

RYEDALE
DISTRICT
COUNCIL



The Ryedale Plan

Infrastructure Delivery Plan **January 2012**

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Flood Defences and Utilities	5
3	Communication	12
4	Transport	14
5	Open space, recreational space and burial space	25
6	Health and Education	31
7	Local Projects	34
8	Securing Infrastructure Improvements	35
9	Delivery of infrastructure	37
10	Documents References and Links	40
11	Annex 1 – Critical Infrastructure	
12	Annex 2 – Stage 1 Necessary Infrastructure	
13	Annex 3 – Stage 2 Necessary Infrastructure	

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This Infrastructure Development Plan (IDP) accompanies the Publication Local Plan Strategy and its purpose is to set out what the infrastructure requirements are for the development envisaged in the Publication Local Plan Strategy (formerly known as Core Strategy). This includes the following infrastructure considerations:
- How much will it cost?
 - Who will fund it?
 - Who will deliver it?
 - When will it be delivered?
- 1.2 Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Spatial Planning requires that Core Strategies should be supported by evidence of what physical, social and green infrastructure is required to enable the development proposed in a development plan to take place. Similarly the Draft National Planning Policy Framework requires that a collaborative approach is taken with infrastructure providers and neighbouring local authorities to assess the 'quality and capacity' of appropriate current infrastructure and its ability to meet forecast demands. This includes transport, water, energy, telecommunications, utilities, health and social care, waste and flood defence infrastructure. This should lead to strategic policies which make provision for the various infrastructure requirements identified.
- 1.3 Ultimately the IDP must clearly demonstrate that the infrastructure requirements arising from the scale and distribution of development set out in the Publication Draft Core Strategy can be accommodated.
- 1.4 There are numerous partners involved in the delivery of infrastructure and the Council is only involved directly in a relatively small number of infrastructure schemes. Therefore the IDP brings together the investment plans and programmes from relevant infrastructure providers to evidence that the relevant infrastructure necessary to support the planned growth will be in place at the point envisaged. Whilst this IDP is prepared by the Council, it draws from a wide range of capital and investment programmes, and will be updated on a regular basis in liaison with infrastructure providers.
- 1.5 This document sets out the details what the infrastructure needs of the District are and how this has been arrived at.

What is infrastructure?

- 1.6 Infrastructure in this context is the supporting services and physical networks which enable development to take place and function properly. It is essential to achieving sustainable development.
- 1.7 PPS12: Local Spatial Planning states that good infrastructure planning considers the infrastructure required to support development, costs, sources of funding, timescales for delivery and gaps in funding. The infrastructure planning process should identify, as far as possible:

- infrastructure needs and costs;
- phasing of development;
- funding sources; and
- responsibilities for delivery

Where has the information come from?

1.8 Substantial and ongoing consultation has taken place with infrastructure providers. The identified infrastructure requirements have been developed in consultation with the relevant bodies who either directly deliver or are involved in funding new infrastructure provision. Consultation has involved:

- Stakeholder responses to consultation on the Core Strategy / Local Plan Strategy
- Individual meetings with infrastructure providers/funders to ascertain capacity of existing infrastructure and need for additional infrastructure.
- Ongoing correspondence

1.9 The detailed information resulting from these discussions is set out in Sections 2 to 7.

What are the key infrastructure requirements to support the approach of the Local Plan Strategy?

1.10 The Council has identified the various types of infrastructure based on the chosen strategy. These have been grouped into the following key areas:

- Flood Defences and Utilities
- Communication
- Transport
- Leisure, Open Space, Recreation and Burial Space
- Health and Education
- Community Facilities and Local Projects

1.12 These categories have formed the basis of the structure of this document with a chapter devoted to each type.

1.13 Additionally a summary of these infrastructure types has been set out in Table 3 of Policy SP10 – Physical Infrastructure of the Publication Draft Local Plan Strategy. This is on the basis of the detail set out in this IDP. Policy SP21 – Developer Contributions of the Publication Draft Local Plan Strategy sets out the broad areas for which developer contributions will be sought. These are principally centred around infrastructure provision and are:

- Affordable housing and/ or specialist housing to meet specific needs
- Transport Infrastructure improvements including public and community transport schemes and revenue support; Transport infrastructure schemes; car parking; cycling and pedestrian improvements; travel plans and behavioural change measures
- Education provision and facilities
- Health Care provision

- Emergency services
- Renewable Energy and Community energy schemes and ‘allowable solutions’
- Community buildings, open space, leisure and play facilities, allotments and burial facilities
- Drainage and flood prevention measures
- Water and Sewerage utilities
- Environmental/ public realm improvements
- Green Infrastructure networks
- Biodiversity and habitat compensation measures

1.12 In most cases the infrastructure identified relates to specific areas of Ryedale, however in the case of highways in particular, more strategic improvements could feasibly be secured outside of the District but which directly benefit Ryedale such as A64 corridor enhancements. This is covered further in Section 4.

How do you group the need and timing of infrastructure?

1.13 Within these groups it is important to establish the need and timing of the infrastructure. This is a balance between how critical the improvement is and when it is required. Table 1 in Section x details the different categories chosen to distinguish between different types of infrastructure. These categories have been applied to the various themes of infrastructure and are set out in Annexes 1-3. This information helps to guide the phasing of any improvements to support the strategy set out in The Ryedale Plan.

How do you ensure whether the infrastructure proposed is deliverable?

1.14 This purpose of the IDP demonstrates that the approach being taken forward in the Publication Draft Local Plan Strategy is deliverable and has been guided by the likely infrastructure requirements. In addition to the categories of required infrastructure set out in Table 1 of Section 8, Table 2 also assigns the level of risk attached to that infrastructure coming forward. This information has also assisted in categorising the infrastructure types. The Strategy relies on a limited amount of critical infrastructure. All the critical infrastructure has a low risk of not coming forward.

Will the IDP be updated?

1.15 The IDP is a living document as information relating to infrastructure provision changes on a regular basis. This is necessary to support not only work on the Local Plan Strategy but also the Local Plan Sites and Helmsley documents. Section 8 details how delivery of the infrastructure set out in the infrastructure schedules in Annexes 1-3 are monitored.

2 Utilities and Flood Defences

Utilities

- 2.1 All utility providers of electric, gas and water are required to send 5 or 10 year investment plans to their regulators. This sets out what new investment each utility provider will undertake in that period. For new development, this is based on the adopted development plan of the Local Authority at that time. Their current investment plan cycle is from 2010-2015/2020. Utility providers have a duty to provide services to new development, however the timing of when that new development comes forward (particularly if not identified in the plan) has implications on how much a developer may need to contribute to accessing those utility services.

Yorkshire Water

Water Supply

- 2.2 Yorkshire Water have identified the impacts of the proposed levels of development set out in the Core Strategy on water supply and sewerage capacity. They have also set out areas which have a history of surface water flooding.
- 2.3 Water supply in Ryedale is from a variety of sources: reservoirs, groundwater and river. Yorkshire Water have an integrated trunk distribution network across Yorkshire and accommodating the additional water supply requirements of the development set out in the Core Strategy is not considered an issue. Depending on the nature of the sites some local reinforcement may be necessary. The further the development is away from the trunk distribution network the greater the infrastructure costs. Any new supply mains are paid for by the developer and should be factored into their appraisal of the costs of developing a site.
- 2.4 Ryedale is served by a number of Waste Water Treatment Works (WWTW) which treat foul water (sewage). Parts of Ryedale are not served by any WWTWs and rely on private cesspits, however the Core Strategy is only directing development to settlements which are served by WWTWs. Yorkshire Water have given detailed information regarding the capacity of existing WWTWs. In many cases the impact on WWTW capacity is dependent on the location of development. The site selection process through the Sites and Helmsley Documents will take these factors into account. Additional sewage capacity can be brought into place to accommodate the development proposed in the Core Strategy, and this may have an impact on phasing.

Towns

- 2.5 There is enough existing capacity in Malton and Helmsley to accommodate future development. In Norton, an upgrade to the existing sewage pumping stations would be required. In Pickering there is enough capacity to accommodate sites to the north of the A170 and west of the A169. However south of the A170 and east of the A169 will require a new pumping station or rising mains. Kirkbymoorside is also split with land to the east having

sufficient capacity whilst land to the north, south and west requiring improvements.

Service Villages

- 2.6 The following service villages have enough capacity: Amotherby/ Swinton
- 2.7 The following service villages have limited capacity and may require upgrading of the WWTW: Beadlam/Nawton, Hovingham, Rillington and Thornton-le-Dale
- 2.8 The following service villages have no capacity and the WWTW will require an upgrade: Ampleforth, Sherburn, Sheriff Hutton, Slingsby, Staxton and Willerby
- 2.9 To fit in with the investment plan process the development of allocations in the Service Villages may need to be phased.

Surface Water Flooding

- 2.10 Yorkshire Water have sent through information regarding surface water issues affecting public sewers, particularly in storm situations. These are:

Towns

- 2.11 Malton/Norton – Yorkshire Water’s pumping stations can be affected when the river is in flood.
- 2.12 Pickering – some issues with combined sewer overflows and pumping stations on the Eastgate side of the town.
- 2.13 Kirkbymoorside - surface water drainage issues where the sewers are overloaded due to surface water run-off and a watercourse which connects into the public sewer system in the Market Place.

Service Villages

- 2.14 Ampleforth - has issues whereby surface water ingresses into the public sewers and affects the waste water treatment works (WWTW).
- 2.15 Nawton and Beadlam have been affected in the past, in particular the caravan park, by surface water.
- 2.16 Yorkshire Water’s investment planning process will identify rolling improvements to these issues where necessary. Where new development may have an impact in advance of any programmed upgrading by Yorkshire Water, improvements may need to be funded by the developer.

National Grid

- 2.17 National Grid owns and operates the gas and electric transmission system in England. These largely involve high pressure gas pipelines and high voltage

powerlines. They are responsible for transmitting electricity and gas from source to the local distributor (in Ryedale's case CE Electric for Electricity and Northern Gas Networks for Gas). It is the local distributors that supply electricity and gas to homes and businesses in Yorkshire and the Humber and these are covered in below.

- 2.18 National Grid has made it clear that the scale of growth envisaged in the Core Strategy will not have a significant effect on their infrastructure. They state that "it is unlikely that any extra growth will create capacity issues for National Grid given the scale of these gas and electricity transmission networks. The existing network should be able to cope with additional demands."

