Harrogate District LOCAL PLAN

Built and Natural Environment Site Assessments Volume 11: Nidd – Rainton

October 2016

Harrogate BOROUGH COUNCIL

Contents

1 Introduction 2

2 Policy Context 3
National Policy Context 3
Emerging Local Policy Context 5

3 Methodology 8
Landscape 8
Conservation and Design 13
Ecology 17
Land Drainage 20

4 Site Assessments 21
Nidd 23
North Rigton 27
North Stainley 31
Pannal 60
Rainton 125

1 Introduction

1.1 The Harrogate District Local Plan will make allocations of land for housing, employment uses and a range of other uses where appropriate. The Built and Natural Environment Site Assessments document(s) has been prepared as part of the evidence base to support the Draft Local Plan and has been used to help inform the the choice of draft allocations for housing, employment and mixed use development.[1] This report looks at site options in:

- Nidd
- North Rigton
- North Stainley
- Pannal
- Rainton

1.2 Full details of how sites have been selected can be found in Appendices 7 and 8 of the Harrogate District Draft Sustainability Appraisal (October 2016).[2]

1.3 The council's consultancy team have undertaken studies of potential impacts of development on the following:

- Landscape;
- Conservation and design;
- Ecology; and
- Land Drainage

1 There are number of volumes of The Built and Natural Environment Site Assessment documents, each dealing with different settlements across the district.

2 For further details please visit www.harrogate.gov.uk/sa

2 Policy Context

National Policy Context

Introduction

2.1 The government is committed to protecting and enhancing the quality of the environment. This is expressed in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which clarifies that pursuing sustainable development involves seeking positive improvements in the quality of the built, natural and historic environment. Paragraph 17 of the NPPF sets core planning principles, which include that planning should:

- Always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all future and existing and future occupants of land and buildings;
- Take account of the different roles and character of different areas, promoting the vitality of our main urban areas, protecting Green Belts around them, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and support thriving communities within it;
- Contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution;
- Conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations.

Landscape

2.2 Paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is clear that the planning system should contribute to, and enhance, the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes. To help achieve this aim, paragraph156 requires local plans to include strategic policies to deliver conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscape.

2.3 Through paragraph 113 the NPPF supports the use of local landscape designations but highlights that distinctions should be made between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites so that protection is commensurate with their status and gives appropriate weight to their importance and the contribution they make to the wider ecological network. Where landscape designations are being used, paragraph 113 goes on to require local planning authorities to set criteria based policies against which proposals for any development on or affecting protected landscape areas will be judged.

Conservation and Design

2.4 Design issues are material considerations in the determination of planning applications. Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) clarifies that planning policies and decisions should aim to ensure that developments will function well and add to the overall quality of the area; establish a strong sense of place; respond to local character and history, and reflect local identity; create safe and accessible environments, and; are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and landscape design. Paragraph 60 of the NPPF adds that while policies should not stifle innovation, it is however proper to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness. Paragraph 64 states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take account the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

2.5 Section 12 of the NPPF reinforces the government's overarching aim that the historic environment and heritage assets should be conserved and enjoyed for the quality of life they bring to this and future generations. The NPPF defines a heritage asset as a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape positively identified as having a degree of

significance meriting consideration in planning decisions because of its heritage interest. For the purpose of heritage policy, it defines significance as the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest and goes on to identify that the interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic.

2.6 NPPF explains the importance of recognising and valuing the positive contribution of heritage assets to local character and sense of place; and to conserve those heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance by ensuring that decisions are based on the nature, extent and level of that significance. In accordance with NPPF, in considering the impact of a proposal on any heritage asset, the council will take into account the particular nature of the significance of the heritage asset.

Ecology

2.7 Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 sets out a statutory obligation that, 'Every public body must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity.'

2.8 Section 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out national planning policies for conserving and enhancing the natural environment. Paragraph 109 of the NPPF identifies that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible, contributing to the Government's commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures. Paragraph 110 states that Local Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value, where consistent with other policies in the Framework.

2.9 Paragraph 118 of the NPPF sets out the principles by which local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity when determining planning applications, including:

- if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused;
- proposed development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) likely to have an adverse effect on an SSSI should not normally be permitted.
- development proposals where the primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be permitted;
- opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments should be encouraged;
- planning permission should be refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland and the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland, unless the need for, and benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh the loss.

2.10 In addition, paragraph 115 of the NPPF notes that the conservation of wildlife is an important consideration in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, such as the Nidderdale AONB.

Land Drainage

2.11 There is an increasing body of scientific evidence suggesting that the global climate is changing as a result of human activity. Across the globe the changing climate is likely to give rise to a variety of different impacts. For the UK the projections of future climate change suggest that more frequent, high intensity rainfall events and periods of long-duration rainfall, of the type responsible for the 2007 floods, could be expected.

2.12 In response to meeting the challenge of climate change and flooding, paragraph 100 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) identifies that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk, but where development is necessary, making it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere.

2.13 In terms of planning for future development needs, paragraph 100 identifies that Local Plans should be supported by Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and develop policies to manage flood risk from all sources, taking account of advice from the Environment Agency and other relevant flood risk management bodies, such as lead local flood authorities and internal drainage boards. It goes on to state that Local Plans should apply a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development to avoid where possible flood risk to people and property and manage any residual risk, taking account of the impacts of climate change, by:

- Applying the Sequential Test;
- If necessary, applying the Exception Test;
- Safeguarding land from development that is required for current and future flood management;
- Using opportunities offered by new development to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding; and
- Where climate change is expected to increase flood risk so that some existing development may not be sustainable in the long-term, seeking opportunities to facilitate the relocation od development, including housing, to more sustainable locations

Emerging Local Policy Context

Introduction

2.14 The development plan for Harrogate district comprises the saved policies of the Harrogate District Local Plan (2001; selective alteration 2004) and the Harrogate District Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD)(2009). The council is currently preparing a new Local Plan that will guide sustainable development across the district in the period up to 2035. The council's Local Development Scheme First Review (2016) identifies that the new Local Plan is time tabled for adoption in autumn 2018. Upon adoption this document will replace the saved policies of the Harrogate District Local Plan as well as the Harrogate District Core Strategy.

2.15 In summer 2015 the council consulted on Local Plan Issues and Options. The consultation sought views on what the plan should should seek to achieve over the next 20 or so years, how new homes and jobs should be distributed across the district, what policies should be included in order to ensure that new development is sustainable and the scope of detailed development management policies.

2 Policy Context

2.16 Following further work the council consulted on the initial draft wording of detailed development management policies in November and December 2015. The key issues arising from these consultations can be found in the Harrogate District Local Plan: Issues and Options Consultation Statement (October, 2016).

2.17 In October 2016 the council published the Draft Local Plan for consultation. The draft plan sets out the emerging strategic policies alongside detailed draft development management policies as well as identifying draft allocations of land for future development.

Landscape

2.18 Draft policy NE4: Landscape Character sets out the council's emerging approach to the protection and enhancement of landscape character across the district. The policy requires development proposals to protect, enhance or restore landscape character. It also sets out additional requirements that will apply to proposals affecting the nationally designated Nidderdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), as well as additional requirements affecting locally designated Special Landscape Areas. In addition draft policies HP3: Local Distinctiveness and NE7: Trees and Woodland also have relevance to landscape.

Conservation and Design

2.19 The emerging policies most relevant to conservation and design are draft policies HP2: Heritage Assets and HP3: Local Distinctiveness. HP2 sets out the council's emerging approach to the protection and enhancement of the historic environment. It outlines support for proposals that will help to ensure a sustainable future for the district's heritage assets and makes clear that development should protect and, where appropriate, enhance those elements that contribute to an asset's significance. HP3 sets out the emerging approach to securing high quality building, urban and landscape design. It requires development proposals to protect, enhance or reinforce those characteristics, qualities and features that contribute to the local distinctiveness of the district's urban and rural environments. In addition several other emerging policies also have some relevance to conservation and design issues, including: EC3: Employment Development in the Countryside; HS1: Housing Mix and Density; HS5: Space Standards; HS7: Replacement Dwellings in the Countryside; HS8: Extensions to Dwellings; CC4: Sustainable Design.

Ecology

2.20 The emerging policies most relevant to ecological considerations are draft policies NE3:Protecting the Natural Environment, NE5: Green Infrastructure and NE7: Trees and Woodland; and CC2: Rivers. NE3 aims to safeguard the district's biodiversity and geological heritage. It outlines protection for internationally, nationally and locally designated sites as well as seeking enhancements to biodiversity, priority habitats, protected species, priority species and ecological networks. It also seeks to prevent the loss of irreplaceable habitats. NE5 aims to to conserve and enhance the district's green infrastructure assets primarily in order to safeguard their ecosystems services but also to maximise the wider social, economic and environmental benefits that stem from high quality natural environments. NE7 aims to specifically protect and enhance the contribution that trees and woodland make to landscape character, local distinctiveness and biodiversity. CC2: Rivers aims to ensure that proposals contribute to improving the quality of water bodies and aquatic habitats, and creating terrestrial habitats that are better connected. In addition draft policy NE2: Water Quality also has some relevance to ecology.

Land Drainage

2.21 Draft policy CC1: Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage sets out the council's emerging approach to land drainage. The policy requires development proposals to ensure that there is no increase in the flow rate of surface water run off, and to achieve this, prioritises the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) to manage surface water discharge. SuDS that involve the use of soakaways should always be the first consideration, however, if ground conditions are not suitable for infiltration drainage techniques, the following order of preference should be used to develop an alternative method of surface water disposal:

- Watercourse
- Surface water sewer
- Combined water sewer

2.22 Soakaway drainage should not be used in the central area of Ripon where it has been identified as being at risk from gypsum dissolution. In addition, the policy seeks to resist the building over of culverts and the culverting or canalisation of water course, whilst encouraging the reopening of culverts and the modification of canalised water courses to achieve a more natural state. The policy also outlines support for safeguarding the use of land needed for flood risk management purposes. Draft policies CC2: Rivers; CC4: Sustainable Design and NE2: Water Quality also have some relevance to land drainage.

3 Methodology

3.1 This section sets out how the various assessments have been undertaken.

Landscape

3.2 A Landscape Capacity Assessment has been carried out for the sites put forward for development. A systematic approach has been followed so that the procedure is replicable and is as objective and impartial as possible. The approach is based on specific techniques and good practice guidance on landscape and visual appraisal, and the latest guidance on landscape character assessments contained in:

- Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment: Third Edition (Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment, 2013).
- An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment (Christine Tudor, Natural England, 2014).
- Landscape Character Assessment Guidance for England and Scotland: Topic Paper Number 6: Techniques and Criteria for Judging Capacity and Sensitivity (Scottish Natural Heritage and The Countryside Agency).
- A Guide to Commissioning a Landscape Capacity Study (Scottish Natural Heritage).

3.3 The assessment provides an 'in-principle' assessment of the appropriateness of a site to assist in guiding development to areas where the harm would be at a relatively low level and where it can be mitigated most effectively. The assessment is therefore primarily a comparative exercise in ranking sites according to the capacity of the landscape to accept change without causing harm to the landscape resource taking into consideration the potential for landscape mitigation where appropriate.

3.4 An initial screening exercise was carried out to establish sites located entirely within urban areas. Where it was considered that there were no obvious landscape constraints attached to a site it was screened out from further assessment. The screened out sites are listed below:

Landscape: screened out sites		
Site Code	**Site Name**	**Settlement**
H4	Grove Park Centre	Harrogate
H18	Greenfield Court, 42 Wetherby Road	Harrogate
H20	Land to the rear of the Old Swan	Harrogate
H29	Land at Masham Road	Harrogate
H30	Land adjacent to Prince of Wales Mansions	Harrogate
H37	Land at Station Parade	Harrogate
H60	Claro Road depot	Harrogate
K30	York Place car park	Knaresborough
R1	Land adjacent to 63 Bondgate	Ripon

Landscape: screened out sites		
Site Code	**Site Name**	**Settlement**
R29	Ash Grove Industrial Estate	Ripon

Table 3.1 Landscape: Screened Out Sites

3.5 For sites that were not screened out, the assessment of landscape sensitivity and capacity follows the approach outlined below. Information about the landscape baseline has been gathered using a combination of desk based study and field survey work.

3.6 **Landscape character, area and site description:** A key document is the Harrogate District Landscape Character Assessment (2004), which divides the district into a series of 106 broadly homogeneous landscape character areas. This is a comprehensive document, set within the context of the national assessment of landscape character by the (then) Countryside Commission and English Nature. The assessment is referred to where appropriate in the consideration of the likely harm ensuing from the development and where mitigation measures might be appropriate, or not. Site survey work has been carried out to verify the key characteristics of the area potentially affected and the contribution each site makes to landscape character. In addition the desk study identified the relevant landscape designations for each site. The base line information is recorded in the landscape sensitivity and capacity table and includes a description of the urban edge.

3.7 **Existing urban edge:** The determination of the nature of the urban edge. This is particularly the relationship between the urban edge and the surrounding countryside, whether it is unscreened or whether it is well integrated by tree and woodland cover for example. The assessment considers whether the new development could help restore or reconstruct the urban edge to enhance landscape character and local distinctiveness, or in some circumstances whether the new development would appear intrusive and encroach into open countryside.

3.8 **Trees and hedges:** Describes principal elements of site vegetation that may have a bearing on the physical capacity of the site to accommodate development.

3.9 **Landscape and Green Belt designations:** In this part of the assessment landscape related designations such as the Special Landscape Areas, Conservation Areas, Historic Parks and Gardens and AONB are noted for each site where they apply. The assessment takes into account where these designations may be compromised or affected, and this would count against development. In the case where the designation is likely to be compromised then landscape mitigation measures are identified, including 'off-site' measures such as planting or landscape restoration proposed on land outside the developer's control.

3.10 **Descriptions of proposals for the site:** At this stage, identification of whether the site is being considered for residential development, employment development or mixed (residential and employment) use.

3.11 **Physical sensitivity:** This identifies the landscape's susceptibility to change as a result of the proposed development, and the value placed on the landscape. Landscape sensitivity is a combination of both susceptibility and value, for example, higher value landscapes with high susceptibility to change as a result of the loss of key characteristics or the introduction of uncharacteristic features are assessed to have a higher sensitivity to change.

3 Methodology

Criteria for landscape susceptibility	
Susceptibility	
High	Landscapes where the loss of key characteristics would change. Scale of Enclosure-landscapes with a low capacity to accommodate the type of development proposed owing to the interactions of topography, vegetation cover, built form etc. Nature of land use- landscapes with no or little existing reference or context to the type of development being proposed. Nature of existing elements-landscapes with components that are not easily replaced or substituted (eg. ancient woodland , mature trees, historic parkland etc.) Nature of existing features- landscapes where detracting features or major infrastructure is not present or where present has limited influence on the landscape.
Medium	Scale of enclosure-landscapes with a medium capacity to accommodate the type of development proposed owing to the interactions of topography, vegetation cover, built form etc. Nature of land use-landscapes with some existing reference or context to the type of development being proposed. Nature of existing elements-landscapes with components that are easily replaced or substituted. Nature of existing features-landscapes where detracting features or major infrastructure is present and has a noticeable influence on the landscape.
Low	Scale of enclosure-Landscapes with a high capacity to accommodate the type of development proposed owing to the interactions of topography, vegetation cover, built form etc. Nature of land use- landscapes with extensive existing reference or context to the type of development being proposed. Nature of existing features- landscapes where detracting features or major infrastructure is present and has a dominating influence on the landscape.

Table 3.2 Criteria for Landscape Susceptibility

Criteria for landscape value	
Value	
High	International, National and local designated landscapes. Non-designated landscapes that clearly are valued locally for their distinctive landscape character. Designated areas at an International, Regional, National or Local level (including but not limited to World Heritage Sites, National Parks, AONBs, SLAs etc.) and also considered and important component of the country's character, experienced by a high number of people. Landscape condition is good and components are generally maintained to a high standard. In terms of seclusion, enclosure by land use, traffic and movement, light pollution and presence/absence major infrastructure, the landscape has an elevated level of tranquillity. Rare or distinctive elements and features are key components that contribute to the character of the area.

Criteria for landscape value	
Value	
Medium	Landscapes that are attractive and in reasonable condition but relatively common place. The condition of the landscape tends to be average. i.e. key characteristics are largely intact with some fragmentation. No formal designations but (typically) rural landscapes, important to the setting of villages etc; and also considered a distinctive component of the regional/ county character experienced by a large proportion of its population. Landscape condition is fair and components are generally well maintained. In terms of seclusion, enclosure by land use, traffic and movement, light pollution, presence/absence of major infrastructure, the landscape has a moderate level of tranquillity. Rare or distinctive features are notable components that contribute to the character of the area.
Low	Landscape that are not distinctive and that do not have recognised value to local communities of visitors. These landscapes tend to be extensive, often in poor condition and not rare. No formal designations. Landscape condition may be poor and components poorly maintained or damaged. In terms of seclusion, enclosure by land use, traffic and movement, light pollution, presence/absence of major infrastructure, the landscape has limited levels of tranquillity Rare or distinctive features are not notable components that contribute to the character of the area.

Table 3.3 Criteria for Landscape Value

3.12 **Visual sensitivity:** This relates to the susceptibility of visual receptors to change and the value attached to the views. The susceptibility of visual receptors is dependent upon what people are doing when they are viewing the landscape and the extent to which they are focused on the view. Therefore the more susceptible receptors tend to be residents at home, people engaged in outdoor recreation etc.

Criteria for visual sensitivity	
Visual Sensitivity	
High	Includes occupiers of residential properties and people engaged in recreational activities in the countryside such as using Public Rights of Way.
Medium	Includes people engaged in outdoor sporting activities and people travelling through the landscape on minor roads and trains.
Low	Includes people at place of work e.g. industrial and commercial premises and people travelling through the landscape on A roads and motorways.

Table 3.4 Criteria of Visual Sensitivity

3.13 **Mitigation:** The purpose of this part of the assessment is to establish the degree of harm in landscape terms and whether it can be reduced by mitigation. The degree of harm will vary from site to site and will be capable of mitigation where appropriate to avoid, reduce and where possible remedy any potential negative adverse effects on the environment arising

from the proposed development. It has been assumed for the assessment that each site would be provided with a reasonable degree of landscape mitigation either in terms of primary measures that intrinsically comprise part of the development design through an iterative process, for example siting and location of new built form, or secondary measures designed to specifically address the remaining effects such as structure or screen planting, which are essentially 'add on' measures and the least effective.

3.14 **Likely level of landscape effects:** This is a summary of the impacts and ranges from large through medium to small scale adverse effects.

3.15 **Adjacent sites, cumulative impacts and benefits:** This part of the assessment identifies additional sites in close proximity that may be subject to inter-visibility with potential to impact on both cumulative landscape and visual effects.

3.16 **Overall landscape sensitivity:** Sensitivity is determined by a combination of the value that is attached to a landscape and the susceptibility of the landscape to changes that would arise as a result of the proposed development. Sensitivity ratings are assessed as low, medium/low, medium, high/medium, or high.

3.17 **Overall landscape capacity:** This relates to the degree to which a landscape can accept change without detriment to landscape character. The capacity of the landscape to accept change will depend upon the nature of the development and the opportunities available for mitigation. Those landscapes that have a higher capacity to accommodate new development of a certain type tend to be of lower sensitivity and have greater opportunities to mitigate any adverse effects. Capacity ratings are assessed as high, high/medium, medium, medium/low, or low.

3.18 **Impacts on woodland and trees and potential mitigation:** The final section of the landscape assessment form concerns the likely effect that development could have on woodland and trees both existing and proposed. Assessment scoring is colour coded from dark green- identifying potential for significant woodland creation on site, to red- where development is likely to result in the loss of ancient woodland, veteran and/or protected trees.

Results

3.19 This approach to the assessment has been delivered so that some distinction can be made between areas, which have similar levels of anticipated effects. It is acknowledged that all potential sites, involving (by definition) a significant extension of the built form into what is presently countryside of one form or another, will lead to some degree of harm in landscape terms. That degree of harm will vary from site to site and will be capable of mitigation to a greater or lesser degree according to the site concerned, the eventual development proposals and the appropriateness of the mitigation to landscape character.

3.20 The main purpose and aim of this Landscape Capacity Assessment is to assist in guiding development to areas where the harm is at a relatively low level and where it can be mitigated most effectively.

Conservation and Design

3.21 It is acknowledged that any housing development will impact on the existing built environment and its countryside setting to varying degrees. The assessments carried out by Conservation and Design Officers primarily sought to determine whether development would be harmful to any heritage asset or setting of that asset, or whether development could be designed to protect and potentially enhance the quality of the environment.

3.22 The assessment of the potential sites was carried out in three stages:

1. A desk based study was used to determine whether development of the site directly affected a known heritage asset, potential heritage asset or would affect the setting of one or more heritage assets. Sites where it was identified that development would not directly or indirectly affect heritage assets were then screened out;
2. For sites where development would directly or indirectly impact on heritage assets, a site visit was carried out to:

    a. Study the context of the site to firstly determine whether non-designated historic buildings, structures or places have sufficient significance to be considered non-designated heritage assets, and then secondly to determine whether development would have a harmful or neutral impact on the significance of any heritage asset;
    b. Assess any elements that contribute to local distinctiveness in order to determine if development could be designed in a manner to reinforce local distinctiveness;

3. Finally, there was consideration of how development could be designed to protect, and potentially enhance, the quality of the area and the significance of any heritage asset.

3.23 The first stage of the assessment, the desk-top study, was carried out for all sites. This included ascertaining:

- Whether the site is within, or near to, a Conservation Area; whether there is a Listed Building on or near to the site.
- Whether there are any Scheduled Ancient Monuments on, or near to, the site and whether the site is within the Nidderdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).
- Whether development of the site would impact on a Scheduled Battlefield, Historic Park and Garden, or the World Heritage Site at Fountains Abbey and Studley Royal (although less likely).

3.24 If the site affected any of these heritage assets, further investigation was carried out to ascertain the nature of the asset from existing written, drawn or photographic evidence available to officers, for example the list or monument description, or the conservation area appraisal. The Heritage Environment Record (HER) is kept by North Yorkshire County Council, and the desk-top study carried out by Harrogate Conservation and Design Officers did not include interrogation of the HER, so non-designated archaeological assets, were not considered in the assessment. The desk-top study also included the study of historic maps to ascertain the era of development of buildings on or near the site.

3.25 Sites where development would not impact directly or indirectly on designated assets, or buildings that were constructed before 1910, were screened out. This date was chosen because, although some buildings erected after 1910 are of architectural and local historic interest, it is unlikely that they would have a high value of significance. In most instances,

3 Methodology

these sites were at the edge of settlements and any development would form part of a natural progression of the history of development from the older core outwards to contemporary housing at the outer edge. A list of screened out sites is set out below.

Conservation and Design: screened out sites		
Site Code	**Site Name**	**Settlement**
B4	Land north of Aldborough Gate	Boroughbridge
B6	Land at Back Lane	Boroughbridge
B10	Old Hall Caravan Park, Langthorpe	Boroughbridge
B11	Land at the Bungalow	Boroughbridge
B12	Land at Stumps Cross	Boroughbridge
B18	Old Poultry Farm	Boroughbridge
BL3	Land at Station Lane	Burton Leonard
BW2	Land adjacent to River Nidd	Birstwith
BW9	Land south of Clint Bank	Birstwith
DF4	Land north east of Thornfield Avenue	Dishforth
DF7	Land at Dishforth Airfield	Dishforth
DR7	Land adjoining Meadow Lane	Darley
FF6	Follifoot Ridge Business Park	Follifoot
GH9	Land west of B6265 and north of A59	Green Hammerton
H1	Land south of Penny Pot Lane	Harrogate
H3	Land at Kingsley Road	Harrogate
H6	BT Training Centre, St George's Drive	Harrogate
H7	Land to the east of Fairways Avenue, Starbeck	Harrogate
H24	Land at Woodfield Road	Harrogate
H27	Showground car park, Wetherby Road	Harrogate
H34	Land at Oakdale Farm	Harrogate
H46	Land at Otley Road	Harrogate
H53	Land at Leckhampton, Hill Top Lane	Harrogate
H59	Skipton Road Phase Three	Harrogate
HM4	Land south of Brookfield	Hampsthwaite
HM7	Land off Brookfield Garth	Hampsthwaite
K4	Land at Bridge Farm, Bar Lane	Knaresborough
K10	Field to the rear of Ashlea and Jade Rise, Thistle Hill	Knaresborough

Conservation and Design: screened out sites		
Site Code	**Site Name**	**Settlement**
K14	Trelleborg Factory, Halfpenny Lane	Knaresborough
K15	Land north of Hay a Park Lane	Knaresborough
K23	Land north of Bar Lane and east of Boroughbridge Road	Knaresborough
K24	Land at Halfpenny Lane and south of Water Lane	Knaresborough
K26	Land at OS Field 1748, Thistle Hill	Knaresborough
K29	Merryvale Stud, Cass Lane	Knaresborough
KD1	The Croft	Kirk Deighton
KD6	Land at Scrifitain Lane	Kirk Deighton
KH7	Land north of York Road and west of Pool Lane	Kirk Hammerton
KL1	Filed adjacent to Picking Croft Lane	Killinghall
KL2	Land adjoining Grainbeck Manor	Killinghall
KL5	Land at Grainbeck Lane	Killinghall
KL15	High Warren Farm	Killinghall
M10	Land at Foxholme Lane	Masham
M11	Land at Westholme Road	Masham
MS4	Land north of Aldborough Gate	Minskip
MS5	Land at junction of Aldborough Gate and Main Street	Minskip
OC6	Former Middleton Hospital	Open Countryside
OT1	Land north of Throstle Nest Close 1	Otley
OT2	Land north of Throstle Nest Close 2	Otley
PN3	Land south of Pannal, Phase 2	Pannal
PN4	Land south of Pannal, Phase 3	Pannal
PN5	Land south of Pannal, Phase 4	Pannal
R19	Land to the east of bypass	Ripon
R5	Land north of King's Mead	Ripon
R21	Land at Rotary Way	Ripon
R24	Deverell Barracks	Ripon
R25	Claro Barracks	Ripon
R28	Land at Little Studley Road	Ripon

Table 3.5 Conservation and Design: Screened Out Sites

3 Methodology

3.26 Conservation and Design Officers visited the sites that were not screened out. The site surveys were purely visual assessments. A consistent approach was taken for all sites and the following aspects of each site were noted:

- **Site features:** these include buildings, trees and other landscape features, boundaries, falls in ground levels, water courses or any other particular constraints such as outlook of neighbouring homes or nearby heritage assets.
- **Topography and views:** relation of the site to its topographical context for example; whether on a hill or in a valley, views in and out of the site.
- **Landscape context:** general landscape character and any particular locally distinct features.
- **Grain of surrounding development:** the proximity of buildings to the street, their massing and scale of space between them.
- **Local building design:** the basic form and scale, different materials and styles of buildings on and around the site.

