

**Housing Land Selection Methodology and Assessments Paper**  
**Appendix C: Filey Site Assessments**

Proposed Allocations;

HA22	(03/01&02) Land at Filey Fields Farm, Scarborough Road	3
HA23	(03/06) Land at Church Cliff Drive, opposite Church Cliff Farm	11
HA24	(03/11) Silver Birches, Station Avenue	19

Other Sites;

03/03	a) Land between The Dams and the Railway Line	26
	b) Land between Scarborough Road and the Railway Line	
03/05	Land at Mill Farm, Muston Road	33
03/09	Crescent Grange Farm, Royal Oak	40



## Site Assessment

<b>Housing Allocation Reference:</b>	HA22		
<b>Original Site Ref:</b>	03/01 and 03/02		
<b>Area (ha):</b>	Original area – 5.32 ha (03/01) and 1.76ha (03/02) Proposed area for allocation – 4.86ha		
<b>Parish:</b>	Filey		
<b>Address:</b>	Land at Filey Fields Farm, Scarborough Road		
<b>Score:</b>	<b>Stage A:</b> Pass	<b>Stage B:</b> 2-61-6	<b>Stage C:</b> 25
<b>Concluding Comments:</b>	<p>This site was recommended for allocation at the Preferred Options stage in 2009. As part of the wider consideration land to both the west and north were assessed for an expanded area.</p> <p>In general terms there is certainly scope for a larger area to be included, however, this was complicated at that time by the progressing Filey Flood Alleviation Scheme which seeks to use some of this land for installing the scheme. Whilst this does not prevent the development of these sites in their entirety, it was difficult at that time to define exact boundaries as the scheme was early in the planning stages. This has now progressed and the site can be increased to allow a larger footprint, whilst also dealing with some of the flood alleviation measures within the proposed developments themselves.</p> <p>The land to both the north and west of this site are now included.</p>		
<b>Indicative Yield:</b>	60 dwellings.		

*Prior to Stage A, all sites that cannot accommodate 10 or more dwellings will be dismissed from the formal allocation process in the Local Plan but will be considered to determine if the development limits can be amended to allow small scale housing or be suitable for an exceptions site.*

### **Stage A: Conformity with Settlement Strategy and Major Constraints**

A(i) Conformity with the evolving Scarborough Borough settlement strategy:

Question 1a) Does the proposed site lie within or is well related to an existing settlement? YES / ~~NO~~

*If Yes, proceed to Question 1b.*

*If No, site is dismissed.*

Question 1b) Does the settlement lie within or above the Service Village classification?

YES / ~~NO~~

*If Yes, proceed to Question 2a.*

*If No, proceed to Question 1c.*

Question 1c) Are there any circumstances that would warrant an allocation of housing within the settlement? YES / NO

*If Yes, proceed to Question 2a.*

*If No, site is dismissed.*

Question 2a) Is the site of an appropriate scale/size that reflects the role of the respective settlement as defined in the settlement hierarchy within the Local Plan? YES / ~~NO~~

*If Yes, proceed to Question 3.  
If No, proceed to Question 2b.*

Question 2b) Could a smaller portion of the site be in conformity with the settlement hierarchy? YES / NO

*If Yes, proceed to Question 3.  
If No, site is dismissed.*

#### A(ii) Major Constraints (Environmental and Historic)

Question 3a) Is the site within the prescribed distance of any national or international site of biodiversity or geological value; e.g. RAMSAR, SSSI, SAC, SPA, National Nature Reserves ? YES / NO

Question 3b) If YES would the development have a negative impact on the associated area of protection? YES/NO

EXPLAIN.... The site lies within 10km of the Flamborough Head SAC and SPA, and the Flamborough and Filey Coast pSPA, however, it is of such a scale that it would only have a negligible impact on these protected habitat designations

Question 4) Does the site lie within an area considered to be unsuitable due to its position within a flood risk zone (high risk)? ~~YES~~ / NO

Question 5) Does the site lie within an area considered to be at significant risk of coastal erosion zone, i.e. located within 100 year erosion zone? ~~YES~~ / NO

Question 6) Would the development of the site have an adverse negative impact upon nationally-important archaeology (including Scheduled Monuments) or other high-Grade historic assets or their settings? ~~YES~~ / NO

*If No to all questions 3 to 6, proceed to Question 8  
If Yes, proceed to Question 7*

Question 7) Where one of the above questions may have answered 'yes', does the constraint prohibit development of the entire site with no possibility of amending the site area? ~~YES~~ / ~~NO~~ / N/A

*If Yes, site is dismissed.  
If, as a result of amending site boundaries, a site can no longer yield 10 dwellings or more, it will be dismissed. Where 10 dwellings may be yielded, proceed to Question 8*

#### **Stage B: First Round Scoring**

##### **Question 8) Brownfield or Greenfield Land**

Is the site classified as previously developed land (Brownfield), Greenfield or is it a mixture of both land types?

100% Brownfield	6
Majority Brownfield	4
Majority Greenfield	2
100% Greenfield	1
<b>POINTS</b>	<b>2</b>

##### **Question 9a) Accessibility of site to 'pre-determined' areas by public transport**

This question, along with Question 10, relate to accessibility. With the use of accessibility software, complex transport modelling is utilised to enable the relative accessibility of potential sites to pre-determined services and facilities by sustainable modes such as public transport, walking and cycling.

Destination	Journey time to Destination by Public Transport				
	Less than 15 mins	15 to 30 mins	30 to 45 mins	45 to 60 mins	More than 1 hour
Defined town centres, service centres and neighbourhood centres.	6	4	2	1	0
Major employment centres.	6	4	2	1	0
Indoor Sports Centres / Pools	6	4	2	1	0
To Primary Schooling	6	4	2	1	0
To Secondary Schooling	6	4	2	1	0
To GP Surgery	6	4	2	1	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>32</b>				

**Question 9b) How accessible is the site to existing services and facilities?**

Destination	Walking Distances within			Cycling Distances within		
	500m	1000m	2000m	1.5km	5km	8km
Defined town centres, service centres and neighbourhood centres.	6	4	2	3	2	1
Major employment centres	6	4	2	3	2	1
Indoor Sports Centres / Pools	6	4	2	3	2	1
Primary Schools	6	4	2	3	2	1
Secondary Schools	6	4	2	3	2	1
Train Station	6	4	2	3	2	1
GP Surgeries	6	4	2	3	2	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>29</b>					

**Question 10) Accessibility of site to pre-determined areas for leisure and recreation**

Destination	Within Pre-determined range		
	350m (5 mins)	700m (10 mins)	1000m (15 mins)
Informal Open Space for Recreation	1	0	0
Outdoor Sports Pitches and Facilities	3	2	1
Local Children's Play Area	1	0	0
Neighbourhood Children's Play Area	2	1	0
Settlement Level Children's Play Area	3	2	1

Total	6
-------	---

**Comparison Scores for Q8 to 10**

Brownfield / Greenfield	Accessibility to Services	Accessibility to Recreation
2	61	6

**Stage C: Detailed Site Implications**

*At any stage of this process, where a constraint to development may be so significant, the site could require dismissing.*

**Question 11) Regional and Local Biodiversity**

Would the development of the proposed site affect a regional or local site of biodiversity or geological value or affect any protected species/habitats?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>Part of the site is adjacent to the Community Woodland Project, a valuable community resource offering significant biodiversity and habitats. In such close proximity to such a resource, although not a statutory designation, any scheme would have to incorporate a substantial undeveloped buffer to minimise any impact</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>1</b>
------------------------------	---	--------------	----------

**Question 12) Trees and Hedgerows**

Would the development of the site affect trees or hedgerows not covered by statutory protection or by the BAP?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>Around the site there are areas of vegetation which are considered worthy of retention and could be integrated into a scheme. Additional planting could be used to screen much of the site from the Scarborough Road approach in to Filey. Proximity to Community Woodland Project should be a consideration; however, the site does not encroach and with additional buffer would unlikely have any detrimental impact on established trees and hedgerows.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>1</b>
------------------------------	--	--------------	----------

**Question 13) Historic Environment**

Would the proposed development affect the historic environment including the setting of an historic asset?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>No impact</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>1</b>
------------------------------	------------------	--------------	----------