CE Electric Ltd

- 2.19 CE Electric is the local electricity distribution company which owns and operates NEDL (former Northern Electric Area) and YEDL (Former Yorkshire Electricity area) which supplies electricity and gas to homes and businesses in Ryedale.
- 2.20 CE Electric has confirmed that there is either sufficient capacity across the current distribution network or that local reinforcement of the network to accommodate the scale of growth envisaged in the Core Strategy. The exact nature of any local reinforcement can only be determined through the allocation of sites through the Sites and Helmsley documents. Malton is a grid point linking directly to the National Grid. The main sub-stations are located at Pickering and Thornton le Dale. The existing network is utilised before new infrastructure is considered. Where a network reaches capacity, upgrading will be identified in the Long Term Development Statement (LTDF) the investment plan which is submitted annually to Ofgem. Developers of a site pay to connect into the electricity network, however are only liable for the additional load they place on the network. Again the costs of this are a site specific consideration and developers factor this into the normal costs of developing a site

Northern Gas Networks

- 2.21 Northern Gas Networks (NGN) is the gas distribution company supplying gas to homes and businesses in Yorkshire and the Humber. United Utilities maintain and upgrade the gas distribution network on behalf of NGN. In their response, United Utilities have confirmed that NGN have a duty to provide a gas supply to those requesting a connection. In Ryedale there are two levels of pressurised gas pipelines, Medium Pressure and Low Pressure. Malton, Norton and Pickering are served by both. The rest of the gas network in Ryedale is served by the Low Pressure system on its own.
- 2.22 The level of development set out in the Core Strategy can be accommodated on the gas distribution network, but local reinforcement of the system will be required. The scale and type of this local reinforcement depends on the location of development and ultimately will be determined by the choice of allocations through the Site and Helmsley documents. NGN produce reinforcement strategies on the basis of local authority plans (including the development plan) and enquiries from developers. Delivery of the

reinforcement can be phased to ensure the capacity exists when the connection is required. The costs of these will be substantially funded by NGN, though a small contribution may be required from the developer. These costs will be taken into account by the developer as part of the financial appraisal of bringing forward the site and the strategic collection of developer contributions by the Council for reinforcement of the gas supply network will not be required.

- 2.23 Whilst the exact detail of the reinforcement of the gas distribution network will be a consequence of the sites that come forward for development, United Utilities have identified the following strategic comments:

Medium Pressure System

- 2.24 Malton and Norton – The medium pressure system which supplies Malton and Norton will need reinforcement to accommodate the future load generated by the development.
- 2.25 Pickering/Kirkbymoorside/ Helmsley/ Service Villages – The existing medium pressure system can accommodate the future load.

Low Pressure System

- 2.26 Due to the strategic nature of the Core Strategy, cannot be precise about the impact of the proposed development on the low pressure system. It is likely that some reinforcement may be required as part of the development of specific sites.

North Yorkshire County Council - Waste

- 2.27 North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) is the responsible waste authority covering Ryedale. The District and Borough Councils, together with NYCC and City of York Council, have formed the York and North Yorkshire Waste Partnership (Y&NYWP) to ensure a coordinated approach to waste management across the sub-area. The Partnership has produced a long term waste strategy – Let's Talk Less Rubbish - covering 2006-2026. The strategy sets out the Partnership's intention to create a network of Waste Transfer Stations (WTS), one in each District and Borough in North Yorkshire, where waste will be bulked up and then transported to the proposed Allerton Waste Recovery Park (AWRP). This is a central recycling and energy recovery facility to be located next to the A1(M) near Knaresborough in North Yorkshire.
- 2.28 In Ryedale District, a WTS will be needed from 2015 when the proposed AWRP will be operational, to manage waste for onward treatment and divert waste away from landfill. North Yorkshire County Council has undertaken a comprehensive site search exercise and is close to securing land suitable for a WTS in the Pickering / Malton area.
- 2.29 The Y&NYWP has agreed that the Ryedale WTS should be located in the Pickering / Malton area, where most of the District's residual household waste is produced, thereby making it the most economical and sustainable location.

- 2.30 The development of a WTS in Ryedale forms part of the future NYCC capital programme.

Streetscene Services, Ryedale District Council

- 2.31 The Streetscene section of the Council has requested that developer contributions be taken towards the costs of providing waste and recycling receptacles to new dwellings and the additional equipment required to collect the waste and recycling materials.
- 2.32 Each additional dwelling built in Ryedale requires a set of waste and recycling equipment which comprises wheelie bins, boxes and a bag. This requirement is currently a direct cost to the Council as a result of additional dwellings constructed. In addition the current fleet of bin lorries is at capacity based on the rounds currently undertaken to existing properties. Additional development will exacerbate this pressure. Based on the level of additional development, two additional bin lorries (1 waste lorry and 1 recycling lorry) are required to service the additional dwellings built over the plan period.

Flood Defences

- 2.33 Various bodies are responsible for managing flood risk and associated infrastructure. These roles have been clarified since the introduction of the Flood and Water Management Act following the Pitt Review into the 2007 floods. Principally the main bodies are the Environment Agency, Internal Drainage Boards (IDB) and Local Authorities (generally these are upper tier County or Unitary Authorities).

Responsibilities

- 2.34 The Environment Agency is funded by Defra and part of its remit is to deal with flood risk and defences. This includes responsibility for watercourses designated as 'main rivers', supervising IDB and controlling actions on riparian land. Importantly the Environment Agency has prepared Catchment Flood Management Plans (CFMP) around key main river catchments. CFMPs have been introduced as a recommendation of the Pitt Review and are intended to set out more holistically the scale and extent of flooding now and in the future. CFMPs set policies for managing flood risk within the catchment and to inform planning and decision by key stakeholders. They will be used by the Environment Agency to guide decisions on investment in further plans and specific projects or action. In this regard they inform the choices made through the Ryedale Plan. Within Ryedale, the Derwent CFMP covers most of Ryedale, whilst a very small part of the Ouse CFMP covers the south-western part of Ryedale.
- 2.35 Internal Drainage Boards (IDB) are independent bodies, created under various statutes to manage land drainage in areas of special drainage need. This includes permissive powers under the Land Drainage Act 1991 to undertake flood defence works, other than on watercourses that have been designated as 'Main'. There are three internal drainage boards within Ryedale: Rye, Thornton and Muston and Yedingham.

2.36 Similarly Local Authorities have certain permissive powers to undertake flood defence works under the Land Drainage Act 1991 on watercourses which have not been designated as Main Rivers but which are also not within Internal Drainage Board areas. The Flood and Water Management Act has also introduced two further requirements for Upper Tier Local Authorities. Firstly they will need to create SDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approving bodies in relation to managing surface flood risk. They are also Lead Local Flood Authorities (LLFAs) under the Flood Risk Regulations and have undertaken Preliminary Flood Risk Assessments (PFRAs) for local flood risks from ordinary watercourses, surface runoff and groundwater. This has provided the information to the Environment Agency enabling them to produce initial surface water flood mapping information. In support of the Ryedale Plan and formerly the Local Development Framework, the Council jointly commissioned the North Eastern Yorkshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) in 2006. This was updated in 2010 following national policy changes relating to flood risk and updated flood modelling information. The SFRA provides a range of information to inform planning policy and planning applications. Principally this:

- Identifies forms of flood risk in the area, building on the existing Environment Agency data;
- Provides information on other forms of flooding;
- Identifies flood zone 3 delineation in line with PPS25;
- Identifying flood depths;
- Identifying flood defences;
- Providing guidance on the application of the sequential test; and
- Guidance on Sustainable Drainage/ Land Use Management.

Existing Defences

2.37 There are very limited hard flood defences in Ryedale due to its primarily rural and non-urbanised nature. However significant flood events from the River Derwent in Malton and Norton in 1999 and 2000 resulted in hard and soft flood defences – the Malton/Norton Flood Alleviation Scheme (FAS) - being implemented from 2001-2003. This was designed to 2% protection (1 in 50 year return period). In the Derwent CFMP, the Environment Agency has not identified any plans to upgrade these defences. However ongoing maintenance will be required and this may require some developer contribution over the plan period. Further discussion will take place with the Environment Agency around the level of contribution.

2.38 Whilst there are no other significant flood defences in Ryedale to date, there are other flow management structures such as screens, culverts and sluices. The maintenance of these is necessary to reduce the likelihood and intensity of flood events. The Derwent CFMP identifies that this maintenance will be undertaken by the EA, however the general approach is that of low intervention and generally reactive measures. There are some proposed schemes which are detailed in 2.36.

Proposed Flood Alleviation Measures / Land Management

- 2.39 There have been a number of recent major flood events at Pickering in 1999, 2000, 2002 and 2007. Following this a Flood Alleviation Scheme (FAS) was identified and costed. However due to the system of funding in place, the scheme did not secure funding from the Environment Agency. In light of this, and in an attempt to look at alternative measures to reduce the prevalence and intensity of flooding from Pickering Beck. This has been called 'Slowing the Flow' Pickering Bunds. Sinnington improvements. / Localised improvements done by RDC and NYCC
- 2.40 Localised improvements - £85k from DEFRA grant for property resilience measures and £50k from RDC householder flood resilience grant.

3 Communication

Broadband and Superfast Broadband

BT

- 3.1 BT announced in May 2010 that it was going to invest a further £1bn in its expanding fibre optic network nationally. BT intends to upgrade about three quarters of exchanges, to cover about two-thirds of the country, by 2015. Depending on the technology used these exchanges are theoretically capable of providing speeds of up to 40Mbit/s or 100Mbit/s. In December 2011 BT issued a further press release to upgrade its broadband network to superfast fibre-optic at a number of North Yorkshire market towns. The only town named in Ryedale is Malton at this stage.

NYnet

- 3.2 NYnet public private partnership to enable enhanced broadband provision across North Yorkshire. The lead partner is North Yorkshire County Council working with the telecom provider BT. The first two stages have now been completed which has involved the installation of fibre optic network supporting 40 points of presence or 'PoPs' across North Yorkshire. PoPs are essentially access points to the internet and house the equipment necessary to support the network such as servers and routers. This roll-out to connect schools, libraries and Council Offices was completed in June 2010.
- 3.3 PoPs are currently established in the following settlements in Ryedale:
- Malton and Norton
 - Pickering
 - Kirkbymoorside
 - Sherburn
 - Snainton
- 3.4 Further roll-out of broadband provision via NYnet is covered in the wider partnership of Connecting North Yorkshire which is set out below.

Connecting North Yorkshire

- 3.5 Connecting North Yorkshire (CNY) is a partnership of North Yorkshire County Council, City of York Council, the seven North Yorkshire District Councils, NYnet, key local community organisations, the national parks and businesses through the Local Enterprise Partnership and the Federation of Small Businesses. It was formed to support a bid to Broadband Delivery UK (BDUK). BDUK is a Government initiative with a pot of £530m of funding to bring super fast broadband to the third of UK homes and businesses which won't be provided for by the broadband market and would otherwise miss out. CNY was successful in being selected as a 'pilot' for the BDUK initiative and has secured an initial £17.8m to carry out procurement of a broadband supplier to rollout high quality broadband to the parts of the York and North Yorkshire which currently do not have (or have poor quality) broadband. Additional European funding from the European Rural Development Fund

(ERDF) has also been applied for to increase the funding to approximately £30m.