Results

3.27 On consideration of these aspects, the officers determined whether development of the site would result in any detrimental impact on the historic environment or local character. For all the sites visited the following questions were addressed:

- Whether development would conserve those elements that contribute towards the significance of designated and/or non-designated heritage assets?
- Whether development would provide opportunity for high quality design which supports local distinctiveness?

3.28 For sites within Conservation Areas the following additional question was also addressed:

- Whether development would contribute to local distinctiveness and countryside character by improving a poor quality site?

3.29 The survey information will also be used to provide guidance on how future development could be shaped on those sites put forward for allocation in order to minimise any harm to the historic environment or local character whilst maximising any opportunities to enhance or better reveal heritage assets and contribute positively to local distinctiveness.

Ecology

3.30 An ecological assessment to identify the likely ecological impacts of development with particular regard to protected and priority species, sites and habitats was considered for each site. A small number of sites, which were considered to have negligible biodiversity interest, were screened out of the assessment. A list of screened out sites is provided below:

Ecology: screened out sites		
Site Code	**Site Name**	**Settlement**
H4	Grove Park Centre	Harrogate
H29	Land at Masham Road	Harrogate
R1	Land adjacent to 63 Bondgate	Ripon

Table 3.6 Ecology: Screened Out Sites

3.31 For sites not screened out, the assessment sought to identify potential impacts on particular ecological receptors, as set out below:

3.32 **International Sites:** Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) and Special Protection Areas (SPAs) form part of the European Natura 2000 network of sites that are considered to have international importance under the EU Habitats Directive and the EU Birds Directive. These directives are transposed into UK law through the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010. A Habitats Regulations Assessment may be required for any plan or project that may give rise to significant impacts on these sites.

3.33 **Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs):** These sites are designated by Natural England due to their national importance. Reference was also made to whether a site is identified as being within a SSSI risk zone. These are produced by Natural England to help understand whether a SSSI, SAC or SPA will be affected by proposals nearby.

3.34 **Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs):** Reference has been made to the list of SINCs contained in Appendix 3 of the Harrogate District Local Plan (2001), as well as additional sites that have been surveyed and ratified by the North Yorkshire SINC Panel and are relevant to the areas being assessed.

3.35 **Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) Priority Habitats:** Local BAP priority habitats are listed in the Harrogate District Biodiversity Action Plan (Harrogate Borough Council, 2012), and a list of UK priority habitats is available on the Department of the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) website.

3.36 **Phase 1 Habitat Survey Target Note Features:** Target Notes (TNs) give brief description of ecologically notable features. Particular reference was had to the Harrogate District Phase 1 Habitat Survey (P1HS) (1992), although Target Notes from other more up to date Phase 1 Habitat Surveys are referred to where appropriate.

3.37 The assessment also identified the following sites features that may indicate the potential presence of ecological receptors:

3.38 **Sward:** This has been noted by reference to the Harrogate District Phase 1 Habitat Survey (1992), and updated, where appropriate, through a site visit.

3 Methodology

3.39 **Trees and Hedges:** The presence of trees and/or hedges was noted from site visits, aerial photographs or site photographs. Any trees that may merit additional protection through a Tree Protection Order (TPO) were also noted.

3.40 **Water and/or wetland:** This was noted from Ordnance Survey (OS) maps, historical maps, aerial photographs and, where necessary, site visits

3.41 **Buildings and structures:** This was noted from site visits, Ordnance Survey (OS) maps, historical maps, aerial photographs, site photographs and the assessments carried out by the council's Conservation and Design Officers.

3.42 As semi-natural habitats have become increasingly fragmented the importance of maintaining or restoring habitat connectivity is becoming better recognised. As a result, the context of the site in relation to habitat connectivity and/or corridors was also considered. This was primarily assessed from aerial photographs and Ordnance Survey (OS) maps with further data from site photographs and site visit. Maps and corridor descriptions from Natural England's work on regionally important Green Infrastructure (GI) corridors were also consulted.

3.43 Finally, the landscape character of the area that each site sits within, identified from the Harrogate District Landscape Character Assessment and Natural England's National Character Areas, was noted along with any relevant guidance relating to the particular character area, including extracts from the Environmental Opportunities section of the relevant National Character Area Profile.

3.44 In light of the information gathered for each site, opportunities for mitigation and for habitat creation through the development of Green Infrastructure (GI) and Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) were considered. The known presence or likelihood of protected species, BAP priority species or invasive alien species was recorded- in addition to the assessment above, this was also informed by existing knowledge of the known presence of these species and checked against an alert layer provided by the North and East Yorkshire Ecological Data Centre .

Results

3.45 An overall conclusion for each site, pulls together the research results to identify the likely impact of development on the site, highlighting the ecological constraints as well as mitigation that may be required alongside any potential enhancement opportunities afforded. This has then been used to score each site. The potential scores range from dark green (no adverse impact, potential for enhancement and net gains to biodiversity) through yellow, then orange, to red (a significant adverse effect on designated sites, the wider ecological network and/or priority species).

3.46 Almost all sites will have some level of ecological interest but it is comparatively rare that ecological sensitivity is such as to preclude development entirely. Relatively few sites have therefore been graded as 'red'. More often, biodiversity can be integrated into sites as part of good design and often there will be opportunities for positive enhancement, either on, and/or where appropriate, off-site through 'biodiversity offsetting'. For sites where this is comparatively straight-forward e.g. maintenance of boundary features around the site, the site is likely to have been graded as 'green'. Where mitigation should be possible but which may, for example, reduce the overall housing density of the site through retention of important features such as trees or a buffer zone along a stream, then it will have been graded as 'yellow'. Sites which are scored orange may have more substantial biodiversity interest, but this could generally be mitigated for with good design and appropriate safeguarding of

features of interest. The colour score schema does therefore provide an indication of ecological acceptability but it needs to be carefully interpreted in the light of the fuller assessment. The summary conclusion adds a little detail to the colour score.

3.47 In most cases, further ecological survey work will be required in the production of development briefs and a full ecological survey and assessment is likely to be required for any site, if and when it is brought forward for development as part of any planning application, in accordance with guidance from the Chartered Institute for Environmental and Ecological Management.[(3)]

3 Methodology

Land Drainage

3.48 The council's land drainage engineer has reviewed the potential impact of development in terms of flood risk and whether development will increase flood risk elsewhere. The assessment provides an 'in-principle' assessment of the appropriateness of a site to assist in directing development away from areas at highest risk.

3.49 A land drainage assessment was undertaken for each site. All assessments were undertaken in a consistent manner, taking account of the following documents and procedures:

- National Planning Policy Framework
- Flood Risk Regulations 2009
- Flood and Water Management Act 2010
- Land Drainage Act 1991

3.50 Additionally, more site specific information was obtained from:

- Environment Agency Flood Zone Maps;
- Harrogate Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (Level 1);
- Historic flooding records;
- Yorkshire Water and sewer records; and
- Local knowledge of the area.

Results

3.51 On consideration of these aspects, the land drainage engineer determined whether development of the site would maintain and where possible improve surface water and groundwater quality. The potential scores range from dark green (no adverse impact) through yellow, then orange, to red (very adverse effects of additional surface water discharge on nearby watercourses where mitigation would be unlikely).

4 Site Assessments

Nidd

Site Ref	Site Name	Site Area	Page
NI1	Land off Nidd Hall Drive, Nidd	1.5033	23

Table 4.1 Nidd Site

North Rigton

Site Ref	Site Name	Site Area	Page
NR1	Land at Rigton Hill and Beeston Lane, North Rigton	0.6051	27

Table 4.2 North Rigton Site

North Stainley

Site Ref	Site Name	Site Area		Page
NS1	Land south of A6108 and Shop Wood, North Stainley	4.4483		31
NS2	Land off A6108 opposite Lightwater Farmhouse, North Stainley	5.2851		36
NS3	Land to west of Cockpit Green, North Stainley	8.2496	Draft Allocation - housing	40
NS4	Former Piggery, Lightwater Farm, North Stainley	2.7488		46
NS5	Land at Lightwater Farm, North Stainley	1.749		51
NS6	Land south of A6108 (smaller site), North Stainley	2.9053	Draft Allocation - housing	56

Table 4.3 North Stainley Sites

Pannal

Site Ref	Site Name	Site Area		Page
PN1	Spring Lane, Pannal	0.6344		60
PN2	Walton Head, Pannal	25.5876		65
PN3	Land south of Pannal, Phase 2	5.7244		70
PN4	Land south of Pannal, Phase 3	13.5563		74
PN5	Land south of Pannal, Phase 4	7.1108		77
PN6	Land adjoining Black Swan, Burn Bridge Road, Pannal	1.1467		80
PN7	Cross's Field, Hill Foot Lane, Pannal	0.6623		86
PN8	Land south of Hill Foot Lane, Pannal	0.7921		92
PN9	Land north of Hill Foot Lane, Pannal	0.5696		96
PN13	Land to the east and west of Leeds Road (larger site), Pannal	81.7772		101
PN14	Land to the east and west of Leeds Road (smaller site), Pannal	16.1328	Draft Allocation - housing	109
PN16	Land to the west of A61, Pannal	1.501	Draft Allocation - Gypsy and Traveller site	117

Table 4.4 Pannal Sites

4 Site Assessments

Rainton

Site Ref	Site Name	Site Area		Page
RN1	The Grange, Rainton	0.4326		125
RN2	Former Agricultural Buildings, Rainton	0.6266	Draft Allocation - housing	128
RN3	Village Farm, Sleights Lane, Rainton	0.686	Draft Allocation - housing	133
RN4	Land at Brakehill Farm, Rainton	1.2727		138

Table 4.5 Rainton Sites

Settlement: Nidd

Site: NI1 (Land off Nidd Hall Drive, Nidd)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site located north of Nidd between the village and Nidd Hall. LCA50: Brearton and Nidd Arable farmland.
Landscape description	Area description: Moderate scale landscape with undulating landform and good woodland and tree cover. Land use is mainly arable with areas of grassland and older field systems. Nidd Hall landscape makes an important contruibution to the diversity of the area. Site description: Linear area of parkland on the approach to Nidd Hall incorporating parkland trees.
Existing urban edge	The site is in a rural location and is part of the designed landscape of Nidd Hall.
Trees and hedges	Parkland trees worthy of TPO
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open countryside
Description of proposal for the site	Employment and/or residential
Physical Sensitivity	The designed landscape is susceptible to the loss of parkland and the introduction of uncharacterisitic built form.
Visual Sensitivity	The site is not widely visible due to existing tree cover.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of parkland in a valued designed landscape.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Mitigation would not be possible.
Likely level of landscape effects	Large scale adverse effect due to impact on the designed landscape and the setting of listed buildings to the north.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	None

Conclusion

Will there be the opportunity for development to contribute to distinctiveness and countryside character?

Rationale	Rating
Sensitivity Rating: High – key distinctive characteristics are very vulnerable to change; typically a high valued landscape where landscape conditions is very good and where detracting features or major infrastructure is not present or where present has limited influence on the landscape resulting in a higher susceptibility to change.	Red
Capacity Rating: Low – the area has very limited or no capacity to accommodate the type and scale of the development proposed and there are few if any opportunities for appropriate mitigation.	Red

Will it increase the quality and quantity of tree or woodland cover?
Will it make use of opportunities wherever possible to enhance the environment as part of other initiatives?

Rationale	Rating
Development on the land would be likely to result in the loss of woodland or trees the impact of which cannot be fully mitigated.	Orange

Summary conclusion	High sensitivity landscape has no capacity for the type of development proposed without detriment the character.

Settlement: Nidd

Site: NI1 (Land off Nidd Hall Drive, Nidd)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Conservation and Design

Conservation and Design Site Assessment

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Nidd Hall (GIILB). St Peters Church (GIILB); Cross base and shaft (GIILB) located in the churchyard associated with St Peters Church; stabling (GIILB) to the rear of and associated with Nidd Hall.
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Parkland setting of Nidd Hall.
Commentary on heritage assets.	Setting of Nidd Hall (GIILB). Nidd Church and stabling to the rear of and associated with Nidd Hall are also grade II listed.
Topography and views	Gently undulating. Filtered views of Nidd Hall through or below canopies of mature trees.
Landscape context	Gently undulating parkland landscape containing mature parkland trees, woodland clumps and estate railings. In the foreground of Nidd Hall are landscaped gardens and a large fishpond.
Grain of surrounding development	Nidd Hall, orientated north- west to south- east, and set in a parkland landscape. The Hall is now used as a hotel, conference and leisure complex with additional letting bedrooms to the north side. The former stables to the north have been converted to further letting bedrooms. The church is located to the west of the Hall. Forming part of the building group are cottages all set in a wooded cluster.
Local building design	Estate properties associated with Nidd Hall.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The site is in the foreground of the Hall and within the estate. The site is currently accessed off the B6165 via Nidd Hall Drive. This is a single track road with passing places and leads to Nidd Hall Hotel. The site is irregular in shape bounded to the west by Town Street with mature trees along the frontage and to the East Nidd Hall Drive. In either direction lies open countryside. To the north lies the Nidd Hall hotel complex. The site contains a significant number of mature trees. A small archery range with targets and equipment store is located adjacent to the western boundary of the site.

Conclusion

Will it contribute to local distinctiveness and countryside character? (Only applies to sites in Conservation Areas).

Rationale	Rating
Site is not within a Conservation Area.	n/a

Will it conserve those elements which contribute towards the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets?

Rationale	Rating
Development is likely to result in harm to elements which contribute to the significance of a heritage asset and the harm is not capable of mitigation.	Red

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

Rationale	Rating
The nature of the site means that built development will have a negative impact on local distinctiveness.	Red

Summary conclusion	Linear site flanking Nidd Hall Drive. The site is detached from the clustered building group to the north of the Hall. Visually prominent on approach to the Hall. Impact on setting of the Hall.

Settlement: Nidd

Site: NI1 (Land off Nidd Hall Drive, Nidd)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	None likely to be impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	None likely to be impacted
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likely to be impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	Parkland and veteran trees
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Improved pasture
Trees and Hedges	Mature parkland trees on site, fronted by woodland strip
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature on-site and boundary trees are liklely to merit TPO protection
Water/Wetland	None on site. There is a 'fish pond' 150m to the NE
Slope and Aspect	Gently undulating
Buildings and Structures	None on site other than roadside park wall (largely ivy covered)
Natural Area	NCA 22: Pennines Dales Fringe
Environmental Opportunity	SE04: Supporting and encouraging the creation of grass/woodland buffer strips, in-field grass strips, sediment traps, ponds and wetland habitats to slow run-off and intercept sediments and pollutants…
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 50 Brearton and Nidd arable farmland: • “Parkland trees are important to diverse landscape pattern and require a program of replacement and management”. • “Promote woodland and tree planting to respect landform and landscape pattern, strengthening key woodland and tree characteristics”.
Connectivity/Corridors	The parkland has a valuable assemblage of mature and likely veteran trees that are a significant bioidversity asset. The adjacent treed disused railway and network of field boundaries provides connectivity with the Nidd Gorge to the south
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Development would disrupt the parkland habitat and would be difficult to mitigate for even with additional planting and the retention of all mature trees.
Protected Species	Mature trees and woodland are likely to support nesting birds and roosting and foraging bats. Badger may occur. Some potential for great crested newt in nearby pond.
BAP Priority Species	Not known
Invasive Species	Not known
Notes	

Conclusion

Will it deliver net gains to biodiversity and protect and enhance existing networks of priority habitats and species and provide for long term management of wildlife habitats? Will it offer opportunities to enhance Green Infrastructure?

Rationale	Rating
Some potential adverse effects on designated sites (Local Site, SSSI, LNR, the wider ecological network and/or priority habitats and species but appropriate siting/scale or substantial mitigation should enable development.	Orange

Summary conclusion	The parkland supports a valuable assemblage of mature and likely veteran trees that are a significant bioidversity asset. Development would disrupt the parkland habitat and would be difficult to mitigate for even with additional planting and the retention of all mature trees.

Settlement: Nidd

Site: NI1 (Land off Nidd Hall Drive, Nidd)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.	According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed site is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred. We are however, aware of flooding incidents in the general area 7 downstream of the site due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide. We have received significantly increased levels of complaints over recent years from concerned residents affected by, and threatened by flooding from these watercourses. Due to the number of major development proposals in the general area planning to discharge surface water to the same watercourses, it is essential that surface water discharge is kept to an absolute minimum. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) should always be any developer's first consideration and giving preference to soakaways. In my view, infiltration drainage is unlikely to be fully successful at this location due to ground conditions in the surrounding area being predominantly heavy clay soils. However, any potential developer would be expected to submit a detailed feasibility study showing the use of SuDS including soakaways permeable cellular pavements, grassed swales, infiltration trenches, wetlands, ponds and green roofs that assist in dealing with surface water at source, has been fully explored. Any proposed discharge of surface water from the development site should be restricted to Greenfield rates (1.4 l/s/ha for all storm scenarios). The overall strategy should show that there is sufficient on site attenuation to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without increasing the restricted flows to the watercourse. Applicants would be expected to agree the outline drainage strategy with the LPA in principle before any planning consent is granted. The outline drainage information should include an assessment of flood risk to the site & surrounding area, topographical survey, feasibility of infiltration drainage, on site storage, rates of discharge, outfall location & condition survey results of existing watercourses (on or off site) and proposals for dealing with any identified remedial items. The proposed development land would be classed as major development due to the specified size of the site. Consequently, NYCC in its capacity as Lead Local Flood Authority should be consulted regarding the surface water drainage strategy (Statutory Consultee).

Conclusion

Will it maintain and where possible improve surface water and groundwater quality?

Rationale	Rating
Some adverse effects of additional surface water discharge on nearby watercourses but appropriate mitigation should enable development.	Orange

Settlement: North Rigton

Site: NR1 (Land at Rigton Hill and Beeston Lane, North Rigton)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Land situated on the northern edge of North Rigton with open countryside beyond. LCA 61: South West Harrogate Undulating Farmland
Landscape description	Area description: A mediumm scale undulating landscape consting of rectangular fiields bounded by hedgerow. Despite the lack of many woodland blocks, well treed hedgerow boundaries create a wooded feel to the area and filter views. Site description: Rectangular narrow area of paddock contained by high hedgerows and occasional hedgerow trees. Site located behind children's play area with field gate access off Rigton Hill
Existing urban edge	Adjoining the northern built form edge of the village with a modern barn structure situated within the site's eastern boundary
Trees and hedges	A tall hedgerow wiith occasional hedgerow trees define all site boundaries
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Green Belt. Policy SG3 Settlement Growth: Conservation of the countryside including Green Belt.
Description of proposal for the site	Assume residential development of low density to reflect grain of viillage and village edge.
Physical Sensitivity	The site comprises a narrow rectangular shaped paddock bounded by mature hedgerows, A public footpath is routed along the full length of the site's southern boundary. The site is considered of high value and highly susceptible to change.
Visual Sensitivity	Views of the site are heavily filtered by surrounding hedgerow vegetation with glimpsed views from Rigton Hill highway and the public footpath routed through the site.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of pasture and potential impact on public footpath
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	The is some scope for mitigation wiith additional planting Site development would extend settlement edge into countryside.
Likely level of landscape effects	Change in character of open fiield on edge of village and effects on public footpath. Medium scale effect in sensitive location
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	None

Conclusion

Will there be the opportunity for development to contribute to distinctiveness and countryside character?

Rationale	Rating
Sensitivity Rating: High – key distinctive characteristics are very vulnerable to change; typically a high valued landscape where landscape conditions is very good and where detracting features or major infrastructure is not present or where present has limited influence on the landscape resulting in a higher susceptibility to change.	Red
Capacity Rating: Low – the area has very limited or no capacity to accommodate the type and scale of the development proposed and there are few if any opportunities for appropriate mitigation.	Red

Will it increase the quality and quantity of tree or woodland cover?
Will it make use of opportunities wherever possible to enhance the environment as part of other initiatives?

Rationale	Rating
Development need not result in the loss of existing woodland or trees.	Light Green

Summary conclusion	The site comprises a narrow rectangular shaped paddock bounded by mature hedgerows, A public footpath is routed along the full length of the site's southern boundary. The site is considered of high value and highly susceptible to change.The area has limited capacity to accept change that would result from the development of this area of pasture without detriment to landscape character.

Settlement: North Rigton

Site: NR1 (Land at Rigton Hill and Beeston Lane, North Rigton)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Conservation and Design

Conservation and Design Site Assessment

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Sycamore Farm House (grade II). Moated site (ancient Monument).
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Highfold.
Commentary on heritage assets.	Sycamore Farm House is located to the south west but is set well back from the road and therefore the site would be located in the wider setting of the building but with no direct visual connection. The ancient monument is a moated site (the remains a medieval dwelling). It is located to the south east of the site and hence there may be some archaeological implication and also impact on its setting. Highfold, a traditional stone house and attached outbuildings with later alterations to fenestration, abuts the south side of the site – the site is therefore located directly within its setting.
Topography and views	Slight drop in ground level down to Beestons Lane.Front of site in context with views through village, to south, in landscape setting. Views down Beestons Lane with rural setting beyond.
Landscape context	Rolling hills, woods, fields with hedgerow boundaries. Green Belt.
Grain of surrounding development	Rural village, frontage buildings along lane but also dwellings set behind frontage plots. Close relationship between buildings and then opens out as move down lane to south. - Small green opposite village garden / play area.
Local building design	Stone building with stone slate roofs or pantiles. Small scale, traditional buildings of rural character. In addition, some more recent dwellings, sometimes with render and pantiles, also bungalows.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The site is a paddock, located to the rear of a village garden / play area. A modern barn is located at the north east end of the site, separated by a post and rail fence boundary from the rest of the site, with its own access from Beestons Lane. Hedgerows along the north and south boundaries, some post and rail fence. The rear elevation of Highfold abuts directly onto the south side of the site, near the logical position of an entrance.

Conclusion

Will it contribute to local distinctiveness and countryside character? (Only applies to sites in Conservation Areas).

Will it conserve those elements which contribute towards the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets?	
Rationale	Rating
Development is likely to harm elements which contribute to the significance of a heritage asset but the harm is capable of mitigation.	Orange
Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?	
Rationale	Rating
The nature of the site means that built development will have a negative impact on local distinctiveness but there are opportunities for mitigation and improvements.	Orange
Summary conclusion	Development on the site would affect rural the setting of the village, the site being located on the edge of the village which is surrounded by open countryside. Housing of standard density would harm this rural edge but it may be possible to accept a very low number (one or two) if of appropriate, locally distinctive design and scale and all aspects to maintain rural character. Land to the east end of the site should be retained as paddock or use for gardens. Access into the site, if proposed from the current access adjacent to Highfold, would need to be appropriately designed.

Settlement: North Rigton

Site: NR1 (Land at Rigton Hill and Beeston Lane, North Rigton)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	None likely to impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	Great Almscliffe Crag geological SSSI 1 km to the SW
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likely to impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Improved pasture
Trees and Hedges	Hedgerows around site; include some mature trees along Beeston's Lane
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature trees are likely to merit TPO protection
Water/Wetland	None on site
Slope and Aspect	The land rises gently towards the west
Buildings and Structures	There is a modern storage shed in the eastern end
Natural Area	NCA 22: Pennines Dales Fringe
Environmental Opportunity	SEO4 Enhancing and connecting semi-natural habitats in river corridors to improve the wildlife movement corridors between lowland and upland. SE04: Supporting and encouraging the creation of grass/woodland buffer strips, in-field grass strips, sediment traps, ponds and wetland habitats to slow run-off and intercept sediments and pollutants… SEO 1: "Protect and connect native broadleaved woodland, parkland and veteran trees to maximise their value for wildlife, flood risk alleviation, water quality, climate regulation, recreation, sense of place and sense of history".
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 61South West Harrogate Upland Fringe Undulating Farmland Promote woodland planting along valleys and close to existing buildings to enhance wildlife corridors... Maintain and replant hedgerows so that they are high and bushy especially along the roadsides. Promote varied management regimes todiversify field appearance and improve biodiversity
Connectivity/Corridors	Trees and hedgerows along the boundaries of the small fields around the village link the upland fringe with the Wharfe Valley to the south
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Retain and enhance the trees and hedgerows with semi-natural habitats
Protected Species	Nesting birds and foraging bats are likley to utilise the boundary trees and hedgerows
BAP Priority Species	Not known
Invasive Species	Not known
Notes	

Conclusion

Will it deliver net gains to biodiversity and protect and enhance existing networks of priority habitats and species and provide for long term management of wildlife habitats? Will it offer opportunities to enhance Green Infrastructure?

