the hill north of the site, and also designed to prevent loss of privacy of Lund Cottage. The access road should be set close to the field boundary wall until the bend, where there should be a verge, on which some incidental trees can be planted. Additionally the small area immediately adjacent the village hall should have small trees planted in order to soften its impact. Further back in the site, new housing should be arranged to form a court around the turning head of the access road, in as tight a manner as the topography will allow. The car park should be resurfaced in traditional materials to match the new access road, parking spaces should be marked and new trees planted to soften the impact of parked cars. It is suggested that Lund Cottage has a private area behind it, bounded by a stone wall with vehicular access gate. Provision of tree planting (including in and amongst housing) to help integrate the development and provide a softer settlement edge is essential to the southeast. The development should not be constrained by highway layout to ensure the open character of the village is retained. Retain stonewalls.							

LONG MARSTON

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
RL29a	✓✓	✓/x	O	✓	✓	✓	Preferred option	This site offers the potential for sustainable development and there are no other constraints identified.
RL29b	✓✓	xx	O	✓	x	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development would result in harm to the settlement character by virtue of high adverse impact on landscape character and the historic environment. The site does not follow the traditional linear settlement of the village and is divorced from the main village intruding into open countryside. A further development constraint is that the site cuts through two elongated fields, which are remnants of the medieval strip enclosures. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL29c	✓✓	xx	O	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development would result in harm to the settlement character by virtue of high adverse impact on landscape character and the historic environment. The site does not follow the traditional linear settlement of the village and is divorced from the main village intruding into open countryside. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL60	✓✓	xx	O	✓	✓	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. The rural character of the site should be retained. Site RL29a selected in preference to this site.

RL1144	✓✓	x	o	✓	x	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development would cause significant harm to the form and character of the village. This site is at the edge of the village and intrudes into open countryside. Development of this site is inappropriate and would appear divorced from the village on the south side of Angram Road. A development constraint has also been identified as the site does not include a sufficient frontage to enable access of acceptable standards to be formed on to the public highway. Measures to mitigate the environmental from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL2057	✓✓	x	o	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development would cause significant harm to the form and character of the village. This site is at the edge of the village, intrudes into open countryside and development of this backland site is inappropriate and would appear incongruous to the form and layout of village. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL2063	✓✓	x	o	✓	✓	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. The rural character of the site should be retained. Site RL29a selected in preference to this site.

MARKINGTON

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
RL1073	✓✓	xx	○	✓	x	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development would result in harm to settlement character. Any development would be elevated and dominate the road junction and setting of Markington Hall. Development constraints have also been identified. The site and its boundary trees and hedgerows are part of an important habitat network around the village and development would be ecologically damaging. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL1074	✓✓	xx	○	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development would result in harm to character of the street and would undermine the settlement pattern of the village by helping to fill in an important gap in the built form. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL1075	✓✓	x	○	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development would result in harm to settlement character. The site provides a sense of openness. The view and gap in the built form should be retained. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.

MARTON CUM GRAFTON

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
RL61	✓✓	xx	○	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development would result in harm to the settlement character by virtue of high adverse impact on landscape character and the historic environment. Development would detract from the rural setting of the village and Conservation Area and supports many important landscape features. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL61a	✓✓	xx	○	✓	x	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development would result in harm to the settlement character by virtue of high adverse impact on landscape character and the historic environment. Development would detract from the rural setting of the village and Conservation Area and supports many important landscape features. Furthermore development constraints were identified in respect of impact on ecology. The pond, sward, hedges and woodland may all be features valuable in their own right and their integrity may be disrupted by development. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.

RL87	✓✓	xx	o	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development would result in harm to the settlement character by virtue of high adverse impact on landscape character and the historic environment. The site is detached from the village built form and development here would be detrimental to the character of the area and would prevent key views from Thorny Hill Lane. The development of this site (especially the field to the east) would adversely affect the landscape setting of the village. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL1111	✓✓	xx	o	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development would result in harm to the settlement character by virtue of high adverse impact on landscape character and the historic environment. The northern part of the site on the other side of the lane is very detached from the village built form and development here would be detrimental to the character of the area and would prevent any key views from the lane. The site presents itself towards open countryside to the north and any development in the lower half of the site including the land on the opposite side of Stockfield Lane would be a significant intrusion. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.

RL1126	✓✓	xx	o	✓	x	x	Rejected	<p>The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development would result in harm to the settlement character by virtue of high adverse impact on landscape character and the historic environment. The majority of the site is designated as open space important to the rural character of the village conservation area and there are important views across the site. Development would adversely affect the landscape setting and views towards the village from the south and east. The effects would be difficult to mitigate since the site occupies an open visible location at the edge of the village.</p> <p>In addition a potential development constraint has been identified. The site is currently accessed from Grafton Lane, via Yew Tree Farm, however due to restricted visibility to the right, this access is not suitable for further development. It may be possible to form a suitable access at the corner of the site, near Shuttle Road Cottage. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.</p>
RL1126(1)	✓✓	xx	o	✓	✓	x	Rejected	<p>The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition a potential development constraint has been identified. The site is currently accessed from Grafton Lane, via Yew Tree Farm, however due to restricted visibility to the right, this access is not suitable for further development. It may be possible to form a suitable access at the corner of the site, near Shuttle Road Cottage.</p>
Additional Notes on mitigation:								
Not applicable								

MASHAM

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
M1	✓✓	✓	x	x	✓	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site for housing would perform poorly against economic objectives. This site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development. However, a development constraint has been identified as flooding is a significant constraint on this site with 92% included in flood zone 3a. The site is within the development limit so development could still come forward as a windfall site if compliant with planning policy. Walking distance to a bus stop (450m) results in a poor accessibility score.
M3	✓✓	x	0	x	✓	✓	Preferred Option	Note this forms part of a larger preferred option M3001.
M5	✓✓	xx	0	x	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. There would be a high adverse effect on landscape character and the historic environment as the site is prominent outside the development limit on an approach road to Masham. Walking distance to a bus stop results in a poor accessibility score. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
M6	✓✓	xx	0	x	✓	x	Preferred Option	Note this forms part of a larger Preferred Option M3002
M7	✓✓	✓✓	xx	✓	✓	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against economic objectives. It is currently vacant but is a former employment site that should be retained to support the vitality of Masham.
M1001	✓✓	xx	0	x	✓	x	Preferred Option	Note this forms part of a larger Preferred Option M3001
M1002	✓✓	xx	0	x	✓	x	Preferred Option	Note this forms part of a larger Preferred Option M3002
M1004	✓✓	xx	0	x	✓	✓	Preferred Option (part)	Note this forms part of a larger Preferred Option M3001

M3001	✓✓	xx	O	x	✓	✓	Preferred Option	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. However there is the potential to improve accessibility and no other constraints have been identified. Mitigation to address adverse impacts in order to protect the character and approaches to Masham can be provided. This land is needed for housing if the town's housing requirement is to be met.
M3002	✓✓	xx	O	x	✓	✓	Preferred Option	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. However there is the potential to improve accessibility and no other constraints have been identified. Mitigation to address adverse impacts in order to protect the character and approaches to Masham can be provided. This land is needed for housing if the town's housing requirement is to be met.
Additional Notes on mitigation:								
M3001	Retention and enhancement of existing trees and hedgerows where possible. New boundary and structure planting within the site and along the southern boundary to protect the amenity of neighbouring properties, minimise the impact of the development on the surrounding landscape to the south and to provide a buffer area between the development and the feed mill. The network of footpaths, including public rights of way, through and around the site should be improved and enhanced as part of the development including a link to the Market Place. Protect key views, in particular towards the church, the conservation area and open countryside.							
M3002	Existing mature trees on site should be retained and new boundary and structure planting within the site provided. Protect key views into the site from the Swinney Beck Bridge and Westholme Road across open countryside and the western edge of the town and from Foxholme Lane to the edge of the settlement. Enhance the floodplain of the Swinney Beck to enhance biodiversity, landscape structure and open space, address flood water issues as part of a sustainable urban drainage scheme and to provide a buffer zone between the development and the employment area/feed mill to the north.							