- 3.6 The purpose of CNY is to provide a fit for purpose broadband network which delivers to as many households in North Yorkshire as is possible. CNY are aiming to have 100% broadband coverage in North Yorkshire by 2017. The procurement of a supplier is taking place in 2012. Updates are progress is available at www.northyorks.gov.uk/broadband.

4 Transport

North Yorkshire County Council - Highways

4.1 North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) is the Local Highways Authority covering Ryedale and is responsible for roads (other than the strategic road network), pavements, cycle paths, bridleways and footpaths. NYCC's third Local Transport Plan (LTP) is made up of two parts, Part 1 is the strategic document covering 15 year from 2011 which sets out the issues facing the County and how these can be addressed. Part 2 is the 5 year delivery plan setting out how NYCC will manage, maintain and improve the highway network in the County, including monitoring their performance against targets set. Underpinning the LTP is a range of Highway Strategies that help to deliver the objectives of the LTP. These have been prepared at various points in time and relate to different versions of the LTP. For Ryedale the current strategies apply:

4.2 These documents were prepared in light of the first Local Transport Plan 2001-2006:

Malton and Norton Traffic Management Strategy 2005 (TMS)

4.3 This looked at a range of highway improvements ranging from strategic highway improvements to accessibility, public realm and safety improvements.

4.4 Significant consultation was undertaken with partners and stakeholders to gauge public views on the range of schemes.

4.5 In particular the strategy looked at 5 potential strategic highway improvements. These were:

- 'Missing slip' at Brambling Fields A64 junction with Scarborough Road, Norton – this involves the provision of a slip road to enable traffic travelling from York on the A64 to turn into Scarborough Road, Norton reducing through traffic through the towns.
- Improved movement at Musley Bank A64 junction with York Road, Malton – this involves enabling traffic from Scarborough on the A64 to turn onto York Road and vice versa
- New Grade Separated Junction at intersection of A64 and B1257 at Broughton Road, Malton – a new junction access onto the A64
- Beverley Road to Scarborough Road link road, Norton
- York Road to Welham Road link road (known as the 'Woolgrowers link')

4.6 Consultation confirmed the importance of some of these strategic improvements and the Brambling Fields improvement was identified as the most supported improvement. Highway modelling conducted as part of the TMS also showed this improvement delivered the most benefit for the cost involved. It is important to note that the A64 is a trunk road and is therefore managed by the Highways Agency as part of the strategic road network (see Highway Agency section below) Where strategic improvements are

suggested on the A64 this needs to be done in consultation and partnership with the Highways Agency.

- 4.7 The final TMS strategy proposed, identified and prioritised schemes for implementation. A phasing programme was devised to implement the Malton and Norton Transportation Strategy, which set out the main measures and options, the timescale for implementation and the estimated cost of the projects.
- 4.8 To date a number of schemes have been implemented, some schemes have been cancelled and some schemes are still to be implemented and as such currently sit on NYCC's Reserve List of Schemes. Reserve List schemes which are still required have been brought forward into the Malton Service Centre Transportation Strategy (SCTS) process described below for further investigation.
- 4.9 Significant work on the Brambling Fields improvement and related measures have taken place since the TMS was completed. This is covered below.

Pickering Integrated Transport Strategy 2005 (PITS)

- 4.10 Similar to the Malton and Norton TMS, the PITS document looked at a number of potential road, cycle, path and public realm improvements in Pickering. Substantial consultation was undertaken to assess the public support for proposals and to suggest any other improvements. The final strategy was adopted in November 2005 agreed a set of generally small scale improvements, though with a number of un-programmed larger scale improvements (junctions of A170/Vivis Lane, A170/A169 and A170/Outgang Road). Some limited schemes have been implemented, however most have not been undertaken. A notable change is that the Vivis Lane/ A170 junction realignment is not now being progressed due to the successful appeal by Lidl for a foodstore on the former Pickering Coalyard, which prevents the realignment of the junction. However as part of the application, Lidl agreed to upgrade the traffic signals to a MOVA system which will enable a small increase in the capacity of the junction. Those schemes not implemented through PITS will be considered through the Pickering SCTS which is detailed below.
- 4.11 These documents were/are being prepared against the objectives of LTP2:

Service Centre Transportation Strategies (SCTSs)

- 4.12 An SCTS involves the identification of transportation improvement schemes and initiatives aimed at helping to build sustainable communities, through contributing to NYCC's second Local Transport Plan (LTP2) Objectives.
- 4.13 A total of 28 Service Centre study areas were identified across North Yorkshire based on the Settlement Study, carried out by NYCC. There are three SCTS study areas in Ryedale: Malton and Norton, Pickering and Helmsley and Kirkbymoorside SCTS.

- 4.14 As distinct from the previous approach of the Malton/Norton TMS and PITS, the SCTS focuses on the role of the town/s set in the context of their wider hinterland, hence the term 'service centre'. It is important to note that SCTS do not simply focus on road improvements. They also link to wider objectives of the LTP in promoting modal shift through improved cycleways and enhanced accessibility to Townsby means other than a private motorcar.
- 4.15 Government funding to NYCC has been substantially cut from the 2011/2012 financial year and this will have an impact on future capital investment by NYCC to new transport schemes. NYCC have confirmed that their priority will now be repairing and maintaining the existing highway network. Therefore the available funds in the capital programme to provide new highway improvements through the scheme prioritisation process, has been significantly reduced. This extends to SCTS budgets for highway improvements which has been lost. SCTS's produced now – which includes Malton and Pickering will comprise two parts: an implementation plan and a strategy section. The implementation plan will list and prioritise maintenance of the highway network and are funded. However the strategy section which sets out new capital schemes for highway improvements will have no funding allocated to it through NYCC's Capital Programme.
- 4.16 Therefore the importance of developer contributions in delivering new improvements as a consequence of new development – whether site-specific through a S106 Agreement or whether strategic through the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) - has an added importance. This is dealt with below.
- 4.17 Where schemes are essential to the delivery of the Core Strategy such as Brambling Fields and the associated complementary measures, these are specifically mentioned in the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule in Annex 1. Other improvements set out in SCTSs, whilst important to accommodating additional growth, are not critical to the delivery of the Core Strategy. However funding will be identified through a mixture of NYCC's Highways Capital Programme when funds become available and through developer contributions. Where improvements are directly related to the development of specific sites, this will be addressed as part of the allocation and subsequent planning application. Elsewhere CIL funds may be used to supplement the NYCC Highways Capital Programme in bringing forward these improvements.

Malton and Norton SCTS

- 4.18 Malton and Norton SCTS is covers a wide hinterland stretching to Foxholes to the East and Buttercrambe to the South. It is currently at the second round of public consultation stage after identifying a number of improvement schemes. These improvement schemes have been identified through the 2005 Malton and Norton TMS, Reserve List review and through the first stakeholder consultation. Following the consultation, the SCTS will be finalised with those schemes supported by stakeholders.
- 4.19 It is important to note that the new slip at the Brambling Fields A64 junction and the complementary measures around Butcher Corner improvements and the recommended junction improvements described in this report have also been taken on board and form part of the SCTS public consultation. Further

strategic improvements for Malton and Norton which are described below, will also be included in the Strategy part of the SCTS.

Pickering SCTS

- 4.20 The implementation plan part of the SCTS has been drafted and is awaiting approval by NYCC's Executive. The strategy section has yet to be commenced. This will consider unimplemented schemes from the PITS document, and other schemes on the reserve list if schemes as well as suggestions from stakeholder consultation. The Council will have ongoing discussion with NYCC regarding this process. In particular the Council will seek to include improvements to the access to Thornton Road Industrial Estate to enable potential expansion of Thornton Road Industrial Estate.

Helmsley and Kirkbymoorside SCTS

- 4.21 This is the only completed SCTS in Ryedale to date. It covers Helmsley and Kirkbymoorside as well as including villages such as Ampleforth and Nawton/ Beadlam. The improvements that were finally selected for consideration, are small scale in nature, and mainly include pedestrian and bus facility improvements.

Consultation and Joint Working with NYCC

- 4.22 The Council has consulted NYCC on the Core Strategy in the course of its preparation, as well as individual meetings with Highways Officers. Together these confirm that the development proposed in the Core Strategy – subject to site selection through the Sites and Helmsley documents - can be accommodated on the highway network. This view is supported by the following:

Butcher Corner, Malton

- 4.23 The Council is required to monitor air quality under European Law. In the UK it is Air Quality Regulations which set out national Air Quality Objectives (AQO) – which are essentially permissible limits for certain pollution particulates. This monitoring is undertaken in areas where there are known areas of poor air quality. In 2009 monitoring data indicated sustained exceedence of the AQO for NO₂ around the 'Butcher Corner' area in the centre of Malton (the cross road where Yorkersgate/ Castlegate/ Old Maltongate and Wheelgate intersect). This has meant that 2009 Butcher Corner and the approaches to it, were designated an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) in line with regulations. Further assessment in 2010 has shown that NO₂ levels are still exceeding permitted levels. An Air Quality Management Plan is being prepared as a result of the AQMA being declared. It is essential that this sets out what actions will be taken to reduce levels of NO₂ particulates. LTP3 recognises the importance of tackling poor air quality under Objective 2: "Reducing the impact of transport on the natural and historic environment and tackling climate change". Clearly there are limited physical changes that can be undertaken at Butcher Corner to improve air quality, given its town centre location in a conservation area. The only realistic option available is to reduce high particulate emitting traffic travelling through

the junction via the Brambling Fields improvement described under the Malton and Norton TMS. This also has the added benefit of reducing traffic congestion through the towns. Therefore this has been reflected in the decision by NYCC to part fund the Brambling Fields and town centre complementary measures described below.

Brambling Fields and Town Centre Complementary Measures

- 4.24 This is an improvement which is critical to the delivery of the Core Strategy. Further work was undertaken on the Brambling Fields A64 junction improvement modelling potential schemes following the Malton and Norton TMS and in 2009 NYCC was awarded additional money from the Regional Transport Board to use of potential projects. Together with RDC funding, NYCC agreed to use some of their additional funding to front fund the Brambling Fields improvement and associated complementary measures in the town. This investment will then be reclaimed through developer contributions and recycled into other projects. The Council has been collecting developer contributions towards this improvement since 2007, based on the amount of additional traffic being put through Butcher Corner as a result of the development. The collection of money to date has been through Section 106 legal agreements, however this is likely to change once the Council puts in place a charging schedule under the Community Infrastructure Levy.
- 4.25 Significant preparatory work has been undertaken for delivering Brambling Fields and a planning application is likely to be submitted in Spring/Summer 2011, and construction starting in January 2012 assuming a Public Inquiry is not required. Construction is estimated to take 6 months to complete.