Rationale	Rating
Some potential effects on designated sites (SINC, SSSI, LNR), the wider ecological network and/or priority habitats and species but relatively easy to mitigate for.	Yellow

Summary conclusion	Trees and hedgerows along the boundaries of the small fields around the village link the upland fringe with the Wharfe Valley to the south. Retain and enhance the trees and hedgerows with semi-natural habitats

Settlement: North Rigton

Site: NR1 (Land at Rigton Hill and Beeston Lane, North Rigton)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.	According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed site is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred. We are however, aware of flooding incidents in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide. We have received significantly increased levels of complaints over recent years from concerned residents affected by, and threatened by flooding from these watercourses. Due to the number of major development proposals in the general area planning to discharge surface water to the same watercourses, it is essential that surface water discharge is kept to an absolute minimum. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) should always be any developer's first consideration and giving preference to soakaways. In my view, infiltration drainage is unlikely to be fully successful at this location due to ground conditions in the surrounding area being predominantly heavy clay soils. However, any potential developer would be expected to submit a detailed feasibility study showing the use of SuDS has been fully explored. Any proposed discharge of surface water from the development site should be restricted to Greenfield rates (1.4 l/s/ha for all storm scenarios). The overall strategy should show that there is sufficient on site attenuation to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without increasing the restricted flows to the watercourse. Applicants would be expected to agree the outline drainage strategy with the LPA in principle before any planning consent is granted. The outline drainage information should include an assessment of flood risk to the site & surrounding area, topographical survey, feasibility of infiltration drainage, on site storage, rates of discharge, outfall location & condition survey results of existing watercourses (on or off site) and proposals for dealing with any identified remedial items.

Conclusion

Will it maintain and where possible improve surface water and groundwater quality?

Rationale	Rating
Neutral or slight effects of additional surface water discharge on nearby watercourses.	Yellow

Settlement: North Stainley

Site: NS1 (Land south of A6108 and Shop Wood, North Stainley)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	The site is located on the north west side of North Stainley off the A6108 LCA77: North Ripon Farmland
Landscape description	Area description: Gently rolling open agricultural landscape punctuated with farmsteads, woodland and the village of North Stainley. Site description: Grass field to the north end of the village and woodland covering approximately one third of the site to the south.
Existing urban edge	Rural village edge comprising garden boundaries.
Trees and hedges	Hedgerow boundary with the A6108.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open Countryside
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The landscape is susceptible to change as a result of the loss of trees and woodland although it is assumed the woodland would be retained as part of any development.
Visual Sensitivity	The site provides the approach to North Stainley from the north and is slightly raised on its western side making it prominent on the approach to the village.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of open field that contributes to the setting of the village.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Assume that the woodland will be retained and additional mitigation will comprise green infrastructure across the site to link with the village green.
Likely level of landscape effects	Medium to large scale affect due to the size of the site in relation to the village and the impact on the approach to the village which would become more prominent.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	NS3 is located to the south and the cumulative effects of both sites being developed would be considerable.

Conclusion

Will there be the opportunity for development to contribute to distinctiveness and countryside character?

Rationale	Rating
Sensitivity Rating: High/medium – key distinctive characteristics are vulnerable to change; typically a high to medium valued landscape where landscape conditions is good where detracting features or major infrastructure is not present or where present has limited influence on the landscape.	Orange
Capacity Rating: Medium/low – the area is not able to accommodate development of the scale and type proposed without detriment to landscape character and visual amenity and the opportunities for appropriate mitigation are limited.	Orange

Will it increase the quality and quantity of tree or woodland cover?
Will it make use of opportunities wherever possible to enhance the environment as part of other initiatives?

Rationale	Rating
Development on the land would be likely to result in the loss of woodland or trees the impact of which cannot be fully mitigated.	Orange

Summary conclusion	This assumes the woodland is retained. The landscape would have greater capacity to accept a smaller scale development against the village edge that improved integration of development with the countryside.

Settlement: North Stainley

Site: NS1 (Land south of A6108 and Shop Wood, North Stainley)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Conservation and Design

Conservation and Design Site Assessment

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Sleningford Grange (GIILB) is to the north of the site.
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	The church (ungraded) is located to the east in close proximity to the site boundary.
Commentary on heritage assets.	Sleningford Grange (GIILB) to the north of the site- development of the full extent of the site may impact on the setting of Sleningford Grange.The church is sited to the east.
Topography and views	The site contributes to the setting of the village and is prominent on approaching the village from the north.
Landscape context	Gently undulating countryside punctuated with farmsteads, individual country houses, woodland clumps, mature tree belts and the Village of North Stainley.
Grain of surrounding development	North Stainley Hall to the south and to the west of the Hall the land is sub-divided in paddocks for grazing horses. Lightwater Farmhouse and sites NS3, NS4 and NS5 to the south. Lightwater Valley further south. Sleningford Grange to the north. Bungalows to the north. Cul-de-sacs to the east. Open countryside to the west. Holmtree Lane, an isolated dwelling, further west but visible from the village and from the A6108.
Local building design	Heterogeneity. Seningford Grange is constructed of coursed rubble stone and cobbles with a stone slate roof. The village primary school is stone. Stainley Hall is constructed of brick in a Flemish bond, with an ashlar plinth and details and a stone slate roof. Some historic cottages are rendered. Recent housing developments in the village seek to reflect local distinctiveness in the palette and application of materials- including brick, render, stone plinths and details, pantiles- and in the vernacular forms. Bungaloid forms and dwellings that are suburban in style and appearance are also evident.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	Grass field to the north end of the village. Shop Wood covers approximately a third of the site to the south. Watercourse runs across the site through Shop Wood. 20th century residential development, Roseberry Grove, to the south-east. Open countryside to the north and west. Bungalows to the north of the opposite side of the A6108. Further north is Sleningford Grange (GIILB). The site extends beyond the northern limit of the built form of the village. Site is visually prominent on approaching the village from the north and land rises slightly to the west- though the south-eastern portion of the site is lower. The church is to the east. Further east, on the opposite side of the A6108 is a modern housing development which is well-spaced, interspersed with trees and open green spaces, and constitutes good design.

Conclusion

Will it contribute to local distinctiveness and countryside character? (Only applies to sites in Conservation Areas).

Rationale	Rating
Site is not within a Conservation Area.	n/a

Will it conserve those elements which contribute towards the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets?

Rationale	Rating
Development is likely to harm elements which contribute to the significance of a heritage asset but the harm is capable of mitigation.	Orange

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

Rationale	Rating
The nature of the site means that built development will have a negative impact on local distinctiveness but there are opportunities for mitigation and improvements.	Orange

Summary conclusion	The site contributes to the setting of the village and is prominent on approaching the village from the north. There is scope to accommodate housing development on this site at the village edge, though development should be confined to the south-eastern part of the site where the ground level is lower, thereby avoiding the rising ground in the north western part of the site. Development on the higher ground would assume undue prominence. This is a large site proportionate to the village, but development on the lower ground could potentially deliver an improved urban edge thereby aiding the transition from built form to open countryside. The site is in close proximity to the church- whilst the church is currently viewed in the context of residential development, any scheme for development on the site should demonstrate due regard to design, scale and height of buildings to avoid competing with the church. The layout should be designed to maintain views of the church from the north and west.

Settlement: North Stainley

Site: NS1 (Land south of A6108 and Shop Wood, North Stainley)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	None likley to be impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	Ripon Parks SSSI c.1300m to east
SSSI Risk Zone	NE require consultation on residential development of 100 units or more - potential drainage link from site to SSSI
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	Five Ponds Wood c.1km to SW
BAP Priority Habitats	Potential ancient woodland, hedgerows
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	Nearest are village pond - noted to be stocked with fish
Sward	Improved pasture (P1HS 1992)
Trees and Hedges	Shop Wood - southern part dates back to at least 1st edition OS - size is c. 1 ha so could be ancient woodland (NE have only mapped areas of AW >2ha). Two field trees in pasture, which has roadside hedge
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Woodland and field trees likely to merit TPO
Water/Wetland	Ditches drain through Shop Wood into village via ponds and ultimately River Ure
Slope and Aspect	Land rises very gently to the west
Buildings and Structures	None on site (building existed late C19th-early 20th)
Natural Area	NCA 30 Southern Magnesian Limestone
Environmental Opportunity	SEO 2: Protect and manage existing semi-natural habitats, including grasslands, wetlands and woodlands; and increase the area of semi-natural habitats, restore and create new areas, and create networks and links between habitats, to make their ecology more resilient and to afford increased movement of species.
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 77 North of Ripon Farmland • “Encourage reinstatement of hedgerows and hedgerow trees” • “Explore the potential for creation and management of magnesian limestone grassland in this area in accordance with Harrogate District Biodiversity Action Plan”
Connectivity/Corridors	Ditches connect woodland with village ponds and ultimately river Ure. Some of A6108 verges are species-rich
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	There may be an opportuity to enhance and buffer the woodland and the boundary hedges with new native planting
Protected Species	The woodland may support ground flora and badgers. The woodland, hedges and field trees may support bats and nesting birds. Some potential for ground nesting birds in the pasture. GCN possible in village ponds (although they may be stocked with fish).GCN occurs at Lightwater Quarry c. 1km to SW.
BAP Priority Species	Not known
Invasive Species	Not known (Some of village ponds have Crassula helmsii)
Notes	

Conclusion

Will it deliver net gains to biodiversity and protect and enhance existing networks of priority habitats and species and provide for long term management of wildlife habitats? Will it offer opportunities to enhance Green Infrastructure?

Rationale	Rating
Significant adverse effects on designated sites (Local Site, SSSI, LNR), the wider ecological network and/or priority habitats and species.	Red

Summary conclusion	The site is 'red' for ecology due to inclusion of Shop Wood, which requires full ecological assessment. Development on improved pasture may be acceptable, providing woodland is protected and buffered and opportunity is taken to incorporate enhancement for bioidversity,

Settlement: North Stainley

Site: NS1 (Land south of A6108 and Shop Wood, North Stainley)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.	According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed site is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred. We have received past complaints of flooding issues arising from the watercourse discharging through the site. The waterway is restricted through the rear gardens at Roseberry Green and under The A108. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide. We have received significantly increased levels of complaints over recent years from concerned residents affected by, and threatened by flooding from local watercourses in the area. Due to the number of major development proposals in the general area planning to discharge surface water to the same watercourses, it is essential that surface water discharge is kept to an absolute minimum. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) should always be any developer's first consideration and giving preference to soakaways. In my view, infiltration drainage is unlikely to be fully successful at this location due to ground conditions in the surrounding area being predominantly heavy clay soils. However, any potential developer would be expected to submit a detailed feasibility study showing the use of SuDS including soakaways permeable cellular pavements, grassed swales, infiltration trenches, wetlands, ponds and green roofs that assist in dealing with surface water at source, has been fully explored. Any proposed discharge of surface water from the development site should be restricted to Greenfield rates (1.4 l/s/ha for all storm scenarios). The overall strategy should show that there is sufficient on site attenuation to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without increasing the restricted flows to the watercourse. Applicants would be expected to agree the outline drainage strategy with the LPA in principle before any planning consent is granted. The outline drainage information should include an assessment of flood risk to the site & surrounding area, topographical survey, feasibility of infiltration drainage, on site storage, rates of discharge, outfall location & condition survey results of existing watercourses (on or off site) and proposals for dealing with any identified remedial items. The proposed development land would be classed as major development due to the specified size of the site. Consequently, NYCC in its capacity as Lead Local Flood Authority should be consulted regarding the surface water drainage strategy (Statutory Consultee).

Conclusion

Will it maintain and where possible improve surface water and groundwater quality?

Rationale	Rating
Some adverse effects of additional surface water discharge on nearby watercourses but appropriate mitigation should enable development.	Orange

Settlement: North Stainley

Site: NS2 (Land off A6108 opposite Lightwater Farmhouse, North Stainley)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	The site is located on the south side of North Stainley east of the A6108 LCA77: North Ripon Farmland
Landscape description	Area description: Gently rolling open agricultural landscape punctuated with armsteads, woodland and the village of North Stainley. Site description: Grass field surrounded by woodland to the north, east and south possibly associated with designed landscape at North Stainley Hall.
Existing urban edge	Site detached from urban edge. Large farmstead on the opposite side of the A6108. Also North Stainley Hall in parkland located on the opposite side of the A6108.
Trees and hedges	Woodland to north, east and south part of which is within the northern corner of the site. Hedgerow boundary with road.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open countryside
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	Detached from village development on this site would appear as a separate settlement. Landscape character has high susceptibility to change as a result of the loss of this field.
Visual Sensitivity	Visually contained by surrounding woodland. Development would be prominent on approach to village and Lightwater valley. Visibility across the wider landscape restricted by woodland.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of characterisitic field overlooking the village.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	It would be essential to retain and protect woodland and the expand gree infrastructure.
Likely level of landscape effects	Large scale adverse affects due to the loss of a field in open countryside detached from the village of North Stainley.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	NS5 and NS4 on the opposite site of the road would increase adverse effects if developed in conjuction with this site.

Conclusion

Will there be the opportunity for development to contribute to distinctiveness and countryside character?

Rationale	Rating
Sensitivity Rating: High – key distinctive characteristics are very vulnerable to change; typically a high valued landscape where landscape conditions is very good and where detracting features or major infrastructure is not present or where present has limited influence on the landscape resulting in a higher susceptibility to change.	Red
Capacity Rating: Low – the area has very limited or no capacity to accommodate the type and scale of the development proposed and there are few if any opportunities for appropriate mitigation.	Red

Will it increase the quality and quantity of tree or woodland cover?
Will it make use of opportunities wherever possible to enhance the environment as part of other initiatives?

Rationale	Rating
Development on the land would be likely to result in the loss of woodland or trees the impact of which cannot be fully mitigated.	Orange

Summary conclusion	High sensitivity as a result of being detached from the existing village and the scale of development proposed in open countryside. Development of this site in open countryside would affect character of the wider landscape.

Settlement: North Stainley

Site: NS2 (Land off A6108 opposite Lightwater Farmhouse, North Stainley)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Conservation and Design

Conservation and Design Site Assessment

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Stainley Hall (GII*LB); Stables at Stainley Hall (GIILB); Gate piers and gates to Stainley Hall (GIILB).
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	None.
Commentary on heritage assets.	Setting of Stainley Hall (GII*LB). Stainley Hall (GII*LB) constructed in 1715 with 19th century additions and restoration in 1985; brick built in Flemish bond with ashlar plinth and details and a stone slate roof; 3 storeys. Stables at Stainley Hall (GIILB) former stables now outbuilding; constructed in the mid 18th century of coursed cobbles with gritstone dressings and a purple slate roof; 2 storeys 3 bays with a projecting central gabled bay with a carriage arch and a triangular pattern of 3 tiers of pigeon holes in the gable. Gate piers and gates to Stainley Hall (GIILB) late 18th century date; wrought iron and rusticated ashlar.
Topography and views	Land rises to the south and falls to the north. Site enclosed by woodland to the north, south and east. Established hedgerow encloses the site to the west, parallel with the road.
Landscape context	Watercourse follows the northern boundary from west to east across the site. Open countryside. Grassland field detached from village by open field and Bog Wood.
Grain of surrounding development	Lightwater Farmhouse to the west on the opposite side of the road. The farmhouse is orientated north to south with relatively blind gable facing east to the road (A6108). Village to the north west.
Local building design	Lightwater Farmhouse: 2 storey cobble stone construction. Agricultural sheds and stabling behind. Lodge to the north of the farmhouse, gable presentation to the street.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	Open field on edge of village, beyond and divorced from village envelope, Enclosed by hedgerow. Opposite North Stainley Hall (GIILB). Part of the site is woodland- Bogs Wood.

Conclusion

Will it contribute to local distinctiveness and countryside character? (Only applies to sites in Conservation Areas).

Rationale	Rating
Site is not within a Conservation Area.	n/a

Will it conserve those elements which contribute towards the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets?

Rationale	Rating
Development is likely to result in harm to elements which contribute to the significance of a heritage asset and the harm is not capable of mitigation.	Red

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

Rationale	Rating
The nature of the site means that built development will have a negative impact on local distinctiveness.	Red

Summary conclusion	Development would impact on the setting of the village and the setting of Stainley Hall and former stables. Development of this site would be harmful by virtue of the scale of development proposed in open countryside and given that the site is on rising land detached from the settlement.

Settlement: North Stainley

Site: NS2 (Land off A6108 opposite Lightwater Farmhouse, North Stainley)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	None near enough to be impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	Ripon Parks SSSI c.800m to east
SSSI Risk Zone	NE require consultation on residential development of 100 units or more - potential drainage link
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	Five Ponds Wood c.750m to SW
BAP Priority Habitats	Wet woodland, hedgerows, potential veteran trees
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None; nearest is village pond - noted to be stocked with fish
Sward	Improved pasture (P1HS)
Trees and Hedges	Bog Wood, and wooded eastern and southern boundaries. These may be relatively recent plantations but older boundary rees may survive. Single field tree - possibly veteran or dead. Roadside hedgerow
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Woodland Mature trees on site probably merit consideration for TPOs
Water/Wetland	Proable drainage link via stream through Bog Wood betweenStainley Hall and nearby village ponds into High Batts (SSSI).
Slope and Aspect	Generally flat with slight fall to the east
Buildings and Structures	None
Natural Area	NCA 30 Southern Magnesian Grassland
Environmental Opportunity	SEO 2: Protect and manage existing semi-natural habitats, including grasslands, wetlands and woodlands; and increase the area of semi-natural habitats, restore and create new areas, and create networks and links between habitats, to make their ecology more resilient and to afford increased movement of species.
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 77 North of Ripon Farmland • “Encourage reinstatement of hedgerows and hedgerow trees” • “Explore the potential for creation and management of magnesian limestone grassland in this area in accordance with Harrogate District Biodiversity Action Plan”
Connectivity/Corridors	Wooded boundaries form a network of small woodlands linking the village into the River Ure corridor
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Retain hedgrows and buffer and enhance the small adjoining woodlands
Protected Species	Woodland, trees and hedges may support bats and nesting birds. Some potential for other woodland species e.g. badger and we woodland flora. Possibility of ground nesting birds in pasture. GCN possible in village ponds and Stainley Hall Ponds (although may be stocked with fish).
BAP Priority Species	Not known
Invasive Species	some of village ponds have Crassula
Notes	

Conclusion

Will it deliver net gains to biodiversity and protect and enhance existing networks of priority habitats and species and provide for long term management of wildlife habitats? Will it offer opportunities to enhance Green Infrastructure?

Rationale	Rating
Some potential adverse effects on designated sites (Local Site, SSSI, LNR, the wider ecological network and/or priority habitats and species but appropriate siting/scale or substantial mitigation should enable development.	Orange

Summary conclusion	Woodland Trees and hedges should be protected. retained, buffered and enhanced during the course of development. Potential for increased recreational and hydrological impacts on Ripon Parks SSSI. Possible in-combination effects with otherr adjacent developments. Potential for the presence of protected species.

Settlement: North Stainley

Site: NS2 (Land off A6108 opposite Lightwater Farmhouse, North Stainley)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.	According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed site is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred. We are however, aware of flooding incidents in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide. We have received significantly increased levels of complaints over recent years from concerned residents affected by, and threatened by flooding from these watercourses. Due to the number of major development proposals in the general area planning to discharge surface water to the same watercourses, it is essential that surface water discharge is kept to an absolute minimum. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) should always be any developer's first consideration and giving preference to soakaways. In my view, infiltration drainage is unlikely to be fully successful at this location due to ground conditions in the surrounding area being predominantly heavy clay soils. However, any potential developer would be expected to submit a detailed feasibility study showing the use of SuDS including soakaways permeable cellular pavements, grassed swales, infiltration trenches, wetlands, ponds and green roofs that assist in dealing with surface water at source, has been fully explored. Any proposed discharge of surface water from the development site should be restricted to Greenfield rates (1.4 l/s/ha for all storm scenarios). The overall strategy should show that there is sufficient on site attenuation to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without increasing the restricted flows to the watercourse. Applicants would be expected to agree the outline drainage strategy with the LPA in principle before any planning consent is granted. The outline drainage information should include an assessment of flood risk to the site & surrounding area, topographical survey, feasibility of infiltration drainage, on site storage, rates of discharge, outfall location & condition survey results of existing watercourses (on or off site) and proposals for dealing with any identified remedial items. The proposed development land would be classed as major development due to the specified size of the site. Consequently, NYCC in its capacity as Lead Local Flood Authority should be consulted regarding the surface water drainage strategy (Statutory Consultee).

Conclusion

Will it maintain and where possible improve surface water and groundwater quality?

Rationale	Rating
Some adverse effects of additional surface water discharge on nearby watercourses but appropriate mitigation should enable development.	Orange

Settlement: North Stainley

Site: NS3 (Land to west of Cockpit Green, North Stainley)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site located on south side of North Stainely at the back of a single row of houses west of the A6108. LCA77: North Ripon Farmland
Landscape description	Area description: Gently rolling open agricultural landscape punctuated with farmsteads, woodland and the village of North Stainley. Site description: Strip fields with hedgerow boundaries are remnants of historic field pattern that provide the settiing for the village. Site slightly elevated above the village.
Existing urban edge	New development in North Stainley is low density and generally integrates well with the surrounding countryside due to presence of mature trees.
Trees and hedges	Hedgerow field boundaries (some overgrown/unmanaged) with some trees. Wide verge with semi mature trees on boundary with A6108.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open countryside
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	Field pattern contributes to the setting of this small village and is susceptible to change.
Visual Sensitivity	Site overlooks village roof tops and is reasonably well contained visually.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of green field and historic field systems that contribute to the setting of North Stainley.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Green Infrastructure to link with the village green.
Likely level of landscape effects	Medium to large scale adverse effect due to loss of fields, scale of development proposed and potential effect on North Stainley Hall and associated designed landscape.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	Site NS1 to the north links with this site. The development of both sites would envelope the west side of the village.

Conclusion

Will there be the opportunity for development to contribute to distinctiveness and countryside character?

Rationale	Rating
Sensitivity Rating: High/medium – key distinctive characteristics are vulnerable to change; typically a high to medium valued landscape where landscape conditions is good where detracting features or major infrastructure is not present or where present has limited influence on the landscape.	Orange
Capacity Rating: Medium/low – the area is not able to accommodate development of the scale and type proposed without detriment to landscape character and visual amenity and the opportunities for appropriate mitigation are limited.	Orange

Will it increase the quality and quantity of tree or woodland cover?
Will it make use of opportunities wherever possible to enhance the environment as part of other initiatives?

Rationale	Rating
Development would potentially result in the loss of some woodland or trees, but any loss is likely to be mitigated.	Yellow

Summary conclusion	Sensitive due to the historic field pattern and contribution to the setting of the Village and North Stainley Hall. Capacity of the landscape to accept change would increase with a reduction in size and density of development proposed.

Settlement: North Stainley

Site: NS3 (Land to west of Cockpit Green, North Stainley)	
Natural and Built Heritage Assessments	**Type: Conservation and Design**
Conservation and Design Site Assessment	
Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Stainley Hall (GII*LB) and gazebo (GIILB). Stables at Stainley Hall (GIILB).
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Older properties, specifically Estate Yard Cottages, fronting the village street.
Commentary on heritage assets.	Setting of Stainley Hall (GII*LB) and gazebo (GIILB) associated with Stainley Hall (G II* LB). Stainley Hall (GII*LB) constructed in 1715 with 19th century additions and restoration in 1985; brick built in Flemish bond with ashlar plinth and details and a stone slate roof; 3 storeys. Stables at Stainley Hall (GIILB) former stables now outbuilding; constructed in the mid 18th century of coursed cobbles with gritstone dressings and a purple slate roof; 2 storeys 3 bays with a projecting central gabled bay with a carriage arch and a triangular pattern of 3 tiers of pigeon holes in the gable. Gate piers and gates to Stainley Hall (GIILB) late 18th century date; wrought iron and rusticated ashlar. The gazebo is a landmark along the A6108 between Ripon and West Tanfield due to its distinctive cylindrical form, conical roof, and proximity to the roadside. It is a feature of interest among the townscape of North Stainley. The Gazebo (GIILB), Estate Yard Cottages and the Staveley Arms form an important 'gateway' into the core of the village. When travelling from Ripon into North Stainley, this is the first point where there are buildings on opposite sides of the road and their proximity to the road (plus the location of the gazebo) relative to other buildings in the village provides this sense of a gateway. Both Estate Yard Cottages and the Staveley Arms provide similar vernacular frontages and forms and are hence complimentary to each other. Both have three bay two storey domestic elevations facing the road with lower gabled single storey ranges to the north. The Gazebo probably dates from the early-to-mid nineteenth century. It appears to have been built for the Staveleys of Stainley Hall (GII*LB) as a feature of the walled garden serving the Hall. The Gazebo stood at the northern corner of the walled garden and was accessed from within the garden, with small windows allowing views up and down the village street. Its original purpose is unclear, though perhaps it was no more than a folly, for its circular plan and conical roof capped by a timber finial are all unusual and draw attention to the Gazebo. Although the Gazebo was an independent structure, it was an integral component of the walled garden. The southern gable of 1-5 Estate Yard Cottages was also an integral part of the walled garden, as it formed part of the northwestern boundary to the garden and for a time was linked to the Gazebo by a short section of wall. Like the Gazebo and garden wall, this gable is a cobble construction. 1-5 Estate Yard Cottages might well be contemporary with the Gazebo; it is certainly shown on the 1852 OS. This map shows that the rest of the site (to the north of Estate Yard Cottages) was either an orchard or a planted landscape screen between the road and Hall park. By 1890 a smithy stood roughly where the existing shop stands. The 1890 OS (above) shows that Estate Yard Cottages was a single dwelling (it had probably been built as such), with a small courtyard of outbuildings to the rear. A path linked this dwelling to the walled garden and the Hall via a path to the rear of the walled garden. The present name of Estate Yard Cottages and map evidence suggest the occupant of the house played an important role in the day to day running of the estate.
Topography and views	Land falls down to the east towards the village.Filtered views of Stainley Hall to the south through the trees. Distant views to the to the east of woodland and hills on the horizon. Slightly elevated above the village.