**Question 14) Character of Built Area**

Would the development affect the built character of the town or village?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	Appropriate scale, massing and design would enable an adequate integration of site with existing dwellings adjacent and if carefully designed provide a pleasant entrance to Filey. The entrance is currently characterised on this side by the rears of properties and unsightly agricultural buildings. An outwardly facing well-designed scheme could improve the character of this area.	<b>Score</b>	<b>1</b>
------------------------------	--	--------------	----------

**Question 15) Impact on the Landscape**

What is the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development with respect to the conservation and enhancement of distinctive rural and coastal landscape character areas?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<p>The site lies in an area designated as D4 (Lebberston and Filey) Coastal Hinterland. This area has a sense of openness and visual relationships with the coast.</p> <p>In respect of the northern part of the site (above Cherry Tree Drive) the site rises up towards the cliff top. The development of this site and the relative height compared to adjacent development could result in this site being prominent within the landscape and interrupting the rolling agricultural fields towards the cliff. Views from the well-used Community Woodland Area and the recreation footpaths along the cliff top could be impacted upon. It is considered that a carefully designed scheme in terms of massing and height could soften impact considerably and allow the new development to integrate into the existing residential development.</p> <p>In relation to the western part of the site, it is well connected to the urban form of Filey, however, further to the west, the land becomes increasingly prominent. The site as proposed for allocation, however, does not extend the full width of the original submission and could be integrated with the existing form of the town with little detriment to the wider landscape.</p>	<b>Score</b>	<b>1</b>
------------------------------	--	--------------	----------

**Question 16) Flood Risk**

Is the proposal within an area at risk of flooding?

*Note: Sites deemed at a high risk of flooding are likely to have been dismissed at Stage 1 of assessment process.*

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	Zone 1.	<b>Score</b>	<b>3</b>
------------------------------	---------	--------------	----------

**Question 17) Agricultural land**

Would the development of the site result in the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>Grade 3 and Grade 7 Urban classification.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>2</b>
------------------------------	--	--------------	----------

**Question 18) Water Supply and Source Protection Zones**

Would the development adversely affect a water supply?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>No impact</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>3</b>
------------------------------	------------------	--------------	----------

**Question 19) Mineral Resources**

Would the development of the land impact on mineral resources?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>No impact upon mineral resources.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>2</b>
------------------------------	--	--------------	----------

**Infrastructure****Question 20) School Capacity**

What is the capacity of schools to cope with the development?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>Sufficient school capacity.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>2</b>
------------------------------	------------------------------------	--------------	----------

**Question 21) Capacity of Utility Providers**

What is the capacity of existing utilities (Water, Sewage, etc) to cope with the development?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>Significant Waste Water Treatment Works Capacity constraints associated with Filey, however, individually the number of dwellings associated with this development would not push the WWTW over capacity. The cumulative impact and any restrictions on total development in Filey will have to be considered separately.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>2</b>
------------------------------	--	--------------	----------

**Question 22) Impact on Strategic Highway Network**

Does the development have an adverse impact on the Strategic Road Network?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>No impact on the strategic highway network.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>2</b>
------------------------------	--	--------------	----------

**Question 23) Impact on Local Highways Network**

Is the highway network (local) able to safely and efficiently cope with this development?



<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>Access available onto Scarborough Road, whilst a secondary access could potentially be brought from Cherry Tree Drive if required. The necessity for a secondary access would be determined by the yield of development. North Yorkshire County Council Highways have confirmed, subject to overcoming any potential ransom strip issues, a suitable junction separation will be required and be demonstrated in a Transport Assessment / Statement. Due to the layout, it is also advised the developers consider an appropriate layout in accordance with the requirements of any Section 38 agreement.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>2</b>
------------------------------	--	--------------	----------

**Amenity Issues**

**Question 24) Land Use Conflicts**

Would the development of the site be compatible with adjoining land uses (now or in the future) or are there conflict / amenity issues?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>With design, development would be adequately integrated into existing dwellings and community woodland area. Playing Fields recently relocated to the north of the site but not considered to be any conflict. The proposal also includes an area of natural open space running across this part of Filey which could finally link the Country Park with Parish Wood and the Playing Fields to the west.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>2</b>
------------------------------	---	--------------	----------

**Question 25) Other Issues and Constraints**

Are there any other constraints that prevent the site from being developed?

No	No known constraints
<b>No</b>	<b>Some constraints but mitigation possible</b>
Yes	Constraints exist and mitigation unlikely.
<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<p><b>The main issue not covered under previous headings is the Filey Flood Alleviation Scheme. As a result of previous flooding events, Filey has sought to address the problem and put measures in place to reduce the likelihood of similar events. The site(s) being considered here also forms part and is adjacent to the proposed alleviation solution. Close working with the project group for this scheme has confirmed that the development of this land will not prejudice this scheme and could, in of its own right, contribute to flood alleviation measures. There is also the proposed benefit of providing the natural area of open space to the north of the town providing a link between the Country Park and the playing fields.</b></p> <p><b>Public Footpath intersects the site running past the existing building. This could create conflicts for space, however, retention or mitigation would enable the overcoming of this. The site is in an area identified in the SFRA as being a Drainage Sensitive Area.</b></p>

### **Availability and Deliverability**

#### **Question 26) Ownership**

Are there any ownership constraints?

<b>No</b>	<b>Owner has submitted site and is willing to sell</b>
Yes	Ownership constraints or little developer interest

#### **Question 27) Timescale for Development**

Is the site likely to be developed within the Local Plan period up to 2032?

<b>Within 5 years</b>	Site can be developed within first 5 years and any constraints can be overcome.
-----------------------	---

#### **Overall Assessment of Deliverability**

Any comments on estimated yield; overarching constraints, justification or mitigation; revised site boundary where necessary for instance.

Developing the full site would represent growth of Filey to the north and west. Whilst, there is scope for partial development north of Cherry Tree Drive and to the immediate west of the current limits of Filey this must be looked at in line with the proposed Filey Flood Alleviation Scheme.

The extent of the Filey Flood Alleviation Scheme land requirement has now been determined. This has resulted in the potential allocation of additional land to both the west and north compared to previous stages of Local Plan production. The housing allocation is considered acceptable subject to the appropriate implementation of the Flood Alleviation Scheme and wider public open space requirements in this part of Filey.

Indicative Yield	60 dwellings.
------------------	---------------

## Site Assessment

<b>Housing Allocations Reference:</b>	HA 23		
<b>Site Ref:</b>	03/06		
<b>Area (ha):</b>	1.62 ha		
<b>Parish:</b>	Filey		
<b>Address:</b>	Land at Church Cliff Drive, opposite Church Cliff Farm		
<b>Score:</b>	<b>Stage A:</b> Pass	<b>Stage B:</b> 1-71-3	<b>Stage C:</b> 25
<b>Concluding Comments:</b>	<p>Site offers opportunity for development within Filey that is of a scale that would not cause capacity issues. The site would be deemed a logical expansion within the existing town area and may form an extension to Wooldale Drive. Design considerations should be placed upon proximity to Listed Church Cliff Farm, and entrance to Caravan Park however, this could be overcome with a sympathetic scheme that enhances this area of Filey.</p> <p>The site was considered appropriate for allocation at the Preferred Options stage and this remains the recommendation of officers.</p>		
<b>Indicative Yield:</b>	30 dwellings.		

*Prior to Stage A, all sites that cannot accommodate 10 or more dwellings will be dismissed from the formal allocation process in the Local Plan but will be considered to determine if the development limits can be amended to allow small scale housing or have the potential to be suitable as an exceptions site in the rural area.*

### **Stage A: Conformity with Settlement Strategy and Major Constraints**

#### A(i) Conformity with the evolving Scarborough Borough settlement strategy:

Question 1a) Does the proposed site lie within or is well related to an existing settlement? YES / ~~NO~~

*If Yes, proceed to Question 1b.*

*If No, site is dismissed.*

Question 1b) Does the settlement lie within or above the Service Village classification?