Malton and Norton Strategic Transport Assessment (STA)

- 4.26 As the focus of development proposed in the Core Strategy is in Malton and Norton, it was essential to assess the highway impact on the local highway network. To this end the Council commissioned a Strategic Transport Assessment for Malton and Norton (STA). This grouped together the development sites put forward for potential development through the LDF in Malton and Norton and assessed their impact through various graduated scenarios. This was done by utilising the Malton/Norton SATURN highway model managed by Jacobs on behalf of NYCC. The STA assumes that the Brambling Fields junction improvement and associated town centre complementary measures described above are in place.
- 4.27 Scenario 1 was a 'baseline' of sites which had been considered in various studies and were considered to be likely to come forward in advance of the LDF. The STA report compares each further Scenario to the 'baseline' to give a relative view of the difference in impact. This enabled the report to feature a 'traffic light' system to visually illustrate this. However it is important to note that NYCC, in their role as highway authority, looked at the absolute ratio of flow to capacity figures for each of the junctions highlighted, rather than the relative comparison.

- 4.28 The total amounts of development considered through the STA are well in excess of the amount of development proposed through the Core Strategy to 2026. This was due to the fact that the scenarios were based on groups of real sites and it was not appropriate to omit sites at this stage. Robust and generous assumptions were also made around the use and density of development in trip generation, as limited information had been submitted by the proposers of the sites. Other transport modes were also taken into account such as cycling. The addendum to the STA considers the latest set of complementary measures as these have been amended from the measures set out in the original STA report.
- 4.29 The findings of the STA demonstrate that there are a number of options for accommodating the development proposed in the Core Strategy to 2026 and beyond. The STA recommends the following scenarios:
- **Scenario 2** - Sites in Malton
 - **Scenario 3** – Sites in Norton
 - **Scenario 4A** - Sites in Malton and Norton (equally pro-rated down by 50%)
 - **Scenario 6** – Woolgrowers expansion site involving a new link road
- 4.30 Scenarios 2, 3 and 4A can be accommodated through the improvement of four internal junctions in Malton and Norton without a strategic highway improvement beyond Brambling Fields being required. The STA identified deliverable options (solutions within the highway boundary) for the internal junction improvements and these are being identified in the Malton and Norton SCTS. Scenario 6 implicitly involves a strategic highway improvement as a link road between York Road and Welham Road is required to service the site.
- 4.31 The STA considered Scenario 4A to be particularly useful in demonstrating that the approximate level of development proposed in the Core Strategy to 2026 could be accommodated in Malton and Norton through a mixture of sites on both sides of the River Derwent. The internal junction improvements are critical to the delivery of the Core Strategy.
- 4.32 NYCC confirmed their agreement to the findings of the STA on a strategic basis. This was subject to the specific impacts being assessed through highway modelling of the individual sites through the site selection process, given the theoretical nature of the STA assumptions. The Council's draft site selection methodology expects that sites being proposed in Malton and Norton will be subject to highways modelling, utilising the Malton and Norton SATURN model.

Further Strategic Improvement Close to Malton and Norton Beyond 2026

- 4.33 The findings of the STA show that beyond 2026, it is likely that a further strategic improvement - in addition to Brambling Fields - will be required. There are a number of potential opportunities for accommodating this and the STA investigated three possibilities. Two have been put forward as part of the development of significant expansion sites in Norton. These are:

- **Circa 70ha development known as ‘Woolgrowers’** – this involves a link road between York Road and Welham Road and which was modelled as Scenario 6. The link road has been indicatively costed at £25.6 million.
 - **Circa 90ha development called ‘Norton East’ in the STA**– this involves a link road between Beverley Road and Scarborough Road and was modelled as Scenario 5. The link road has been indicatively costed at £24 million.
- 4.34 The third involved investigating further a new Grade Separated Junction (GSJ) between Broughton Road/ B1257 and the A64. As mentioned above, this was initially suggested in the Malton and Norton TMS, and the work undertaken by Jacobs for the STA provides a desktop study of the likely cost and potential designs of a GSJ in that location. A number of options were considered in light of a planning application for a new Sports Centre and all weather pitch in the vicinity of that area which would have conflicted with a potential new GSJ. This involved investigating options which didn’t involved the take up of a particular quadrant of the Malton School playing field. This application has subsequently been approved by NYCC and the development has now been completed. The various options were costed at between £13 and £16 million. Since the STA was completed a planning application has been submitted to develop another piece of land which would affect the ability to deliver a GSJ in that location. This has been approved in principle subject to the completion of a S106 legal agreement.
- 4.35 In there formal response to the STA, NYCC asked the Council to take into account the needs for an additional strategic improvement to Malton and Norton over the next plan period. Whilst they acknowledge that it is not possible to safeguard specific sites at this stage, they want to ensure that future long term expansion of Malton and Norton is not prejudiced. Whilst the STA looked at a particular location for the provision of a new GSJ access onto the A64, this is not the only location where this can be achieved. As there are numerous undeveloped spaces around Malton and Norton, a new GSJ access can be potentially delivered in a number of locations. At this stage only a limited desktop study through the STA has been undertaken which enables an indicative cost to be ascertained. Further substantial work would need to be undertaken, to take forward any potential scheme beyond 2026. Any scheme on the A64 would need to be weighted against any of the other strategic improvements in terms of cost benefit analysis. The STA makes it clear that a number of improvements are theoretically possible and any review of the LDF would need to take this forward in partnership with NYCC and the Highways Agency where it impacts on the A64. Where a strategic improvement is proposed on the A64 trunk road, the Highways Agency have raised concerns in principle about identifying a GSJ improvement. This is covered in detail below under the Highways Agency section below.
- 4.36 There is extremely limited public sector funding for major road schemes at present and it is unlikely that any Government funding would be made available to the Council for strategic improvements. Therefore other means of funding will need to be secured. Even though no decision on which strategic improvement will be brought forward beyond 2026 has been made, it is likely

that collecting developer contributions through CIL is the only realistic avenue to ensure the potential deliverability of an improvement. Where a strategic improvement is developer led, it would be expected that a significant part of the cost in delivering that road link would be borne by the developer as part of the development of the site. Where there is a funding gap, this can be supplemented by CIL, subject to viability appraisal. Decisions on when to collect contributions to a major strategic road improvement will be taken at the point when the LDF is reviewed in the future.

Strategic Road Improvements Outside the Ryedale Administrative Boundary

- 4.37 NYCC has led on an A64 Corridor Connectivity Study, together with partners including the Council and the Highways Agency. This looked at the route of the A64 from York to Scarborough to assess what measures may need to be put in place to accommodate future development and to manage the general trend of growth in traffic demand. The study did not focus solely on potential highway improvements to ease congestion and improve the safety record of the A64, it also looked at other measures that can help to manage the demands on the network including: promoting modal shift through enhanced public transport services and facilities, reducing the need to travel through sustainable development choices (including improved broadband access for home working/businesses) and management of high seasonal traffic flows.
- 4.38 The study looked at flows on the A64 at 2026 with and without proposed future development of the various settlements along the route to understand the pressures that the A64 is likely to face. This was based on the national SATURN model developed by the Highways Agency and the NYCC's VISUM County Wide model. This indicates that there will be significantly increased flows travelling west on the A63 between Malton and York in 2026 when potential development is factored in. Flows between Malton and Scarborough did not generally indicate a significant increase. The study therefore proposes a range of interventions over the short (to 2016), medium (to 2021) and long term (beyond 2021). These are:
- **Local Sustainable Transport Opportunities** – encouraging significant mode-change for short trips within York, Scarborough and Malton & Norton. The set of Local Sustainable Transport Opportunities packages catered for the specific challenges and opportunities in each of the urban centres, linking closely to local transport (LTP3) and development strategies.
 - **A64 Road Improvements and Traffic Management** – to address the capacity, journey-time reliability and road safety issues identified on the A64. For A64 improvements, alternative packages were derived to assess the different impacts of low, medium and high cost approaches to road improvements. The final chosen range from small scale improvements to partial dualling of the A64.
 - **Rail Enhancements** – to increase opportunities and incentives to utilise the York-to Scarborough (and other) rail services as a means of travel within the corridor, reducing dependence on the A64.
- 4.39 Whilst many of these measures are specific to Ryedale, this study considers the wider benefits of a joint approach to managing the traffic demands on the

A64. This includes potential improvements to the A64 corridor outside of the Ryedale area. Where there is a demonstrable benefit to Ryedale such as assisting to accommodate development and which satisfies the objectives set out in the Core Strategy, this approach is supported by the Council. It is likely that further work will be undertaken by partners to develop potential improvements identified in this study further. Some schemes are of a more strategic scale and it is likely that a variety of funding sources will be sought including funding from Central Government, though in the short term there are extremely limited opportunities to secure this in more rural areas without a robust business case. Other improvements are of a more local scale and funding sources are therefore limited. Relevant schemes identified in the A64 Corridor Connectivity Study, where additional funding is required, will be considered by the Council through the CIL Charging Schedule which will be prepared in due course. A number of measures identified relate to softer measures which can be implemented through the site allocation process – such as selection of sites such as relating new development to existing cycling and walking networks and car sharing schemes.

Development Elsewhere in Ryedale

4.40 NYCC support the spatial strategy proposed which seeks to focus development on the Principal Town of Malton and Norton and then to a lesser development Pickering, Kirkbymoorside and Helmsley with a network of service villages, noting that the Inspector endorsed this approach at the original Core Strategy examination. This they consider reflects local priorities and provides a sound basis for the future location of development in the area.

4.41 Similar to Malton and Norton, it is the choice of sites in Pickering, Kirkbymoorside, Helmsley and in the Service Villages which will enable NYCC to determine the traffic impacts associated with the development and to agree appropriate mitigation measures. To inform that process NYCC Highway Officers are examining all the potential sites submitted through the Ryedale Plan in the Towns and Service Villages in terms of their highway suitability. This is a similar assessment to that when considering a planning application and will be reflected in the Site Selection Methodology that the Council is preparing. In addition, contributions will be sought for some wider improvements in Pickering and elsewhere and will be informed by the SCTSs, LTP3 Action Plans, and any other relevant Transport Strategies. Where a development has a direct association with an identified potential improvement, this will be expected to be undertaken as part of the development of the site.