Landscape context	Arable fields to the west. Paddocks used for grazing horses to the south. Houses fronting the village street (A6108) to the east. 20th century housing development to the north, specificaly Cockpit Close and Roseberry Grove. A good example of a modern housing development is evident to the east on the opposite side of the A6108 off Watermill Lane. Redundant former public house at the edge of the built form of the settlement on the east side of the A6108- opposite the south eastern corner of the site. Shop Wood to the north forming site NS1. Woodland belt borders the west boundary and beyond. Wooded area to the south-east corner- partially within the site- within the setting of Stainley Hall.
Grain of surrounding development	Residential.
Local building design	Formerly a linear village with modern cul-de-sacs of well-spaced dwellings, interspersed with trees and open green spaces. Good housing mix. Palette of materials: brick, cobble stone and render.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	A footpath runs east to west in the northern part of the site and parallel with the western site boundary. Lake in the foreground of Stainley Hall. Heritage assets within and adjacent to the site boundary as explained detailed above.

Conclusion

Will it contribute to local distinctiveness and countryside character? (Only applies to sites in Conservation Areas).

Rationale	Rating
Site is not within a Conservation Area.	n/a

Will it conserve those elements which contribute towards the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets?

Rationale	Rating
Development is likely to harm elements which contribute to the significance of a heritage asset but the harm is capable of mitigation.	Orange

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

Rationale	Rating
The nature of the site means that built development will have a negative impact on local distinctiveness but there are opportunities for mitigation and improvements.	Orange

Summary conclusion	Retain Gazebo. Retain and re-use Estate Yard Cottages. Maintain the setting of heritage assets and enhance the street scene and local distinctiveness of North Stainley. Estate Yard Cottages form a vital component of the setting of the listed building, both visually and historically. Demolition of these cottages would leave the gazebo standing as an isolated feature and would hence lack a meaningful context, which would undermine the significance of the listed building. The use of vernacular and historic building types would help a development scheme on this site to respect its context. Development of this site would require a landscape buffer along the southern boundary adjacent to Stainley Hall in order to protect the setting of the Hall. Good routes through and access to open countryside should be maintained.

Settlement: North Stainley

Site: NS3 (Land to west of Cockpit Green, North Stainley)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	None impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	Ripon Parks SSSI c.1km to east
SSSI Risk Zone	NE require consultation on residential development of 100 units or more - potential drainage link
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	Five Ponds Wood c.750m to SW
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows, potential veteran trees
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None; nearest is village pond - noted to be stocked with fish
Sward	Improved pasture (northern 2 fields) and arable (southern field)
Trees and Hedges	SE corner of site includes corner of woodland. Field boundary hedges with trees and occasional field trees
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature trees on site probably merit consideration for TPOs
Water/Wetland	Stainley Hall and village ponds close by. Proable drainage link via stream through Bog Wood into High Batts (SSSI)
Slope and Aspect	Ssite rises gently to the south-west
Buildings and Structures	Former garage, shop, cottages,outbuildings and gazebo buildings near road
Natural Area	NCA 30 Southern Magnesian Grassland
Environmental Opportunity	SEO 2: Protect and manage existing semi-natural habitats, including grasslands, wetlands and woodlands; and increase the area of semi-natural habitats, restore and create new areas, and create networks and links between habitats, to make their ecology more resilient and to afford increased movement of species.
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 77 North of Ripon Farmland • “Encourage reinstatement of hedgerows and hedgerow trees” • “Explore the potential for creation and management of magnesian limestone grassland in this area in accordance with Harrogate District Biodiversity Action Plan”
Connectivity/Corridors	Hedgerows with occasional mature trees are becoming relict but help link small woodlands which may have once formed part of North Stainley Hall parkland
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Opportunity to link wooodland to north with that to west through woodland planting and develop corridor along bridleway to Cockpit Close
Protected Species	Trees. hedges and buildings may support bats and nesting birds. Some potential woodland species and for ground nesting birds in pasture. GCN possible in village ponds and Stailey Hall Ponds (although may be stocked with fish). Occurs at Lightwater Quarry c. 1km to SW. Full ecological survey required.
BAP Priority Species	None known
Invasive Species	some of the village ponds have Crassula
Notes	

Conclusion

Will it deliver net gains to biodiversity and protect and enhance existing networks of priority habitats and species and provide for long term management of wildlife habitats? Will it offer opportunities to enhance Green Infrastructure?

Rationale	Rating
Some potential adverse effects on designated sites (Local Site, SSSI, LNR, the wider ecological network and/or priority habitats and species but appropriate siting/scale or substantial mitigation should enable development.	Orange

Summary conclusion	Trees and hedges should be protected. retained and enhanced during the course of development. Opportunity to link woodlands along western boundary with enhanced hedgerow planting. Possible in-combination effects with otherr adjacent developments. Some potential for the presence of protected species. Full ecological survey required.

Settlement: North Stainley

Site: NS3 (Land to west of Cockpit Green, North Stainley)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.	According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed site is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred. We are however, aware of flooding incidents in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers, watercourses & overland flows from the application site to property on Cockpit Close. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide. We have received significantly increased levels of complaints over recent years from concerned residents affected by, and threatened by flooding from these watercourses. Due to the number of major development proposals in the general area planning to discharge surface water to the same watercourses, it is essential that surface water discharge is kept to an absolute minimum. Drainage strategies for mixed or brownfield sites should provide characteristics, which are similar to Greenfield behaviour. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) should always be any developer's first consideration and giving preference to soakaways. In my view, infiltration drainage is unlikely to be fully successful at this location due to ground conditions in the surrounding area being predominantly heavy clay soils. However, any potential developer would be expected to submit a detailed feasibility study showing the use of SuDS including soakaways permeable cellular pavements, grassed swales, infiltration trenches, wetlands, ponds and green roofs that assist in dealing with surface water at source, has been fully explored. It is likely that a proportion of the existing buildings and barns etc. are not positively drained to either a watercourse or public sewer, consequently, A full survey of the drainage systems should be undertaken to establish condition and outfall location. In line with current development control drainage standards in this and neighbouring councils, discharge of roof/surface water from the existing Brownfield areas of the site should be reduced by a minimum 30% of existing peak flows + 30% to account for future climate change. Areas of the site that have not been previously developed or positively drained will be classed as Greenfield land. Accordingly, any proposed discharge of surface water from these areas should be restricted to Greenfield rates (1.4 l/s/ha for all storm scenarios). The overall strategy should show that there is sufficient on site attenuation to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without increasing the restricted flows to the watercourse. Applicants would be expected to agree the outline drainage strategy with the LPA in principle before any planning consent is granted. The outline drainage information should include an assessment of flood risk to the site & surrounding area, topographical survey, feasibility of infiltration drainage, on site storage, rates of discharge, outfall location, existing peak flow rates, proposed peak flow rates & condition survey results of existing watercourses (on or off site) and proposals for dealing with any identified remedial items. The proposed development land would be classed as major development due to the specified size of the site. Consequently, NYCC in its capacity as Lead Local Flood Authority should be consulted regarding the surface water drainage strategy (Statutory Consultee).

Conclusion

Will it maintain and where possible improve surface water and groundwater quality?

Rationale	Rating
Some adverse effects of additional surface water discharge on nearby watercourses but appropriate mitigation should enable development.	Orange

Settlement: North Stainley

Site: NS4 (Former Piggery, Lightwater Farm, North Stainley)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site located on south side of North Stainley off Water Lane west of the A6108 set back from the road behind a farmstead. LCA77: North Ripon Farmland
Landscape description	Area description: Gently rolling open agricultural landscape punctuated with farmsteads, woodland and the village of North Stainley. Site description: Former pig farm surrounded by woodland in open countryside. Bunding to the south boundary screens the site but is not characterisitic.
Existing urban edge	Site detached from urban edge separated from edge of village by North Stainley Hall parkland. Site contributes to the separation of Lightwater Valley from North Stainley. North Stainley Hall and associated landscape provides the setting on the south side of Stainley.
Trees and hedges	Native hedge to east and south. Trees to west and conifer hedge on north side of field separating field from farm buildings.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open countryside. Bridleway through the site.
Description of proposal for the site	Employment use
Physical Sensitivity	Loss of trees and and introduction of employment development on a site formerly in agricultural use. The is some susceptibility but the site may be suited to some forms of employment development.
Visual Sensitivity	Site reasonably well contained visually by woodland on site and broadleaved plantations associated with Lightwater valley.
Anticipated landscape effects	Potential loss of trees and additon of employment scale buildings.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Retention of existing vegetation is essential and strengthening of boundary vegetation would be required. Opportunity to improve bunding on site. Built form should represent agricultural built form character in the area.
Likely level of landscape effects	Medium scale as the site is separate from the village and potentially has closer physical links with Lightwater Valley.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	NS5 adjacent to the east proposed for housing use. Possible issues with residential amenity on that site as well as cumulative effects.

Conclusion

Will there be the opportunity for development to contribute to distinctiveness and countryside character?

Rationale	Rating
Sensitivity Rating: High/medium – key distinctive characteristics are vulnerable to change; typically a high to medium valued landscape where landscape conditions is good where detracting features or major infrastructure is not present or where present has limited influence on the landscape.	Orange
Capacity Rating: Medium – the area is able to accommodate some development of the type and scale proposed with some adverse impacts on landscape and visual amenity that may only be mitigated in part. Opportunities for enhancement are limited.	Yellow

Will it increase the quality and quantity of tree or woodland cover?
Will it make use of opportunities wherever possible to enhance the environment as part of other initiatives?

Rationale	Rating
Development on the land would be likely to result in the loss of woodland or trees the impact of which cannot be fully mitigated.	Orange

Summary conclusion	The site has previously been in use for an agricultural business and new development for employment use may be accommodated without significant further detriment to landscape character assuming that built form and layout is representative of agricultural business in the area.

Settlement: North Stainley

Site: NS4 (Former Piggery, Lightwater Farm, North Stainley)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Conservation and Design

Conservation and Design Site Assessment

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Stainley Hall (GII*LB). Stables at Stainley Hall (GIILB) former stables now outbuilding. Gate piers and gates to Stainley Hall (GIILB).
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	None.
Commentary on heritage assets.	Stainley Hall (GII*LB) constructed in 1715 with 19th century additions and restoration in 1985; brick built in Flemish bond with ashlar plinth and details and a stone slate roof; 3 storeys. Stables at Stainley Hall (GIILB) former stables now outbuilding; constructed in the mid 18th century of coursed cobbles with gritstone dressings and a purple slate roof; 2 storeys 3 bays with a projecting central gabled bay with a carriage arch and a triangular pattern of 3 tiers of pigeon holes in the gable. Gate piers and gates to Stainley Hall (GIILB) late 18th century date; wrought iron and rusticated ashlar.
Topography and views	Site fairly contained by mature trees and bunding. Site detached from village.
Landscape context	Gently undulating countryside punctuated with farmsteads, individual country houses, woodland clumps, mature tree belts and the Village of North Stainley- site is separated from the village by North Stainley Hall.
Grain of surrounding development	Lightwater Farmhouse to the north-west. The farmhouse is orientated north to south with relatively blind gable facing east to the road (A6108). Village to the north west. Lightwater Valley to the south-west. The adjacent site (NS5) comprises of modern agricultural sheds in the northern part of the site and a small grassland field in the southern part.
Local building design	Lightwater Farmhouse to the north-west: 2 storey cobble stone construction. Agricultural sheds and stabling behind. Lodge further north of the farmhouse, gable presentation to the street.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	Former pig farm. Redundant agricultural sheds, extensive area of hardstanding- formerly the concrete padstones for more sheds- and a small menage in the eastern part of the site. A bridleway crosses the site. Bunding to the southern boundary of the site. Post and rail boundary to the east. Lightwater Farmhouse, a 2 storey cobble stone construction, to the north-east corner of the site. Water Lane is parallel with and adjacent to the southern boundary. To the east of the site, on the opposite side of the A6108 is NS2. Immediately adjacent to the site on the east side is NS5. To the north-east, behind mature conifers and bunding, is North Stainley Hall and land sub-divided into paddocks for grazing horses. Further north-west is open arable land and a mature woodland belt. Lightwater Valley is to the south-west.

Conclusion

Will it contribute to local distinctiveness and countryside character? (Only applies to sites in Conservation Areas).

Rationale	Rating
Site is not within a Conservation Area.	n/a

Will it conserve those elements which contribute towards the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets?

Rationale	Rating
Development is likely to harm elements which contribute to the significance of a heritage asset but the harm is capable of mitigation.	Orange

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

Rationale	Rating
The nature of the site means that built development will have a negative impact on local distinctiveness but there are opportunities for mitigation and improvements.	Orange

Summary conclusion	Employment use built form is unlikely to contribute to distinctiveness and countryside character but will depend upon the design and scale of built form. There maybe scope to adapt/ convert existing farm buildings. Development of the site would compromise the visual separation between the village and Lightwater Valley. Landscaping should be integral to any development proposal for the site. The site is detached from the village. Development of the site would impact on the setting of Stainley Hall (GII*LB).

Settlement: North Stainley

Site: NS4 (Former Piggery, Lightwater Farm, North Stainley)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	None near enough to be impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	Ripon Parks SSSI c.1250m to east
SSSI Risk Zone	NE require consultation on residential development of 100 units or more - potential drainage link to Ripon Parks
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	Five Ponds Wood c.650m to west
BAP Priority Habitats	Woodland, hedgerows
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None;
Sward	Overgrown and ruderal grassland around old buildings
Trees and Hedges	woodlland exists on site on the eastern and northern boundaries
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Woodland on site probably merits consideration for TPOs
Water/Wetland	Small pond mapped on site. Stainley Hall and village ponds close by.
Slope and Aspect	Generally flat
Buildings and Structures	Farm buildings and former pig housing
Natural Area	NCA 30 Southern Magnesian Grassland
Environmental Opportunity	SEO 2: Protect and manage existing semi-natural habitats, including grasslands, wetlands and woodlands; and increase the area of semi-natural habitats, restore and create new areas, and create networks and links between habitats, to make their ecology more resilient and to afford increased movement of species.
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 77 North of Ripon Farmland • “Encourage reinstatement of hedgerows and hedgerow trees” • “Explore the potential for creation and management of magnesian limestone grassland in this area in accordance with Harrogate District Biodiversity Action Plan”
Connectivity/Corridors	Wooded boundaries form a network of small woodlands linking the west side of the village into the River Ure corridor
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Retain hedgrows and buffer and enhance the small adjoining woodlands
Protected Species	Woodland, trees. hedges and buildings may support bats and nesting birds. Some potential woodland species e.g. badger and for woodland ground flora. GCN possible in small pond, occurs at Lightwater Quarry c. 850m to west
BAP Priority Species	Not known
Invasive Species	Some of village ponds have Crassula
Notes	

Conclusion

Will it deliver net gains to biodiversity and protect and enhance existing networks of priority habitats and species and provide for long term management of wildlife habitats? Will it offer opportunities to enhance Green Infrastructure?

Rationale	Rating
Significant adverse effects on designated sites (Local Site, SSSI, LNR), the wider ecological network and/or priority habitats and species.	Red

Summary conclusion	Woodland should be protected, retained and buffered. Some potential for the presence of protected species. Redevelopment of footprint of former piggery unlikley to be ecologically senistive but possible in-combination effects with otherr adjacent developments. Full ecological survey required.

Settlement: North Stainley

Site: NS4 (Former Piggery, Lightwater Farm, North Stainley)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.	According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed site is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred. We are however, aware of flooding incidents in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide. We have received significantly increased levels of complaints over recent years from concerned residents affected by, and threatened by flooding from these watercourses. Due to the number of major development proposals in the general area planning to discharge surface water to the same watercourses, it is essential that surface water discharge is kept to an absolute minimum. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) should always be any developer's first consideration and giving preference to soakaways. In my view, infiltration drainage is unlikely to be fully successful at this location due to ground conditions in the surrounding area being predominantly heavy clay soils. However, any potential developer would be expected to submit a detailed feasibility study showing the use of SuDS including soakaways permeable cellular pavements, grassed swales, infiltration trenches, wetlands, ponds and green roofs that assist in dealing with surface water at source, has been fully explored. Any proposed discharge of surface water from the development site should be restricted to Greenfield rates (1.4 l/s/ha for all storm scenarios). The overall strategy should show that there is sufficient on site attenuation to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without increasing the restricted flows to the watercourse. Applicants would be expected to agree the outline drainage strategy with the LPA in principle before any planning consent is granted. The outline drainage information should include an assessment of flood risk to the site & surrounding area, topographical survey, feasibility of infiltration drainage, on site storage, rates of discharge, outfall location & condition survey results of existing watercourses (on or off site) and proposals for dealing with any identified remedial items. The proposed development land would be classed as major development due to the specified size of the site. Consequently, NYCC in its capacity as Lead Local Flood Authority should be consulted regarding the surface water drainage strategy (Statutory Consultee).

Conclusion

Will it maintain and where possible improve surface water and groundwater quality?

Rationale	Rating
Some adverse effects of additional surface water discharge on nearby watercourses but appropriate mitigation should enable development.	Orange

Settlement: North Stainley

Site: NS5 (Land at Lightwater Farm, North Stainley)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site located south of North Stainley at Lightwater Farm. LCA77: North Ripon Farmland
Landscape description	Area description: Gently rolling open agricultural landscape punctuated with farmsteads, woodland and the village of North Stainley. Site description: Farm buildings complex and adjacent small grass field to the south.
Existing urban edge	Site separated from edge of village by North Stainly Hall parkland.
Trees and hedges	Native hedgerow to the east and south. Trees to the west and conifer hedge through the site separating the field from the farm buildings.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open countryside
Description of proposal for the site	Residential development (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	Loss of small grass field that contributes to the agricultural setting of North Stainley and the Hall.
Visual Sensitivity	Bridleway crosses the site and views would be affected. Views on the approach to North Stainley would be affected.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of field and potential loss of hedgerow. Affect on separation of Lightwater Valley from the village.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Green infrastructure to reflect similar provisions provided with recent development in North Stainley.
Likely level of landscape effects	Large scale adverse due to the nature of the proposed development in a key location.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	NS5 adjacent for employment and NS2 opposite for housing potentially increases adverse affects on landscape character .

Conclusion

Will there be the opportunity for development to contribute to distinctiveness and countryside character?

Rationale	Rating
Sensitivity Rating: High – key distinctive characteristics are very vulnerable to change; typically a high valued landscape where landscape conditions is very good and where detracting features or major infrastructure is not present or where present has limited influence on the landscape resulting in a higher susceptibility to change.	Red
Capacity Rating: Low – the area has very limited or no capacity to accommodate the type and scale of the development proposed and there are few if any opportunities for appropriate mitigation.	Red

Will it increase the quality and quantity of tree or woodland cover?
Will it make use of opportunities wherever possible to enhance the environment as part of other initiatives?

Rationale	Rating
Development would potentially result in the loss of some woodland or trees, but any loss is likely to be mitigated.	Yellow

Summary conclusion	No capacity for the whole site to be developed without detriment to landscape character and the setting of the village and North Stainley Hall. There is some capacity if only the area of existing farm buildings were developed.

Settlement: North Stainley

Site: NS5 (Land at Lightwater Farm, North Stainley)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Conservation and Design

Conservation and Design Site Assessment

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Stainley Hall (GII*LB). Stables at Stainley Hall (GIILB) former stables now outbuilding. Gate piers and gates to Stainley Hall (GIILB).
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Lightwater Farmhouse, a 2 storey cobble stone construction, is immediately adjacent to the north-east corner of the site.
Commentary on heritage assets.	Stainley Hall (GII*LB) constructed in 1715 with 19th century additions and restoration in 1985; brick built in Flemish bond with ashlar plinth and details and a stone slate roof; 3 storeys. Stables at Stainley Hall (GIILB) former stables now outbuilding; constructed in the mid 18th century of coursed cobbles with gritstone dressings and a purple slate roof; 2 storeys 3 bays with a projecting central gabled bay with a carriage arch and a triangular pattern of 3 tiers of pigeon holes in the gable. Gate piers and gates to Stainley Hall (GIILB) late 18th century date; wrought iron and rusticated ashlar.
Topography and views	Site is visible on approach into the village from the south.
Landscape context	Gently undulating countryside punctuated with farmsteads, individual country houses, woodland clumps, mature tree belts and the Village of North Stainley- site is separated from the village by North Stainley Hall.
Grain of surrounding development	Lightwater Farmhouse to the north-west. The farmhouse is orientated north to south with relatively blind gable facing east to the road (A6108). Village to the north west. Lightwater Valley to the south-west. Redundant agricultrual sheds, extensive area of hardstanding- formerly the concrete padstones for more sheds- and a small manege to the west of the site.
Local building design	Lightwater Farmhouse to the north: 2 storey cobble stone construction. Agricultural sheds and stabling behind. Lodge further north of the farmhouse, gable presentation to the street.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The site comprises of modern agricultural sheds in the northern part of the site and a small grassland field in the southern part. A bridleway crosses the site. Bunding to the southern boundary of the site and to the north of the site, flanking the north side of the bridleway. Hedgerow boundary to the east and south. Lightwater Farmhouse, a 2 storey cobble stone construction, is immediately adjacent to the north-east corner of the site. Water Lane is parallel with and adjacent to the southern boundary. To the east of the site, on the opposite side of the A6108 is NS2. Immediately adjacent to the site on the west side is NS4. To the north is, behind mature conifers and bunding, is North Stainley Hall and land sub-divided into paddocks for grazing horses. Further north-west is open arable land and a mature woodland belt.

Conclusion

Will it contribute to local distinctiveness and countryside character? (Only applies to sites in Conservation Areas).

Rationale	Rating
Site is not within a Conservation Area.	n/a

Will it conserve those elements which contribute towards the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets?

Rationale	Rating
Development is likely to harm elements which contribute to the significance of a heritage asset but the harm is capable of mitigation.	Orange

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

Rationale	Rating
The nature of the site means that built development will have a negative impact on local distinctiveness but there are opportunities for mitigation and improvements.	Orange

Summary conclusion	Employment use built form is unlikely to contribute to distinctiveness and countryside character but will depend upon the design and scale of built form. There maybe scope to adapt/ convert existing farm buildings. Development should not exceed the developed area of the site, thereby retaining the small field in the southern part of the site and retaining the visual separation between the village and Lightwater Valley.

Settlement: North Stainley

Site: NS5 (Land at Lightwater Farm, North Stainley)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	None near enough to be impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	Ripon Parks SSSI c.1200m to east
SSSI Risk Zone	NE require consultation on residential development of 100 units or more - potential drainage link to Ripon Parks
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	Five Ponds Wood c.750m to west
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Southerrn field improved pasture (1992 P1HS). [A6108 frontage (outside site boundary) may support semi-improved grassland as some verges in vicinity are species-rich]
Trees and Hedges	Externally, woodland bounds the site to the north and west. Trees line western site boundary. Hedgrerows with some trees along other boundaries of southern field, which also supports one or two small field trees, Some ornamnetal trees around farm buildings.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Some of the trees on site may merit TPO protection
Water/Wetland	Stainley Hall and village ponds close by to north. Small pond mapped at adjacnet former piggery. .
Slope and Aspect	Generally flat
Buildings and Structures	Farm buildings appear to consist of large modern farm sheds.
Natural Area	Southern Magnesian Grassland
Environmental Opportunity	SEO 2: Protect and manage existing semi-natural habitats, including grasslands, wetlands and woodlands; and increase the area of semi-natural habitats, restore and create new areas, and create networks and links between habitats, to make their ecology more resilient and to afford increased movement of species.
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 77 North of Ripon Farmland • “Encourage reinstatement of hedgerows and hedgerow trees” • “Explore the potential for creation and management of magnesian limestone grassland in this area in accordance with Harrogate District Biodiversity Action Plan”
Connectivity/Corridors	Wooded boundaries form a network of small woodlands linking the west of the village into the River Ure corridor
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Retain and enhance boundaries; buffer adjoining small woodlands; there may be an opportunity to create a small Suds wetland to enhance the network of ponds around the village.
Protected Species	Boundary woodland, trees. hedges and buildings may support bats and nesting birds. GCN possible in small ponds close to site, occurs at Lightwater Quarry c. 850m to wes
BAP Priority Species	Not known
Invasive Species	None known
Notes	

Conclusion

Will it deliver net gains to biodiversity and protect and enhance existing networks of priority habitats and species and provide for long term management of wildlife habitats? Will it offer opportunities to enhance Green Infrastructure?

Rationale	Rating
Some potential effects on designated sites (SINC, SSSI, LNR), the wider ecological network and/or priority habitats and species but relatively easy to mitigate for.	Yellow

Summary conclusion	Native trees and hedges should be retained and protected. Adjacent woodland may require to be buffered. Some potential for the presence of protected species. Redevelopment of agricultural buildings or improved pasture unlikley to be ecologically senistive but possible in-combination effects with otherr adjacent developments. Full ecological survey required.