YES / ~~NO~~

*If Yes, proceed to Question 2a.*

*If No, proceed to Question 1c.*

Question 1c) Are there any circumstances that would warrant an allocation of housing within the settlement? YES / NO

*If Yes, proceed to Question 2a.*

*If No, site is dismissed.*

Question 2a) Is the site of an appropriate scale/size that reflects the role of the respective settlement as defined in the settlement hierarchy within the Local Plan? YES / ~~NO~~

*If Yes, proceed to Question 3.*

*If No, proceed to Question 2b.*

Question 2b) Could a smaller portion of the site be in conformity with the settlement hierarchy? YES / NO

*If Yes, proceed to Question 3.  
If No, site is dismissed.*

**A(ii) Major Constraints (Environmental and Historic)**

Question 3a) Is the site within the prescribed distance of any national or international site of biodiversity or geological value; e.g. RAMSAR, SSSI, SAC, SPA, National Nature Reserves ? YES / NO

Question 3b) If YES would the development have a negative impact on the associated area of protection? YES/NO

EXPLAIN.... This site lies within 10km of Flamborough Head, however, it is of such a scale that would accommodate less than 50 dwellings and any impact from increased recreational pressure is therefore considered to be minor.

Question 4) Does the site lie within an area considered to be unsuitable due to its position within a flood risk zone (high risk)? YES / NO

Question 5) Does the site lie within an area considered to be at significant risk of coastal erosion zone, i.e. located within 100 year erosion zone? YES / NO

Question 6) Would the development of the site have an adverse negative impact upon nationally-important archaeology (including Scheduled Monuments) or other high-Grade historic assets or their settings? YES / NO

*If No to all questions 3 to 6, proceed to Question 8  
If Yes, proceed to Question 7*

Question 7) Where one of the above questions may have answered 'yes', does the constraint prohibit development of the entire site with no possibility of amending the site area? YES / NO / N/A

*If Yes, site is dismissed.  
If, as a result of amending site boundaries, a site can no longer yield 10 dwellings or more, it will be dismissed. Where 10 dwellings may be yielded, proceed to Question 8*

**Stage B: First Round Scoring**

**Question 8) Brownfield or Greenfield Land**

Is the site classified as previously developed land (Brownfield), Greenfield or is it a mixture of both land types?

100% Brownfield	6
Majority Brownfield	4
Majority Greenfield	2
100% Greenfield	1
<b>POINTS</b>	<b>1</b>

**Question 9a) Accessibility of site to 'pre-determined' areas by public transport**

This question, along with Question 10, relate to accessibility. With the use of accessibility software, complex transport modelling is utilised to enable the relative accessibility of potential sites to pre-determined services and facilities by sustainable modes such as public transport, walking and cycling.

Destination	Journey time to Destination by Public Transport				
	Less than 15 mins	15 to 30 mins	30 to 45 mins	45 to 60 mins	More than 1 hour
Defined town	6	4	2	1	0

centres, service centres and neighbourhood centres.					
Major employment centres.	<b>6</b>	4	2	1	0
Indoor Sports Centres / Pools	6	4	<b>2</b>	1	0
Primary Schools	<b>6</b>	4	2	1	0
Secondary Schools	<b>6</b>	4	2	1	0
GP Surgeries	<b>6</b>	4	2	1	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>32</b>				

**Question 9b) How accessible is the site to existing services and facilities?**

Destination	Walking Distances within			Cycling Distances within		
	500m	1000m	2000m	1.5km	5km	8km
Defined town centres, service centres and neighbourhood centres.	6	<b>4</b>	2	<b>3</b>	2	1
Major employment centres	6	<b>4</b>	2	<b>3</b>	2	1
Indoor Sports Centres / Pools	6	4	2	3	2	1
Primary Schools	6	<b>4</b>	2	<b>3</b>	2	1
Secondary Schools	6	4	<b>2</b>	3	<b>2</b>	1
Train Station	6	<b>4</b>	2	<b>3</b>	2	1
GP Surgeries	6	<b>4</b>	2	<b>3</b>	2	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>39</b>					

**Question 10) Accessibility of site to pre-determined areas for leisure and recreation**

Destination	Within Pre-determined range		
	350m (5 mins)	700m (10 mins)	1000m (15 mins)
Informal Open Space for Recreation	1	0	0
Outdoor Sports Pitches and Facilities	3	2	<b>1</b>
Local Children's Play Area	1	0	0
Neighbourhood Children's Play Area	<b>2</b>	1	0
Settlement Level Children's Play Area	3	2	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>		

**Comparison Scores for Q8 to 10**

Brownfield / Greenfield	Accessibility to Services	Accessibility to Recreation
1	71	3

**Stage C: Detailed Site Implications**

*At any stage of this process, where a constraint to development may be so significant, the site could require dismissing.*

### Question 11) Regional and Local Biodiversity

Would the development of the proposed site affect a regional or local site of biodiversity or geological value or affect any protected species/habitats?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>No impact on designated site.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>1</b>
------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------	----------

### Question 12) Trees and Hedgerows

Would the development of the site affect trees or hedgerows not covered by statutory protection or by the BAP?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>No significant vegetation on site although hedgerows screen site from adjacent Caravan Park. It would be likely these would be retained with development.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>1</b>
------------------------------	--	--------------	----------

### Question 13) Historic Environment

Would the proposed development affect the historic environment including the setting of an historic asset?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<p><b>Church Cliff Farm is a listed building located to the south over Church Cliff Drive. The Borough Council's Conservation Officer has considered the impact upon the heritage assets and concluded as follows;</b></p> <p><b>“Church Cliff Drive forms the approach to the Filey Country Park and is assumed will form a main entrance to the site but it should not be widened. This boundary is closest to the Heritage Assets and the most sensitive to adverse development impacts. For development here not to have an adverse effect on the Heritage Assets it needs to be one of three alternatives;</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. A predominantly open green area with the small existing trees retained, new tree planting, no private drives or car parking and single storey development well set back, served off a private drive or a road further to the north. Main frontages should face Church Cliff Drive to avoid later conservatory or other ad hoc extensions intruding into view.</b></li> <li><b>2. An enclosed courtyard or terrace of single storey development with</b></li> </ol>	<b>Score</b>	<b>1</b>
------------------------------	---	--------------	----------

	<p>tall perimeter brick walls to small private yards to reflect the 1989/90 development to south. Car parking again and vehicular access again to be sited to the north of the development.</p> <p>3. An open U or L shaped courtyard with a communal green area with trees facing south. Car parking again and vehicular access again to be sited to the north of the development. There may be potential for this to be sheltered or other managed residential accommodation.</p> <p>Subject to the above requirements, which are considered would satisfy Para 126 of the NPPF, in making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness, the site is considered suitable for development.”</p>		
--	--	--	--

**Question 14) Character of Built Area**

Would the development affect the built character of the town or village?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>Proximity to the Listed Building would guarantee high quality design at the southern end of the site but consideration should also be placed on ensuring integration with existing dwellings to the west at Wooldale Drive.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>1</b>
------------------------------	--	--------------	----------

**Question 15) Impact on the Landscape**

What is the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development with respect to the conservation and enhancement of distinctive rural and coastal landscape character areas?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<p><b>The site lies in an area designated as D4 (Lebberston and Filey) Coastal Hinterland. This area has a sense of openness and visual relationships with the coast.</b></p> <p><b>This site is raised up toward the rear although still of little real landscape value. The site is relatively hidden, is disconnected from the main landscape beyond towards the coast and is more connected to the main urban fabric of Filey. The development of this site would do little to detract from its setting within the wider landscape.</b></p>	<b>Score</b>	<b>1</b>
------------------------------	---	--------------	----------

**Question 16) Flood Risk**

Is the proposal within an area at risk of flooding?