NYCC Highways Capital Programme – Ryedale Area

4.42 NYCCs capital programme are set out over 2 years and is made up of two parts – new highway improvements and prioritised routine maintenance schemes. Due to a significantly lower financial settlement from the Government to NYCC for 2011/12 and 2012/13, the majority of highway spending is now being channelled into maintenance of the existing highway network. Previous NYCC Capital Programmes identified a number of new capital highway improvements which were prioritised from the relevant transportation strategy. The expectation from NYCC in the current funding

climate, is that new capital improvements identified in the SCTs will come forward through new development proposals. This will be either directly as part of the allocation/ planning application to bring forward a site or as a financial contribution through CIL.

Highways Agency (HA)

4.43 The HA is an Executive Agency of the Department for Transport (DfT), and is responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the strategic road network (SRN) in England. Their two primary concerns are to improve road safety along their network and to ensure journey time reliability. In Ryedale the HA is responsible for managing the A64 trunk road which connects the A1(M) in the west to York, Malton and finally Scarborough in the East. The A64 acts a strong commuter route with a notable westerly flow in the AM peak and easterly flow in the PM peak, demonstrating the strong influence of York. The A64 is also subject to strong seasonal variation due to its access to the East Coast, particularly during the school holidays. This can lead to traffic congestion at peak points. The A64 Corridor Connectivity Study examines issues facing the A64 in detail and is mentioned above.

4.44 The Council has been in regular contact with the HA over the lifetime of the preparation of the Core Strategy. The HA response to the Summer Consultation Document of 2009 highlighted concerns about any further improvements to the SRN beyond the Brambling Fields improvement. In particular, this was in relation to a potential new GSJ access onto Broughton Road which has been investigated through the Malton and Norton STA. The HA highlighted the objection in principle, which is reflective of Department for Transport policy (DfT Circular 02/2007: Planning and the Strategic Road Network):

Paragraph 40 'There is a general presumption that there will be no capacity enhancements on routes of strategic national importance purely to accommodate new development (and these would be subject to environmental and deliverability consideration).'

Paragraph 41 'There is a general presumption that there will be no additional accesses to motorways and other routes of strategic national importance'

Paragraph 42 'The Agency will adopt a graduated and less restrictive approach to accesses on the remainder of the strategic road network, but there will still be a presumption in favour of using the existing accesses and junctions. Any additional junction or increased junction capacity should be identified in the LDD and/or RTS and will be considered within the context of the Agency's forward programme of works.'

4.45 The STA concluded that in this plan period a further strategic improvement beyond the new slip road at the A64 Brambling Fields junction, was not necessary to accommodate the levels of development proposed. However it also concluded that a further strategic improvement would be required beyond this plan period (2026) to accommodate future development and demonstrated that there are a number of options available for this (this is covered in further detail on the Malton and Norton STA above). To this end

the Council is not relying on a further strategic improvement as part of this LDF, however it will work with NYCC and the Highways Agency when the LDF is reviewed to investigate the most suitable further strategic improvement at that time. As mentioned above, there are a choice of improvements, two of which do not involve changes to the A64. The highway improvements that are necessary to implementing the LDF are fully costed and deliverable.

- 4.46 In their response to the 2010 consultation, the HA requested further information regarding the capacity of the Brambling Fields improvement to accommodate the development proposed in Malton and Norton through the Core Strategy. This was assessed both by the STA and informed the design of the additional slip road. This information has been sent to the HA and they are satisfied that the additional development can be accommodated by the improvement as designed.
- 4.47 The HA also queried the traffic impact of development in the service villages, particularly those in the vicinity of the A64, which may require improvements to the A64. However after confirming the amounts of development proposed in these locations and the ability to choose appropriate sites through the site selection process, the HA confirmed that this was not a concern.
- 4.48 In preparation for their response to the Council, the HA carried out transport modelling utilising their SATURN traffic model, known as the Network Analysis Tool (NAT). This involves assessing the impact of cross-boundary development on the A64 route capacity and linking in to the rest of the HA's network. Currently this shows some stress westbound on the A64 between York and Malton. This modelling was based on all of the sites that have been submitted through the Ryedale Plan, being developed. However only a small proportion of sites submitted to the Council will be allocated for development. To this end the HA are refining their modelling of new potential development by factoring in more accurately the levels of development proposed. The HA intends to send through some amended NAT modelling runs based on the anticipated development set out in The Ryedale Plan and other authorities along the A64 corridor. This is expected shortly.
- 4.49 As mentioned above, the Council is aware of the principle of collecting developer contributions towards highway improvements which may be out side Ryedale. The A64 may be an area where this can be justified. However any potential improvement must demonstrably benefit the Ryedale area and contribute to delivering the plan objectives. Further work on this is being discussed with the HA and taken further through a York Sub-Area Infrastructure Planning Group. This is currently at an early stage but it is hoped that a Memorandum of Understanding relating to cross-boundary infrastructure including highways will be signed.

5 Open space, recreational space and burial space

Sport England

- 5.1 Sport England is a Government Agency responsible for delivering the Government's sporting objectives. They support and facilitate the provision of new sporting and recreational facilities in line with the need identified in line with Planning Policy Guidance 17: Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation (PPG17) assessments. Sport England has produced a variety of guidance to facilitate the provision and protection of new and existing sporting and recreation areas.
- 5.2 In their consultation responses to the Council, Sport England support the approach of the Core Strategy in identifying Principal and Local Service Centres. They suggest that existing community facilities are protected and new or enhanced facilities are provided in association with housing and employment development, where necessary. The scale and location of such social infrastructure should be supported by a robust evidence base as set out in PPG17. Policy CS10 of the Core Strategy sets out the approach to protecting community services and facilities. The Council has also carried out an Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study in line with PPG17 and will seek to address deficiencies in line with its findings. Further information on the precise deficiencies is set out below.

Ryedale District Council – Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study (PPG17 Audit)

- 5.3 A PPG17 Open Space Audit was completed by PMP for the Council in 2007. This assesses the existing provision of open space, sport and recreation facilities and then identifies any qualitative or quantitative deficiencies in existing provision based on local provision standards. From that information it then makes policy recommendations for addressing these deficiencies as well as guiding new or enhanced provision required as part of new development. Ryedale is unusual in that only two sites are owned and managed directly by the Council. The majority of sites are owned and managed by Town and Parish Councils and in some cases Sports Associations or Committees.
- 5.4 The study considered nine typologies of open space, sport and recreation facilities:
- Informal market town open space
 - Provision for children and young people
 - Outdoor Sports Facilities
 - Village open space
 - Indoor sports facilities
 - Allotments
 - Green corridors
 - Churchyards and Cemeteries
- 5.5 The study is a comprehensive assessment of the provision of open space, sport and recreation facilities across all settlements in Ryedale. However, given the Settlement Hierarchy set out in Policy SP1 of the Publication Draft

Local Plan Strategy, it is critical to focus on the places where additional development will be planned. Then deficiencies in existing provision can be addressed through new or enhanced provision to meet the local standards:

5.6 Malton and Norton

Informal market town open space (Including parks and gardens)

- Provision of amenity space generally well distributed in Malton and Norton. Additional/extended provision in the South East (Norton) and West (Malton) of the towns as currently insufficient to meet informal recreational needs. Need for additional recreational amenity space in Old Malton.
- Need for a formal park in Malton and Norton – this could be completely new or the conversion of existing informal space.

Provision for children and young people

- Quantitative deficiencies in children's provision particularly in West Malton and North Norton.
- Quantitative deficiencies in young people's provision particularly in Malton and Southern and Eastern Norton.
- Qualitative deficiencies in children's and young people's provision. Existing sites could be upgraded to be 'multi-age'.

Outdoor Sports Facilities

- Currently a qualitative deficiency in outdoor sports provision.
- Additional development may result in quantitative deficiency for outdoor sports provision.

Indoor sports facilities

- Recognition that many residents travel outside of Ryedale to utilise larger facilities and therefore extension/expansion of facilities would retain more people locally and improve accessibility.
- Quantitative need for indoor sports facility in Malton at time of study though new Dry Sports Centre constructed at Malton School.
- Quantitative requirement for a swimming pool at Malton
- Currently no qualitative or quantitative need at Norton, however Derwent Pool nearing end of theoretical operational life and replacement/refurbishment will be required.

Allotments

- Qualitative need to improve a minority of allotment sites
- Generally good quantitative provision at time study was carried out, however additional development will create a quantitative need.

Green corridors

- To be addressed through the allocation of new development. All green infrastructure in and around the site should be taken into account taking advantage of linking with existing green corridors and creating new links where possible.

Churchyards and Cemeteries

- Qualitative deficiencies identified.

5.7 Pickering

Informal market town open space

- Lack of enough informal recreation space in East and West Pickering.
- Potential for a formal park as supported by consultation. Recent approval in principle for a Community Park as part of a housing development at Whitby Road, Pickering.

Provision for children and young people

- Quantitative deficiency in provision for both children and young people in East Pickering.
- Consider rationalisation of existing facilities as four in close proximity.

Outdoor Sports Facilities

- Currently a qualitative deficiency in outdoor sports provision.
- Additional development is likely to result in quantitative deficiency for outdoors sports provision.

Indoor sports facilities

- No deficiencies identified in study. However Council investigating expansion of Ryedale Pool to enhance facilities available.

Allotments

- Quantitative need for additional allotment provision

Green corridors

- To be addressed through the allocation of new development. All green infrastructure in and around the site should be taken into account taking advantage of linking with existing green corridors and creating new links where possible.

Churchyards and Cemeteries

- Open space study doesn't identify a particular deficiency in Pickering, however the town Council has proposed that new burial space is required.

5.8 Kirkbymoorside

Informal market town open space

- Additional informal amenity space required.
- Existing amenity space could be 'formalised' as park and garden space as currently lacking

Provision for children and young people

- Quantitative deficiency in West Kirkbymoorside for both children and young people.

Outdoor Sports Facilities

- Qualitative deficiency in existing outdoor sports facilities.

Indoor sports facilities

- Quantitative deficiency for indoor sports facilities.

Allotments

- Quantitative need for additional allotment provision

Green corridors

- To be addressed through the allocation of new development. All green infrastructure in and around the site should be taken into account taking advantage of linking with existing green corridors and creating new links where possible.

5.9 Helmsley

Informal market town open space

- Additional informal amenity space required.
- Existing amenity space could be 'formalised' as park and garden space as currently lacking

Provision for children and young people

- Quantitative deficiency in South-East Helmsley for young people's provision.
- Qualitative deficiency in central site for children's provision

Outdoor Sports Facilities

- Quantitative deficiency in South East Helmsley

Indoor sports facilities

- Quantitative deficiency for indoor sports facilities.

Allotments

- Quantitative need for additional allotment provision

Green corridors

- To be addressed through the allocation of new development. All green infrastructure in and around the site should be taken into account taking advantage of linking with existing green corridors and creating new links where possible.