Settlement: North Stainley

Site: NS5 (Land at Lightwater Farm, North Stainley)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.	According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed site is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred. We are however, aware of flooding incidents in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide. We have received significantly increased levels of complaints over recent years from concerned residents affected by, and threatened by flooding from these watercourses. Due to the number of major development proposals in the general area planning to discharge surface water to the same watercourses, it is essential that surface water discharge is kept to an absolute minimum. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) should always be any developer's first consideration and giving preference to soakaways. In my view, infiltration drainage is unlikely to be fully successful at this location due to ground conditions in the surrounding area being predominantly heavy clay soils. However, any potential developer would be expected to submit a detailed feasibility study showing the use of SuDS including soakaways permeable cellular pavements, grassed swales, infiltration trenches, wetlands, ponds and green roofs that assist in dealing with surface water at source, has been fully explored. Any proposed discharge of surface water from the development site should be restricted to Greenfield rates (1.4 l/s/ha for all storm scenarios). The overall strategy should show that there is sufficient on site attenuation to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without increasing the restricted flows to the watercourse. Applicants would be expected to agree the outline drainage strategy with the LPA in principle before any planning consent is granted. The outline drainage information should include an assessment of flood risk to the site & surrounding area, topographical survey, feasibility of infiltration drainage, on site storage, rates of discharge, outfall location & condition survey results of existing watercourses (on or off site) and proposals for dealing with any identified remedial items. The proposed development land would be classed as major development due to the specified size of the site. Consequently, NYCC in its capacity as Lead Local Flood Authority should be consulted regarding the surface water drainage strategy (Statutory Consultee).

Conclusion

Will it maintain and where possible improve surface water and groundwater quality?

Rationale	Rating
Some adverse effects of additional surface water discharge on nearby watercourses but appropriate mitigation should enable development.	Orange

Settlement: North Stainley

Site: NS6 (Land south of A6108 (smaller site), North Stainley)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	The site is located on the north west side of North Stainley off the A6108 LCA77: North Ripon Farmland
Landscape description	Area description: Gently rolling open agricultural landscape punctuated with farmsteads, woodland and the village of North Stainley. Site description: Grass field to the north end of the village.
Existing urban edge	Rural village edge comprising garden boundaries.
Trees and hedges	Hedgerow boundary with the A6108.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open Countryside
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The landscape is susceptible to change as a result of the loss of trees and woodland although it is assumed the woodland would be retained as part of any development.
Visual Sensitivity	The site provides the approach to North Stainley from the north and is slightly raised on its western side making it prominent on the approach to the village.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of open field that contributes to the setting of the village and views on the approach to the village.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Buildings should be set back from the road and significant green infrastructure incorporated to integrate development with the suffounding landscape. Build form density should reflect existing.
Likely level of landscape effects	Medium to large scale affect due to the size of the site in relation to the village and the impact on the approach to the village which would become more prominent.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	NS3 is located to the south and the cumulative effects of both sites being developed would be considerable.

Conclusion

Will there be the opportunity for development to contribute to distinctiveness and countryside character?

Rationale	Rating
Sensitivity Rating: High/medium – key distinctive characteristics are vulnerable to change; typically a high to medium valued landscape where landscape conditions is good where detracting features or major infrastructure is not present or where present has limited influence on the landscape.	Orange
Capacity Rating: Medium/low – the area is not able to accommodate development of the scale and type proposed without detriment to landscape character and visual amenity and the opportunities for appropriate mitigation are limited.	Orange

Will it increase the quality and quantity of tree or woodland cover?
Will it make use of opportunities wherever possible to enhance the environment as part of other initiatives?

Rationale	Rating
Development on the land would be likely to result in the loss of woodland or trees the impact of which cannot be fully mitigated.	Orange

Summary conclusion	The landscape has limited capacity to accept development as proposed due to the affect on village character and extension of build form into the rural landscape. Landscape capacity would increase for lower density development in a smaller area at the back of existing housing.

Settlement: North Stainley

Site: NS6 (Land south of A6108 (smaller site), North Stainley)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Conservation and Design

Conservation and Design Site Assessment

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Sleningford Grange (GIILB) is to the north of the site.
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	The church (ungraded) is located to the east in close proximity to the site boundary.
Commentary on heritage assets.	Sleningford Grange (GIILB) to the north of the site- development of the full extent of the site may impact on the setting of Sleningford Grange.The church is sited to the east.
Topography and views	The site contributes to the setting of the village and is prominent on approaching the village from the north.
Landscape context	Gently undulating countryside punctuated with farmsteads, individual country houses, woodland clumps, mature tree belts and the Village of North Stainley.
Grain of surrounding development	North Stainley Hall to the south and to the west of the Hall the land is sub-divided in paddocks for grazing horses. Lightwater Farmhouse and sites NS3, NS4 and NS5 to the south. Lightwater Valley further south. Sleningford Grange to the north. Bungalows to the north. Cul-de-sacs to the east. Open countryside to the west. Holmtree Lane, an isolated dwelling, further west but visible from the village and from the A6108.
Local building design	Heterogeneity.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	A green field site on the north-western edge of the village that rises gently to the west. The site comprises a grass field used for agricultural pasture that is bound by hedgerows to the north and east, and stock fencing to the south and west. Within the field, there are two mature trees. There are several isolated dwellings detached from the main extent of the village to the north of the site, residential development, a school and a church to the east, an area of woodland to the south and open countryside to the west.

Conclusion

Will it contribute to local distinctiveness and countryside character? (Only applies to sites in Conservation Areas).

Rationale	Rating
Site is not within a Conservation Area.	n/a

Will it conserve those elements which contribute towards the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets?

Rationale	Rating
Development is likely to harm elements which contribute to the significance of a heritage asset but the harm is capable of mitigation.	Orange

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

Rationale	Rating
The nature of the site means that built development will have a negative impact on local distinctiveness but there are opportunities for mitigation and improvements.	Orange

Summary conclusion	The site contributes to the setting of the village and is prominent on approaching the village from the north. There is scope to accommodate housing development on this site at the village edge, though development should be confined to the south-eastern part of the site where the ground level is lower, thereby avoiding the rising ground in the north western part of the site. Development on the higher ground would assume undue prominence. This is a large site proportionate to the village, but development on the lower ground could potentially deliver an improved urban edge thereby aiding the transition from built form to open countryside. The site is in close proximity to the church- whilst the church is currently viewed in the context of residential development, any scheme for development on the site should demonstrate due regard to design, scale and height of buildings to avoid competing with the church. The layout should be designed to maintain views of the church from the north and west.

Settlement: North Stainley

Site: NS6 (Land south of A6108 (smaller site), North Stainley)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	None likley to be impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	Ripon Parks SSSI c.1300m to east
SSSI Risk Zone	NE require consultation on residential development of 100 units or more - potential drainage link from site to SSSI
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	Five Ponds Wood c.1km to SW
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows; woodland adjacent to west
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	Nearest are village ponds - noted to be stocked with fish
Sward	Improved pasture (P1HS 1992)
Trees and Hedges	Field tree in pasture, which has roadside hedge; occasional boundary tree; Shop Wood adjacent to west
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Field tree and boundary likely to benefit from TPO protection
Water/Wetland	Ditches drain through Shop Wood, along southern site booundary, into village via ponds and ultimately River Ure
Slope and Aspect	Land rises very gently to the west
Buildings and Structures	None
Natural Area	NCA 30 Southern Magnesian Limestone
Environmental Opportunity	SEO 2: Protect and manage existing semi-natural habitats, including grasslands, wetlands and woodlands; and increase the area of semi-natural habitats, restore and create new areas, and create networks and links between habitats, to make their ecology more resilient and to afford increased movement of species.
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 77 North of Ripon Farmland • “Encourage reinstatement of hedgerows and hedgerow trees” • “Explore the potential for creation and management of magnesian limestone grassland in this area in accordance with Harrogate District Biodiversity Action Plan”
Connectivity/Corridors	The ditches connects adjacent woodland with village ponds and ultimately the river Ure. Some of A6108 verges are species-rich
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	There may be an opportuity to enhance and buffer the woodland and the boundary hedges with new native planting
Protected Species	The adjacent woodland may support ground flora and badgers. The woodland, hedges and field trees may support bats and nesting birds. Some potential for ground nesting birds in the pasture. GCN possible in village ponds (although they may be stocked with fish).GCN occurs at Lightwater Quarry c. 1km to SW.
BAP Priority Species	Not known
Invasive Species	None known
Notes	

Conclusion

Will it deliver net gains to biodiversity and protect and enhance existing networks of priority habitats and species and provide for long term management of wildlife habitats? Will it offer opportunities to enhance Green Infrastructure?

Rationale	Rating
Some potential adverse effects on designated sites (Local Site, SSSI, LNR, the wider ecological network and/or priority habitats and species but appropriate siting/scale or substantial mitigation should enable development.	Orange

Summary conclusion	The adjacent woodland should be surveyed so that any impacts from development on this site can be approproately mitigated for. The woodland and boundary hedgerows and field trees should be retained and buffered using native species.

Settlement: North Stainley

Site: NS6 (Land south of A6108 (smaller site), North Stainley)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.	According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed site is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred. We have received past complaints of flooding issues arising with the watercourse discharging through Shop Wood and Roseberry Green. The waterway is restricted through the rear gardens at Roseberry Green and under The A108. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide. We have received significantly increased levels of complaints over recent years from concerned residents affected by, and threatened by flooding from local watercourses in the area. Due to the number of major development proposals in the general area planning to discharge surface water to the same watercourses, it is essential that surface water discharge is kept to an absolute minimum. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) should always be any developer's first consideration and giving preference to soakaways. In my view, infiltration drainage is unlikely to be fully successful at this location due to ground conditions in the surrounding area being predominantly heavy clay soils. However, any potential developer would be expected to submit a detailed feasibility study showing the use of SuDS including soakaways permeable cellular pavements, grassed swales, infiltration trenches, wetlands, ponds and green roofs that assist in dealing with surface water at source, has been fully explored. Any proposed discharge of surface water from site should be restricted to Greenfield rates (1.4 l/s/ha for all storm scenarios or a minimum of 5 (five) l/s, whichever is the greater). The overall strategy should show that there is sufficient on site attenuation to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year rainfall event, to include for climate change & urban creep can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without increasing the restricted flows to the watercourse. Applicants would be expected to agree the outline drainage strategy with the LPA in principle before any planning consent is granted. The outline drainage information should include an assessment of flood risk to the site & surrounding area, topographical survey, feasibility of infiltration drainage, on site storage, rates of discharge, outfall location & condition survey results of existing watercourses (on or off site) and proposals for dealing with any identified remedial items. The proposed development land would be classed as major development due to the specified size of the site in terms of sustainable urban drainage systems (SuDS) . Accordingly, NYCC in its capacity as Lead Local Flood Authority should be consulted regarding the surface water drainage strategy (Statutory Consultee).

Conclusion

Will it maintain and where possible improve surface water and groundwater quality?

Rationale	Rating
Some adverse effects of additional surface water discharge on nearby watercourses but appropriate mitigation should enable development.	Orange

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN1 (Spring Lane, Pannal)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Situated on the northern side of Spring Lane Pannal. LCA 60: Upper Crimple Valley
Landscape description	Area description: Small scale pastoral valley landform separates the northern edge of Burn Bridge with the southern urban edge of Harrogate. Clark Beck runs north-west to south-east through this area within a treed corridor. Managed hedgerows define fields with occasional hedgerow trees. Views within the area are generally limited by mid-distance horizons and intervening tree cover. Site Description: The site consists of a small irregular shaped paddock which is overgrown and unmanaged at an elevation of about 98m AOD. A dilapidated timber building is situated at the north-west corner of the site. A drystone wall separates the site from the public highway with the remaining boundaries consisting of un-managed hedgerow with hedgerow trees. Clark Beck runs alongside the site's western boundary
Existing urban edge	Spring Lane forms the northern boundary of residential development at Burn Bridge.
Trees and hedges	Hedgrows with occasional hedgerow trees are situated along the site's western, northern and eastern boundaries.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	C9 Special Landscape Area
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume30+dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	This site contrubutes to the agricultural landscape character of the rural/urban edge. The field however is not particularly large and not representative of the surrounding field pattern.
Visual Sensitivity	Low-lying site. Views of the site woud be likely from two PRoWs to the north-west and north-east, glimpsed through the tree lined boundaries of the site.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of a small unmanaged field introducing new built form on the edge of the settlement.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Tree planting enhancement along Spring Lane would be essential if any development were to occur
Likely level of landscape effects	Medium scale adverse effects to landscape quality and harm to the settng of the settlement
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	N/A

Conclusion

Will there be the opportunity for development to contribute to distinctiveness and countryside character?

Rationale	Rating
Sensitivity Rating: High/medium – key distinctive characteristics are vulnerable to change; typically a high to medium valued landscape where landscape conditions is good where detracting features or major infrastructure is not present or where present has limited influence on the landscape.	Orange
Capacity Rating: Medium – the area is able to accommodate some development of the type and scale proposed with some adverse impacts on landscape and visual amenity that may only be mitigated in part. Opportunities for enhancement are limited.	Yellow

Will it increase the quality and quantity of tree or woodland cover?
Will it make use of opportunities wherever possible to enhance the environment as part of other initiatives?

Rationale	Rating
Development need not result in the loss of any existing woodland or trees and there is potential for significant woodland creation on site.	Dark Green

Summary conclusion	Site is low-lying and contained by mature hedgerow trees on western, northern and eastern boundaries. The landscape has some capacity to accept development on this site provided that mitigation measures are carried out.

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN1 (Spring Lane, Pannal)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Conservation and Design

Conservation and Design Site Assessment

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Pannal Conservation Area.
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	The Old School House and The Old School Room.
Commentary on heritage assets.	The site is located close to the north-west corner of Pannal Conservation Area and therefore impact on its setting is a relevant consideration. The Old School House and The Old School Room (currently used as a scout hut) are located to the north west of the site, within the conservation area. The latter dates from 1817 and is a single storey hip roofed building retains its original pointed windows with keystones and stone surrounds on its south side. Also, located within the surrounding countryside, to the north of the site, are likely to be heritage assets, such as those associated with farmsteads.
Topography and views	Views looking directly into the site from Spring Lane are rather enclosed (when trees in leaf) due to the surrounding hedges / trees but the site is visible in wider views from various viewpoints e.g. when looking south west from the tip of the conservation area.
Landscape context	A pastoral landscape that separates the northern edge of Burn Bridge and Pannal with the southern urban edge of Harrogate.
Grain of surrounding development	Varied – the historic grain of Pannal village (broadly linear about its main street), together with the 20th century housing of Burn Bridge and additional housing of Pannal. Also, in relation to the rural context – dispersed settlements of farms / cottages within the surrounding farmland.
Local building design	Stone predominates as the traditional material of the area.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The site is a small irregular shaped paddock, located within the rural context of Burn Bridge / Pannal. A timber storage building is situated at the north-west corner of the site. A stone wall and verge forms the boundary to Spring Lane, which runs along the southern edge of the site. Other boundaries consist of un-managed hedgerow with hedgerow trees. Clark Beck runs alongside the site's western boundary

Conclusion

Will it contribute to local distinctiveness and countryside character? (Only applies to sites in Conservation Areas).

Rationale	Rating
Site is not within a Conservation Area.	n/a

Will it conserve those elements which contribute towards the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets?

Rationale	Rating
Development is likely to result in harm to elements which contribute to the significance of a heritage asset and the harm is not capable of mitigation.	Red

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

Rationale	Rating
The nature of the site means that built development will have a negative impact on local distinctiveness.	Red

Summary conclusion	The site is located within the rural surroundings of Burn Bridge / Pannal – this land presents a strong contrast with the residential development to the south of Spring Lane. Although there are some buildings in the valley, they are very limited in number and density and are, for the most part, historic and therefore are an established part of the character of the area. Development to standard density / form on the site would therefore represent a break from the established pattern of development. Although some ‘enclosure’ of the site would be gained from the existing trees, this would not be present throughout the year and would not be sufficient to mitigate the impact of development. Whilst one or two locally distinctive dwellings, designed to appear as though added ‘organically’ over time, may be acceptable, a formal scheme of uniform dwellings would not. Also to be considered is the risk of setting a precedent for further development which could then lead to coalescence of Pannal and Harrogate in the future.

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN1 (Spring Lane, Pannal)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	None likely to be impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	None likely to be impacted
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likely to be impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Improved pasture - P1HS 1992 (now somewhat neglected)
Trees and Hedges	Treed hedges along alll field boundaries except the roadside may include potential veteran trees and elements of riparian woodland along the beckside.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Boundary trees - including potential veterans likely to merit TPO protection
Water/Wetland	Corridor of Clarke Beck on western boundary of site encompasses a substantial floodzone
Slope and Aspect	Dips gently south westerly towards the beck
Buildings and Structures	Stone wall to roadside; 2-3 small wooden sheds/stables
Natural Area	NCA 22: Pennines Dales Fringe
Environmental Opportunity	SE04: Supporting and encouraging the creation of grass/woodland buffer strips, in-field grass strips, sediment traps, ponds and wetland habitats to slow run-off and intercept sediments and pollutants from farmland
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 60 Upper Crimple Valley • “To promote the retention, regeneration and management of hedgerows to maintain field boundaries.” • “Encourage management and continuity of wooded character of River Crimple and marginal vegetation as a wildlife corridor”. • “Encourage management for biodiversity in line with the aims of the Harrogate Biodiversity Action Plan”.
Connectivity/Corridors	Clarke Beck links countryside between Pannal and SW Harrogate into the Crimple Valley
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	The floodzone which comprises a substantial proportion of the site should be developed as semi-natural habitat as multifunctional green infrastructure
Protected Species	Batsand nesting birds may utilise boundary trees and hedges. Riparian species may utilise the Clarke Beck
BAP Priority Species	Not known
Invasive Species	Himalayan balsam likely
Notes	

Conclusion

Will it deliver net gains to biodiversity and protect and enhance existing networks of priority habitats and species and provide for long term management of wildlife habitats? Will it offer opportunities to enhance Green Infrastructure?

Rationale	Rating
Some potential adverse effects on designated sites (Local Site, SSSI, LNR, the wider ecological network and/or priority habitats and species but appropriate siting/scale or substantial mitigation should enable development.	Orange

Summary conclusion	Boundary trees (including potential veterans) and hedges and green infrastructure corridor of Clarke Beck should be protected and enhanced through generous green infrastructure provision, in association with any proposed development, which may be constrained by the extent of the floodzone. Full ecological survey required.

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN1 (Spring Lane, Pannal)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.	According to the Environment Agency flood maps, a large proportion of this site towards the western boundary is situated in flood zones 2 & 3. Consequently, development in the flood zones should be avoided. We are aware of significant flooding incidents in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses, which includes Clark Beck & Crimple Beck. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide. We have received significantly increased levels of complaints over recent years from concerned residents affected by, and threatened by flooding from these watercourses and general run-off from adjacent land. Due to the number of major development proposals in the general area planning to discharge surface water to the same watercourses, it is essential that surface water discharge is kept to an absolute minimum. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) should always be any developer's first consideration and giving preference to soakaways. In my view, infiltration drainage is unlikely to be fully successful at this location due to ground conditions in the surrounding area being predominantly heavy clay soils. However, any potential developer would be expected to submit a detailed feasibility study showing the use of SuDS including soakaways permeable cellular pavements, grassed swales, infiltration trenches, wetlands, ponds and green roofs that assist in dealing with surface water at source, has been fully explored. Any proposed discharge of surface water from the development site should be restricted to Greenfield rates (1.4 l/s/ha for all storm scenarios). The overall strategy should show that there is sufficient on site attenuation to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without increasing the restricted flows to the watercourse. Applicants would be expected to agree the outline drainage strategy with the LPA in principle before any planning consent is granted. The outline drainage information should include an assessment of flood risk to the site & surrounding area, topographical survey, feasibility of infiltration drainage, on site storage, rates of discharge, outfall location & condition survey results of existing watercourses (on or off site) and proposals for dealing with any identified remedial items. Additionally, due to the close proximity with flood zones 2 & 3, a risk/sequential based approach must be taken to this site.

Conclusion

Will it maintain and where possible improve surface water and groundwater quality?

Rationale	Rating
Some adverse effects of additional surface water discharge on nearby watercourses but appropriate mitigation should enable development.	Orange

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN2 (Walton Head, Pannal)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Land to the north of the A658 and to the east of the A61 Leeds Harrogate Road. LCA 62 Wharfe Valley Side Farmland
Landscape description	Area description: A moderate to large-scale area and is the broad and hummocky valley side of the Wharfe Valley. Land use is simple and harmonious with medium sized grassland fields Site description: The site consists of eight medium to large scale pastoral and arable fields bounded by hedgerows incorporating two woodland belts. There are also a number of isolated field trees which are likely to be former hedgerow trees. The site gently rises from 110metres in the west to approximatley 140metres in the east. There is a distinct east west crestline in the centre of the site along which runs a public footpath. An additional footpath runs through the site routed south to north from the A658 highway
Existing urban edge	Remote from the settlement edge of Pannal Ash with Walton Head Farm situated along the site's eastern boundary
Trees and hedges	Fields bounded by hedgerows and hedgerow trees with two woodland copses with several isolated field trees.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	The site is situated within Green Belt R11 Right of Way
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume30+dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	Open valley side would be interrupted by built development with loss of arable and pastoral landscape
Visual Sensitivity	Views of the site from footpaths within the wider area. Highly valued landscape situated within Green Belt which is highly susceptible to change.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of large scale arable and pastoral fields introducing built form into open countryside
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Large scale screen planting could be put in place in advance of development along highway frontages and limit development to lower areas of topography
Likely level of landscape effects	Large scale adverse effects. Loss of fields introducing built development into an open valley landscape visible from the west and south
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	Potential adverse effects should sites PN3 and PN4 be developed to the west.

Conclusion

Will there be the opportunity for development to contribute to distinctiveness and countryside character?

Rationale	Rating
Sensitivity Rating: High – key distinctive characteristics are very vulnerable to change; typically a high valued landscape where landscape conditions is very good and where detracting features or major infrastructure is not present or where present has limited influence on the landscape resulting in a higher susceptibility to change.	Red
Capacity Rating: Low – the area has very limited or no capacity to accommodate the type and scale of the development proposed and there are few if any opportunities for appropriate mitigation.	Red

Will it increase the quality and quantity of tree or woodland cover?
Will it make use of opportunities wherever possible to enhance the environment as part of other initiatives?

Rationale	Rating
Development need not result in the loss of any existing woodland or trees and there is potential for significant woodland creation on site.	Dark Green

Summary conclusion	Site lies adjacent to a major approach road and 'gateway' to Harrogate within Green Belt. Development would significantly impact on the openness of the countryside. Opportunities to effectively mitigate adverse impacts are extremely limited

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN2 (Walton Head, Pannal)	
Natural and Built Heritage Assessments	**Type: Conservation and Design**
Conservation and Design Site Assessment	
Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	None
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Walton Head Farm
Commentary on heritage assets.	Walton Head Farm is a nineteenth century farmstead. Buildings have been converted and altered, such that the architectural value of some have been diminished, however in the main, the farmstead with farmhouse, is considered to be a heritage asset; albeit not of high significance it contributes to the landscape character. The fields surrounding the farmstead are historically associated to the farm and contribute substantially to its significance.
Topography and views	Generally the land falls to the west, but the site levels are quite complex. In the area of the eastern field, the land falls steeply and then falls are gentler towards the west. However Walton Head farm sits on Swarth Hill, so on site land rises in its vicinity. The A658 passes from a cutting east of the site to a point where it is slightly higher than the site and there are extensive views across the southwestern part of the site from this point on. Due to rising land, the eastern parts of the site are more visible from the west. From the higher land there are extensive views out to the west across to Almscliffe Crag and beyond.
Landscape context	The site is isolated from the settlement of Spacey Houses, which is east of Pannal.
Grain of surrounding development	North of the site and west of the A61 is a short terrace down a narrow road that faces southwest. North of the site on the east side of Princess Royal Way is Long Acre, a late twentieth century cul-de-sac development. Facing the main road is a mixture of detached, semi-detached and short row of attached houses set behind front gardens and quite close side to side. Behind these is another row, but at the rear of the development are detached houses set behind small front gardens and close side to side. To the north is Walton Place, which is predominantly semi-detached houses with front gardens. They are set apart at greater distances than those buildings of Long Acre, and are set parallel to the cul-de-sac and main road. To its north and east is Walton Park, which is predominantly detached houses set around culs-de-sac off curvilinear main avenues. Some houses are gable onto the road, all are set behind modest front gardens.They are set quite close side to side. On Princess Royal Way, between Walton Place and Walton Park, is Spacey Houses Farm (now converted to residential), which takes the form of three small yards, the one at the corner of Walton Place is almost fully enclosed yard. Walton Head Farmhouse is to the south of its farm yard and is orientated to enjoy the southern aspect.

Local building design	The farmhouses and buildings are of stone with predominanly stone slate roofs. They are of simple dual pitched form, and have a large wall to window ratio given them a robust appearance. The terrace west of the A61 (Ashleigh, Broomleish and Oakleigh) are late Victorian and have stone walls and Welsh slate roof. They have generous heights and have vertical emphasis.Unfortunately flat roofed dormers are detrimental to their appearance. The houses of Long Acre are of reconstituted stone, the depth of the buildings and their generously pitched roofs result in buildings with dominent roofscape and large gables. Windows do not have the proportions of the Victorian and earlier houses, but have a pseudo historic style. Rather than terraces, houses are attached, often with garages between. They do not reflect local distinctiveness. The two storey houses, and very few bungalows, on Walton Place have shallower pitched hipped roofs in the main, and there is a mixture of brick, render and of different roof tiles. Windows are generally wide, and these houses have a horizontal emphasis. Walton Park housing has walls of random reconstituted stone and concrete tiled roofs. Many buildings are deep in plan and often there is greater complexity of form. Windows are wide, and these houses have a horizontal emphasis. The materials prevent these buildings from appearing too alien in the landscape.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The site is large and consists of a number of small fields. Although some of the internal boundary hedges have been lost, a few hedges remain on site and some former hedgerow trees remain in the southwestern part of the site. Generally the site boundary is of high hedges, although due to road levels the hedge to the west part of the southern boundary is low as seen from the road. There are a number of hedgerow trees to the site boundaries. To the east of the site, near the south, is woodland and there is a small area of woodland east of the northen corner of the site. There are trees south of Walton Head Farm, and trees alongside a drain that runs just below the steepest part of the site. From next to Walton Head Farm, two footpaths cross the site, one running to the east and the other to the south.