MELMERBY

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
RL43	✓✓	x	O	✓	✓	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. The site lies wholly within the village development limit and if development were to be proposed, this could be assessed under existing development control policies. The allocation of housing land within the development limits of Group C villages is not promoted by the Core Strategy
RL80	✓✓	x	O	✓	x	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development of the site would result in harm to the settlement character and development constraints have also been identified. The access to the rear is via a domestic driveway. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL1010	✓✓	xx	O	✓	✓	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. A development constraint has been identified as access is as the site is accessed via part of an existing domestic driveway, and access from Wobeck Lane is preferable.
RL1010a	✓✓	x	O	✓	✓	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. A development constraint has been identified as access is as the site is accessed via part of an existing domestic driveway, and access from Wobeck Lane is preferable.
RL1010b	✓✓	✓/x	O	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	The site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development and no other constraints have been identified.

RL3016	✓✓	xx	o	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development of the site would result in harm to settlement character as it would remove one of the few smaller fields remaining in the area, and would affect the approach to the village from the east. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
Additional Notes on mitigation:								
RL1010b	The hedgerows bounding the site could be retained and repaired.							

MINSKIP

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
RL39a	✓✓	✓/x	○	✓	✓	x	Rejected	Whilst this site offers the potential for sustainable development, the development of the site in its entirety would not be consistent with the function of a Group C settlement where only small scale extensions to the village for affordable housing are compliant with the adopted Core Strategy. However development of a smaller part of the site would be appropriate (See RL3044 below)
RL1127	✓✓	x	○	✓	✓	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. A development constraint is noted in respect of the role and function of this settlement. Development of the site in its entirety would not be consistent with the function of a Group C settlement where only small scale releases for affordable housing are allowed by the adopted Core Strategy. Part of the site lies within the development limit and could come forward for development under Core Strategy policy SG2. In addition there may be scope to convert some of the traditional brick built farm buildings under policy SG3.
RL1128	✓✓	xx	○	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development would result in harm to the settlement character by virtue of high adverse impact on landscape character. Development would not respect the approach to the village and be contrary to the open landscape setting of the wider area. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL1128(1)	✓✓	x	○	✓	✓	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development constraints have been identified. This is a tenanted farm and a long lease has been entered into which means that the site is no longer available.

RL3044	✓✓	x	o	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. However, development of the site scores positively for accessibility, impact on settlement character and development constraints.
Additional Notes on mitigation:								
RL3044	Provide hedgerows to southern and western boundaries to include new tree planting to soften urban edge of development when viewed from this direction.							

PANNAL

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
H74(1)	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	See H74(a)	The site offers potential to deliver sustainable development and no other constraints have been identified. Planning permission has been granted for an extension to an existing garage. The majority of the site lies within the preferred option H74a.
H74a	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓	× (see reasons)	Preferred Option	(Site put forward by the landowners for a mix of uses including housing, employment and village facilities) The site offers potential to deliver sustainable development and no other constraints have been identified. This is a brownfield site in a highly accessible location. Opportunity to improve quality of design and impact on settlement character through redevelopment. Opportunity to improve park and ride facilities associated with the railway station. The key issue on the future of this site is the balance of uses. The amount of employment land lost under the landowner's proposals is considered unacceptable. Instead, the Council's preferred site option seeks to provide for the majority of the site (some 5.5 hectares) to be for a high quality business park along with a small amount of new homes and village facilities on the road frontage. A study has commenced on the feasibility and appropriate scale of park and ride facilities around Harrogate.
H74	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	Note this forms part of a larger Preferred Option H74a.
RL2023	✓✓	xx	o	✓	x	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition, development of the site would result in harm to the settlement character, and other development constraints have been identified. Prominent corner site on edge of village. Net developable area restricted due to presence of mature trees and watercourse. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.

RL2024	✓✓	x	O	✓	✓	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition, development constraints have been identified. The sites irregular shape, size and the need to retain a substantial green link through the site makes development difficult for more than a handful of dwellings accessed off a private road.
RL2073a	✓✓	xx	O	✓	x	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition there would be a high adverse effect on landscape character and development would be out of scale with the settlement. A development constraint has been identified as satisfactory vehicular access to western half of site is likely to be unachievable. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL2073b	✓✓	xx	O	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. No other constraints have been identified. The impact on landscape can be minimised through effective mitigation. Existing boundary vegetation and site topography help to screen site from surroundings. Highly accessible location. Opportunity to improve access arrangements to adjacent employment area and reduce speed of traffic entering the village. Site H74a would provide for 20 new dwellings in Pannal. This is a relatively small amount of new housing for a Group B settlement. Site RL2073b is put forward as it meets the Council's site selection process to identify more land in Group B settlements.
Additional Notes on mitigation:								
H74a	Tree planting on the boundary and within southern part of site will be necessary to soften the impact of development and also separate land uses. There may be the opportunity for creating a small SUDS wetland, possibly associated with the damp grassland in the northwestern corner. This would help protect the Old Mill Pond and Crimple to the north, which have apparently been affected by pollution from the site in the past. Trees, shrubs and hedgerows on the site perimeters should be retained. The mature oak should be protected with a TPO. The damp grassland and the potential of the site to support orchids should be investigated in early summer. Provide footpath links to Crimple Valley and National Trail/Long Distance Route. Provide open space in new development to replace sports facilities currently on site.							
RL2073b	Provide planting in and amongst low-density development. Spacing of buildings should allow trees to grow and reach maturity, complementing tree cover along the valley floor. A good quality, substantial landscape screen would be needed along the N edge. Trees along beck bank should be retained and form part of a larger open landscaped area. There may be the opportunity to create a SUDS wetland associated with the floodplain of the Crimple and to reinforce the wet woodland of the floodplain corridor.							