5.10 Service Villages

Provision for children and young people

- Amotherby – Quantitative deficiency for children’s provision which could be satisfied by upgrading of existing amenity spaces.
- Staxton and Willerby – Qualitative deficiency for young people’s provision.
- Thornton le Dale – Quantitative deficiency for children and young people’s provision.
- Further development in Rillington and Sheriff Hutton will result in quantitative need for additional children and young people’s provision.

Village open space

- Quantitative need for additional village open space in Amotherby, Rillington, Staxton and Willerby and Thornton le Dale
- Qualitative deficiency at Amotherby and Swinton, Ampleforth and Beadlam and Nawton.

Indoor sports facilities

- Quantitative and qualitative deficiency in indoor sports facilities due to lack of or unsuitable village halls.

Allotments

- A general quantitative need for additional allotment provision

Green corridors

- To be addressed through the allocation of new development. All green infrastructure in and around the site should be taken into account taking advantage of linking with existing green corridors and creating new links where possible.

5.11 In most cases, any deficiencies identified in the study will be addressed through the allocation of new development and consideration of planning applications. This includes provision on site and off site commuted sums. In some cases there are general needs such as municipal parks and indoor sports provision which will need to be pooled to deliver the facility. This will be

addressed through developer contributions and identified in the Council's CIL charging schedule.

Property Services, Ryedale District Council

- 5.12 Property Services have identified the need for refurbishment and expansion of elements of the existing leisure provision in Ryedale. Given the focus of additional development at Malton and Norton and the need to meet standards on indoor leisure provision, the demands on Derwent Pool in Norton are likely to increase. It is anticipated to need refurbishment or replacement in the next 10-15 years will be required.
- 5.13 Ryedale Pool in Pickering has also identified as requiring extension to accommodate expanding requirements for leisure activities and equipment. The Open Air Swimming Pool at Helmsley requires upgrading to improve and support leisure activity in the Town. Ryedale District Council have committed £500k in their Capital Programme towards Helmsley Pool to support the upgrade, however additional funding is required.

6 Health and Education

Health

North Yorkshire and York Primary Care Trust (PCT)

- 6.1 The North Yorkshire and York Primary Care Trust covers all of York and North Yorkshire currently. The NHS is likely to go through significant restructuring due to the proposed Coalition Government's health reforms. This is seeking to abolish PCTs across England and replace them with GP consortia who will commission NHS services directly. Once the Health and Social Care Bill gains Royal Assent, the new structures will become clearer.
- 6.2 As the PCT is still in existence until these changes take place, the North Yorkshire and York PCT still retains responsibility for Malton Community Hospital, GP Practices and NHS Dentist provision. The Council have consulted and met with the PCT to ascertain what impact the level and distribution of development proposed will have on their services, and whether there may be capacity problems as a result. Following a meeting with the PCT, they confirmed that they did not consider there would be any capacity problems at present.

Ryedale Doctor's Surgeries

- 6.3 In addition to consulting the PCT direct, the Council has also directly consulted with Doctor's Surgeries in the Malton and Norton, Pickering, Kirkbymoorside and Helmsley. These have confirmed that either that there is capacity within their practices to accommodate the likely increased population, or the potential to create capacity as a result of the new housing development proposed in the Local Plan Strategy.

NYCC – Extracare

- 6.4 In 1999 NYCC adopted a policy of In 1999 North Yorkshire County Council agreed its 'Our Future Lives' policy which set out plans to replace its elderly persons homes with extra care housing schemes, providing accommodation and services for the whole community. Extra care housing is effectively 'assisted living' developments which enable residents to live independently whilst offering the security a range of facilities on site, with access to 24-hour care/support services. NYCC have identified the level and location of Extracare provision required based on identified need. This is reflected in Policy SP4 of the Publication Draft Local Plan Strategy where there is a District wide requirement for at least 160 Extracare bed spaces, made up of four 40-bed schemes. The locations identified are Malton, Pickering, Helmsley and Kirkbymoorside. The Extracare team at NYCC are undertaking a site search and where possible utilising existing NYCC assets.
- 6.5 The delivery of the Extracare accommodation is being undertaken through a Special Purpose Vehicle which is a partnership between NYCC and selected developers. It is not anticipated that developer contributions will be required to fund the additional Extracare accommodation.

Education

NYCC - Education

- 6.6 Detailed discussions have taken place with NYCC Education to ascertain the impact of the amount and distribution of housing development as proposed in Policy SP2 of the Local Plan Strategy. Based on their calculation of how many additional school places will be generated by the housing, NYCC Education Officers have set out the likely requirements. This has been recently updated in January 2012 based on the 2011 school roll. This has resulted in some changes to additional provision which are shown below. Please note that this is based on school catchment information and represents a best estimation of the likely impact.

Primary Education

Malton and Norton

- 6.7 The Local Plan Strategy sets out that 50% of housing should be focussed on Malton and Norton. However it does not specify how this should be split definitively between Malton and Norton. This will ultimately be a product of the allocation process through the selection of sites through the Local Plan Sites document. NYCC have provided estimated requirements on a number of scenarios.
- 6.8 The additional primary capacity required in Malton and Norton will depend on the pattern of sites chosen. In all cases new provision will be required. On current indications it appears that a new primary school will be required for Norton as there is less existing capacity. For Malton the scale of new provision depends on the level of new housing, rising from new classroom teaching space via extensions to the existing primary schools to a new primary school. However the primary educational needs of the twin towns needs to be considered holistically ensuring that best use is made of existing school provision and each primary school's capacity to extend. However it is likely that a new primary school is likely to be required for both Malton and Norton over the plan period.

Pickering

- 6.9 NYCC have undertaken further analysis of the 2011 school rolls and based on this it is likely that a new primary school will be required. However NYCC are undertaking a further discrete piece of work analysing the proposed impact of the levels of development set out in the Local Plan Strategy. This will be available in Summer 2012. An initial view is that it is likely that a new primary school will be required in Pickering over the plan period.

Kirkbymoorside

- 6.10 Additional teaching space equivalent to 3-4 classrooms and ancillary space to the existing primary school is likely to be required.

Helmsley

- 6.11 Additional teaching space may be required potentially equivalent to a classroom extension.

Service Villages

- 6.12 Additional teaching space is likely to be required in the form of a classroom extension at:
- Amotherby and Swinton - two additional class rooms likely to be required
 - Nawton/Beadlam – one additional class room likely to be required
 - Staxton and Willerby – one additional class room is likely to be required

- 6.13 There is likely to be sufficient capacity at: Ampleforth, Hovingham, Rillington, Sherburn, Sheriff Hutton, Slingsby and Thornton le Dale.

Secondary Education

- 6.14 There are four secondary schools/colleges in Ryedale which effectively fall into a with a Southern Ryedale and Northern Ryedale catchment split. These are:
- Malton School, Middlecave Road, Malton
 - Norton College, Langton Road, Norton
 - Lady Lumley's School, Swainsea Road, Pickering
 - Ryedale School, Nawton
- 6.15 They are largely centred around the market towns with the exception of Ryedale School which is situated between Kirkbymoorside and Helmsley.
- 6.16 Consultation with NYCC education is ongoing and no firm figures for additional capacity required has been sent. However it is likely that additional capacity will be required at Malton School, Norton College and Lady Lumley's school. No new secondary school will be required in this plan period. Further information has been requested from NYCC Education to quantify the additional capacity required.

7 Local Projects

Economic Development Section, Ryedale District Council

Public Realm

- 7.1 The “Malton Town Centre Public Realm Study” was undertaken in 2010 by Jacobs for the Council. This examined public realm enhancements at a number of areas in Malton town centre and routes between Malton and Norton. Principally this considered public enhancements to the Market place, Spital and Finkle Street and Railway Street/ Norton Interchange and Blackboards. Jacobs costed the full work at £2.45m, however different elements of the improvements can be introduced rather than all at once. No funding has been secured for the works. However improvements can be timed to support the wider regeneration of the town centre.

Milton Rooms

- 7.2 A feasibility study was commissioned in 2010 to assess options for the enhanced use of the Milton Rooms and Assembly Rooms in Malton. This is a public venue used mainly for community events including theatre, exhibitions, public events and auctions. The feasibility study considered a number of options including upgrading the theatre to have a box office, integrating dedicated artist space and supporting a multi-use venue with modern facilities. The preferred option in the feasibility report was costed at £8.3m. No funding has been secured for this work.

7 Securing Infrastructure Improvements

Mechanism for Securing Infrastructure Improvements

- 7.1 Infrastructure improvements will be secured based on the information contained within this IDP. However it should be noted that this is not an exhaustive list of infrastructure and that the IDP will be updated on a regular basis where necessary. The approach to collecting developer contributions towards the infrastructure required to support the development proposed is set out in Policy SP21 – Developer Contributions of the Publication Draft Local Plan Strategy. It states:
- 7.2 *“New development will contribute to the place making objectives and aspirations of this strategy and to the infrastructure necessary to support future development in the District. These are necessary to support the development and meet the community needs arising from a scheme. Contributions will also be sought to mitigate the impact of development on existing social, physical and utilities infrastructure, green infrastructure and natural resources or as compensation for the loss or damage to a facility, feature or resource of acknowledged significance”*

Section 106 Legal Agreements

- 7.2 Currently developer contributions are secured by a clause in the Town and Country Planning Act (1990). ‘Section 106’ legal agreements (s106) allows on site and off site contributions to be collected by a Local Planning Authority. These are subject to the Circular 5/05 ‘reasonable’ tests namely that they are:
- Necessary to make the proposal acceptable in planning terms
 - Relevant to Planning
 - Directly related to the proposed development
 - Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development
 - Reasonable in all other respects

Community Infrastructure Levy

- 7.3 Community Infrastructure Levy or CIL is a tariff based charge to raise money to address infrastructure needs arising from new development. The level of charge it is based on the size and type of proposed new development. It is made up of two elements a charging schedule and accompanying viability assessment. The charging schedule sets the level of tariff for different types and (where stipulated) locations of development. The tariff is expressed as a cost per net additional sq metre. The viability assessment examines the economic impact of the charge on different types of development. The level of charge is a balance between the need to raise monies to address infrastructure requirements against the need to ensure that the development proposed is viable. The ability to collect CIL was introduced in 2010 and amended in 2011. Collection of CIL provides an appropriate mechanism to secure strategic infrastructure improvements across Ryedale.

- 7.4 There is currently a transitional period for Local Planning Authorities to move from relying solely on s106 agreements to preparing a CIL Charging Schedule. From April 2014, the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations specify that the use of s106 agreements will be strictly limited to largely site specific matters, supporting the collection of CIL.