Conclusion

Will it contribute to local distinctiveness and countryside character? (Only applies to sites in Conservation Areas).

Rationale	Rating
Site is not within a Conservation Area.	n/a

Will it conserve those elements which contribute towards the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets?

Rationale	Rating
Development is likely to harm elements which contribute to the significance of a heritage asset but the harm is capable of mitigation.	Orange

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

Rationale	Rating
The nature of the site means that built development will have a negative impact on local distinctiveness.	Red

Summary conclusion	Development of the whole site would cause the loss of all open land around the farmstead, with the exception of that to its southwest, consequently it would harm its setting. Development of this site isolated from existing settlement would have a negative impact on local distinctiveness. (Note these comments take no note of the Green Belt policies).

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN2 (Walton Head, Pannal)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	None likely to be impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	None likely to be impacted
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likely to be impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Improved Pasture [Not Assessed P1HS 1992]
Trees and Hedges	The site is bounded by mostly by hedges, some with matrure trees forming sheter belts in places. The are occassionlal mature field trees, especially in the south western field.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature on-site and boundary trees are likely to merit TPO protection
Water/Wetland	Drains run west-east through centre of site
Slope and Aspect	The site slopes down from the south east close to the A658 down towards the north and the A61
Buildings and Structures	None on site
Natural Area	NCA 22: Pennines Dales Fringe
Environmental Opportunity	SE04: Supporting and encouraging the creation of grass/woodland buffer strips, in-field grass strips, sediment traps, ponds and wetland habitats to slow run-off and intercept sediments and pollutants from farmland
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 62 Wharfe Valley Side Farmland "Promote...retention repair and sensitive management of hedgerows and hedgerow trees" "Promote native woodland planting..." "Protect and manage ancient semi-natural woodland"
Connectivity/Corridors	The site forms a link in the network of medium sized pasture fields with well-treed boundary hedges south of Harrogate between Spacey Houses and the northern edge of the lower Wharfe valley.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Existing trees and hedgerows and watercourses should be retained, protected and enhanced with new native planting of trees, shrubs and restoration of wildflower meadows. Green corridors should be created, buffering along hedgerows and ditches
Protected Species	Nesting birds and bats are likely to utilise trees and hedgerows. Records of kites and barn owls in the vicinity
BAP Priority Species	Potential for priority species of ground-nesting birds and brown hare
Invasive Species	None known
Notes	RL2042 (part) 2010 (amber)

Conclusion

Will it deliver net gains to biodiversity and protect and enhance existing networks of priority habitats and species and provide for long term management of wildlife habitats? Will it offer opportunities to enhance Green Infrastructure?

Rationale	Rating
Some potential adverse effects on designated sites (Local Site, SSSI, LNR, the wider ecological network and/or priority habitats and species but appropriate siting/scale or substantial mitigation should enable development.	Orange

Summary conclusion	The site comprises part of the green corridor between Spacey Houses and the northern edge of the lower valley of the River Wharfe. Existing trees and hedgerows and watercourses should be retained, protected and enhanced with new native planting of trees, shrubs and restoration of wildflower meadows. Green corridors should be created, buffering along hedgerows and ditches

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN2 (Walton Head, Pannal)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.	According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed development is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred. We are however, aware of significant flooding incidents in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses including Clarke Beck & the River Crimple. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide. We have received significantly increased levels of complaints over recent years from concerned residents affected by, and threatened by flooding from these watercourses and general run-off from adjacent land. Due to the number of major development proposals in the general area planning to discharge surface water to the same watercourses, it is essential that surface water discharge is kept to an absolute minimum. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) should always be any developer's first consideration and giving preference to soakaways. In my view, infiltration drainage is unlikely to be fully successful at this location due to ground conditions in the surrounding area being predominantly heavy clay soils. However, any potential developer would be expected to submit a detailed feasibility study showing the use of SuDS including soakaways permeable cellular pavements, grassed swales, infiltration trenches, wetlands, ponds and green roofs that assist in dealing with surface water at source, has been fully explored. Any proposed discharge of surface water from the development site should be restricted to Greenfield rates (1.4 l/s/ha for all storm scenarios). The overall strategy should show that there is sufficient on site attenuation to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without increasing the restricted flows to the watercourse. Applicants would be expected to agree the outline drainage strategy with the LPA in principle before any planning consent is granted. The outline drainage information should include an assessment of flood risk to the site & surrounding area, topographical survey, feasibility of infiltration drainage, on site storage, rates of discharge, outfall location & condition survey results of existing watercourses (on or off site) and proposals for dealing with any identified remedial items. The proposed development land would be classed as major development due to the specified size of the site. As such, NYCC in its capacity as Lead Local Flood Authority should be consulted regarding the surface water drainage strategy (Statutory consultee). The River Crimple is classed as Main River, as such the Environment Agency should be consulted regarding any proposals that may affect this waterway.

Conclusion

Will it maintain and where possible improve surface water and groundwater quality?

Rationale	Rating
Some adverse effects of additional surface water discharge on nearby watercourses but appropriate mitigation should enable development.	Orange

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN3 (Land south of Pannal, Phase 2)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Land south of Pannal. Phase 2 LCA62: Wharfe Valley Side Farmland
Landscape description	Area description: The wider area is moderate to large-scale area consisting of the broad and hummocky valley side of the Wharfe Valley. Land use is simple and harmonious with medium sized grassland fields bound by hedges and fences in place for horse and livestock control. Site description: The site consists of one rectangular pastoral field together with part of a larger field with a narrow frontage alongside the A61 Leeds Harrogate Road. Hedgerows and occasional hedgerow trees define most boundaries with an undefined boundary within the open field to the east. A PRoW is routed along the site's southern boundary with the Leeds to Harrogate railway alongside the north western edge of the site. The site gently falls from south east to north west from Swarth Hill, a local high point to the north of the A61. Intervening land between the site and the settlement edge has planning permission for playing fields and new access road as part of the mixed use re-development of the former Dunlopillo factory
Existing urban edge	Situated to the south of and separated from the Pannal employment area within open countryside. Intervening open land has planniing permission for playing fields and new access road asociated with the re-development of the former Dunlopillo site.
Trees and hedges	Site part bounded by hedgerows and hedgerow trees
Landscape and Green Belt designations	The site is situated within Green Belt R11 Rights of Way
Description of proposal for the site	Employment and residential (assume30+dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The landscape condition is good and considered of high value and situated in the Green Belt. Susceptibility to change is however considered to be medium with some reference to the type of development being proposed immediately to the north of the site. Overall sensitivity is considered to be high
Visual Sensitivity	Views of the site from the PRoW routed along the site's southern boundary. Views particularly of the southern edge of the site from the A61 travelling north would also be likely as well as from Burn Bridge Lane to the west. The site is largley screened by built form to the north
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of pastoral fields replaced with built development visible on rising landform and impacting on the open valley landscape
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Large scale screen planting could be put in place in advance of development particulary along the site's southern and eastern boundaries
Likely level of landscape effects	Large scale adverse effects. Loss of fields introducing built development into an open valley landscape visible from the west and south
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	Potential significant adverse effects should adjoining site PN4 to the south and PN2 to the east be developed.

Conclusion

Will there be the opportunity for development to contribute to distinctiveness and countryside character?

Rationale	Rating
Sensitivity Rating: High – key distinctive characteristics are very vulnerable to change; typically a high valued landscape where landscape conditions is very good and where detracting features or major infrastructure is not present or where present has limited influence on the landscape resulting in a higher susceptibility to change.	Red
Capacity Rating: Medium/low – the area is not able to accommodate development of the scale and type proposed without detriment to landscape character and visual amenity and the opportunities for appropriate mitigation are limited.	Orange

Will it increase the quality and quantity of tree or woodland cover?
Will it make use of opportunities wherever possible to enhance the environment as part of other initiatives?

Rationale	Rating
Development need not result in the loss of existing woodland or trees.	Light Green

Summary conclusion	Site situated adjacent to and visible from a major approach road to Harrogate affecting the openness of the Green Belt. Opportunities to effectively mitigate adverse impacts are limited. Development would extend the settlement edge into a prominent location within open countryside.

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN3 (Land south of Pannal, Phase 2)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	None likely to be impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	None likely to be impacted
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likely to be impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Improved pasture P1HS 1992 but now appears only semi-improved.
Trees and Hedges	Hedgerows, most with lines of trees form the internal and external field boundaries of the site
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature boundary and on-site trees are likley to merit TPO protection
Water/Wetland	A drain runs e-w along the field boundary across the middle of the SW part of site
Slope and Aspect	The site slopes down to the north away from the road towards the railway line
Buildings and Structures	None
Natural Area	NCA 22: Pennines Dales Fringe
Environmental Opportunity	SE04: Supporting and encouraging the creation of grass/woodland buffer strips, in-field grass strips, sediment traps, ponds and wetland habitats to slow run-off and intercept sediments and pollutants from farmland
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 62 Wharfe Valley Side Farmland "Promote...retention repair and sensitive management of hedgerows and hedgerow trees" "Promote native woodland planting..." "Protect and manage ancient semi-natural woodland"
Connectivity/Corridors	The site forms a link in the network of medium sized pasture fields with well-treed boundary hedges set between the transport corridors of the A61 and the railway, within the Crimple Valley to the south of Harrogate between Pannal and the northern edge of the lower Wharfe valley.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Protect, retain and enhance hedgerows and trees and provide buffers of semi-natural habitat including restoration of wildflower meadows, especially along the railway corridor
Protected Species	Nesting birds and bats are likely to utilise trees and hedgerows.
BAP Priority Species	Not known
Invasive Species	Not known
Notes	

Conclusion

Will it deliver net gains to biodiversity and protect and enhance existing networks of priority habitats and species and provide for long term management of wildlife habitats? Will it offer opportunities to enhance Green Infrastructure?

Rationale	Rating
Some potential adverse effects on designated sites (Local Site, SSSI, LNR, the wider ecological network and/or priority habitats and species but appropriate siting/scale or substantial mitigation should enable development.	Orange

Summary conclusion	Pasture fields with trees and hedgerows form a valuable network within the wider Crimple Valley. Protect, retain and enhance hedgerows and trees and provide buffers of semi-natural habitat including restoration of wildflower meadows, especially along the railway corridor

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN3 (Land south of Pannal, Phase 2)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.	According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed development is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred. We are however, aware of significant flooding incidents in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses including Clarke Beck & the River Crimple. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide. We have received significantly increased levels of complaints over recent years from concerned residents affected by, and threatened by flooding from these watercourses and general run-off from adjacent land. Due to the number of major development proposals in the general area planning to discharge surface water to the same watercourses, it is essential that surface water discharge is kept to an absolute minimum. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) should always be any developer's first consideration and giving preference to soakaways. In my view, infiltration drainage is unlikely to be fully successful at this location due to ground conditions in the surrounding area being predominantly heavy clay soils. However, any potential developer would be expected to submit a detailed feasibility study showing the use of SuDS including soakaways permeable cellular pavements, grassed swales, infiltration trenches, wetlands, ponds and green roofs that assist in dealing with surface water at source, has been fully explored. Any proposed discharge of surface water from the development site should be restricted to Greenfield rates (1.4 l/s/ha for all storm scenarios). The overall strategy should show that there is sufficient on site attenuation to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without increasing the restricted flows to the watercourse. Applicants would be expected to agree the outline drainage strategy with the LPA in principle before any planning consent is granted. The outline drainage information should include an assessment of flood risk to the site & surrounding area, topographical survey, feasibility of infiltration drainage, on site storage, rates of discharge, outfall location & condition survey results of existing watercourses (on or off site) and proposals for dealing with any identified remedial items. The proposed development land would be classed as major development due to the specified size of the site. As such, NYCC in its capacity as Lead Local Flood Authority should be consulted regarding the surface water drainage strategy (Statutory consultee). The River Crimple is classed as Main River, consequently, the Environment Agency should be consulted regarding any proposals that may affect this waterway.

Conclusion

Will it maintain and where possible improve surface water and groundwater quality?

Rationale	Rating
Some adverse effects of additional surface water discharge on nearby watercourses but appropriate mitigation should enable development.	Orange

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN4 (Land south of Pannal, Phase 3)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Land south of Pannal. Phase 3 LCA62: Wharfe Valley Side Farmland
Landscape description	Area description: The wider area is moderate to large-scale, consisting of the broad and hummocky valley side of the Wharfe Valley. Land use is simple and harmonious with medium sized grassland fields bound by hedgerows and fences in place for horse and livestock control. Site description: The site consists of four medium-scale pastoral fields bounded mainly by hedgerows and occasional hedgerow trees. The A61 Leeds Harogate Road adjoins the south eastern boundary with Burn Bridge Lane to the southwest. A PRoW is routed along the site's north eastern boundary. The Leeds to Harrogate railway runs in a cutting to the north west. The site gently falls from Swarth Hill situated at the esastern boundary, a local highpoint, falling away to the west. There is evidence of former quarrying activities on the hill which includes areas of scrub woodland regeneration
Existing urban edge	Situated to the south of and separated from the Pannal employment area within open countryside
Trees and hedges	Site part bounded by hedgerows and hedgerow trees with areas of woodland regeneration
Landscape and Green Belt designations	The site is situated within Green Belt R11 Rights of Way
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume30+dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The landscape condition is good and considered of high value and situated in the Green Belt. Susceptibility to change is also considered to be high with the site remote from the settlement edge. Overall sensitivity is judged to be high
Visual Sensitivity	Views of the site from the PRoW routed along the site's northwestern boundary. Open views of the site from the A61 when travelling north as well as from Burn Bridge Lane to the west.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of pastoral fields replaced with built development visible on rising landform impacting on the open valley landscape
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Large scale screen planting could be put in place in advance of development particularly along the site's southern and eastern boundaries
Likely level of landscape effects	Large scale adverse effects. Loss of fields introducing built development into an open valley landscape visible from the west and south
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	Potential significant adverse effects should adjoining site PN3 to the north and PN2 to the east be developed.

Conclusion

Will there be the opportunity for development to contribute to distinctiveness and countryside character?

Rationale	Rating
Sensitivity Rating: High – key distinctive characteristics are very vulnerable to change; typically a high valued landscape where landscape conditions is very good and where detracting features or major infrastructure is not present or where present has limited influence on the landscape resulting in a higher susceptibility to change.	Red
Capacity Rating: Low – the area has very limited or no capacity to accommodate the type and scale of the development proposed and there are few if any opportunities for appropriate mitigation.	Red

Will it increase the quality and quantity of tree or woodland cover?
Will it make use of opportunities wherever possible to enhance the environment as part of other initiatives?

Rationale	Rating
Development need not result in the loss of existing woodland or trees.	Light Green

Summary conclusion	Site situated adjacent to and visible from a major approach road to Harrogate affecting the openness of the Green Belt. Opportunities to effectively mitigate adverse impacts are extremely limited Development would significantly extend the settlement edge into a highly visible and prominent location within open countryside.

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN4 (Land south of Pannal, Phase 3)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	None likely to be impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	None likely to be impacted
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likely to be impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Improved pasture
Trees and Hedges	There are hedgerows along most field boundaries some with lines of mature tree; trees and shrubs regenerated along the disused quarry at swarth hill
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature boundary trees are likely to merit TPO protection
Water/Wetland	A drain is present alongside Burn Bridge Lane and on the sites northeast boundary
Slope and Aspect	The site slopes down from a high point towards the sites south east corner down to the railway line
Buildings and Structures	Disused quarry at swarth hill; stonewall present along much of the sites southeastern boundary alongside the A61. Bridge over the railway in western corner.
Natural Area	NCA 22: Pennines Dales Fringe
Environmental Opportunity	SE04: Supporting and encouraging the creation of grass/woodland buffer strips, in-field grass strips, sediment traps, ponds and wetland habitats to slow run-off and intercept sediments and pollutants from farmland
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 62 Wharfe Valley Side Farmland "Promote...retention repair and sensitive management of hedgerows and hedgerow trees" "Promote native woodland planting..." "Protect and manage ancient semi-natural woodland"
Connectivity/Corridors	The site forms a link in the network of medium sized pasture fields with well-treed boundary hedges set between the transport corridors of the A61 and the railway, within the Crimple Valley to the south of Harrogate between Pannal and the northern edge of the lower Wharfe valley.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Protect, retain and enhance hedgerows and trees and provide buffers of semi-natural habitat including restoration of wildflower meadows, especially along the railway corridor and the disused quarry which should be retained as open greenspace.
Protected Species	Nesting birds and bats are likely to utilise trees and hedgerows and possibly the railway bridge.
BAP Priority Species	Not known
Invasive Species	Not known
Notes	

Conclusion

Will it deliver net gains to biodiversity and protect and enhance existing networks of priority habitats and species and provide for long term management of wildlife habitats? Will it offer opportunities to enhance Green Infrastructure?

Rationale	Rating
Some potential adverse effects on designated sites (Local Site, SSSI, LNR, the wider ecological network and/or priority habitats and species but appropriate siting/scale or substantial mitigation should enable development.	Orange

Summary conclusion	Protect, retain and enhance hedgerows and trees and provide buffers of semi-natural habitat including restoration of wildflower meadows, especially along the railway corridor and the disused quarry which should be retained as open greenspace.

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN4 (Land south of Pannal, Phase 3)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.	According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed development is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred. We are however, aware of significant flooding incidents in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses including Clarke Beck & the River Crimple. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide. We have received significantly increased levels of complaints over recent years from concerned residents affected by, and threatened by flooding from these watercourses and general run-off from adjacent land. Due to the number of major development proposals in the general area planning to discharge surface water to the same watercourses, it is essential that surface water discharge is kept to an absolute minimum. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) should always be any developer's first consideration and giving preference to soakaways. In my view, infiltration drainage is unlikely to be fully successful at this location due to ground conditions in the surrounding area being predominantly heavy clay soils. However, any potential developer would be expected to submit a detailed feasibility study showing the use of SuDS including soakaways permeable cellular pavements, grassed swales, infiltration trenches, wetlands, ponds and green roofs that assist in dealing with surface water at source, has been fully explored. Any proposed discharge of surface water from the development site should be restricted to Greenfield rates (1.4 l/s/ha for all storm scenarios). The overall strategy should show that there is sufficient on site attenuation to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without increasing the restricted flows to the watercourse. Applicants would be expected to agree the outline drainage strategy with the LPA in principle before any planning consent is granted. The outline drainage information should include an assessment of flood risk to the site & surrounding area, topographical survey, feasibility of infiltration drainage, on site storage, rates of discharge, outfall location & condition survey results of existing watercourses (on or off site) and proposals for dealing with any identified remedial items. The proposed development land would be classed as major development due to the specified size of the site. As such, NYCC in its capacity as Lead Local Flood Authority should be consulted regarding the surface water drainage strategy (Statutory consultee). The River Crimple is classed as Main River, as such the Environment Agency should be consulted regarding any proposals that may affect this waterway.

Conclusion

Will it maintain and where possible improve surface water and groundwater quality?

Rationale	Rating
Some adverse effects of additional surface water discharge on nearby watercourses but appropriate mitigation should enable development.	Orange

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN5 (Land south of Pannal, Phase 4)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Land south of Pannal. Phase 4 LCA62: Wharfe Valley Side Farmland
Landscape description	Area description: The wider area is a moderate to large-scale area consisting of the broad and hummocky valley side of the Wharfe Valley. Land use is simple and harmonious with medium sized grassland fields bordered by hedgerows and fences in place for horse and livestock control. Site description: The site consists of an irregular shaped arable field bordered by the A61 to the east, the A658 to the southwest and Burn Bridge Lane to the northeast. The Leeds Harrogate railwy line borders the site to the west situated within a cutting and separated from the site by a wide grassed embankement along which is a row of mature trees. Remaining roadside boundaries are defined by hedgrerows and occasional hedgerow trees. The site is flat and low-lying situated below surrounding road levels
Existing urban edge	Situated to the south of and separated from the Pannal employment area within open countryside
Trees and hedges	Site partly bordered by hedgerows and occasional hedgerow trees
Landscape and Green Belt designations	The site is situated within Green Belt
Description of proposal for the site	Employment site
Physical Sensitivity	The landscape condition is good and considered of medium value and situated in the Green Belt. Susceptibility to change is also considered to be medium surrounded on three sides by busy roads which has a noticeable influence on the landscape setting. Overall sensitivity is predicted to be medium
Visual Sensitivity	Views of the site from the surrounding road network and busy roundabout junction
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of pastoral fields replaced with built development visible from surrounding road network and impacting on the open valley landscape
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Large scale perimeter screen planting could be put in place in advance of development which would have to be on bunded margins surrounding this low-level site to be effective
Likely level of landscape effects	Large scale adverse effects. Loss of fields introducing built development into an open valley landscape visible from surrounding roads
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	Potential significant adverse effects should site PN4 to the north and PN2 to the east be developed.

Conclusion

Will there be the opportunity for development to contribute to distinctiveness and countryside character?

Rationale	Rating
Sensitivity Rating: High – key distinctive characteristics are very vulnerable to change; typically a high valued landscape where landscape conditions is very good and where detracting features or major infrastructure is not present or where present has limited influence on the landscape resulting in a higher susceptibility to change.	Red
Capacity Rating: Low – the area has very limited or no capacity to accommodate the type and scale of the development proposed and there are few if any opportunities for appropriate mitigation.	Red

Will it increase the quality and quantity of tree or woodland cover?
Will it make use of opportunities wherever possible to enhance the environment as part of other initiatives?

Rationale	Rating
Development need not result in the loss of existing woodland or trees.	Light Green

Summary conclusion	Site situated adjacent to and visible from a major road intersection and approach roads to Harrogate affecting the openness of the Green Belt. Opportunities to effectively mitigate adverse impacts would be extremely limited for this highly visible low level site Development would significantly extend the settlement edge into a highly visible and prominent location within open countryside.

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN5 (Land south of Pannal, Phase 4)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	None likely to be impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs
SSSI Risk Zone	None likely to be impacted
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likely to be impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Improved pasture
Trees and Hedges	There are hedgerows along most field boundaries with some with lines of trees and shrubs e.g. along the disused embankment, the railway and the drain in the south
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature boundary trees are likely to merit TPO protection
Water/Wetland	There is a drain along the southern boundary
Slope and Aspect	Generally flat other than the disused railway embankment along the western boundary
Buildings and Structures	Bridge over the railway in north western corner.
Natural Area	NCA 22: Pennines Dales Fringe
Environmental Opportunity	SE04: Supporting and encouraging the creation of grass/woodland buffer strips, in-field grass strips, sediment traps, ponds and wetland habitats to slow run-off and intercept sediments and pollutants from farmland
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 62 Wharfe Valley Side Farmland "Promote...retention repair and sensitive management of hedgerows and hedgerow trees" "Promote native woodland planting..." "Protect and manage ancient semi-natural woodland"
Connectivity/Corridors	The site forms a link in the network of medium sized pasture fields with well-treed boundary hedges set between the transport corridors of the A61 and the railway, within the Crimple Valley to the south of Harrogate between Pannal and the northern edge of the lower Wharfe valley.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Protect, retain and enhance hedgerows and trees and provide buffers of semi-natural habitat including restoration of wildflower meadows, especially along the railway corridor and the disused quarry which should be retained as open greenspace.
Protected Species	Nesting birds and bats are likely to utilise trees and hedgerows and possibly the railway bridge.
BAP Priority Species	Not known
Invasive Species	Not known
Notes	

Conclusion

Will it deliver net gains to biodiversity and protect and enhance existing networks of priority habitats and species and provide for long term management of wildlife habitats? Will it offer opportunities to enhance Green Infrastructure?

Rationale	Rating
Some potential adverse effects on designated sites (Local Site, SSSI, LNR, the wider ecological network and/or priority habitats and species but appropriate siting/scale or substantial mitigation should enable development.	Orange

Summary conclusion	Protect, retain and enhance hedgerows and trees and provide buffers of semi-natural habitat including restoration of wildflower meadows, especially along the railway corridor and the drain along the southern boundary

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN5 (Land south of Pannal, Phase 4)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.	According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed development is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred. We are however, aware of significant flooding incidents in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses including Clarke Beck & the River Crimple. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide. We have received significantly increased levels of complaints over recent years from concerned residents affected by, and threatened by flooding from these watercourses and general run-off from adjacent land. Due to the number of major development proposals in the general area planning to discharge surface water to the same watercourses, it is essential that surface water discharge is kept to an absolute minimum. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) should always be any developer's first consideration and giving preference to soakaways. In my view, infiltration drainage is unlikely to be fully successful at this location due to ground conditions in the surrounding area being predominantly heavy clay soils. However, any potential developer would be expected to submit a detailed feasibility study showing the use of SuDS including soakaways permeable cellular pavements, grassed swales, infiltration trenches, wetlands, ponds and green roofs that assist in dealing with surface water at source, has been fully explored. Any proposed discharge of surface water from the development site should be restricted to Greenfield rates (1.4 l/s/ha for all storm scenarios). The overall strategy should show that there is sufficient on site attenuation to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without increasing the restricted flows to the watercourse. Applicants would be expected to agree the outline drainage strategy with the LPA in principle before any planning consent is granted. The outline drainage information should include an assessment of flood risk to the site & surrounding area, topographical survey, feasibility of infiltration drainage, on site storage, rates of discharge, outfall location & condition survey results of existing watercourses (on or off site) and proposals for dealing with any identified remedial items. The proposed development land would be classed as major development due to the specified size of the site. As such, NYCC in its capacity as Lead Local Flood Authority should be consulted regarding the surface water drainage strategy (Statutory consultee). The River Crimple is classed as Main River, as such the Environment Agency should be consulted regarding any proposals that may affect this waterway.