PATELEY BRIDGE

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
P1	✓✓	✓	○	✓	✗	✓	Rejected	The site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development. However the site scores negatively in terms of impact on landscape and the conservation area. There is limited potential to mitigate harm on the landscape and conservation area. Site has many constraints which would affect yield and result in a limited supply of housing compared with harm that development of this site would cause to the landscape and setting of AONB and Conservation Area. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
P2	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	Note this forms part of a larger Preferred Option P3001
P3	✓	✓/✗	○	✗	✓	✓	Preferred Option	The site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development. However there is a negative score against accessibility. Potential to mitigate negative accessibility score through extension of key bus network. Site forms part of P3a which is a Preferred Option
P3a	✓✓	✓/✗	○	✗	✓	✓	Preferred Option	The site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development, however, there is a negative score against accessibility There is potential to mitigate negative accessibility score through extension of the key bus network.
P5	✓✓	✗	○	✗	✓	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. The site fails to comply with the Core Strategy's accessibility criteria. The landowner has put forward another similar option (P5a) for this area of land. P5 follows field boundaries whereas the extent of site P5a is defined by the contours of the land omitting any steep slopes. Both sites have no other constraints identified under landscape character and development constraints, however P5a is preferable because the boundary omits a steeply sloping area of land to the north.

P5a	✓✓	x	o	x	✓	✓	Preferred Option	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. Potential for the negative accessibility score to be mitigated through improvements to the key bus network and there are no other settlement or development constraints. This site is preferable to P5 because its boundary follows contours of the land and omits the steeply sloping land to the north.
P6	✓✓	✓✓	xx	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	Note this forms part of a larger Preferred Option P3001
P1001	✓✓	xx	o	✓	x	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition there would be a high adverse effect on landscape character. There are also development constraints due to the loss of a mostly wooded priority habitat site. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
P3000	✓✓	✓/x	o	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development. However, there would be a high adverse effect on landscape character and harm to settlement character due to the loss of an important view as identified in the Conservation Area Appraisal. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
P3001	✓✓	✓✓	o	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	This site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development and no other constraints have been identified. The site comprises P2 and P6, both brownfield sites currently in employment use within the main built up area of Pateley Bridge.
Additional Notes on mitigation:								
P3a	Negative score against accessibility is due to the sites location away from the key bus network. The size of the site provides the potential for the negative accessibility score to be mitigated by securing a bus stop near to the site to access the key bus network. Careful landscape mitigation will be required.							
P5a	Negative score against accessibility is due to the sites location away from the key bus network. The size of the site provides the potential for the negative accessibility score to be mitigated by securing a bus stop near to the site to access the key bus network. Careful landscape mitigation will be required.							
P3001	Development would be subject to the successful relocation of the current employment uses. Further investigation will be required to determine whether the risk of flooding can be avoided/mitigated. A level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) will be required.							

RAINTON

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
RL1092	✓✓	x	○	✓	x	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development of the site would result in harm to settlement character and development constraints have been identified, as development would result in the loss of a significant amount of Grade 2 agricultural land. The site is also large and extends away from the built form of the village. Allocation of it would not fit in the settlement hierarchy as identified in the Core Strategy. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL3031	✓✓	✓/x	○	✓	✓	x	Rejected	The site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development, however, the site is too large, and allocation would be inappropriate for the role and function of this settlement as identified in the Core Strategy.

RIPLEY

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
DL70	✓✓	xx	0	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development would result in harm to settlement character due to potential harm to the distinctive layout of Ripley. Development would result in loss of a key open space that provides an open and attractive setting to the Conservation Area and the harm cannot be mitigated. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.

SCOTTON

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
RL32	✓✓	x		✓	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition, development of the site would result in a high adverse impact on the landscape. The site is highly visible on approach to the village and forms a key space in its landscape setting. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL124	✓✓	xx		✓	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition, development of the site would result in a high adverse impact on the landscape. Site is highly valued with a diverse range of special landscape characteristics. Development of Scotton Lodge would be inappropriate and development of the southern part of the site would be detrimental to the setting. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL1057	✓✓	xx	0	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition, development of the site would result in a high adverse impact on the landscape. The site is a highly valued site in the central part of the village. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL1108	✓✓	xx	0	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition, development of the site would result in a high adverse impact on the landscape. The site should be left open as it provides an important rural setting to the settlement. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.

RL3025	✓✓	✓/x	○	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	The site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development and no other constraints have been identified.
RL3026	✓✓	✓/x	○	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	The site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development and no other constraints have been identified.
RL3035	✓✓	✓	○	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	The site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development and no other constraints have been identified.
Additional Notes on mitigation:								
RL3025	The mature hedgerows should be retained.							
RL3026	The mature hedgerows should be retained.							

SHAROW

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
RL16	✓✓	✓/x	0	✓	✓	✓	Rejected	The site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development. However, the site is already within the existing development limit for Sharow and whilst its development may be acceptable through the granting of planning permission, the Core Strategy does not promote the allocation of land within the existing built up area of Group C villages.
RL1116	✓✓	✓/x	0	✓	✓	x	Rejected	The site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development. However, development constraints have been identified as the site is difficult to access and, doing so may necessitate the demolition of the house or building at the north of the site. The site is also considered too large, and allocation of it would not comply with the settlement growth strategy in the Core Strategy.

SICKLINGHALL

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
RL1145	✓✓	xx	0	✓	x	✓	Preferred Option	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. Whilst development of the site would result in harm to the character of the settlement mitigation measures can reduce the impact to an acceptable level. This site is deliverable and development of this site offers the potential for community benefits through car parking and biomass plant for school.
RL2017	✓✓	xx	0	✓	✓	x	Reject	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. The size of the site would not comply with the role and function of the settlement and the growth strategy as identified in the Core Strategy.
RL2017a	✓✓	xx	0	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. However, the site forms only a small part of RL2017 and with mitigation measures the impact on the environment can be reduced to an acceptable level. No other constraints identified.
RL2046	✓✓	xx	0	✓	✓	✓	Reject	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. No other constraints. Site's RL1145 and RL2017a considered more appropriate to put forward as preferred site options.
RL2047	✓✓	xx	0	✓	✓	x	Reject	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development constraints have been identified. The site does not include a sufficient frontage to enable an access of acceptable standards to be formed onto the public highway.
Additional Notes on mitigation:								
RL1145	The site size allows the layout of potential development to avoid harm to the High Flush pond and allow for significant landscaping.							
RL2107a	Hedgerows should be retained to protect the rural character of the site.							

SKELTON ON URE

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
RL553	✓✓	✓	○	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	This site offers the potential for sustainable development and no other constraints have been identified
RL554	✓✓	✗	○	✓	✗	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development would cause significant harm to the form and character of the village and to the setting of a listed building. Built development in this location will affect the attractive rural setting of the village and Newby estate and its approaches. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL555	✓✓	✗	○	✓	✓	✗	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development constraints have been identified. Securing an appropriate access to the site would be difficult.
RL555(1)	✓✓	✓/✗	○	✓	✓	✗	Rejected	Whilst this site offers the potential for sustainable development, additional development constraints have been identified. Securing an appropriate access to the site would be difficult.
RL2016	✓✓	✓/✗	○	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	This site offers the potential for sustainable development and there are no other constraints identified.