The Council's Approach

- 7.5 The Council will produce a CIL Charging Schedule in consultation with developers, local communities and service providers and will undertake the necessary work and procedural requirements to ensure that the charging schedule or levy rates do not undermine the economic viability of development. The charging schedule will be compiled alongside the preparation of the Local Plan Sites Document in order to ensure that the viability of the CIL rates can be considered in the context of contributions such as affordable housing and also to ensure that the ability of sites to contribute to the delivery of affordable housing and infrastructure improvements can be fully considered as part of the site selection process. The Council will seek to appoint consultants to support the work on preparing a Charging Schedule and accompanying viability assessment in 2012. The timetable for preparing the Local Plan Sites and Helmsley documents is set out in the Council's Local Development Scheme.
- 7.6 Prior to the CIL Charging Schedule being put in place, S106 will be the primary mechanism for securing developer contributions in line with Policy SP21. Following adoption of the CIL Charging Schedule, S106 Agreements will still be secured for on-site (or development specific) contributions essential to the granting of planning permission for an individual scheme. All other contributions will be collected via CIL. Further information on the funding of infrastructure improvements is set out in Section 8.

8 Delivery of infrastructure

- 8.1 As this document sets out, there are numerous partners involved in the delivery of infrastructure and the Council is only involved directly in a relatively small number of infrastructure schemes. However the purposed of this IDP is to bring together those key infrastructure types, to demonstrate that the scale and distribution of development set out in the Publication Draft Core Strategy can be accommodated and the required infrastructure will be in place when it is needed. It does not set out all the detailed infrastructure provision from the various providers. For this information, the specific capital and investment programmes of the various providers should be referred to.

Categories of Infrastructure Importance

- 8.2 As discussed above there are different categories of infrastructure importance relating to the delivery of the approach set out in the Core Strategy. Some infrastructure is critical to the delivery of the Core Strategy – that is without them the strategy will face significant barriers to being delivered. Some infrastructure is necessary – the infrastructure is required to accommodate development but the timing and phasing is less critical. Finally some infrastructure is preferred – that is infrastructure (including services and facilities) which assists in building sustainable communities but the timing and phasing is not critical. Relate to different categories of infrastructure relating to their urgency. Table 1 set this out below:

Table 1

Categories of Infrastructure Importance to Delivery of the Core Strategy Approach	Definition
Critical	The identified infrastructure is critical and without this, the development cannot proceed. <i>(e.g. some transport infrastructure)</i>
Stage 1 - Necessary	The identified infrastructure is necessary to support new development, but the precise timing and phasing is less critical. Some development may occur before the ahead of the provision of infrastructure. <i>(e.g. additional school capacity)</i>
Stage 2- Necessary	The delivery of this infrastructure is preferred to ensure balanced and sustainable communities but the timing and phasing is not critical. <i>(e.g. public realm improvements)</i>

Risk to Delivery

- 8.3 In additional to distinguishing between the categories of infrastructure importance, it is also important to assess the risk attached to the delivery of infrastructure and any contingencies required to manage the risk. Table 2 below sets out the different levels of risk that the Council has formulated:

Table 2

Risk to Infrastructure Delivery	Definition
Low	Infrastructure requirements are identified, costs are known and funding is secured or a robust mechanism identified to secure funding. No other planning or consents are required, and/or there is a statutory duty to provide the required infrastructure in step with development.
Medium	Infrastructure requirements are identified and there is a clear mechanism identified to secure funding. Planning /and or other consents may be required to secure delivery. There is a strong likelihood that consents would be granted.
High	Either/or: Infrastructure requirements are identified but there is no clear mechanism at present to secure funding. Planning and/or other consents are required to secure delivery. The likelihood of consents being granted is uncertain.

8.4 These tables form the basis for the Infrastructure tables attached as Annexes to this IDP. Annex 1 sets out 'Critical infrastructure', Annex 2 sets out 'Stage 1 Necessary Infrastructure' and Annex 3 sets out 'Stage 2 Necessary infrastructure'. All annexes consider the risk attached to the provision of that infrastructure (using the categories identified) and any mitigation possible to manage the risk.

Funding

8.5 Funding for the identified infrastructure improvements will come from a variety of sources, as it brings together information from a variety of sources. Much of this information is taken from the capital programmes of the relevant bodies. Annexes 1-3 identify the Lead Delivery Partner who is responsible for the scheme. In most cases this also identifies who is funding the improvement unless otherwise stated. Much of the infrastructure is related directly to the development coming forward such as utilities and open space, which is particularly the case for necessary development.

8.6 The Council has taken an approach on the basis of reducing the risk involved in being able to deliver the strategy proposed. This has led to the amount of reliance on critical infrastructure being minimised. In all cases funding for the critical infrastructure set out in Annex 1 has or will have been secured at the point it is required. Therefore there is no significant funding gap for major strategic improvements required in this plan period, which acts as a barrier to

development being brought forward. This will assist in the setting of a viable and appropriate CIL Charging Schedule. As stated in Section 4, contributions will be taken in this plan period to assist in a major highway improvement in the next plan period. This will be taken forward through the work on the CIL Charging Schedule.

- 8.7 Clearly funding regimes and infrastructure being delivered over the lifetime of the Ryedale Plan will be subject to change. This IDP will be updated on a regular basis to inform and support development coming forward at the point envisaged in the Plan – see the monitoring and review section below.

Monitoring and Review

- 8.8 AMR will be the principal mechanism for monitoring the progress of delivering key infrastructure projects on an annual basis.
- 8.9 The Council already has a duty to undertake regular monitoring through its Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) of the Ryedale Plan.
- 8.10 It is considered that the most appropriate mechanism for ensuring that the IDP is regularly monitored will be to incorporate this into the AMR process. The AMR would then include a separate section specifically on the IDP, reviewing the progress made against the IDP Delivery Schedules and identifying whether this gives rise to concerns such that a more formal periodic review of the IDP is necessary.
- 8.11 It is important to note that liaison with service providers and partners is an ongoing process and this mechanism will ensure that is appropriately reflected.

9 Documents References and Links

- 9.1 This list represents some of the key information referred to in this document. This is not an exhaustive list and reference should be made to the Council's Evidence Base (<http://ldf.ryedale.gov.uk>) and other partner's information for further detailed information.

Air Quality Action Plan, Ryedale District Council

Air Quality Management Area Order, Ryedale District Council

A64 Corridor Connectivity Study, Jacobs, February 2011

Connecting North Yorkshire

<http://www.northyorks.gov.uk/broadband>

Draft Site Selection Methodology, March 2011

Helmsley and Kirkbymoorside Service Centre Transportation Strategy (June 2008)

<http://www.northyorks.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=3949&p=0>

Lets Talk Less Rubbish: A Municipal Waste Management Strategy for the City of York and North Yorkshire 2006-2026

[http://www.letstalklessrubbish.com/ltlr/Library0.nsf/0/082DD8E1D09A09E1802572E20049B308/\\$file/c.%20Lets%20Talk%20Less%20Rubbish%20Waste%20Strategy.pdf](http://www.letstalklessrubbish.com/ltlr/Library0.nsf/0/082DD8E1D09A09E1802572E20049B308/$file/c.%20Lets%20Talk%20Less%20Rubbish%20Waste%20Strategy.pdf)

Local Transport Plan 3: North Yorkshire County Council

Malton and Norton Traffic Management Strategy (2005)

Malton SCTS Consultation

Malton Town Centre Public Realm Improvements, Jacobs, July 2009

http://extranet.ryedale.gov.uk/pdf/Jacobs%20public%20realm%20Draft_Final_Report_Revitalise_Malton.pdf

NYnet

www.nynet.co.uk

Pickering Integrated Transport Strategy (2005)

Ryedale Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study, PMP, March 2007

Annex 1: Critical Infrastructure (The identified infrastructure is critical and without this, the development cannot proceed.)

What	When	Why	Lead delivery organisation	Cost	Sources of funding	Any dependencies	Risk of not proceeding	Contingency
Transport								
Additional Slip at Road Brambling Fields junction on the A64 at Norton	Construction - Jan 2012 Completion - July 2012	Critical infrastructure to accommodate future development in Malton and Norton (linked to complementary measures)	Highways Agency	£5.6m	NYCC RDC Highways Agency S106 monies	Town Centre complementary measures in Malton and Norton	Medium	Not required
Package of town centre measures in Malton and Norton town centre to ensure proper operation of Brambling Fields improvement	To be implemented immediately on completion of Brambling Fields Slip Road	Critical infrastructure to accommodate future development in Malton and Norton (linked to Brambling Fields)	NYCC	£0.5m	NYCC RDC	Additional slip road on A64 at Brambling Fields	Medium	Not required
Package of internal junction improvements in Malton and Norton	Implementation phased throughout plan period as allocations are brought forward	Critical infrastructure to accommodate future development in Malton and Norton	NYCC	£TBC	Developer Contributions	Both Additional slip road on A64 at Brambling Fields and Town Centre complementary measures in Malton and Norton	Low	Choice and phasing of development sites changed to accommodate development

	Definition
Low	Infrastructure requirements are identified, costs are known and funding is secured or a robust mechanism identified to secure funding. No other planning or consents are required, and/or there is a statutory duty to provide the required infrastructure in step with development.
Medium	Infrastructure requirements are identified and there is a clear mechanism identified to secure funding. Planning /and or other consents may be required to secure delivery. There is a strong likelihood that consents would be granted.
High	Either/or: Infrastructure requirements are identified but there is no clear mechanism at present to secure funding. Planning and/or other consents are required to secure delivery. The likelihood of consents being granted is uncertain.

Annex 2 – Stage 1 Necessary Infrastructure (The identified infrastructure is necessary to support new development, but the precise timing and phasing is less critical. Some development may occur before the ahead of the provision of infrastructure.)