Conclusion

Will it maintain and where possible improve surface water and groundwater quality?

Rationale	Rating
Some adverse effects of additional surface water discharge on nearby watercourses but appropriate mitigation should enable development.	Orange

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN6 (Land adjoining Black Swan, Burn Bridge Road, Pannal)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site adjoins the Black Swan PH, Burn Burn Bridge Road, Pannal. LCA 60: Upper Crimple Valley
Landscape description	Area description: Small-scale pastoral valley landform abutting the southwestern limits of Harrogate. Tree cover is good with individual trees scattered along field boundaries. The improved fields are managed for livestock and to the north of the River Crimple, small fields typical of early enclosure are randomly arranged. Prominent views of The Warren plantation woodland situated at the end of a ridge is visible 0.5km to the south-west. Site Description: The site consists of a rectangular field in pastoral use which gently slopes to the south. A drystone wall runs alongside Burn Bridge Road frontage with hedgerow boundaries to the north and west and stockproof fencing to the south, all boundaries apart from the drystone wall running along the frontage have occasional hedgerow trees.
Existing urban edge	Burn Bridge Road forms the main boundary to residential development situated mainly to the east. Scattered propertiies within a pastoral setting front Burn Bridge Road to the west
Trees and hedges	Two hedgrows with occasional hedgerow trees are situated along the site's northern and eastern boundaries with hedgerow trees along the stock fenced southern boundary
Landscape and Green Belt designations	C9 Special Landscape Area
Description of proposal for the site	Assume low residential density consistent with nearby properties and reflective of urban/rural edge
Physical Sensitivity	Pastoral landform would be interrupted by built development with loss of rural edge setting.
Visual Sensitivity	Views of site from Burn Bridge Road affecting views into the wider landscape to the west and southwest.. Views of the site are also likely from The Harrogate Ringway circular footpath to the west.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of a pastoral field introducing new built form on the edge of the settlement.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Limited opportunities for enhancement
Likely level of landscape effects	Medium scale adverse effects on the Special Landscape Area introducing built development into an open valley edge setting
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	Potential adverse effects should site refs PN7, PN8 and PN9 be developed to the north.

Conclusion

Will there be the opportunity for development to contribute to distinctiveness and countryside character?

Rationale	Rating
Sensitivity Rating: High/medium – key distinctive characteristics are vulnerable to change; typically a high to medium valued landscape where landscape conditions is good where detracting features or major infrastructure is not present or where present has limited influence on the landscape.	Orange
Capacity Rating: Medium/low – the area is not able to accommodate development of the scale and type proposed without detriment to landscape character and visual amenity and the opportunities for appropriate mitigation are limited.	Orange

Will it increase the quality and quantity of tree or woodland cover?
Will it make use of opportunities wherever possible to enhance the environment as part of other initiatives?

Rationale	Rating
Development need not result in the loss of existing woodland or trees.	Light Green

Summary conclusion	Site important to the setting of the southern edge of the village with frequent views possible into the wider landscape to the west Opportunities to mitigate effects of development are limited due to sensitivity of site location.

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN6 (Land adjoining Black Swan, Burn Bridge Road, Pannal)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Conservation and Design

Conservation and Design Site Assessment

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	None.
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	None.
Commentary on heritage assets.	None.
Topography and views	Good open views along the valley (and across the site) from all along Burn Bridge Road alongside the site. Quality of view is such that a public bench stands in front of 41 Burn Bridge Road, facing across the site with good views of the rural landscape of the valley.
Landscape context	Urban/rural fringe. Fields bounded by low hedges, good lines and clumps of trees along field boundaries. Crimple Beck and its densely wooded banks form a key feature of the landscape, with views across the back screened by the trees. TPO tree on site. Several TPO trees directly adjoining the southern and northern boundaries of the site.
Grain of surrounding development	East side of Burn Bridge Road: fairly low density suburban housing. Houses oriented to face road with uniform set backs. Principal elevations face road. Corner houses oriented to face corner rather than one road. Spaces between neighbouring dwellings not particularly wide, hence, enclosed character to street. Open plan gardens or low hedge front boundaries. Front gardens sufficiently deep to allow some trees to reach maturity, softening the street scene. Otherwise, trees limited to rear boundaries of back gardens. North and south of site: far lower density. Buildings in fairly large plots with much greater tree cover. Abundance of matures trees of townscape value.
Local building design	The Croft / Penrhyn: early C20th semi detached dwellings. Brick with render upper floor, some half timbering and hung tiles. Hipped red clay tile roof with gabled projecting bays. Typical suburban dwellings of their time. Four Oaks: 1970s broad gable fronted house with lower gabled wing set at right angle. Artificial tile roof. Appears to be buff coloured artstone. Not locally distinctive. East side Burn Bridge Road: mix of heights including bungalow, dormer bungalow, two storey houses and 2 ½ storey houses. Mix of early C20th and mid C20th dwellings. Predominantly hipped roofs with a minority of gabled buildings. Frequent use of gable fronted feature bays to enliven elevations. Mix of render and brick and render. Mix of slate and tiled roofs, with all roofs overhanging at the eaves. Attractive townscape, but not locally distinctive per se. Generally good quality of design. Black Swan: early C20th public house with strongly domestic appearance. Stone lower floor, half timbered upper floor, attic expressed in hipped dormer in roof and gabled dormers which break through the eaves. Oversailing red clay tile roof. Hipped apart from central feature gable to principal elevation. A local landmark.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	No buildings on site. Site is two agricultural fields separated by a low hedge. Good line of trees by north eastern corner of site. TPO tree in centre of field to the west of this tree line. 3 good mature trees dotted along west boundary, 2 along central boundary within site. Stone boundary wall along Burn Bridge Road, fence boundary to north boundary, low hedges elsewhere. Gentle fall from north to south across site.

Conclusion

Will it contribute to local distinctiveness and countryside character? (Only applies to sites in Conservation Areas).

Rationale	Rating
Site is not within a Conservation Area.	n/a

Will it conserve those elements which contribute towards the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets?	
Rationale	Rating
Development is likely to harm elements which contribute to the significance of a heritage asset but the harm is capable of mitigation.	Orange
Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?	
Rationale	Rating
The nature of the site means that built development will have a negative impact on local distinctiveness but there are opportunities for mitigation and improvements.	Orange
Summary conclusion	The principal constraint is the good views across the site. A balance must be struck between accommodating dwellings and upholding the openness of this urban/rural edge. Simply mirroring the existing development on Burn Bridge Road would close the street scene off in an unsatisfactory fashion. It should be possible to see across the site at one or two points along Burn Bridge Road to prevent it from becoming divorced from the wider landscape. The density of buildings on the site should not exceed that of the surrounding area, otherwise the development would seriously harm the area's character which is typified by tree cover, broad streets and space about buildings. Trees on the site should be retained and trees bordering the site should be given sufficient space. Stone boundary wall should be retained. Hedges should be incorporated into development if possible. Opportunity to continue the high quality townscape of the surrounding area and respond creatively to its varied built forms and architecture. The need to provide a low building density, broad street, retain trees and provide space for new ones to mature will significantly reduce the yield of this site. In the same vein, the provision of vistas terminating in open countryside from Burn Bridge Road will reduce the potential yield of the site. The surrounding townscape is such that small, densely packed dwellings will appear to be crammed into the site and inferior to the existing dwellings. Well articulated masses, contemporary response to early C20th suburbia, but avoiding twee details and badly proportioned buildings. No buildings exceeding a domestic scale, though large domestic scale buildings containing flats may be possible.

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN6 (Land adjoining Black Swan, Burn Bridge Road, Pannal)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	None likely to be impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	None likely to be impacted
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likely to be impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Improved pasture (not assessed P1HS 1992)
Trees and Hedges	There are hedgerows to all boundaries except the roadside, although the southern and western hedges are gappy. There are several mature trees (mostly ash) dotted along the southern and northern boundaries.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	TPOs should be considered for those trees not already protected
Water/Wetland	None on site; River Crimple within 25m of the SW of the site
Slope and Aspect	Generally flat
Buildings and Structures	None other than roadside wall.
Natural Area	NCA 22: Pennines Dales Fringe
Environmental Opportunity	SE04: Supporting and encouraging the creation of grass/woodland buffer strips, in-field grass strips, sediment traps, ponds and wetland habitats to slow run-off and intercept sediments and pollutants from farmland
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 60 Upper Crimple Valley • “To promote the retention, regeneration and management of hedgerows to maintain field boundaries.” • “Encourage management and continuity of wooded character of River Crimple and marginal vegetation as a wildlife corridor”. • “Encourage management for biodiversity in line with the aims of the Harrogate Biodiversity Action Plan”.
Connectivity/Corridors	The site forms part of a network of medium sized pasture fields with well-treed boundary hedges between Hill Foot and Brackenthwaite Lanes, which links in with the wooded corridor of the Crimple Beck.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	There would be the opportunity to plant hedges with trees along the roadside wall and enhance the existing hedgerows to the site with native trees and shrubs. There may be the opportunity to create a small SUDS wetland in the south-western corner of the site adjacent to the Crimple Beck
Protected Species	Nesting birds are likely to be associated with the hedgerows and trees and bats may roost in the mature trees
BAP Priority Species	Not known
Invasive Species	None known
Notes	RL3004 (also included field to north) 2010 (amber)

Conclusion

Will it deliver net gains to biodiversity and protect and enhance existing networks of priority habitats and species and provide for long term management of wildlife habitats? Will it offer opportunities to enhance Green Infrastructure?

Rationale	Rating
Some potential adverse effects on designated sites (Local Site, SSSI, LNR, the wider ecological network and/or priority habitats and species but appropriate siting/scale or substantial mitigation should enable development.	Orange

Summary conclusion	Development may be acceptable on the site from an ecological viewpoint, providing that trees and hedges within and bordering the site are protected, retained and enhanced as part of green infrastructrure provision. A generous belt of native tree planting along the southern boundary would enhance the River Crimple corridor. There may be the opportunityu to create a small Suds wetland in the SW corner of the site. A new hedgerow should be planted along the roadside bounday and all the boundary hedges could be reinforced with more trees.

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN6 (Land adjoining Black Swan, Burn Bridge Road, Pannal)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.	According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed development is located within flood zone 1. Nonetheless the site abuts flood zone 2. We are aware of significant flooding incidents in the immediate surrounding area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses includiing Clarke Beck & the River Crimple. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide. We have received significantly increased levels of complaints over recent years from concerned residents affected by, and threatened by flooding from these watercourses and general run-off from adjacent land. Due to the number of major development proposals in the general area planning to discharge surface water to the same watercourses, it is essential that surface water discharge is kept to an absolute minimum. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) should always be any developer's first consideration and giving preference to soakaways. In my view, infiltration drainage is unlikely to be fully successful at this location due to ground conditions in the surrounding area being predominantly heavy clay soils. However, any potential developer would be expected to submit a detailed feasibility study showing the use of SuDS including soakaways permeable cellular pavements, grassed swales, infiltration trenches, wetlands, ponds and green roofs that assist in dealing with surface water at source, has been fully explored. Any proposed discharge of surface water from the development site should be restricted to Greenfield rates (1.4 l/s/ha for all storm scenarios). The overall strategy should show that there is sufficient on site attenuation to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without increasing the restricted flows to the watercourse. Applicants would be expected to agree the outline drainage strategy with the LPA in principle before any planning consent is granted. The outline drainage information should include an assessment of flood risk to the site & surrounding area, topographical survey, feasibility of infiltration drainage, on site storage, rates of discharge, outfall location & condition survey results of existing watercourses (on or off site) and proposals for dealing with any identified remedial items. The proposed development land would be classed as major development due to the specified size of the site. As such, NYCC in its capacity as Lead Local Flood Authority should be consulted regarding the surface water drainage strategy (Statutory consultee). The River Crimple is classed as Main River, as such the Environment Agency should be consulted regarding any proposals that may affect this waterway.

Conclusion

Will it maintain and where possible improve surface water and groundwater quality?

Rationale	Rating
Some adverse effects of additional surface water discharge on nearby watercourses but appropriate mitigation should enable development.	Orange

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN7 (Cross's Field, Hill Foot Lane, Pannal)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site situated at Cross's Field Hill Foot Lane Pannal: LCA60 Upper Crimple Valley
Landscape description	Area description: Small scale pastoral valley landform abutting the south-west limits of Harrogate. Tree cover is good with individual trees scattered along field boundaries. The improved fields are managed for livestock and to the north of the River Crimple, small fields typical of early enclosure are randomly organised. Prominent views of The Warren plantation woodland situated at the end of a ridge is visible 0.5km to the south-west. Site Description: The site comprises a rectangular field which has the appearance of a domestic garden. There are several mature trees including some distinctive evergreen specimens that are visible outside the site enhancing the wooded character of this part of the village
Existing urban edge	The site is well contained by boundary trees and is detached from the main urban edge across Burn Bridge Road.
Trees and hedges	The site is bordered along all sides by a mature hedgerow with hedgerow trees. There are a number of distinctive evergreen specimens within the site situated close to the road edge.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	C9 Special Landscape Area
Description of proposal for the site	Assume low residential density consistent with nearby properties and reflective of urban/rural edge
Physical Sensitivity	The site comprises of a rectangular field that has the appearance of a domestic garden. There are several mature trees including some distinctive evergreen specimens that are visible outside the site enhancing the wooded character of this part of the village. The upper part of the field is marshy with a ditch flowing south-east
Visual Sensitivity	The site is hidden behind tall hedgerows on the northern boundary, however to the west there are open views across the Crimple Valley as far as Horn Bank in the far distance
Anticipated landscape effects	Development would result in the loss of an attractive garden landscape that contributes to the open landscape setting of the village
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Limited opportunities for enhancement since the site is already well vegetated along its boundaries. Development would appear as a significant encroachment into a key space within the village
Likely level of landscape effects	Medium scale adverse effects on the Special Landscape Area introducing built development into a valley edge setting
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	Potential adverse effects should site refs PN7, PN8 and PN9 be developed to the north.

Conclusion

Will there be the opportunity for development to contribute to distinctiveness and countryside character?

Rationale	Rating
Sensitivity Rating: High/medium – key distinctive characteristics are vulnerable to change; typically a high to medium valued landscape where landscape conditions is good where detracting features or major infrastructure is not present or where present has limited influence on the landscape.	Orange
Capacity Rating: Medium/low – the area is not able to accommodate development of the scale and type proposed without detriment to landscape character and visual amenity and the opportunities for appropriate mitigation are limited.	Orange

Will it increase the quality and quantity of tree or woodland cover?
Will it make use of opportunities wherever possible to enhance the environment as part of other initiatives?

Rationale	Rating
Development need not result in the loss of existing woodland or trees.	Light Green

Summary conclusion	Site important to the setting of the southern edge of the village with views over the Crimple Valley to the south. Opportunities to mitigate effects of development are limited due to the site's high sensitivity and visual prominence.

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN7 (Cross's Field, Hill Foot Lane, Pannal)	
Natural and Built Heritage Assessments	**Type: Conservation and Design**
Conservation and Design Site Assessment	
Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Dawcross Farmhouse (GIILB).
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Dawcross.
Commentary on heritage assets.	Within setting of Dawcross Farmhouse (GIILB), an attractive modest Georgian house with symmetrical three bay front elevation. Decorative Greek Revival doorcase. Simple gabled form, stone with slate roof. Attached outbuilding / barn range to rear of house set at a right angle to the house. Slightly lower, stone with a slate roof. Locally distinctive. Dawcross: early /mid C19th farmhouse, symmetrical three bay elevation. Stone with tabled stone slate roof. Simple asymmetrical gabled form, with lower gabled rear wing. Detached barn. Stone with stone slate roof. Plain verges. Locally distinctive.
Topography and views	Moderate fall from north to south across site. North eastern corner of site is raised above the adjacent road junction and is fronted by a stone retaining wall. Good views across site and valley landscape beyond from Hillfoot Lane. North Eastern corner of site forms terminal feature of vistas looking down Burn Bridge Road. Similarly there are good views over the site and valley from higher up Burn Bridge Road. Good views along Hillfoot Lane of east facing principal elevation of Dawcross Farmhouse (Listed).
Landscape context	Urban/rural fringe. Fields bounded by low hedges, good lines and clumps of trees along field boundaries.
Grain of surrounding development	Hillfoot Lane / Dawcross Rise / Four Oaks / The Croft / Penrhyn: scattered, well spaced buildings in generous plots for the most part. Buildings generally oriented south apart from Dawcross Farm, which faces east. Most dwellings set in large gardens with dense perimeter hedges, trees and shrubs concealing buildings from view for the most part. A minority of buildings adjoin the road directly or are set back slightly from it, the rest tend to be set well back. Large gaps between neighbouring buildings. Burn Bridge Road, as above, but houses more visible in the street, with short set back distance, and all buildings oriented to face the road. Tree-lined verge between front gardens and road.
Local building design	Dawcross Farmhouse: attractive modest Georgian house with symmetrical three bay front elevation. Decorative Greek Revival doorcase. Simple gabled form, stone with slate roof. Attached outbuilding / barn range to rear of house set at a right angle to the house. Slightly lower, stone with a slate roof. Locally distinctive. Low Garth: hipped roof stone bungalow, first half C20th. Slate roof with low hipped wing. Not locally distinctive. Dawcross: early /mid C19th farmhouse, symmetrical three bay elevation. Stone with tabled stone slate roof. Simple asymmetrical gabled form, with lower gabled rear wing. Detached barn. Stone with stone slate roof. Plain verges. Locally distinctive. East side Burn Bridge Road: various domestic revival / arts and crafts influenced early C20th detached suburban dwellings. White render with stone dressings. Mix of stone slate roofs, red clay tiles, and red and green pantiles. Mix of hipped and gabled roofs. Mix of plain verges and tabling where roofs are gabled. Simple forms enlivened by projecting gabled bays, gablets and lean-tos. Not locally distinctive per se, but well designed. The Croft / Penrhyn: early C20th semi detached dwellings. Brick with render upper floor, some half timbering and hung tiles. Hipped red clay tile roof with gabled projecting bays. Typical suburban dwellings of their time. Four Oaks: 1970s broad gable fronted house with lower gabled wing set at right angle. Artificial tile roof. Appears to be buff coloured artstone. Not locally distinctive.

Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	No buildings on site. Site bisected by a small watercourse with step, tree-lined banks. The small space to the north of this is like a small green in the junction. This part of the site is bounded by a stone wall and contains a substantial mature tree. Rest of site is more garden-like rather than a field or paddock. The southern half contains various mature trees of mixed species. Some of the trees are very tall. The northern half is more open, but there are two mature trees along the western edge. Hedge boundaries to site apart from stone retaining wall around north eastern corner.

Conclusion

Will it contribute to local distinctiveness and countryside character? (Only applies to sites in Conservation Areas).

Rationale	Rating
Site is not within a Conservation Area.	n/a

Will it conserve those elements which contribute towards the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets?

Rationale	Rating
Development is likely to result in harm to elements which contribute to the significance of a heritage asset and the harm is not capable of mitigation.	Red

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

Rationale	Rating
The nature of the site means that built development will have a negative impact on local distinctiveness.	Red

Summary conclusion	The site contributes to the setting of the listed building and to the open, rural character of the settlement. Development across the site would be harmful to the setting of the heritage asset and contrary to the established grain. The various constraints on this site cumulatively render this site unsuitable for development without significant harm to the townscape, street scene and setting of the listed building. Stream and north eastern corner of site should be left as they are. They are attractive features of the townscape and street scene of the area. The existing trees on the site should be retained as these enhance the townscape. Views of the front elevation of Dawcross Farm along Hill Foot Lane should be retained. Views down Burn Bridge Road terminating in the north eastern corner of the site should not be harmed by development. The constraints of the stream, views and trees leave only a very small ‘developable’ site area. Even so a small scale development could have a significant impact on views and the character of the local townscape.

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN7 (Cross's Field, Hill Foot Lane, Pannal)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	None likely to be impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	None likely to be impacted
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likely to be impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows, stream
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Appears improved pasture [not assessed P1HS 1992]. “Marsh” is marked on the OS map by the stream.
Trees and Hedges	Hedgerows (including a tall one to the north) with trees bound the site, apart from NE corner, where there is a substantial mature tree. Two further mature trees are present along the W. edge. Site bisected by a small watercourse with steep, tree-lined banks. The southern half contains various mature trees of mixed species including some tall conifers. Some of the trees are very tall.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature trees on and bounding the site are highly likley to merit TPO protection
Water/Wetland	There is a spring with a small watercourse with steep, tree-lined banks that cuts across the NE corner.
Slope and Aspect	The site slopes gently to the southwest towards the River Crimple
Buildings and Structures	None on site apart from stone retaining wall around NE corne
Natural Area	NCA 22: Pennines Dales Fringe
Environmental Opportunity	SE04: Supporting and encouraging the creation of grass/woodland buffer strips, in-field grass strips, sediment traps, ponds and wetland habitats to slow run-off and intercept sediments and pollutants from farmland
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 60 Upper Crimple Valley • “To promote the retention, regeneration and management of hedgerows to maintain field boundaries.” • “Encourage management and continuity of wooded character of River Crimple and marginal vegetation as a wildlife corridor”. • “Encourage management for biodiversity in line with the aims of the Harrogate Biodiversity Action Plan”.
Connectivity/Corridors	The site forms a link in the network of medium sized pasture fields with well-treed boundary hedges between Hill Foot Lane and Brackenthwaite Lane, which links in with the wooded corridor of the Crimple Beck.The stream forms a green corridor within the site but may be culverted as it flows south of the site towards the Crimple along the roadside.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Retain, protect and buffer trees and the strean on site. There may be the opportunity to create a small SUDS wetland in association with the stream. It may be possible to enhance the stream to the south of the site.
Protected Species	Nesting birds are likely to be associated with the hedgerows and trees and bats may roost in the mature trees.There may be potential for water vole along the watercourse.
BAP Priority Species	None known
Invasive Species	None known
Notes	RL2023 2010 (red) Sward and watercourse require assessment.

Conclusion

Will it deliver net gains to biodiversity and protect and enhance existing networks of priority habitats and species and provide for long term management of wildlife habitats? Will it offer opportunities to enhance Green Infrastructure?

Rationale	Rating
Significant adverse effects on designated sites (Local Site, SSSI, LNR), the wider ecological network and/or priority habitats and species.	Red

Summary conclusion	The stream, trees and hedgerows are valuable features that should be retained, protected and buffered. Small scale development may be acceptable on other parts of the site, providing that existing features are retained and enhanced and given adequate space.

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN7 (Cross's Field, Hill Foot Lane, Pannal)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.	According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed development is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred. We are however, aware of significant flooding incidents in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses including Clarke Beck & the River Crimple. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide. We have received significantly increased levels of complaints over recent years from concerned residents affected by, and threatened by flooding from these watercourses and general run-off from adjacent land. Due to the number of major development proposals in the general area planning to discharge surface water to the same watercourses, it is essential that surface water discharge is kept to an absolute minimum. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) should always be any developer's first consideration and giving preference to soakaways. In my view, infiltration drainage is unlikely to be fully successful at this location due to ground conditions in the surrounding area being predominantly heavy clay soils. However, any potential developer would be expected to submit a detailed feasibility study showing the use of SuDS including soakaways permeable cellular pavements, grassed swales, infiltration trenches, wetlands, ponds and green roofs that assist in dealing with surface water at source, has been fully explored. Any proposed discharge of surface water from the development site should be restricted to Greenfield rates (1.4 l/s/ha for all storm scenarios). The overall strategy should show that there is sufficient on site attenuation to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without increasing the restricted flows to the watercourse. Applicants would be expected to agree the outline drainage strategy with the LPA in principle before any planning consent is granted. The outline drainage information should include an assessment of flood risk to the site & surrounding area, topographical survey, feasibility of infiltration drainage, on site storage, rates of discharge, outfall location & condition survey results of existing watercourses (on or off site) and proposals for dealing with any identified remedial items. The River Crimple is classed as Main River, as such the Environment Agency should be consulted regarding any proposals that may affect this waterway.

Conclusion

Will it maintain and where possible improve surface water and groundwater quality?

Rationale	Rating
Some adverse effects of additional surface water discharge on nearby watercourses but appropriate mitigation should enable development.	Orange

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN8 (Land south of Hill Foot Lane, Pannal)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Land south of Hill Foot Lane Pannal: LCA60 Upper Crimple Valley
Landscape description	Area description: Small scale pastoral valley landform abutting the south-west limits of Harrogate. Tree cover is good with individual trees scattered along field boundaries. The improved fields are managed for livestock and to the north of the River Crimple, small fields are randomly organised which are typical of early enclosure. Views of The Warren plantation woodland situated at the end of a prominent ridge is visible 0.5km to the south-west. Site Description: The site comprises a triangular pastoral field which gently slopes to the south-east. Field boundaries include a part hedgerow and part drystone wall along Hill foot Lane. Remaining boundaries include drystone walls,hedgerows and post and rail fencing. There several distinctive boundary trees which are particuiarly evident along Hill Foot Lane enhancing the setting of this part of the village
Existing urban edge	The site is detached from the main urban edge of the village within widely scattered fringe development
Trees and hedges	The site is bounded in part by a mature hedgerow with hedgerow trees. There are a number of distinctive trees along Hill Foot Lane
Landscape and Green Belt designations	C9 Special Landscape Area
Description of proposal for the site	Assume low residential density consistent with nearby properties and reflective of urban/rural edge
Physical Sensitivity	The site comprises of a broadly triangular field in pastoral use bounderd by a combination of hedgerows, drystone walls and post and rail fencing. There are several mature trees along all site boundaries
Visual Sensitivity	The site is highly visible from Hill Foot Lane. There are also likely to be mid to long distance views of this gently sloping site across the Crimple Valley and from the Harrogate Ringway PRoW to the west.
Anticipated landscape effects	Development would result in the loss of an attractive gently sloping pastoral field that contributes to the open landscape setting of the village
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Limited opportunities for enhancement as mitigation screen planting would have an adverse effect on the openness of the setting.
Likely level of landscape effects	Large scale adverse effects on the Special Landscape Area introducing built development into a valley edge setting
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	Potential adverse effects should site refs PN7and PN9 be developed to the east and north-east

Conclusion

Will there be the opportunity for development to contribute to distinctiveness and countryside character?