SPOFFORTH

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
RL68	✓✓	xx	0	✓	x	✓	Reject	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development would result in harm to the settlement character by virtue of high adverse impact on landscape character and the historic environment. The site is an important open space within the conservation area and development would affect the setting of adjoining listed buildings. There are important views across the site from the road and from the site across to the church. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL2043	✓✓	✓/x	0	✓	✓	x	Reject	Whilst the site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development, development constraints have been identified. The site lies within the proposed development limit and is enclosed by housing development on three sides with the former railway embankment providing screening on the remaining western boundary. Currently it does not include a sufficient frontage to enable an access of acceptable standards to be formed onto the public highway. If this constraint was overcome the site may have potential for some housing.

STAVELEY

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
RL2	✓✓	xx	O	✓	x	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would, perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition, development would result in harm to the settlement character as the west side of Arkendale Road has little development and therefore any development would significantly harm the settlement pattern. Development constraints have also been identified as development would disrupt the intimate field system around this part of the village. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL70	✓✓	xx	O	✓	✓	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. Development constraints have been identified due to its proximity to the SINC wetlands to the northwest.
RL1113(1)	✓✓	✓/x	O	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	The site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development and there are no other constraints identified.
Additional Notes on mitigation:								
RL1113(1)	Mature hedgerows along the northern boundary should be retained to screen the site.							

SUMMERBRIDGE

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
RL131	✓✓	x	O	✓	x	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development would result in harm to settlement character. The site provides a natural open space within the village. The village takes on a very linear form at its northern end with limited amounts of public space. Loss of this site would reduce the openness and harm the natural setting to the church and war memorial. There are no options for mitigation. A development constraint has also been identified as development has the potential for significant harm to the bordering SINC ancient woodland and adjoining stream. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL131(1)	✓✓	✓/x	O	✓	x	✓	Rejected	The site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development. However, development would result in harm to settlement character. The site provides a natural open space within the village. The village takes on a very linear form at its northern end with limited amounts of public space. Loss of this site would reduce the openness and harm the natural setting to the church and war memorial. There are no options for mitigation. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL1107	✓✓	✓/x	O	✓	x	✓	Rejected	Note this forms part of a larger Preferred Option RL1107a. The site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development, however development of the site would have an adverse impact on the landscape and harm cannot be mitigated since extensive woodland planting would be required and the site area is limited.
RL1107a	✓✓	✓/x	O	✓	x	✓	Preferred Option	The site offers the potential to deliver sustainable development. Whilst there is a negative score under settlement character due to impact on the rural character and landscape setting, the site size offers potential for substantial native tree planting to mitigate landscape impact (approximately a third of the site).

RL2014	✓✓	x	o	✓	x	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development would result in harm to settlement character. Development constraints have also been identified due to the loss of older boundary trees that form a valuable woodland habitat. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
Additional Notes on mitigation:								
RL1107a	The development of this site will impact on rural village character at this southern approach, however if well designed some development could improve the edge of the settlement. Development would only be acceptable with substantial area of planting to west and south boundaries at least 20m width. Few likely adverse ecological impacts and the possibility for substantial planting of native trees for landscaping, together with potential SUDs wet woodland may represent a significant opportunity for enhancement, in keeping with guidance in the Landscape Character Assessment.							

TOCKWITH

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
RL14	✓✓	✓/x	○	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	Note this forms part of a larger Preferred Option RL14a
RL14A	✓✓	x	○	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. However no other significant constraints have been identified. The site would have limited visual impacts as it is located centrally in the village and is surrounded by development on three sides. Development should protect views across the site to the church and from the site to the countryside to the south. It also provides the opportunity to create new pedestrian and cycle links across the site to the school and playing fields.
RL14(1)	✓✓	x	○	✓	x	x	Reject	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development of the site would result in harm to the settlement character by virtue of a high adverse impact on landscape character and effects on designated sites and/or priority habitats and species. Development constraints have been identified as this would lead to an unacceptable loss of green space with hedges and veteran trees and the loss of remnants of the villages old 'toft' field system, plus green infrastructure associated with the churchyard and vicarage. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.

RL103A	✓✓	✓	○	✓	✗	✓	Preferred Option	Note this forms part of a larger Preferred Option RL14a
RL103B	✓✓	✗	○	✓	✓	✓	Reject	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. Site RL14a chosen in preference to this site. RL14a is able to provide a long term growth option for the village and improve the relationship/accessibility between the village and the school.
RL1014	✓✓	✓/✗	○	✓	✓	✓	Preferred Option	Note this forms part of a larger Preferred Option RL14a
RL1022	✓✓	✗✗	○	✓	✓	✗	Reject	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development constraints have been identified. The site has no direct connection/frontage to a highway maintainable at the public expense as Kendal Lane is only adopted as public highway for part of its length and the development site is beyond this point.
RL1055	✓✓	✗✗	○	✓	✗	✗	Reject	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would, on balance, perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development of the site would result in harm to the settlement character by virtue of a high adverse impact on landscape character and effects on designated sites and/or priority habitats and species. Development constraints have also been identified as the site comprises a rich mixture of habitats (woodland, scrub, ruderal unimproved grassland, hardstanding and elements of wetland) that represents an important resource for both wildlife and informal recreation in this landscape dominated by intensive arable farming. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.
RL1086	✓✓	✗✗	○	✓	✗	✓	Reject	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition development of the site would result in harm to the settlement character by virtue of a high adverse impact on landscape character. Measures to mitigate the environmental harm from the development of this site are unlikely to be achieved and this harm is considered to outweigh the need for housing in the settlement.

RL1086a	✓✓	x	O	✓	✓	✓	Reject	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. No other significant constraints identified. However, the rural character of site should be retained. Site RL14a chosen in preference to this site. RL14a is able to provide a long term growth option for the village and improve the relationship/accessibility of the village to the school.
RL1086a(1)	✓✓	xx	O	✓	✓	✓	Reject	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. No other significant constraints identified. Site RL14a chosen in preference to this site – RL14a is able to provide a long term growth option for the village and improve the relationship/accessibility of the village to the school.
RL1086b	✓✓	xx	O	✓	✓	✓	Reject	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. RL14a chosen in preference to this site – RL14a is able to provide a long term growth option for the village and improve the relationship/accessibility of the village to the school.
RL2054	✓✓	x	O	✓	✓	✓	Reject	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. No other significant constraints identified. However, the rural character of site should be retained. RL14a chosen in preference to this site – RL14a is able to provide a long term growth option for the village and improve the relationship/accessibility of the village to the school.
Additional Notes on mitigation:								
RL14a	Retention of existing trees and hedgerows and provision of pedestrian and cycle routes across the site to provide access to the school and playing fields.							

WATH

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
RL3033	✓✓	✓✓	xx	✓	✓	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development of housing on this site would perform poorly against economic objectives. Development would result in the loss of existing employment land. A development constraint has been identified as part of the site is liable to flood risk. In addition, the site also extends away from the built form of the village and is too large such that allocation of the site would not comply with the role and function of the settlement and the growth strategy in the Core Strategy.