*Note: Sites deemed at a high risk of flooding are likely to have been dismissed at Stage 1 of assessment process.*

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>Flood zone 1.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>3</b>
------------------------------	----------------------	--------------	----------

**Question 17) Agricultural land**

Would the development of the site result in the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>Grade 3</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>2</b>
------------------------------	----------------	--------------	----------

**Question 18) Water Supply and Source Protection Zones**

Would the development adversely affect a water supply?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>No impact on water supply</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>3</b>
------------------------------	----------------------------------	--------------	----------

**Question 19) Mineral Resources**

Would the development of the land impact on mineral resources?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>No impact on mineral resources</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>2</b>
------------------------------	---------------------------------------	--------------	----------

**Infrastructure**

**Question 20) School Capacity**

What is the capacity of schools to cope with the development?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>Sufficient school capacity.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>2</b>
------------------------------	------------------------------------	--------------	----------

**Question 21) Capacity of Utility Providers**

What is the capacity of existing utilities (Water, Sewage, etc) to cope with the development?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>Significant Waste Water Treatment Works Capacity constraints associated with Filey, however, individually the number of dwellings associated with this development would not push the WWTW over capacity. The cumulative impact and any restrictions on total development in Filey will have to be considered separately.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>2</b>
------------------------------	--	--------------	----------

**Question 22) Impact on Strategic Highway Network**

Does the development have an adverse impact on the Strategic Road Network?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>No impact on strategic highway network.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>2</b>
------------------------------	--	--------------	----------



### Question 23) Impact on Local Highways Network

Is the highway network (local) able to safely and efficiently cope with this development?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>NYCC Highways have confirmed that the primary access to the site should be taken from Church Cliff Drive. The site could also be accessed from Wooldale Drive, however, this should only serve a small number of properties, perhaps forming only a cul-de-sac.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>2</b>
------------------------------	--	--------------	----------

### Amenity Issues

#### Question 24) Land Use Conflicts

Would the development of the site be compatible with adjoining land uses (now or in the future) or are there conflict / amenity issues?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>Development could be integrated with existing dwellings to the west. Caravan Park adjacent to the east, however, this is screened by vegetation and could be compatible.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>2</b>
------------------------------	---	--------------	----------

#### Question 25) Other Issues and Constraints

Are there any other constraints that affect the site?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>The site is in an area identified in the SFRA as being a Drainage Sensitive Area. There are ongoing plans in relation to the Filey Flood Alleviation Scheme. It is unlikely the proposals will prevent development of this site alone, however, it may be something that requires attention at application stage in order not to jeopardise the wider Flood Alleviation Scheme.</b>
------------------------------	--

### Availability and Deliverability

#### Question 26) Ownership

Are there any ownership constraints?

<b>No</b>	<b>Owner has submitted site and is willing to sell</b>
<b>Yes</b>	<b>Ownership constraints or little developer interest</b>

#### Question 27) Timescale for Development

Is the site likely to be developed within the Local Plan period up to 2032?

<b>Within 5 years</b>	<b>Site can be developed within first 5 years and any constraints can be overcome.</b>
-----------------------	--

### **Overall Assessment of Deliverability**

Any comments on estimated yield; overarching constraints, justification or mitigation; revised site boundary where necessary for instance.

Although the south of the Borough suffers from Waste Water Treatment Works capacity constraints, it is likely development of this site would fall under the estimated threshold at which expansion of the Treatment Works would be required.
--

The site forms a logical 'rounding-off' of this aspect of Filey. Access is readily available whilst the land, although sloping up to its rear, is not particularly prominent and offers little to the character of the area. Church Cliff Farm opposite the site is a listed building thus a requirement is needed for assurances over design that integrates not only with this but also existing dwellings adjacent to the east at Wooldale Drive. This site would be the preferential option for development within Filey.

The indicative yield is at a relatively low density to replicate the existing development nearby which would be considered representative of a similar scheme appropriate here.

Indicative Yield	30 dwellings.
------------------	---------------

## Site Assessment

<b>Housing Allocations Reference:</b>	HA24		
<b>Original Site Ref:</b>	03/11		
<b>Area (ha):</b>	0.33 ha		
<b>Parish:</b>	Filey		
<b>Address:</b>	Silver Birches, Station Avenue, Filey		
<b>Score:</b>	<b>Stage A:</b> Pass	<b>Stage B:</b> 6-84-7	<b>Stage C:</b> 27
<b>Concluding Comments:</b>	<p>The site is an appropriate brownfield site for redevelopment subject to the re-provision of elderly care elsewhere in the locality.</p> <p>The site is in the form of a North Yorkshire County Council run care home and is available subject to the appropriate relocation of these services elsewhere.</p>		
<b>Indicative Yield:</b>	30 dwellings		

*Prior to Stage A, all sites that cannot accommodate 10 or more dwellings will be dismissed from the formal allocation process in the Local Plan but will be considered to determine if the development limits can be amended to allow small scale housing or have the potential to be suitable as an exceptions site in the rural area.*

### **Stage A: Conformity with Settlement Strategy and Major Constraints**

A(i) Conformity with the evolving Scarborough Borough settlement strategy:

Question 1a) Does the proposed site lie within or is well related to an existing settlement? YES / ~~NO~~

*If Yes, proceed to Question 1b.*

*If No, site is dismissed.*

Question 1b) Does the settlement lie within or above the Service Village classification?

YES / ~~NO~~

*If Yes, proceed to Question 2a.*

*If No, proceed to Question 1c.*

Question 1c) Are there any circumstances that would warrant an allocation of housing within the settlement? YES / NO

*If Yes, proceed to Question 2a.*

*If No, site is dismissed.*

Question 2a) Is the site of an appropriate scale/size that reflects the role of the respective settlement as defined in the settlement hierarchy within the Local Plan? YES / ~~NO~~

*If Yes, proceed to Question 3.*

*If No, proceed to Question 2b.*

Question 2b) Could a smaller portion of the site be in conformity with the settlement hierarchy? YES / NO

*If Yes, proceed to Question 3.*

*If No, site is dismissed.*

A(ii) Major Constraints (Environmental and Historic)

Question 3a) Is the site within the prescribed distance of any national or international site of biodiversity or geological value; e.g. RAMSAR, SSSI, SAC, SPA, National Nature Reserves ? YES / NO

Question 3b) If YES would the development have a negative impact on the associated area of protection? ~~YES~~/NO

EXPLAIN.... This site lies within 10km of Flamborough Head, however, it is of such a scale that would accommodate fewer than 50 dwellings and any impact from increased recreational pressure is therefore considered to be minor. Additionally this is a replacement for an elderly care home so the actual additional number of persons is not as great as a new greenfield site.

Question 4) Does the site lie within an area considered to be unsuitable due to its position within a flood risk zone (high risk)? ~~YES~~/ NO

Question 5) Does the site lie within an area considered to be at significant risk of coastal erosion zone, i.e. located within 100 year erosion zone? ~~YES~~ / NO

Question 6) Would the development of the site have an adverse negative impact upon nationally-important archaeology (including Scheduled Monuments) or other high-Grade historic assets or their settings? ~~YES~~ / NO

*If No to all questions 3 to 6, proceed to Question 8  
If Yes, proceed to Question 7*

Question 7) Where one of the above questions may have answered 'yes', does the constraint prohibit development of the entire site with no possibility of amending the site area? ~~YES/NO/N/A~~

**Further Assessment through Appropriate Assessment required if not dismissed on other grounds below.**

*If Yes, site is dismissed.  
If, as a result of amending site boundaries, a site can no longer yield 10 dwellings or more, it will be dismissed. Where 10 dwellings may be yielded, proceed to Question 8*

**Stage B: First Round Scoring**

**Question 8) Brownfield or Greenfield Land**

Is the site classified as previously developed land (Brownfield), Greenfield or is it a mixture of both land types?

100% Brownfield	6
Majority Brownfield	4
Majority Greenfield	2
100% Greenfield	1
<b>POINTS</b>	<b>6</b>

**Question 9a) Accessibility of site to 'pre-determined' areas by public transport**

This question, along with Question 10, relate to accessibility. With the use of accessibility software, complex transport modelling is utilised to enable the relative accessibility of potential sites to pre-determined services and facilities by sustainable modes such as public transport, walking and cycling.