What	When	Why	Lead delivery organisation	Cost	Sources of funding	Any dependencies	Risk of not proceeding	Contingency
Flood Defences and Utilities								
Local Reinforcement of Water Supply in Market Towns and Service Villages	Phased in conjunction with sites being brought forward through the Sites and Helmsley Documents	Necessary infrastructure to support future development in Towns and Service Villages in tandem with new development	Yorkshire Water	Not costed	Yorkshire Water Site specific developer (dependent on when site brought forward in investment plan cycle)	Reinforcement dependent on sites being brought forward for development	Low	Phasing of release of sites to manage water supply capacity
Additional WWTW Capacity in Norton, Pickering, Kirkbymooside, Ampleforth, Sherburn, Sheriff Hutton, Slingsby, Staxton and Willerby	Phased in conjunction with sites being brought forward through the Sites and Helmsley Documents	Necessary infrastructure to support future development in Towns and Service Villages in tandem with new development	Yorkshire Water	Not costed	Yorkshire Water Site specific developer (dependent on when site brought forward in investment plan cycle)	Additional WWTW capacity dependent on sites being brought forward for development	Low	Phasing of release of sites to fully utilise existing WWTW capacity
Potential additional WWTW Capacity in Nawton/Beadlam, Hovingham, Rillington and Thornton le Dale	If shown to be needed then phased in conjunction with sites being brought forward through the Sites and Helmsley Documents	Necessary infrastructure to support future development in Towns and Service Villages in tandem with new development if shown to be required	Yorkshire Water	Not costed	Yorkshire Water Site specific developer (dependent on when site brought forward in investment plan cycle)	Additional WWTW capacity dependent on sites being brought forward for development	Low	Phasing of release of sites to fully utilise existing WWTW capacity. Additional WWTW capacity only undertaken if shown to be required
Local Reinforcement of Electricity Supply in Market Towns and Service Villages	Where required, phased in conjunction with sites being brought forward through the Sites and Helmsley Documents	Necessary infrastructure to support future development in Towns and Service Villages in tandem with new development where required	NEDL (part of CE Electric Ltd)	Not costed	NEDL Site specific developer need to contribute towards a proportion of the costs.	Local Reinforcement dependent on sites being brought forward for development	Low	Phasing of release of sites to fully utilise existing electricity supply capacity if necessary
Reinforcement of Medium Pressure Gas Supply Network in Malton and Norton	Phased in conjunction with sites being brought forward through the Sites and Helmsley Documents	Necessary infrastructure to support future development in Malton and Norton in tandem with new development	Northern Gas Networks	Not costed	Northern Gas Site specific developer need to contribute a proportion of the costs	Local Reinforcement dependent on sites being brought forward for development	Low	Phasing of release of sites to fully utilise existing Medium Pressure network if necessary.

Reinforcement of Low Pressure System in Market Towns and Service Villages	Documents Phased in conjunction with sites being brought forward through the Sites and Helmsley Documents	development Necessary infrastructure to support future development in Market Towns and Service Villages in tandem with new development	Northern Gas Networks	Not costed	Northern Gas Networks Site specific developer may need to contribute a proportion of the costs	Local Reinforcement dependent on sites being brought forward for development	Low	Phasing of release of sites to fully utilise existing Low Pressure network if necessary.
Provision of waste and recycling bins and bin lorries	Bins – In line with the delivery of new housing Bin lorries - TBC	Necessary infrastructure to address strain on waste and recycling collection	RDC	Bins - £65 per household Bin lorries - £350k	Developer contributions	None	Low	None needed – waste collection and recycling is essential
Transport								
Site specific highway improvements necessary to satisfactorily accommodate the development	Phased in conjunction with sites being brought forward through the Sites and Helmsley Documents	Necessary highway improvements to ensure safe and efficient operation of the road network	Developer (guided by NYCC)	Site specific costs	Developer	None	Low	Phasing of release of sites to ensure improvements are in place when required by NYCC
Open space, recreational space and burial space								
Provision of a formal park in Malton and Norton	Phased in conjunction with sites being brought forward through the Sites and Helmsley Documents	To ensure adequate park provision in Malton and Norton	Developer (guided by RDC)	Not costed but will be examined through work on Sites and Helmsley documents	Developer contributions or part of the development of a site if opportunity arises	Dependent on choices of sites	Medium	
Children's and Young people's play provision in Market Towns and Service Villages where additional provision is required	Phased in conjunction with sites being brought forward through the Sites and Helmsley Documents	To ensure adequate provision either on site or through developer contributions to off-site provision	Developer	Not costed but will be examined through work on Sites and Helmsley documents	Direct provision or through pooled developer contributions.	Dependent on choices of sites	Medium	
Provision of informal market town open space in the Market Towns	Phased in conjunction with sites being brought forward through the Sites and Helmsley Documents	To ensure adequate provision either on site or through developer contributions to off-site provision	Developer	Not costed but will be examined through work on Sites and Helmsley documents or delivered directly by developer	Direct provision or through pooled developer contributions.	Dependent on choices of sites	Medium	
Additional Outdoor Play Provision in the Market Towns	Phased in conjunction with sites being brought forward	To ensure adequate provision either on site or	Developer	Not costed but will be examined through work on	Direct provision or through pooled developer contributions	Dependent on choices of sites	Medium	

	through the Sites and Helmsley Documents	through developer contributions to off-site provision	Developer	Sites and Helmsley documents	Direct provision or through pooled developer contributions	Dependent on choices of sites	Medium	
Additional Village open space at: Amotherby, Rillington, Staxton and Willerby and Thornton le Dale (quantitative) Amotherby and Swinton, Ampleforth and Beadlam and Nawton. (qualitative)	Phased in conjunction with sites being brought forward through the Sites and Helmsley Documents	To ensure adequate provision either on site or through developer contributions to off-site provision	Developer	Not costed but will be examined through work on Sites and Helmsley documents or delivered directly by developer	Direct provision or through pooled developer contributions	Dependent on choices of sites	Medium	
Green Infrastructure	Phased in conjunction with sites being brought forward through the Sites and Helmsley Documents	To ensure that new development creates new or enhances existing green infrastructure	Developer	Not costed but part of the development costs in bringing sites forward	Direct provision or through pooled developer contributions.	Dependent on choices of sites	Medium	
Health and Education								
Provision of 160 Extracare spaces at Malton, Pickering, Kirkbymoorside and Helmsley	TBC	To ensure adequate elderly care provision as set out in Policy CS4 of the Publication Draft Core Strategy	NYCC/Special Purpose Vehicle	TBC	NYCC/Special Purpose Vehicle	No	Medium	Range of sites being investigated – choice will be based on suitability and deliverability
Potential new primary schools or significant extension to existing primary schools to create additional teaching space at Malton/Norton and Pickering	Phased in conjunction with sites being brought forward through the Sites and Helmsley Documents	To ensure that additional school places are delivered in tandem with increased child population resulting from new development	NYCC	TBC	Developer contributions	Exact requirements dependent on choice of sites	Low	Development can be phased to utilise existing school capacity until enough funding has been secured to deliver additional provision
Extension to existing primary schools to create additional teaching space at Kirkbymoorside, Helmsley, Ampleforth, Amotherby and Swinton, Staxton and Willerby.	Phased in conjunction with sites being brought forward through the Sites and Helmsley Documents	To ensure that additional school places are delivered in tandem with increased child population resulting from new development	NYCC	TBC	Developer contributions	Exact requirements dependent on choice of sites	Low	Development can be phased to utilise existing school capacity until enough funding has been secured to deliver additional provision

Risk to Infrastructure Delivery	Definition
Low	<p>Infrastructure requirements are identified, costs are known and funding is secured or a robust mechanism identified to secure funding.</p> <p>No other planning or consents are required, and/or there is a statutory duty to provide the required infrastructure in step with development.</p>
Medium	<p>Infrastructure requirements are identified and there is a clear mechanism identified to secure funding.</p> <p>Planning /and or other consents may be required to secure delivery. There is a strong likelihood that consents would be granted.</p>
High	<p>Either/or:</p> <p>Infrastructure requirements are identified but there is no clear mechanism at present to secure funding.</p> <p>Planning and/or other consents are required to secure delivery.</p> <p>The likelihood of consents being granted is uncertain.</p>

Annex 3 – Stage 2 Necessary Infrastructure (The delivery of this infrastructure is important to ensure balanced and sustainable communities but the timing and phasing is not critical)

What	When	Why	Lead delivery organisation	Cost	Sources of funding	Any dependencies	Risk of not proceeding	Contingency
Utilities and Flood Defences								
Provision of a Waste Transfer Station in Malton/ Pickering area.	Design and planning - 2013/14 Construction - 2014/15 Operation - April 2015	Part of a network of proposed WTSs which will serve the County Wide Allerton Waste Recovery Park.	NYCC	£1.5m	NYCC	Delivery of the County Wide Allerton Waste Recovery Park.	Medium	None
Communication								
Business and community groups gaining access to NYNET	TBC	Ensure that broadband provision is more widely available in the District	NYNET	£TBC	NYNET NYCC RDC Developer Contributions	Wider rollout of broadband and superfast broadband by BT	Low	None necessary
Transport								
Major strategic highway improvement to accommodate development beyond 2026	Potential developer contributions in the medium term to deliver an improvement beyond 2026 subject to the review of the Core Strategy	To accommodate development on the highway network beyond 2026	NYCC	Between £13m and 25m	Developer contributions NYCC RDC DTF/ HA		High	Choice of strategic highway improvements possible to maximise potential deliverability.
Package of highway and cycleway improvements as identified in Transport Strategies (TMS and SCTS)	Implementation phased throughout plan period as allocations are brought forward	To ensure safe and efficient operation of highway network including cycleways	NYCC	To be established through SCTSs which are yet to be completed	Developer Contributions NYCC	Both Additional slip road on A64 at Brambling Fields and Town Centre complementary measures in Malton and Norton	Medium	Choice and phasing of development sites changed to accommodate development

Open space, recreational space and burial space

	TBC		RDC		Developer contributions RDC	None	Medium
Replacement of Derwent Pool, Norton					Developer contributions RDC	None	Medium
Extension to Ryedale Pool, Pickering	TBC		RDC		Developer contributions RDC	None	Medium
Additional allotment provision	Phased in conjunction with sites being brought forward through the Sites and Helmsley Documents	To meet the needs of the additional population	Developer	Not costed but will be examined through work on Sites and Helmsley documents	Direct provision or through pooled developer contributions.	None	Medium
Additional Burial space in Malton, Norton and Pickering	Phased in conjunction with sites being brought forward through the Sites and Helmsley Documents	Additional capacity required	RDC	Not costed but will be examined through work on Sites and Helmsley documents	Developer contributions RDC	None	Medium
Local Projects							
Public Realm and Transport Interchange Improvements at Malton and Norton	Implementation phased throughout plan period as allocations are brought forward	To improve accessibility and permeability around the town centre as well as increasing the attractiveness of the town centres	NYCC RDC FME	£2.45m	Direct provision and through pooled developer contributions.		
Milton Rooms Remodelling	TBC	To upgrade a key community building into a multi-use facility	RDC	£8.3m	Developer Contributions External Funding RDC Capital Programme	None	High

	Definition
Risk to Infrastructure Delivery	
Low	Infrastructure requirements are identified, costs are known and funding is secured or a robust mechanism identified to secure funding. No other planning or consents are required, and/or there is a statutory duty to provide the required infrastructure in step with development.
Medium	Infrastructure requirements are identified and there is a clear mechanism identified to secure funding. Planning /and or other consents may be required to secure delivery. There is a strong likelihood that consents would be granted.
High	Either/or: Infrastructure requirements are identified but there is no clear mechanism at present to secure funding. Planning and/or other consents are required to secure delivery.