WHIXLEY

Site	SA Score			Accessibility	Settlement Character	Development Constraints	Preferred Option/ Rejected	Reasons (include reference to the potential for mitigation)
	Soc	Env	Econ					
RL1068	✓✓	xx	0	✓	✓	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. The site lies wholly within the development limits of the village and could be brought forward for development under Core Strategy policy SG2. The Core Strategy does not seek to allocate sites within the built up area of Group C villages.
RL1129	✓✓	xx	0	✓	✓	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. Part of the site has been identified within the adopted Conservation Area Character Appraisal as an 'important open space'.
RL1130	✓	xx	0	✓	✓	x	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. In addition a development constraint has been identified. The site is currently used as allotments (recreational open space), protected by Saved Policy R1 of the Local Plan.
RL1131	✓✓	x	0	✓	✓	✓	Rejected	The Council's sustainability appraisal indicates that development on this site would perform poorly against environmental objectives. No other significant constraints. Development of the site would harm the dispersed spatial quality of the southern approach (Station Road) to the village.

CRITERIA FOR SCREENING OUT SITE FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION

	Criteria used to screen out site options	Justification
1	Site does not lie adjacent to the development limit/proposed development limit of a Group A, B or C settlement (Core Strategy Policy SG2). Site should be screened out unless the Council's SHLAA clearly indicates there is insufficient housing land available adjacent to a development limit to meet the relevant Core Strategy housing target.	Site not well related to a settlement identified for growth in the Core Strategy. The Council's SHLAA indicates that there should be sufficient housing land available for development adjacent to Group A, B and C settlements to meet the housing targets of the Core Strategy.
2	Site is not large enough to accommodate 10 or more dwellings in the District's six main settlements, or 5 or more dwellings in Group B and C villages.	The site area is below the threshold size considered appropriate for the purposes of land allocations in the District's urban and rural areas
3	Site could not be developed without the loss of an area of importance for nature conservation e.g.SSSI, SIN, or LNR	Development of these sites of importance for nature conservation would be contrary to national and local planning policy (Harrogate District Local Plan Saved Policy NC3). The loss of biodiversity is likely to result in unsustainable development.
4	Site lies within the functional flood plain (zone 3b).	National planning policy seeks to avoid building new housing in the functional floodplain.
5	Site lies within the statutory Green Belt, and should be screened out unless it is suitable for land allocation as a rural exception site under Policy HLP3 of the Core Strategy	Site's development would be in conflict with national planning policy and Core Strategy Policy EQ2.
6	Site size would need to be reduced below the allocation threshold in order to avoid the loss of recreational and amenity open space as protected by Harrogate District Local Plan Saved Policies R1 and HD12 and land mark woodland.	The developable area of the site is below the threshold size considered appropriate for the purposes of land allocations in the District's urban and rural areas. Preliminary work suggests a surplus of open space and woodland is unlikely to be identified and therefore such land is unlikely to be available for development. Open space/sports facilities are not easily relocated.
7	Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement.	Development of these sites would be in conflict with the Core Strategy Policies SG2 and SG4. The Council's SHLAA indicates that there should be sufficient housing land available for development on more appropriate sized sites adjacent to Group A, B and C settlements as defined by Core Strategy Policy SG2.
8	The site lies within a Green Wedge of the town of Harrogate as defined by Harrogate District Local Plan Saved Policy C10	The justification for continuing to designate 'green wedges' in relation to planning policy must be revisited during the preparation of the Sites and Policies DPD. However, green wedges are likely to form a key component of the green infrastructure of the District and thereby to be protected and enhanced. The Council's SHLAA indicates that there should be sufficient housing land available for development elsewhere to meet the towns housing requirement without the need to encroach into 'green wedges'.
9	Site lies within a registered historic battlefield	Development of these sites would be contrary to national planning policy.
10	Site cannot be accessed	Such sites would not be deliverable

11	Site could not be developed without the loss of open space or key views or other aspects identified as important to protect in the 2009/2010 conservation area appraisals.	<p>These are key characteristics of the District's conservation areas and have recently been agreed with local communities as important to protect.</p> <p>The Council's SHLAA indicates that there should be sufficient housing land available for development elsewhere to meet the District's housing requirement.</p>
12	Site is not of sufficient size to accommodate 1 hectare of employment land (Harrogate, Knaresborough and Boroughbridge)	The site area is below the threshold size considered appropriate for the purposes of land allocations in the District's urban and rural areas
13	Site's development would adversely affect the character and/or setting of a Scheduled Ancient Monument	This would be contrary to national planning policy.
14	The site is defined as a Best and Good employment site	<p>Policy JB3 seeks to protect and enhance Best and Good employment sites. These are the District's key employment sites and erosion through encroachment to other uses is resisted.</p> <p>The Council's SHLAA indicates that there should be sufficient housing land available for development elsewhere to meet the District's housing requirement.</p>
15	The site is marked on the Local Plan proposals map as an existing housing allocation, but currently development is unlikely to be delivered.	One of the housing land allocations in the Harrogate District Local Plan is conditional upon the satisfactory relocation of the sports club on the site. Unless and until there is some certainty over the club's relocation this site is not available. Work is currently being undertaken on the options for improved sports provision in Harrogate, Knaresborough and Ripon.
16	The site would only be adjacent to the development limit if an additional site were to be allocated	See reasons given against criteria 1 and 7 above.
17	The landowner has indicated that the site is not available for development	In making allocations for development the Council needs to be satisfied that sites are developable within the timeframe of the plan. Availability is one of the key determinants.

APPENDIX 2

SITES SCREENED OUT FROM FURTHER ASSESSMENT

Settlement	Site Code	Address	Reason for Screening the Site Out at Stage 1
Beckwithshaw	RL2055	Land at Beechfield Farm, Beckwithshaw	Site lies within the statutory Green Belt, and should be screened out unless it is suitable for land allocation as a rural exception site under Policy HLP3 of the Core Strategy.
			Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement.
			Site cannot be satisfactorily accessed.
Birstwith	RL1028	Wreaks Road, Birstwith	Site size would need to be reduced below the allocation threshold in order to avoid the loss of recreational and amenity open space as protected by Harrogate District Local Plan Saved Policies R1 and HD12 and land mark woodland.
			Site lies within the functional flood plain (zone 3b).
Birstwith	RL1033	Riversmead, Birstwith	Site is not large enough to accommodate 10 or more dwellings in the District's six main settlements, or 5 or more dwellings in Group B and C villages (the allocation threshold).
Birstwith	RL2053	Wreaks Mill, Birstwith	Site lies within the functional flood plain (zone 3b).
Bishop Monkton	RL13	Site adjacent to 4, Vic. Terr., Bishop Monkton	Site cannot be satisfactorily accessed.
Bishop Monkton	RL134	Land at Lawnfield Drive, Bishop Monkton	Site is not large enough to accommodate 10 or more dwellings in the District's six main settlements, or 5 or more dwellings in Group B and C villages (the allocation threshold).
Bishop Monkton	RL135	Land at Boroughbridge Road, Bishop Monkton	Site size would need to be reduced below the allocation threshold in order to avoid the loss of recreational and amenity open space as protected by Harrogate District Local Plan Saved Policies R1 and HD12 and land mark woodland.
Bishop Monkton	RL1044	Land to rear of Renton Close, Bishop Monkton	Site lies within the functional flood plain (zone 3b).
Bishop Monkton	RL1045	Land north of Boroughbridge Road, Bishop Monkton	Site lies within the functional flood plain (zone 3b).
Bishop Monkton	RL2029	Land north of Hall Farm, Bishop Monkton	Site lies within the functional flood plain (zone 3b).
Boroughbridge	B2000	Bar House, Roecliffe Lane, Boroughbridge	The site would only be adjacent to the development limit if an additional site were to be allocated.
Boroughbridge	B2001	Poultry Houses, Leeming Lane, Langthorpe	Site does not lie adjacent to the development limit/proposed development limit of a Group A, B or C settlement (Core Strategy Policy SG2).
Boroughbridge	B2003	Boroughbridge Police Station,	Site is not large enough to accommodate 10 or more dwellings in the District's six main settlements, or 5 or