Destination	Journey time to Destination by Public Transport				
	Less than 15 mins	15 to 30 mins	30 to 45 mins	45 to 60 mins	More than 1 hour
Defined town	6	4	2	1	0

centres, service centres and neighbourhood centres.					
Major employment centres	<b>6</b>	4	2	1	0
Indoor Sports Centres / Pools	6	4	<b>2</b>	1	0
Primary Schools	<b>6</b>	4	2	1	0
Secondary Schools	<b>6</b>	4	2	1	0
GP Surgeries	<b>6</b>	4	2	1	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>32</b>				

**Question 9b) How accessible is the site to existing services and facilities?**

Destination	Walking Distances within			Cycling Distances within		
	500m	1000m	2000m	1.5km	5km	8km
Defined town centres, service centres and neighbourhood centres.	<b>6</b>	4	2	<b>3</b>	2	1
Major employment centres	<b>6</b>	4	2	<b>3</b>	2	1
Indoor Sports Centres / Pools	6	4	2	3	2	1
Primary Schools	<b>6</b>	4	2	<b>3</b>	2	1
Secondary Schools	6	<b>4</b>	2	<b>3</b>	2	1
Train Station	<b>6</b>	4	2	<b>3</b>	2	1
GP Surgeries	<b>6</b>	4	2	<b>3</b>	2	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>52</b>					

**Question 10) Accessibility of site to pre-determined areas for leisure and recreation**

Destination	Within Pre-determined range		
	350m (5 mins)	700m (10 mins)	1000m (15 mins)
Informal Open Space for Recreation	<b>1</b>	0	0
Outdoor Sports Pitches and Facilities	<b>3</b>	2	1
Local Children's Play Area	<b>1</b>	0	0
Neighbourhood Children's Play Area	<b>2</b>	1	0
Settlement Level Children's Play Area	3	2	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>		

**Comparison Scores for Q8 to 10**

Brownfield / Greenfield	Accessibility to Services	Accessibility to Recreation
6	84	7

### **Stage C: Detailed Site Implications**

*At any stage of this process, where a constraint to development may be so significant, the site could require dismissing.*

#### **Question 11) Regional and Local Biodiversity**

Would the development of the proposed site affect a regional or local site of biodiversity or geological value or affect any protected species/habitats?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>The site has no known impact. It is generally urban in form with no distinguishing biodiversity features.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>1</b>
------------------------------	--	--------------	----------

#### **Question 12) Trees and Hedgerows**

Would the development of the site affect trees or hedgerows not covered by statutory protection or by the BAP?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>Site has some scrubby trees bordering part of the site. Could be retained if required.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>1</b>
------------------------------	---	--------------	----------

#### **Question 13) Historic Environment**

Would the proposed development affect the historic environment including the setting of an historic asset?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>Railway Station is listed on the opposite side of the road, however, it is some distance away and redevelopment of this site would not adversely impact station. The current building is of poor design and a replacement may improve setting.</b> <b>The Council's Conservation Officer has commented "This site lies close to the Grade II listed Filey Railway Station and lies within its immediate setting. It could be argued that the Station's curtilage originally included the level crossing and former signalmans crossing house to the south of the site."</b> <b>It is considered that appropriate design could satisfactorily address any issues.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>1</b>
------------------------------	---	--------------	----------

#### **Question 14) Character of Built Area**

Would the development affect the built character of the town or village?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>The surrounding area has no obvious special characteristics and redevelopment would have no adverse impact.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>1</b>
------------------------------	--	--------------	----------

#### **Question 15) Impact on the Landscape**

What is the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development with respect to the conservation and enhancement of distinctive rural and coastal landscape character areas?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>No impact as is entirely within the urban area.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>3</b>
------------------------------	--	--------------	----------

**Question 16) Flood Risk**

Is the proposal within an area at risk of flooding?

*Note: Sites deemed at a high risk of flooding are likely to have been dismissed at Stage 1 of assessment process.*

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>Zone 1.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>3</b>
------------------------------	----------------	--------------	----------

**Question 17) Agricultural land**

Would the development of the site result in the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>Urban area</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>2</b>
------------------------------	-------------------	--------------	----------

**Question 18) Water Supply and Source Protection Zones**

Would the development adversely affect a water supply?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>No impact on water supply.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>3</b>
------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------	----------

**Question 19) Mineral Resources**

Would the development of the land impact on mineral resources?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>No impact on mineral resources.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>2</b>
------------------------------	--	--------------	----------

**Infrastructure**

**Question 20) School Capacity**

What is the capacity of schools to cope with the development?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>Sufficient school capacity.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>2</b>
------------------------------	------------------------------------	--------------	----------

**Question 21) Capacity of Utility Providers**

What is the capacity of existing utilities (Water, Sewage, etc) to cope with the development?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>Significant Waste Water Treatment Works capacity constraints associated with Filey. However, this is an existing site with existing water demands. Its replacement with</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>2</b>
------------------------------	--	--------------	----------

	<b>residential development will have a similar requirement and as such is not considered to impact on capacity in this instance.</b>		
--	--	--	--

**Question 22) Impact on Strategic Highway Network**

Does the development have an adverse impact on the Strategic Road Network?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>No impact upon strategic highway network.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>2</b>
------------------------------	--	--------------	----------

**Question 23) Impact on Local Highways Network**

Is the highway network (local) able to safely and efficiently cope with this development?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>North Yorkshire County Council Highways have confirmed suitable access exists to serve this site.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>2</b>
------------------------------	--	--------------	----------

**Amenity Issues**

**Question 24) Land Use Conflicts**

Would the development of the site be compatible with adjoining land uses (now or in the future) or are there conflict / amenity issues?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>The site lies adjacent to the railway line and any development would have to ensure no adverse impact on the ability to access or maintain the line. As the current building appears to cause no issue there is no reason why a redevelopment should cause in problems.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>2</b>
------------------------------	--	--------------	----------

**Question 25) Other Issues and Constraints**

Are there any other constraints that prevent the site from being developed?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>The site can only be developed subject to the successful relocation of the provision of extra-care. The site will not be available without appropriate re-provision of suitable accommodation for existing residents.</b>
------------------------------	--

**Availability and Deliverability**

**Question 26) Ownership**

Are there any ownership constraints?

<b>No</b>	Owner has submitted site and is willing to sell
<b>Yes</b>	Ownership constraints or little developer interest

**Question 27) Timescale for Development**

Is the site likely to be developed within the Local Plan period up to 2032?



<b>Within 5 years</b>	Subject to the successful provision of extra-care accommodation this should come forward in the first 5 years.
-----------------------	--

**Overall Assessment of Deliverability**

Any comments on estimated yield; overarching constraints, justification or mitigation; revised site boundary where necessary for instance.

Large scale development within Filey is restricted by the limited Waste Water Treatment Works capacity in the southern end of the Borough. This site is of a relatively small scale and is actually a replacement for an existing elderly home. As such, it is not considered to have an impact on the WWTW in terms of capacity.

The site is similar to a recently developed site adjacent and poses no issues or constraints other than the need to replace the existing use elsewhere in the locality (extra care). Subject to this, the site is considered an appropriate brownfield redevelopment opportunity.

Indicative Yield	30 dwellings.
------------------	---------------

## Site Assessment

<b>Housing Allocations Reference:</b>	Not Applicable (Dismissed Site)		
<b>Original Site Ref:</b>	03/03 a & b		
<b>Area (ha):</b>	(a) 5.96 ha (b) 1.21 ha		
<b>Parish:</b>	Filey		
<b>Address:</b>	(a) Land between The Dams and the Railway line (b) Land between Scarborough Road and the Railway line		
<b>Score:</b>	<b>Stage A:</b> Pass	<b>Stage B:</b> 1-65-6	<b>Stage C:</b> 18
<b>Concluding Comments:</b>	<p>This site is located off Scarborough Road at the north-west entrance into Filey. There are constraining issues regarding proximity to 'The Dams' Nature Reserve and the prominence of the location would deem this site less favourable than alternative options within Filey. Waste Water Treatment Works capacity constraints associated with the southern portion of the Borough would prevent the full scale development of this site.</p> <p>The site was recommended for dismissal at the Preferred Options stage and it is considered these reasons remain valid.</p>		
<b>Indicative Yield:</b>	N/A		

*Prior to Stage A, all sites that cannot accommodate 10 or more dwellings will be dismissed from the formal allocation process in the Local Plan but will be considered to determine if the development limits can be amended to allow small scale housing or have the potential to be suitable as an exceptions site in the rural area.*

### **Stage A: Conformity with Settlement Strategy and Major Constraints**

#### A(i) Conformity with the evolving Scarborough Borough settlement strategy:

Question 1a) Does the proposed site lie within or is well related to an existing settlement? YES / ~~NO~~

*If Yes, proceed to Question 1b.*

*If No, site is dismissed.*

Question 1b) Does the settlement lie within or above the Service Village classification?  
YES / ~~NO~~

*If Yes, proceed to Question 2a.*

*If No, proceed to Question 1c.*

Question 1c) Are there any circumstances that would warrant an allocation of housing within the settlement? YES / NO

*If Yes, proceed to Question 2a.*

*If No, site is dismissed.*

Question 2a) Is the site of an appropriate scale/size that reflects the role of the respective settlement as defined in the settlement hierarchy within the Local Plan? YES / ~~NO~~

*If Yes, proceed to Question 3.*

*If No, proceed to Question 2b.*

Question 2b) Could a smaller portion of the site be in conformity with the settlement hierarchy? YES / NO

*If Yes, proceed to Question 3.  
If No, site is dismissed.*

**A(ii) Major Constraints (Environmental and Historic)**

Question 3a) Is the site within the prescribed distance of any national or international site of biodiversity or geological value; e.g. RAMSAR, SSSI, SAC, SPA, National Nature Reserves ? YES / NO

Question 3b) If YES would the development have a negative impact on the associated area of protection? ~~YES~~/NO

EXPLAIN.... This site lies within 10km of Flamborough Head and has the potential to impact, from a recreational focus, the protected site. The actual impact will be assessed through the Appropriate Assessment under the EU Habitats Directive if the site is selected as a potential allocation.

Question 4) Does the site lie within an area considered to be unsuitable due to its position within a flood risk zone (high risk)? ~~YES~~/ NO

Question 5) Does the site lie within an area considered to be at significant risk of coastal erosion zone, i.e. located within 100 year erosion zone? ~~YES~~ / NO

Question 6) Would the development of the site have an adverse negative impact upon nationally-important archaeology (including Scheduled Monuments) or other high-Grade historic assets or their settings? ~~YES~~ / NO

*If No to all questions 3 to 6, proceed to Question 8  
If Yes, proceed to Question 7*

Question 7) Where one of the above questions may have answered 'yes', does the constraint prohibit development of the entire site with no possibility of amending the site area? ~~YES~~ / NO / N/A

**Further Assessment through Appropriate Assessment required if not dismissed on other grounds below.**

*If Yes, site is dismissed.  
If, as a result of amending site boundaries, a site can no longer yield 10 dwellings or more, it will be dismissed. Where 10 dwellings may be yielded, proceed to Question 8*

**Stage B: First Round Scoring**

**Question 8) Brownfield or Greenfield Land**

Is the site classified as previously developed land (Brownfield), Greenfield or is it a mixture of both land types?

100% Brownfield	6
Majority Brownfield	4
Majority Greenfield	2
100% Greenfield	1
<b>POINTS</b>	<b>1</b>

**Question 9a) Accessibility of site to 'pre-determined' areas by public transport**

This question, along with Question 10, relate to accessibility. With the use of accessibility software, complex transport modelling is utilised to enable the relative accessibility of potential sites to pre-determined services and facilities by sustainable modes such as public transport, walking and cycling.

Destination	Journey time to Destination by Public Transport
-------------	---

	Less than 15 mins	15 to 30 mins	30 to 45 mins	45 to 60 mins	More than 1 hour
Defined town centres, service centres and neighbourhood centres.	6	4	2	1	0
Major employment centres	6	4	2	1	0
Indoor Sports Centres / Pools	6	4	2	1	0
Primary Schools	6	4	2	1	0
Secondary Schools	6	4	2	1	0
GP Surgeries	6	4	2	1	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>32</b>				

**Question 9b) How accessible is the site to existing services and facilities?**

Destination	Walking Distances within			Cycling Distances within		
	500m	1000m	2000m	1.5km	5km	8km
Defined town centres, service centres and neighbourhood centres.	6	4	2	3	2	1
Major employment centres	6	4	2	3	2	1
Indoor Sports Centres / Pools	6	4	2	3	2	1
Primary Schools	6	4	2	3	2	1
Secondary Schools	6	4	2	3	2	1
Train Station	6	4	2	3	2	1
GP Surgeries	6	4	2	3	2	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>33</b>					

**Question 10) Accessibility of site to pre-determined areas for leisure and recreation**

Destination	Within Pre-determined range		
	350m (5 mins)	700m (10 mins)	1000m (15 mins)
Informal Open Space for Recreation	1	0	0
Outdoor Sports Pitches and Facilities	3	2	1
Local Children's Play Area	1	0	0
Neighbourhood Children's Play Area	2	1	0
Settlement Level Children's Play Area	3	2	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>		

**Comparison Scores for Q8 to 10**

Brownfield / Greenfield	Accessibility to Services	Accessibility to Recreation
1	65	6

### **Stage C: Detailed Site Implications**

*At any stage of this process, where a constraint to development may be so significant, the site could require dismissing.*

#### **Question 11) Regional and Local Biodiversity**

Would the development of the proposed site affect a regional or local site of biodiversity or geological value or affect any protected species/habitats?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>At its southern end, the site is in close proximity to The Dams Nature Reserve. This is a valuable wetland habitat that is extensively enjoyed by the community. Any development at this part of the site would likely have some impact which, although would be lessened with mitigation, could still be adverse to the habitat.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>-2</b>
------------------------------	--	--------------	-----------

#### **Question 12) Trees and Hedgerows**

Would the development of the site affect trees or hedgerows not covered by statutory protection or by the BAP?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>Site bordered by hedgerows with no significant tree growth on site. Hedgerows would be integrated into design and maintained as screening from The Dams.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>1</b>
------------------------------	---	--------------	----------

#### **Question 13) Historic Environment**

Would the proposed development affect the historic environment including the setting of an historic asset?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>No site of historic importance in this proximity.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>1</b>
------------------------------	--	--------------	----------

#### **Question 14) Character of Built Area**

Would the development affect the built character of the town or village?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>Proximity has little significant intrinsic character.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>1</b>
------------------------------	--	--------------	----------

#### **Question 15) Impact on the Landscape**

What is the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development with respect to the conservation and enhancement of distinctive rural and coastal landscape character areas?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>The site lies in an area designated as D4 (Lebberston and Filey) Coastal Hinterland. This area has a sense of openness and visual relationships with the coast.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>1</b>
------------------------------	--	--------------	----------

	In respect of this site it is well connected to the urban form of Filey (the Pastures Development) and although visible from the entrance to Filey, it is relatively low-lying. Developing beyond existing settlement limit would alter the nature of this wider landscape setting but is not considered to be as prominent or detrimental as on the more coastal slopes on the opposite side of Scarborough Road more characteristic of this landscape designation area.		
--	---	--	--

**Question 16) Flood Risk**

Is the proposal within an area at risk of flooding?

*Note: Sites deemed at a high risk of flooding are likely to have been dismissed at Stage 1 of assessment process.*

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>Zone 1 although this will be monitored. Drainage also to be determined.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>3</b>
------------------------------	--	--------------	----------

**Question 17) Agricultural land**

Would the development of the site result in the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>Grade 3</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>2</b>
------------------------------	----------------	--------------	----------

**Question 18) Water Supply and Source Protection Zones**

Would the development adversely affect a water supply?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>No impact on water supply.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>3</b>
------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------	----------

**Question 19) Mineral Resources**

Would the development of the land impact on mineral resources?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>No impact on mineral resources.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>2</b>
------------------------------	--	--------------	----------

**Infrastructure**

**Question 20) School Capacity**

What is the capacity of schools to cope with the development?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>Sufficient school capacity.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>2</b>
------------------------------	------------------------------------	--------------	----------

**Question 21) Capacity of Utility Providers**

What is the capacity of existing utilities (Water, Sewage, etc) to cope with the development?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>Significant Waste Water Treatment Works capacity constraints associated with Filey. This site is of a scale that would take the WWTW over capacity. This could only be resolved by expanding the treatment works (not planned for) or by a developer contribution. The financial implications of this would likely render the site unviable.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>-2</b>
------------------------------	---	--------------	-----------