		Boroughbridge	more dwellings in Group B and C villages (the allocation threshold).
Boroughbridge	RL130	Bell Close Farm, Minskip	Site does not lie adjacent to the development limit/proposed development limit of a Group A, B or C settlement (Core Strategy Policy SG2).
Boroughbridge	RL1140	Bellwood House, Minskip Road	Site does not lie adjacent to the development limit/proposed development limit of a Group A, B or C settlement (Core Strategy Policy SG2).
Burton Leonard	RL73	Land at Burton Leonard	Site size would need to be reduced below the allocation threshold in order to avoid the loss of recreational and amenity open space as protected by Harrogate District Local Plan Saved Policies R1 and HD12 and land mark woodland. Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement.
Burton Leonard	RL114	Apron Lane, Burton Leonard	Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement. Site does not lie adjacent to the development limit/proposed development limit of a Group A, B or C settlement (Core Strategy Policy SG2). The site would only be adjacent to the development limit if an additional site were to be allocated.
Burton Leonard	RL115	Station Lane, Burton Leonard	Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement.
Burton Leonard	RL133	Land at Burton Leonard	Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement. Site size would need to be reduced below the allocation threshold in order to avoid the loss of recreational and amenity open space as protected by Harrogate District Local Plan Saved Policies R1 and HD12 and land mark woodland.
Burton Leonard	RL1021	Adjacent to water works, Station Lane	Site is not large enough to accommodate 10 or more dwellings in the District's six main settlements, or 5 or more dwellings in Group B and C villages (the allocation threshold).
Burton Leonard	RL1031	Land adj Birkhills, Burton Leonard	Site is not large enough to accommodate 10 or more dwellings in the District's six main settlements, or 5 or more dwellings in Group B and C villages (the allocation threshold).
Burton Leonard	RL1041	Barn and yard adjacent Flats House, Scarah Lane,	Site is not large enough to accommodate 10 or more dwellings in the District's six main settlements, or 5 or more dwellings in Group B and C villages (the allocation threshold).
Burton Leonard	RL1049	Land adjacent to Meadow Court/Thorn Bank,	Site is not large enough to accommodate 10 or more dwellings in the District's six main settlements, or 5 or more dwellings in Group B and C villages (the allocation threshold).
Burton Leonard	RL1085	Land south of Straight Lane, Burton Leonard	Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement.
Burton Leonard	RL2032	Land to rear of Birkhills, Burton Leonard	Site cannot be satisfactorily accessed.

			Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement.
Burton Leonard	RL2056	Land at Field House, Burton Leonard	Site is not large enough to accommodate 10 or more dwellings in the District's six main settlements, or 5 or more dwellings in Group B and C villages (the allocation threshold).
Burton Leonard	RL3032	Land at Flats House, Burton Leonard	Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement.
Darley	RL97	Station Road, Darley	Site is not large enough to accommodate 10 or more dwellings in the District's six main settlements, or 5 or more dwellings in Group B and C villages (the allocation threshold).
Darley	RL98a	Sheepcote Lane, Darley	The site would only be adjacent to the development limit if an additional site were to be allocated. Site does not lie adjacent to the development limit/proposed development limit of a Group A, B or C settlement (Core Strategy Policy SG2).
Darley	RL1138	Rear of Friends Meeting House, Darley	Site is not large enough to accommodate 10 or more dwellings in the District's six main settlements, or 5 or more dwellings in Group B and C villages (the allocation threshold).
Darley	RL2004	Land at Prospect View Farm, Darley	Site is not large enough to accommodate 10 or more dwellings in the District's six main settlements, or 5 or more dwellings in Group B and C villages (the allocation threshold).
Darley	RL2005	Land South of Sheepcote Lane, Darley	Site does not lie adjacent to the development limit/proposed development limit of a Group A, B or C settlement (Core Strategy Policy SG2).
Dishforth	RL6	Land adjoining development limit of Dishforth	Site is not large enough to accommodate 10 or more dwellings in the District's six main settlements, or 5 or more dwellings in Group B and C villages (the allocation threshold).
Dishforth	RL6a	Land at grid ref 438100 472901, Dishforth	Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement. Site cannot be satisfactorily accessed.
Dishforth	RL1039	Land south of Moor Lane, Dishforth	Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement.
Dishforth	RL1087	Land adjacent Grangefields, Dishforth	Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement.
Dishforth	RL1088	Land to the north of Dishforth	Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement.
Dishforth	RL1089	Land to the rear of Crown Farm, Dishforth	Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement.
Dishforth	RL1135	Barker's Farm Fold Yard, Lingham Lane	Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement.
Dishforth	RL1152	Land to the North of Topcliffe Road, Dishforth	Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement.

Follifoot	RL1018	Rear of Moordale Lodge, Follifoot	Site is not large enough to accommodate 10 or more dwellings in the District's six main settlements, or 5 or more dwellings in Group B and C villages (the allocation threshold).
Follifoot	RL1097	Land east of the Church, Follifoot	Site does not lie adjacent to the development limit/proposed development limit of a Group A, B or C settlement (Core Strategy Policy SG2).
Follifoot	RL1098	Land west of the Radcliffe Arms, Follifoot	Site size would need to be reduced below the allocation threshold in order to avoid the loss of recreational and amenity open space as protected by Harrogate District Local Plan Saved Policies R1 and HD12 and land mark woodland.
Follifoot	RL1099	Land north of the Radcliffe Arms, Follifoot	Site size would need to be reduced below the allocation threshold in order to avoid the loss of recreational and amenity open space as protected by Harrogate District Local Plan Saved Policies R1 and HD12 and land mark woodland.
Follifoot	RL1100	Land rear of Park House, Follifoot	Site size would need to be reduced below the allocation threshold in order to avoid the loss of recreational and amenity open space as protected by Harrogate District Local Plan Saved Policies R1 and HD12 and land mark woodland.
Glasshouses	RL1008	Land opposite Harewell Close, Glasshouses	Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement.
Glasshouses	RL1036	High Plain Dam, Glasshouses	Site does not lie adjacent to the development limit/proposed development limit of a Group A, B or C settlement (Core Strategy Policy SG2). The site would only be adjacent to the development limit if an additional site were to be allocated. Site is not large enough to accommodate 10 or more dwellings in the District's six main settlements, or 5 or more dwellings in Group B and C villages (the allocation threshold).
Goldsborough	RL102a	Land at Cockstone Farm, Goldsborough	Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement.
Goldsborough	RL1048	Midgeley Lane, Goldsborough	Site size would need to be reduced below the allocation threshold in order to avoid the loss of recreational and amenity open space as protected by Harrogate District Local Plan Saved Policies R1 and HD12 and land mark woodland.
Grewelthorpe	RL503	Land at Wapping, Grewelthorpe	Site is not large enough to accommodate 10 or more dwellings in the District's six main settlements, or 5 or more dwellings in Group B and C villages (the allocation threshold).
Grewelthorpe	RL1006	Land at Grewelthorpe	Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement.
Grewelthorpe	RL1007	Land adjacent to the pond, Grewelthorpe	Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement.
Grewelthorpe	RL1058	Land south of Beckside House	Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement.
Grewelthorpe	RL1059	Land at Hill Top Farm	The landowner has indicated that the site is not available for development.

			Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement.
Grewelthorpe	RL1060	Land east of Old Vicarage	Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement.
Grewelthorpe	RL1136	Land at north end of Grewelthorpe	Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement.
Hampsthwaite	RL37a	Land at Hampsthwaite	Site cannot be satisfactorily accessed.
Hampsthwaite	RL1106	Land at East of Church Lane, Hampsthwaite	Site lies within the functional flood plain (zone 3b).
Hampsthwaite	RL1112	Land off Hollins Lane, Hampsthwaite	Site does not lie adjacent to the development limit/proposed development limit of a Group A, B or C settlement (Core Strategy Policy SG2). The site would only be adjacent to the development limit if an additional site were to be allocated.
Killinghall	RL1015(1)	Land at Manor Dairy Farm, Killinghall	The landowner has indicated that the site is not available for development.
Killinghall	RL2027	Land at Killinghall Quarry, Killinghall	Site does not lie adjacent to the development limit/proposed development limit of a Group A, B or C settlement (Core Strategy Policy SG2). The site would only be adjacent to the development limit if an additional site were to be allocated.
Kirk Deighton	RL1056	Land north of Esk Gardens, Kirk Deighton	Site does not lie adjacent to the development limit/proposed development limit of a Group A, B or C settlement (Core Strategy Policy SG2).
Kirk Deighton	RL2050a	Land North of Schoolhouse Terrace, Kirk Deighton	Site does not lie adjacent to the development limit/proposed development limit of a Group A, B or C settlement (Core Strategy Policy SG2).
Kirk Deighton	RL2050b	Land South of Schoolhouse Terrace, Kirk Deighton	Site does not lie adjacent to the development limit/proposed development limit of a Group A, B or C settlement (Core Strategy Policy SG2).
Kirk Hammerton	RL101	Land at Kirk Hammerton	Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement.
Kirk Hammerton	RL1000	Land south of Crooked Lane, Kirk Hammerton	Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement.
Kirk Hammerton	RL2035	Land adjacent to Kirk Hammerton Primary School	Site does not lie adjacent to the development limit/proposed development limit of a Group A, B or C settlement (Core Strategy Policy SG2).
Kirk Hammerton	RL2036	Land West of Parker Lane, Kirk Hammerton	Site does not lie adjacent to the development limit/proposed development limit of a Group A, B or C settlement (Core Strategy Policy SG2).
Kirk Hammerton	RL2037	West End Play Area, Kirk Hammerton	Site is not large enough to accommodate 10 or more dwellings in the District's six main settlements, or 5 or more dwellings in Group B and C villages (the allocation threshold).
Kirk Hammerton	RL2038	OS Field 125, Kirk Hammerton	Site does not lie adjacent to the development limit/proposed development limit of a Group A, B or C settlement (Core Strategy Policy SG2).
Kirk Hammerton	RL2041	Land adjacent to West End Play Area, Kirk	Site is not large enough to accommodate 10 or more dwellings in the District's six main settlements, or 5 or

		Hammerton	more dwellings in Group B and C villages (the allocation threshold).
Kirk Hammerton	RL2058	Land at Station Road, Kirk Hammerton	Site is not large enough to accommodate 10 or more dwellings in the District's six main settlements, or 5 or more dwellings in Group B and C villages (the allocation threshold).
Kirkby Malzeard	RL5	Land to north of Main Street, Kirkby Malzeard	Site cannot be satisfactorily accessed. Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement.
Kirkby Malzeard	RL1120	Land west of Church Lane, Kirkby Malzeard	Site is not large enough to accommodate 10 or more dwellings in the District's six main settlements, or 5 or more dwellings in Group B and C villages (the allocation threshold).
Kirkby Malzeard	RL2001	Wensleydale Creamery, Kirkby Malzeard	Site does not lie adjacent to the development limit/proposed development limit of a Group A, B or C settlement (Core Strategy Policy SG2). The site would only be adjacent to the development limit if an additional site were to be allocated. Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement.
Kirkby Malzeard	RL2051	Land West of Hill Crest Farm, Kirkby Malzeard	Site is not large enough to accommodate 10 or more dwellings in the District's six main settlements, or 5 or more dwellings in Group B and C villages (the allocation threshold).
Kirkby Overblow	RL2003	Land at Walton Head Lane, Kirkby Overblow	The site would only be adjacent to the development limit if an additional site were to be allocated. Site lies within the statutory Green Belt, and should be screened out unless it is suitable for land allocation as a rural exception site under Policy HLP3 of the Core Strategy.
Lofthouse	RL1110	Park House, Lofthouse	Site does not lie adjacent to the development limit/proposed development limit of a Group A, B or C settlement (Core Strategy Policy SG2). Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement. The site would only be adjacent to the development limit if an additional site were to be allocated.
Lofthouse	RL1151	Land to the rear of Village Hall, Lofthouse	Site is not large enough to accommodate 10 or more dwellings in the District's six main settlements, or 5 or more dwellings in Group B and C villages (the allocation threshold).
Markington	RL1042	Land at The Barrows, Markington	Site lies within the functional flood plain (zone 3b). Site does not lie adjacent to the development limit/proposed development limit of a Group A, B or C settlement (Core Strategy Policy SG2). Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement.
Markington	RL2052	Land adjacent to Brook House, Markington	Site lies within the functional flood plain (zone 3b).
Masham	M4	Leyburn Road	Site size would need to be reduced below the allocation threshold in order to avoid the loss of recreational and amenity open space as protected by Harrogate District Local Plan Saved Policies R1 and HD12 and land mark woodland.

			Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement.
			Site lies within the functional flood plain (zone 3b).
Masham	M8	Swinburn Road	Site cannot be satisfactorily accessed.
Masham	M1003	Land off Leyburn Road, Masham	The site would only be adjacent to the development limit if an additional site were to be allocated.
			Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement.
			Site lies within the functional flood plain (zone 3b).
Masham	M1005	Land south of Swinton Road, Masham	Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement.
Masham	M1006	Marfield, Masham	Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement.
Masham	M2000	St. Columba's Church, Thorpe Road, Masham	Site is not large enough to accommodate 10 or more dwellings in the District's six main settlements, or 5 or more dwellings in Group B and C villages (the allocation threshold).
			Site size would need to be reduced below the allocation threshold in order to avoid the loss of recreational and amenity open space as protected by Harrogate District Local Plan Saved Policies R1 and HD12 and land mark woodland.
Melmerby	RL1038	East of Grange Terrace, Melmerby	Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement.
Melmerby	RL1078	Grange Farm, Melmerby	Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement.
Pannal	H35	Follifoot Road , Pannal	Site lies within the statutory Green Belt, and should be screened out unless it is suitable for land allocation as a rural exception site under Policy HLP3 of the Core Strategy.
Pannal	H49	Pannal Grange, Pannal Green	The landowner has indicated that the site is not available for development.
Pannal	H1024	Dunlopillo extension	Site lies within the statutory Green Belt, and should be screened out unless it is suitable for land allocation as a rural exception site under Policy HLP3 of the Core Strategy.
			Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement.
Pannal	RL2012	Crimple Valley Garden Centre, Harrogate	Site does not lie adjacent to the development limit/proposed development limit of a Group A, B or C settlement (Core Strategy Policy SG2).
Pannal	RL2042	Land at Walton Head Farm, Pannal	Site lies within the statutory Green Belt, and should be screened out unless it is suitable for land allocation as a rural exception site under Policy HLP3 of the Core Strategy.
			Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement.

Pannal	RL2073	Land to the South of Almsford Bank	Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement.
Pateley Bridge	P1000	Land off Bridgehousegate, Pateley Bridge	Site cannot be satisfactorily accessed. Site is not large enough to accommodate 10 or more dwellings in the District's six main settlements, or 5 or more dwellings in Group B and C villages (the allocation threshold).
Pateley Bridge	P1003	Off Mill Lane, Pateley Bridge	Site cannot be satisfactorily accessed.
Pateley Bridge	P1004	Nydsley, Mill Lane, Pateley Bridge	Site is not large enough to accommodate 10 or more dwellings in the District's six main settlements, or 5 or more dwellings in Group B and C villages (the allocation threshold). Site cannot be satisfactorily accessed.
Pateley Bridge	P1004a	Nydsley, Mill Lane, Pateley Bridge	Site is not large enough to accommodate 10 or more dwellings in the District's six main settlements, or 5 or more dwellings in Group B and C villages (the allocation threshold).
Pateley Bridge	P1005	Land at Southlands, Pateley Bridge	The landowner has indicated that the site is not available for development.
Pateley Bridge	P2001	Pateley Bridge Police Station, Pateley Bridge	Site is not large enough to accommodate 10 or more dwellings in the District's six main settlements, or 5 or more dwellings in Group B and C villages (the allocation threshold).
Scotton	RL125	Land off Main Street, Scotton	Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement.
Scotton	RL1001	Land off New Road, Scotton	Site does not lie adjacent to the development limit/proposed development limit of a Group A, B or C settlement (Core Strategy Policy SG2).
Sharow	RL121	Land N of St. John's Church, Sharow	Site cannot be satisfactorily accessed.
Sharow	RL1019	Land at junction of New Road and Back Lane,	Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement.
Sicklinghall	RL2045	Land at Dairy Farm, Sicklinghall	Site is not large enough to accommodate 10 or more dwellings in the District's six main settlements, or 5 or more dwellings in Group B and C villages (the allocation threshold). Site cannot be satisfactorily accessed.
Skelton on Ure	RL556	Land at S end of Skelton on Ure	Site is not large enough to accommodate 10 or more dwellings in the District's six main settlements, or 5 or more dwellings in Group B and C villages (the allocation threshold).
Spofforth	RL1143a	Land to South of Massey Fold, Spofforth	Site is not large enough to accommodate 10 or more dwellings in the District's six main settlements, or 5 or more dwellings in Group B and C villages (the allocation threshold).
Spofforth	RL1143b	Land to North of Massey Fold, Spofforth	Site is not large enough to accommodate 10 or more dwellings in the District's six main settlements, or 5 or more dwellings in Group B and C villages (the allocation threshold).
Spofforth	RL1150	Land at East Park Road, Spofforth	The landowner has indicated that the site is not available for development.
Spofforth	RL2021	Land to rear of East Park Road, Spofforth	Site cannot be satisfactorily accessed.
Spofforth	RL2044	Land at Hall Cottages, Spofforth	Site does not lie adjacent to the development limit/proposed development limit of a Group A, B or C settlement (Core Strategy Policy SG2).

Spofforth	RL2070	Land adjacent to Spofforth Castle, Spofforth	Site size would need to be reduced below the allocation threshold in order to avoid the loss of recreational and amenity open space as protected by Harrogate District Local Plan Saved Policies R1 and HD12 and land mark woodland.
Staveley	RL1113	Land between Minskip Road and Low Field Lane	Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement.
Staveley	RL1113a	Land between Minskip Road and Low Field Lane	Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement.
Staveley	RL1148	Staveley Mill Farm, Staveley	Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement. Site lies within the functional flood plain (zone 3b).
Staveley	RL1148(1)	Staveley Mill Farm, Staveley	Site's development, by virtue of its scale and location, would clearly be inappropriate to the role, form and character of the settlement.
Staveley	RL1149	Land to the West of The Paddocks, Staveley	Site does not lie adjacent to the development limit/proposed development limit of a Group A, B or C settlement (Core Strategy Policy SG2).
Summerbridge	RL2015	Fire Station, Summerbridge	Site is not large enough to accommodate 10 or more dwellings in the District's six main settlements, or 5 or more dwellings in Group B and C villages (the allocation threshold).
Tockwith	RL1002	Tockwith Methodist Church, Tockwith	Site is not large enough to accommodate 10 or more dwellings in the District's six main settlements, or 5 or more dwellings in Group B and C villages (the allocation threshold).
Tockwith	RL1062	Tockwith Village Hall, Tockwith	Site is not large enough to accommodate 10 or more dwellings in the District's six main settlements, or 5 or more dwellings in Group B and C villages (the allocation threshold). Site does not lie adjacent to the development limit/proposed development limit of a Group A, B or C settlement (Core Strategy Policy SG2).
Tockwith	RL2049	Land to the rear of Rivendell Cottage, Tockwith	The site would only be adjacent to the development limit if an additional site were to be allocated.
Wath	RL3015	Land at Tanfield Lane, Wath	Site is not large enough to accommodate 10 or more dwellings in the District's six main settlements, or 5 or more dwellings in Group B and C villages (the allocation threshold).

In addition a number of sites have been granted planning permission and these are not considered in detail further.

Settlement	Site Code	Address
Boroughbridge	B12	Farnell Technology Park and land to the rear
Boroughbridge	B17	Bar Lane, Boroughbridge
Boroughbridge	RL39	Land at Minskip
Green Hammerton	RL15	Ebor View, Green Hammerton
Pannal	H1071	Land off Princess Royal Way and Spacey Houses
Spofforth	RL1150	Land at East Park Road, Spofforth

Selection of Preferred Site Options By Settlement