#### **Question 22) Impact on Strategic Highway Network**

Does the development have an adverse impact on the Strategic Road Network?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>No impact upon strategic highway network.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>2</b>
------------------------------	--	--------------	----------

#### **Question 23) Impact on Local Highways Network**

Is the highway network (local) able to safely and efficiently cope with this development?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>Access available onto Scarborough Road at northern end of site. To south, site would be accessed through existing dwellings at Pasture Crescent, although this may cause issues on such a scale.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>2</b>
------------------------------	---	--------------	----------

### **Amenity Issues**

#### **Question 24) Land Use Conflicts**

Would the development of the site be compatible with adjoining land uses (now or in the future) or are there conflict / amenity issues?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>Proximity to 'The Dams' Nature Reserve could cause significant conflict to the south, a significant buffer and design consideration may assist in integration and mitigation. Northern site adjoins children's playground, however, this is of a poor standard and requires investment. Integration with existing dwellings unlikely to be a preventing feature.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>2</b>
------------------------------	---	--------------	----------

#### **Question 25) Other Issues and Constraints**

Are there any other constraints that prevent the site from being developed?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>Site intersected by railway line. This may affect developable land with requirement for a buffer for instance. The site could also be considered as two separate entities. The site is in an area identified in the SFRA as being a Drainage Sensitive Area.</b>		
------------------------------	---	--	--

### **Availability and Deliverability**

#### **Question 26) Ownership**

Are there any ownership constraints?

<b>No</b>	Owner has submitted site and is willing to sell
<b>Yes</b>	Ownership constraints or little developer interest

**Question 27) Timescale for Development**

Is the site likely to be developed within the Local Plan period up to 2032?

<b>Not likely to be developed prior to 2032</b>	Constraints exist and mitigation unlikely before 2032. Not allocated but re-considered at a future date.
---	--

**Overall Assessment of Deliverability**

Any comments on estimated yield; overarching constraints, justification or mitigation; revised site boundary where necessary for instance.

Development within Filey is restricted by the limited Waste Water Treatment Works capacity in the southern end of the Borough. This site is of a scale that would take the WWTW over capacity unless there was significant investment, thus affecting the viability of the scheme.

This issue along with the proximity to The Dams nature reserve and the prominence of this site result in this site being less favourable than other options in Filey. An option to develop either side of the railway line could be pursued, however, this would only lessen those issues not eliminate them and would also give an uneven sense of location to the town beyond a more logical expansion and ‘rounding-off’ of the settlement.

Development of the scale of 200 dwellings would also likely be over and beyond the requirement of Filey, particularly with already identified capacity constraints.

Indicative Yield	200 dwellings.
------------------	----------------



## Site Assessment

<b>Housing Allocations Reference:</b>	Not Applicable (Dismissed Site)		
<b>Original Site Ref:</b>	03/05		
<b>Area (ha):</b>	5.91 ha		
<b>Parish:</b>	Filey		
<b>Address:</b>	Land at Mill Farm, Muston Road		
<b>Score:</b>	<b>Stage A:</b> Pass	<b>Stage B:</b> 1-64-2	<b>Stage C:</b> 16
<b>Concluding Comments:</b>	<p>Site in increasingly prominent location at southern entrance to Filey. Although site is unrelated to existing settlement at present, the land between this site and the existing built form is the current allocation at Muston Road. This site, however, would appear much more prominent than the existing allocation as the land raises considerably to the west and would not be set against a backdrop of existing housing allowing vistas to the south, west and central Filey to the east. The impact is of such concern, that when added to the major waste water issues, the site is considered inappropriate and dismissed.</p> <p>The view that the site was considered inappropriate at the Preferred Options stage remains the case as the issues identified have not been overcome. The site remains dismissed.</p>		
<b>Indicative Yield:</b>	N/A		

*Prior to Stage A, all sites that cannot accommodate 10 or more dwellings will be dismissed from the formal allocation process in the Local Plan but will be considered to determine if the development limits can be amended to allow small scale housing or have the potential to be suitable as an exceptions site in the rural area.*

### **Stage A: Conformity with Settlement Strategy and Major Constraints**

A(i) Conformity with the evolving Scarborough Borough settlement strategy:

Question 1a) Does the proposed site lie within or is well related to an existing settlement? YES / ~~NO~~

*If Yes, proceed to Question 1b.*

*If No, site is dismissed.*

Question 1b) Does the settlement lie within or above the Service Village classification?

YES / ~~NO~~

*If Yes, proceed to Question 2a.*

*If No, proceed to Question 1c.*

Question 1c) Are there any circumstances that would warrant an allocation of housing within the settlement? YES / NO

*If Yes, proceed to Question 2a.*

*If No, site is dismissed.*

Question 2a) Is the site of an appropriate scale/size that reflects the role of the respective settlement as defined in the settlement hierarchy within the Local Plan? YES / ~~NO~~

*If Yes, proceed to Question 3.*

*If No, proceed to Question 2b.*

Question 2b) Could a smaller portion of the site be in conformity with the settlement hierarchy? YES / NO

*If Yes, proceed to Question 3.  
If No, site is dismissed.*

A(ii) Major Constraints (Environmental and Historic)

Question 3a) Is the site within the prescribed distance of any national or international site of biodiversity or geological value; e.g. RAMSAR, SSSI, SAC, SPA, National Nature Reserves ? YES / NO

Question 3b) If YES would the development have a negative impact on the associated area of protection? ~~YES~~/NO

EXPLAIN.... This site lies within 10km of Flamborough Head and has the potential to impact, from a recreational focus, the protected site. The actual impact will be assessed through the Appropriate Assessment under the EU Habitats Directive if the site is selected as a potential allocation.

Question 4) Does the site lie within an area considered to be unsuitable due to its position within a flood risk zone (high risk)? ~~YES~~ / NO

Question 5) Does the site lie within an area considered to be at significant risk of coastal erosion zone, i.e. located within 100 year erosion zone? ~~YES~~ / NO

Question 6) Would the development of the site have an adverse negative impact upon nationally-important archaeology (including Scheduled Monuments) or other high-Grade historic assets or their settings? ~~YES~~ / NO

*If No to all questions 3 to 6, proceed to Question 8  
If Yes, proceed to Question 7*

Question 7) Where one of the above questions may have answered 'yes', does the constraint prohibit development of the entire site with no possibility of amending the site area? ~~YES / NO / N/A~~

**Further Assessment through Appropriate Assessment required if not dismissed on other grounds below.**

*If Yes, site is dismissed.  
If, as a result of amending site boundaries, a site can no longer yield 10 dwellings or more, it will be dismissed. Where 10 dwellings may be yielded, proceed to Question 8*

**Stage B: First Round Scoring**

**Question 8) Brownfield or Greenfield Land**

Is the site classified as previously developed land (Brownfield), Greenfield or is it a mixture of both land types?

100% Brownfield	6
Majority Brownfield	4
Majority Greenfield	2
100% Greenfield	1
<b>POINTS</b>	<b>1</b>

**Question 9a) Accessibility of site to 'pre-determined' areas by public transport**

This question, along with Question 10, relate to accessibility. With the use of accessibility software, complex transport modelling is utilised to enable the relative accessibility of potential sites to pre-determined services and facilities by sustainable modes such as public transport, walking and cycling.

Destination	Journey time to Destination by Public Transport				
	Less than 15 mins	15 to 30 mins	30 to 45 mins	45 to 60 mins	More than 1 hour
Defined town centres, service centres and neighbourhood centres.	<b>6</b>	4	2	1	0
Major employment centres	<b>6</b>	4	2	1	0
Indoor Sports Centres / Pools	6	4	<b>2</b>	1	0
Primary Schools	<b>6</b>	4	2	1	0
Secondary Schools	<b>6</b>	4	2	1	0
GP Surgeries	<b>6</b>	4	2	1	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>32</b>				

**Question 9b) How accessible is the site to existing services and facilities?**

Destination	Walking Distances within			Cycling Distances within		
	500m	1000m	2000m	1.5km	5km	8km
Defined town centres, service centres and neighbourhood centres.	6	4	<b>2</b>	3	<b>2</b>	1
Major employment centres	6	4	<b>2</b>	3	<b>2</b>	1
Indoor Sports Centres / Pools	6	4	2	3	2	1
Primary Schools	6	4	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	2	1
Secondary Schools	<b>6</b>	4	2	<b>3</b>	2	1
Train Station	6	4	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	2	1
GP Surgeries	6	4	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	2	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>32</b>					

**Question 10) Accessibility of site to pre-determined areas for leisure and recreation**

Destination	Within Pre-determined range		
	350m (5 mins)	700m (10 mins)	1000m (15 mins)
Informal Open Space for Recreation	1	0	0
Outdoor Sports Pitches and Facilities	3	<b>2</b>	1
Local Children's Play Area	1	0	0
Neighbourhood Children's Play Area	2	1	0
Settlement Level Children's Play Area	3	2	1

Total	2
-------	---

**Comparison Scores for Q8 to 10**

Brownfield / Greenfield	Accessibility to Services	Accessibility to Recreation
1	64	2

**Stage C: Detailed Site Implications**

*At any stage of this process, where a constraint to development may be so significant, the site could require dismissing.*

**Question 11) Regional and Local Biodiversity**

Would the development of the proposed site affect a regional or local site of biodiversity or geological value or affect any protected species/habitats?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>No impact on designated site.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>1</b>
------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------	----------

**Question 12) Trees and Hedgerows**

Would the development of the site affect trees or hedgerows not covered by statutory protection or by the BAP?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>Hedgerows border site although these could be maintained with design.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>1</b>
------------------------------	--	--------------	----------

**Question 13) Historic Environment**

Would the proposed development affect the historic environment including the setting of an historic asset?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>No impact on historic environment.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>1</b>
------------------------------	---	--------------	----------

**Question 14) Character of Built Area**

Would the development affect the built character of the town or village?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>No direct impact although site located at major entrance to the town from the south. This site is certainly more prominent than existing Muston Road allocation and may reflect development out of balance with the remainder of the town although design may address some of these issues.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>-1</b>
------------------------------	--	--------------	-----------

**Question 15) Impact on the Landscape**

What is the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development with respect to the conservation and enhancement of distinctive rural and coastal landscape character areas?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>The site lies in an area designated as D4 (Lebberston and Filey) Coastal Hinterland.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>-3</b>
------------------------------	---	--------------	-----------

	<p><b>This area has a sense of openness and visual relationships with the coast.</b></p> <p><b>Much of the site is raised (20-30 ft) toward a crest at the existing Farmhouse. The land is most prominent here from Bempton Cliffs and Speeton to the south; Hunmanby and the Wolds to the south-west and the centre of Filey to the east. This would not be set against a backdrop of housing either as existing Muston Road allocation is in a dip and well screened from the west.</b></p> <p><b>It is considered that the proposed development should be dismissed solely on landscape impact and the impact it would have on the openness and coastal nature of the landscape.</b></p>		
--	---	--	--

**Question 16) Flood Risk**

Is the proposal within an area at risk of flooding?

*Note: Sites deemed at a high risk of flooding are likely to have been dismissed at Stage 1 of assessment process.*

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>Zone 1.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>3</b>
------------------------------	----------------	--------------	----------

**Question 17) Agricultural land**

Would the development of the site result in the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>Grade 3</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>2</b>
------------------------------	----------------	--------------	----------

**Question 18) Water Supply and Source Protection Zones**

Would the development adversely affect a water supply?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>No impact on water supply.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>3</b>
------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------	----------

**Question 19) Mineral Resources**

Would the development of the land impact on mineral resources?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>No impact on mineral resources.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>3</b>
------------------------------	--	--------------	----------

**Infrastructure**

**Question 20) School Capacity**

What is the capacity of schools to cope with the development?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>Anticipated insufficient primary school capacity although County Council Education suggests any such issue could be overcome with commuted sum or Community Infrastructure Levy. Sufficient secondary school capacity.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>2</b>
------------------------------	---	--------------	----------

**Question 21) Capacity of Utility Providers**

What is the capacity of existing utilities (Water, Sewage, etc) to cope with the development?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>Limited Waste Water Treatment Works capacity to the south of the Borough. This scale of development would put additional pressure on the WWTW and any development would have to happen either after any planned upgrades (none planned) or by paying for upgrades from the development profits, thus affecting the viability of the scheme.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>-2</b>
------------------------------	--	--------------	-----------

**Question 22) Impact on Strategic Highway Network**

Does the development have an adverse impact on the Strategic Road Network?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>No impact on strategic highway network.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>2</b>
------------------------------	--	--------------	----------

**Question 23) Impact on Local Highways Network**

Is the highway network (local) able to safely and efficiently cope with this development?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>Would be likely access would come through existing allocation at Muston Road which little impact on local highways network.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>2</b>
------------------------------	--	--------------	----------

**Amenity Issues**

**Question 24) Land Use Conflicts**

Would the development of the site be compatible with adjoining land uses (now or in the future) or are there conflict / amenity issues?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>Development would likely be compatible with current allocation at Muston Road. Caravan Park in close proximity, however, this would present no significant constraints.</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>2</b>
------------------------------	--	--------------	----------

**Question 25) Other Issues and Constraints**

Are there any other constraints that prevent the site from being developed?

<b>Assessment / Comments</b>	<b>The site is in an area identified by the SFRA as being a Drainage Sensitive area.</b>
------------------------------	--

**Availability and Deliverability**

**Question 26) Ownership**

Are there any ownership constraints?

<b>No</b>	<b>Owner has submitted site and is willing to sell</b>
Yes	Ownership constraints or little developer interest

**Question 27) Timescale for Development**

Is the site likely to be developed within the Local Plan period up to 2032?

<b>Not likely to be developed prior to 2032.</b>	Constraints exist and mitigation unlikely before 2032. Not allocated but re-considered at a future date.
--	--

**Overall Assessment of Deliverability**

Any comments on estimated yield; overarching constraints, justification or mitigation; revised site boundary where necessary for instance.

<p>This site is located at the major entrance into the town from the south and is widely prominent, particularly from its highest point, to the south towards Bempton Cliffs and Speeton, the south-west towards Hunmanby and the Wolds and the east towards the centre of Filey. This is exacerbated as development would not be set against a backdrop of housing as the existing allocation at Muston Road is in a dip in the landscape and is well screened from such viewpoints. Developing this site could significantly alter the balance of the town beyond its existing setting.</p> <p>There are major issues relating to treatment capacity and this development would be unlikely to be connected to WWTW as it would take it over capacity, or, the developer would have to pay for the upgrade which would seriously affect viability.</p> <p>The site is dismissed.</p>	
Indicative Yield	165 dwellings.

## Site Assessment

<b>Housing Allocations Reference:</b>	Not Applicable (Dismissed Site)		
<b>Site Ref:</b>	03/09		
<b>Area (ha):</b>	0.61 ha		
<b>Parish:</b>	Filey		
<b>Address:</b>	Crescent Grange Farm, Royal Oak		
<b>Score:</b>	<b>Stage A:</b> Fail	<b>Stage B:</b>	<b>Stage C:</b>
<b>Concluding Comments:</b>	<p>The site lies to the rear of the small cluster of dwellings known as Royal Oak. This small hamlet is not recognised within the settlement listing within the Local Plan. It is simply a sporadic cluster of dwellings and any further expansion would be contrary to the first part of the methodology that requires development to be well related to the evolving settlement strategy.</p> <p>The site was considered inappropriate for allocation at Preferred Options stage and it is considered none of the reasons for dismissal at the time have been overcome.</p>		
<b>Indicative Yield:</b>	Not Applicable		

*Prior to Stage A, all sites that cannot accommodate 10 or more dwellings will be dismissed from the formal allocation process in the Local Plan but will be considered to determine if the development limits can be amended to allow small scale housing or be suitable for an exceptions site.*

### **Stage A: Conformity with Settlement Strategy and Major Constraints**

A(i) Conformity with the evolving Scarborough Borough settlement strategy:

Question 1a) Does the proposed site lie within or is well related to an existing settlement? ~~YES~~ / NO

*If Yes, proceed to Question 1b.*

*If No, site is dismissed.*