Rationale	Rating
Sensitivity Rating: High/medium – key distinctive characteristics are vulnerable to change; typically a high to medium valued landscape where landscape conditions is good where detracting features or major infrastructure is not present or where present has limited influence on the landscape.	Orange
Capacity Rating: Medium/low – the area is not able to accommodate development of the scale and type proposed without detriment to landscape character and visual amenity and the opportunities for appropriate mitigation are limited.	Orange

Will it increase the quality and quantity of tree or woodland cover?
Will it make use of opportunities wherever possible to enhance the environment as part of other initiatives?

Rationale	Rating
Development need not result in the loss of existing woodland or trees.	Light Green

Summary conclusion	Site important to the setting of the southern edge of the village with views over the Crimple Valley to the south. Opportunities to mitigate effects of development are limited due to the sensitivity and visual prominence of the site.

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN8 (Land south of Hill Foot Lane, Pannal)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Conservation and Design

Conservation and Design Site Assessment

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Dawcross Farm (grade II listed). Bilton Grove Farmhouse (grade II* listed).
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Dawcross.
Commentary on heritage assets.	Development of the will affect the setting of Dawcross Farm (a later 18th century farmhouse with additional farm buildings) and Bilton Grove Farmhouse (a 17th century farmhouse with farm buildings). Non-designated heritage assets are located to the north of Hill Foot Lane, including Dawcross, a two storey, stone house with detached barn (to the north east of Dawcross Farm) and some examples of early 20th century, large houses (set in large gardens and set back from road).
Topography and views	The site is highly visible from Hill Foot Lane with views across the site to the open countryside beyond. Also, important views in context with Dawcross Farm and Bilton Grove Farmhouse. The land slopes away from the road.
Landscape context	A pastoral landscape on the southern side of Harrogate with more urban areas contained within the rural context.
Grain of surrounding development	Very low density / rural grain along Hillcroft Lane – highly characterised by farmsteads. Towards Burn Bridge, higher density of 20th century development. Some larger properties present on the north side of Hill Foot Lane, some historic.
Local building design	Stone is the predominent traditional material of the area.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The site comprises of a broadly triangular field in pastoral use bordered by a combination of hedgerows, drystone walls and post and rail fencing. There are several mature trees along all site boundaries. Dawcross Farm is located to the east of the site – its stone wall forms the boundary between the two. Bilton Grove Farmhouse is located to the west of the site (both farms being located to the south of Hill Foot Lane, the site positioned between the two).

Conclusion

Will it contribute to local distinctiveness and countryside character? (Only applies to sites in Conservation Areas).

Rationale	Rating
Site is not within a Conservation Area.	n/a

Will it conserve those elements which contribute towards the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets?

Rationale	Rating
Development is likely to result in harm to elements which contribute to the significance of a heritage asset and the harm is not capable of mitigation.	Red

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

Rationale	Rating
The nature of the site means that built development will have a negative impact on local distinctiveness.	Red

Summary conclusion	The field contributes greatly to the setting of the two listed buildings, one of which is grade II* listed and generally, to the rural character of Hill Foot Lane. Development across the site would be harmful to the setting of the heritage assets present and be contrary to established grain.

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN8 (Land south of Hill Foot Lane, Pannal)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	None likely to be impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	None likely to be impacted
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likely to be impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Improved pasture
Trees and Hedges	Roadside hedgerow and hedgerows along most other boundaries except western sides of fields. Mature trees scattered along most boundaries and a group of field trees in the north west near Bilton Grove Farm
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature trees likley to merit TPO protection
Water/Wetland	None
Slope and Aspect	The site slopes gently to the southwards towards the River Crimple
Buildings and Structures	None. Stone walls form some of the field boundaries
Natural Area	NCA 22: Pennines Dales Fringe
Environmental Opportunity	SE04: Supporting and encouraging the creation of grass/woodland buffer strips, in-field grass strips, sediment traps, ponds and wetland habitats to slow run-off and intercept sediments and pollutants from farmland
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 60 Upper Crimple Valley • “To promote the retention, regeneration and management of hedgerows to maintain field boundaries.” • “Encourage management and continuity of wooded character of River Crimple and marginal vegetation as a wildlife corridor”. • “Encourage management for biodiversity in line with the aims of the Harrogate Biodiversity Action Plan”.
Connectivity/Corridors	The site forms a link in the network of medium sized pasture fields with well-treed boundary hedges between Hill Foot Lane and Brackenthwaite Lane, which links in with the wooded corridor of the Crimple Beck.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Trees on site should be retained, protected and granted adequate space. Hedgerows should be enhanced with new planting of native shrubs and trees.
Protected Species	Nesting birds are likely to be associated with the hedgerows and trees and bats may roost in the mature trees.
BAP Priority Species	Not known
Invasive Species	Not known
Notes	

Conclusion

Will it deliver net gains to biodiversity and protect and enhance existing networks of priority habitats and species and provide for long term management of wildlife habitats? Will it offer opportunities to enhance Green Infrastructure?

Rationale	Rating
Some potential adverse effects on designated sites (Local Site, SSSI, LNR, the wider ecological network and/or priority habitats and species but appropriate siting/scale or substantial mitigation should enable development.	Orange

Summary conclusion	Part of the network of small fields adjacent to the River Crimple corridor. Should the site be developed, trees on site should be retained, protected and granted adequate space. Hedgerows should be enhanced with new planting of native shrubs and trees to strengthen green infrastructure of the area

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN8 (Land south of Hill Foot Lane, Pannal)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.	According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed development is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred. We are however, aware of significant flooding incidents in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses including Clarke Beck & the River Crimple. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide. We have received significantly increased levels of complaints over recent years from concerned residents affected by, and threatened by flooding from these watercourses and general run-off from adjacent land. Due to the number of major development proposals in the general area planning to discharge surface water to the same watercourses, it is essential that surface water discharge is kept to an absolute minimum. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) should always be any developer's first consideration and giving preference to soakaways. In my view, infiltration drainage is unlikely to be fully successful at this location due to ground conditions in the surrounding area being predominantly heavy clay soils. However, any potential developer would be expected to submit a detailed feasibility study showing the use of SuDS including soakaways permeable cellular pavements, grassed swales, infiltration trenches, wetlands, ponds and green roofs that assist in dealing with surface water at source, has been fully explored. Any proposed discharge of surface water from the development site should be restricted to Greenfield rates (1.4 l/s/ha for all storm scenarios). The overall strategy should show that there is sufficient on site attenuation to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without increasing the restricted flows to the watercourse. Applicants would be expected to agree the outline drainage strategy with the LPA in principle before any planning consent is granted. The outline drainage information should include an assessment of flood risk to the site & surrounding area, topographical survey, feasibility of infiltration drainage, on site storage, rates of discharge, outfall location & condition survey results of existing watercourses (on or off site) and proposals for dealing with any identified remedial items. The River Crimple is classed as Main River, as such the Environment Agency should be consulted regarding any proposals that may affect this waterway.

Conclusion

Will it maintain and where possible improve surface water and groundwater quality?

Rationale	Rating
Some adverse effects of additional surface water discharge on nearby watercourses but appropriate mitigation should enable development.	Orange

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN9 (Land north of Hill Foot Lane, Pannal)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Land north of Hill Foot Lane Pannal: LCA60 Upper Crimple Valley
Landscape description	Area description: Small scale pastoral valley landform abutting the south-west limits of Harrogate. Tree cover is good with individual trees scattered along field boundaries. The improved fields are managed for livestock and to the north of the River Crimple, small fields typical of early enclosure are randomly organised. Site Description: The site comprises an irregular shaped area consistiing of two pastures at the western end of the village. There is a large mature tree in the western corner which is distinctive and highly visible on the approach to the village from the west. A drystone wall separates the site from the property to the west forming an attractive feature with post and rail fencing along the road frontage.
Existing urban edge	The site appears well integrated into the urban edge due to the close proximity of other dwellings and irregular shape of the site boundary
Trees and hedges	The site is bordered by mature hedgerow with hedgerow trees. There is one prominent tree within the site on the western boundary
Landscape and Green Belt designations	C9 Special Landscape Area
Description of proposal for the site	Assume low residential density consistent with nearby properties and reflective of urban/rural edge
Physical Sensitivity	The site comprises of two pastoral fields defined for the most part by hedgerows and drystone wall on the edge of the village on relatively flat ground contained by existing built development on three sides
Visual Sensitivity	The site is hidden behind tall hedgerows on the northern boundary, however to the west there are open views across the Crimple Valley as far as Horn Bank in the far distance
Anticipated landscape effects	Development would result in the loss of two pastoral fields at the edge of the village. However the presence of surrounding hedgerows and properties effectively screen mid and long distance views of the site.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Limited opportunities for enhancement since the site is already well vegetated along its boundaries with the exception of the narrow road frontage. Any development shoud be set back from the highway to protect the rural character of Foot Hill Lane
Likely level of landscape effects	Small scale adverse effects on the Special Landscape Area with built development infill within the village edge setting
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	Potential adverse effects should site refs PN7and PN8 be developed to the south-west and south-east

Conclusion

Will there be the opportunity for development to contribute to distinctiveness and countryside character?

Rationale	Rating
Sensitivity Rating: Medium – key distinctive characteristics are susceptible to change, typically a medium valued landscape where; landscape condition may be fair with some existing reference or context to the type of development being proposed. Landscapes may have components that are not easily replicated/replaced and will have medium susceptibility to change.	Yellow
Capacity Rating: Medium – the area is able to accommodate some development of the type and scale proposed with some adverse impacts on landscape and visual amenity that may only be mitigated in part. Opportunities for enhancement are limited.	Yellow

Will it increase the quality and quantity of tree or woodland cover?
Will it make use of opportunities wherever possible to enhance the environment as part of other initiatives?

Rationale	Rating
Development need not result in the loss of existing woodland or trees.	Light Green

Summary conclusion	Site is well integrated within urban grain of the village edge with limited views of the site. Opportunites to mitigate effects of development by ensuring a sufficient set-back of built-form from the edge of Hill Foot Lane

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN9 (Land north of Hill Foot Lane, Pannal)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Conservation and Design

Conservation and Design Site Assessment

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Dawcross Farmhouse (GIILB).
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Dawcross.
Commentary on heritage assets.	Within setting of Dawcross Farmhouse (GIILB), an attractive modest Georgian house with symmetrical three bay front elevation. Decorative Greek Revival doorcase. Simple gabled form, stone with slate roof. Attached outbuilding / barn range to rear of house set at a right angle to the house. Slightly lower, stone with a slate roof. Locally distinctive. Dawcross: early /mid C19th farmhouse, symmetrical three bay elevation. Stone with tabled stone slate roof. Simple asymmetrical gabled form, with lower gabled rear wing. Detached barn. Stone with stone slate roof. Plain verges. Locally distinctive.
Topography and views	Site well enclosed by boundary features and surrounding development. Limited views into and out of site.
Landscape context	Suburban fringe. Fields bounded by low hedges, good lines and clumps of trees along field boundaries.
Grain of surrounding development	Hillfoot Lane / Dawcross Rise: scattered, well spaced buildings in generous plots for the most part. Buildings generally oriented south apart from Dawcross Farm, which faces east. Most dwellings set in large gardens with dense perimeter hedges, trees and shrubs concealing buildings from view for the most part. A minority of buildings adjoin the road directly or are set back slightly from it, the rest tend to be set well back. Large gaps between neighbouring buildings. Burn Bridge Road, as above, but houses more visible in the street, with short set back distance, and all buildings oriented to face the road. Blackthorn Drive: Higher density suburban dwellings. Short setbacks from street, houses oriented to face street. Narrow gaps between neighbouring houses creates an enclosed street scene. Very low tree cover, and trees are limited to the rear boundaries of back gardens.
Local building design	Greyfriars & Holmgarth: large early C20th semi-detached houses. Brisk with render upper floor, half timbering to gables. Overhanging slate roof edged in bargeboards. Gabled form with twin central gablets. Domestic revival / Arts and Crafts influenced dwellings. Not locally distinctive per se, but well designed and typical of Pannal / south Harrogate. Dawcross Farmhouse: attractive modest Georgian house with symmetrical three bay front elevation. Decorative Greek Revival doorcase. Simple gabled form, stone with slate roof. Attached outbuilding / barn range to rear of house set at a right angle to the house. Slightly lower, stone with a slate roof. Locally distinctive. Low Garth: hipped roof stone bungalow, first half C20th. Slate roof with low hipped wing. Not locally distinctive. Dawcross: early /mid C19th farmhouse, symmetrical three bay elevation. Stone with tabled stone slate roof. Simple asymmetrical gabled form, with lower gabled rear wing. Detached barn. Stone with stone slate roof. Plain verges. Locally distinctive.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	No buildings on site. Two small fields with gated access from Hillfoot Lane. Fence boundary to Hillfoot Lane, stone wall backed by hedge boundary to Greyfriars, low hedge boundary elsewhere. Site bisected by low hedge, substantial mature tree next to this hedge, midway along.Telegraph pole and wires along southern edge.

Conclusion

Will it contribute to local distinctiveness and countryside character? (Only applies to sites in Conservation Areas).

Rationale	Rating
Site is not within a Conservation Area.	n/a

Will it conserve those elements which contribute towards the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets?

Rationale	Rating
Development is likely to enhance or better reveal elements which contribute to the significance of a designated heritage asset.	Dark Green
Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?	
Rationale	Rating
Site re-development provides an opportunity for high quality design.	Dark Green

Summary conclusion	Given the un-intensive character of development along Hill Foot Lane and the general grain / spacing / building density, at most only a handful of dwellings could be accommodated on the site. More dwellings would mean flats with the appearance of large domestic buildings. A high building density would be inappropriate. Awkward shaped small limb of site is too small for a building and an access, so this could be used as access only with houses further back in the site. This would complement the general street scene where the suburban houses are well screened from view. Well articulated masses, in the spirit of early C20th suburbia. Traditional materials (slate, red clay tiles, stone, brick render). Good detailing and proportions.

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN9 (Land north of Hill Foot Lane, Pannal)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	None likely to be impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	None likely to be impacted
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likely to be impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Appears improved. [Not Assessed P1HS 1992]
Trees and Hedges	The site is bounded by hedges (except along the southern boundary) and bisected by a low hedge. There is a substantial mature tree next to this hedge and others in the grounds of adjacent properties.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Boundary trees may benefit from TPO protection
Water/Wetland	None
Slope and Aspect	The site slopes gently down to the south.
Buildings and Structures	None on site
Natural Area	NCA 22: Pennines Dales Fringe
Environmental Opportunity	SE04: Supporting and encouraging the creation of grass/woodland buffer strips, in-field grass strips, sediment traps, ponds and wetland habitats to slow run-off and intercept sediments and pollutants from farmland
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 60 Upper Crimple Valley: • “To promote the retention, regeneration and management of hedgerows to maintain field boundaries.” • “Encourage management and continuity of wooded character of River Crimple and marginal vegetation as a wildlife corridor”. • “Encourage management for biodiversity in line with the aims of the Harrogate Biodiversity Action Plan”.
Connectivity/Corridors	The site forms a link in the network of medium sized pasture fields with well-treed boundary hedges between Hill Foot Lane and Brackenthwaite Lane, which links in with the wooded corridor of the Crimple Beck.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Some extent of green corridor should be retained along the western boundary of the site. There may be the opportunity to create a small SUDS wetland in the lower, southern part of the site or possibly in association with adjacent sites.
Protected Species	Nesting birds are likely to be associated with the hedgerows and trees and bats may roost in the mature trees.
BAP Priority Species	None known
Invasive Species	None known
Notes	RL2024 2010 (amber) Sward requires assessment but appears improved

Conclusion

Will it deliver net gains to biodiversity and protect and enhance existing networks of priority habitats and species and provide for long term management of wildlife habitats? Will it offer opportunities to enhance Green Infrastructure?

Rationale	Rating
Some potential adverse effects on designated sites (Local Site, SSSI, LNR, the wider ecological network and/or priority habitats and species but appropriate siting/scale or substantial mitigation should enable development.	Orange

Summary conclusion	Some small-scale development may be acceptable on the site but a substantial green corridor should be retained running north-south along the western boundary of the site, which may affect the housing density that could be achieved onsite

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN9 (Land north of Hill Foot Lane, Pannal)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.	According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed development is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred. We are however, aware of significant flooding incidents in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses including Clarke Beck & the River Crimple. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide. We have received significantly increased levels of complaints over recent years from concerned residents affected by, and threatened by flooding from these watercourses and general run-off from adjacent land. Due to the number of major development proposals in the general area planning to discharge surface water to the same watercourses, it is essential that surface water discharge is kept to an absolute minimum. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) should always be any developer's first consideration and giving preference to soakaways. In my view, infiltration drainage is unlikely to be fully successful at this location due to ground conditions in the surrounding area being predominantly heavy clay soils. However, any potential developer would be expected to submit a detailed feasibility study showing the use of SuDS including soakaways permeable cellular pavements, grassed swales, infiltration trenches, wetlands, ponds and green roofs that assist in dealing with surface water at source, has been fully explored. Any proposed discharge of surface water from the development site should be restricted to Greenfield rates (1.4 l/s/ha for all storm scenarios). The overall strategy should show that there is sufficient on site attenuation to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without increasing the restricted flows to the watercourse. Applicants would be expected to agree the outline drainage strategy with the LPA in principle before any planning consent is granted. The outline drainage information should include an assessment of flood risk to the site & surrounding area, topographical survey, feasibility of infiltration drainage, on site storage, rates of discharge, outfall location & condition survey results of existing watercourses (on or off site) and proposals for dealing with any identified remedial items. The River Crimple is classed as Main River, as such the Environment Agency should be consulted regarding any proposals that may affect this waterway.

Conclusion

Will it maintain and where possible improve surface water and groundwater quality?

Rationale	Rating
Some adverse effects of additional surface water discharge on nearby watercourses but appropriate mitigation should enable development.	Orange

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN13 (Land to the east and west of Leeds Road (larger site), Pannal)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Land to the east and west of Leeds Road (larger site) Pannal LCA58: Middle Crimple Valley
Landscape description	Area description: Gently undulating valley sides comprise rectilinear fields of improved grassland typical of parliamentary enclosures bound by an ecclectic mix of hedges, walls and fences with individual trees. Although the area is influenced by the urban edge of Harrogate and Pannal there is little built form in the Character Area itself except for several scattered farmsteads. Crimple valley is important to the setting of Harrogate and provides an essential green'rural corridor' separating Harrogate from the village of Pannal and others Site Description: The site comprises of three parcels of land sub-divided into three separate compartments by the A61 Leeds Road and the Leeds to Harrogate railway and spans agricultural land between Harrogate and Pannal within the Crimple Valley. Land to the west comprises principally of pastoral land through which is routed the Harrogate Ringway PRoW.The Crimple Beck flows to the north and then east beneath Almsford Bridge with the beck corridor accommodating TPO'd trees. There are dramatic views of the rising valley landform bounded by woodland to the north west rising from 80m to 120metres. To the east of the A61 there are open arable fields that allow medium and long distance views along the wooded valley landform. The third site area, situated in Green Belt, consists of pastoral land between the railway line and Follifoot Road.
Existing urban edge	The site comprises of three parcels of land situated between the southwest edge of harrogate and the northeast edge of Pannal. The Crimple Hall garden centre lies within the site and Mercedes garage adjoins the site's southern edge.
Trees and hedges	Mature trees and hedgerows define the site and intervening field boundaries. Woodland areas populate upper parts of the valley sides filtering views of surrounding residential development
Landscape and Green Belt designations	C9: Special Landscape Area. R11: Rights of Way GB1: Extent of the Green Belt TPO' d trees
Description of proposal for the site	Employment/residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	Open valley form would be interrupted by built development with loss of pastoral and arable landscape. Should built develpment take place there would be loss of separation distance and built form coalescence between Harrogate and Pannal
Visual Sensitivity	All site areas are highly visible from the surrounding road network and inter-connected PRoWs including Harrogate Ringway
Anticipated landscape effects	Large scale adverse effects.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Opportunities for effective mitigation are extremely limited
Likely level of landscape effects	Large scale adverse effects on the Special Landcape area interrupting the openness of the valley form and loss of built form separation between Harrogate and Pannal
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	None

Conclusion

Will there be the opportunity for development to contribute to distinctiveness and countryside character?

Rationale	Rating
Sensitivity Rating: High – key distinctive characteristics are very vulnerable to change; typically a high valued landscape where landscape conditions is very good and where detracting features or major infrastructure is not present or where present has limited influence on the landscape resulting in a higher susceptibility to change.	Red

Capacity Rating: Low – the area has very limited or no capacity to accommodate the type and scale of the development proposed and there are few if any opportunities for appropriate mitigation.	Red
Will it increase the quality and quantity of tree or woodland cover? **Will it make use of opportunities wherever possible to enhance the environment as part of other initiatives?**	
Rationale	Rating
Development need not result in the loss of existing woodland or trees.	Light Green
Summary conclusion	Site important to setting of the southern edge of Harrogate and preventing built form coalescence. Site is highly visible situated within a Special Landscape Area. Opportunities to mitigate adverse impacts are limited.

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN13 (Land to the east and west of Leeds Road (larger site), Pannal)	
Natural and Built Heritage Assessments	**Type: Conservation and Design**
Conservation and Design Site Assessment	
Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Special Landscape Area. Site adjoins Pannal Conservation Area on southern edge. Site within setting of Grade II Listed St Robert's Church. Setting of Crimple Valley Viaduct (grade II* listed).
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Setting of Fulwith Grange (circa 1850) and Fulwith Mill Farm (pre-1850 in part) (also Almsford Bridge). Old mill race associated with Fulwith Mill, runs through site (archaeological interest).
Commentary on heritage assets.	Pannal Conservation Area is characterised by surviving older eighteenth and nineteenth century buildings scattered between more recent development- post-war demolition made way for new housing developments that have engulfed Pannal in recent years. There are distinct clusters of older buildings surviving at Woodcock Hill. Rural landscape setting of Crimple Valley Viaduct (GIILB*).
Topography and views	Site occupies the valley floor, with Crimple Beck running through the site, incised into the valley floor. West of the Beck there is a gentle fall from west to east, with more steeply rising land further west within the site. Flat land to the south, north and east, but the eastern bank of the Beck is higher than the western bank. Good views from within site up valley sides to fringes of Harrogate- houses in Stone Rings Close visible- and Pannal. Good views along Crimple valley to the east. Good views into the site from Crimple Meadows / Main Street by the Church. Good views from the site of the Church and churchyard. Tree lined banks of Crimple provide a screen between the east and western portions of site. Views across the site to Crimple Viaduct (II*) to the east. The central portion of the site falls away from the railway line before rising steeply towards the edge of Harrogate to large detached houses in Fulwith Grove/Fulwith Road.
Landscape context	Rural 'edge-of town' landscape south of Harrogate. Pasture, but very well used for walking / amenity by locals. Open edge to the south, edge of Harrogate fringed by dense belts of trees. Significant area of woodland to the west at former quarry site. Openness of valley floor limited due to wooded banks of Crimple, and embankments of A61. Farmland. Fields.
Grain of surrounding development	Pannal Green – short terraces arranged around small grassed communal 'greens'. Cul de sac layout with roads serving rear elevations of houses. Gardens of varying sizes, not well enclosed. Clark Beck Close – tightly packed terraces, flats and semi detached houses. Cul de sac layout with houses facing road and lining it closely, giving hard street spaces. Small gardens. Trees limited to banks of becks. Hillside Road and Milton Road – well spaced semi-detached houses. Large gardens relative to sizes of houses. Houses face road behind shallow front gardens. Some trees and high hedges between buildings. Fulwith Road / Drive etc. to the north on the east side of Almsford Bank - generally later 20th century housing with additional early 20th century, large housing to the north and interspersed. Large detached later 20th century housing in Stone Rings development to the north on the west side of Almsford Bridge.
Local building design	St Roberts Church – C14th-C19th stone church in Gothic and Gothic Revival style. Locally distinctive landmark building. Pannal Green – brown brick and panel two storey terraced houses, mid-C20th. Shallow gabled forms with artificial tile roofs. Not locally distinctive. Clark Beck Close – C21st two and three storey pseudo vernacular houses and flats. Stone with slate roofs. Mix of moderate and shallow gabled forms. Attempts to pay concession to area, but not locally distinctive. Hillside Road & Milton Road – brick, render and brick and render two storey interwar semi detached houses. Hipped red tile roofs. Bay windows. Not locally distinctive. Fulwith Road / Drive etc. to the north on the east side of Almsford Bank - generally later 20th century housing with additional early 20th century, large housing to the north and interspersed. Large detached later 20th century housing in Stone Rings development to the north on the west side of Almsford Bridge.

Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The nursery site is adjacent to and on the west side of Leeds Road: two storey 'chalet style' shop / cafe / office and large greenhouses. The western portion of the site is bisected by Crimple Beck – its banks are at different levels and both have significant self sown tree cover. Mature trees dotted along north west boundary, plus other mature trees dotted along field boundaries within the site. Two freestanding mature trees by Ringway Footpath. Mixed species treeline along Leeds Road and railway. The site is bisected by Ringway Footpath with other less formal footpaths branching off to the beck and to the woodland to the north of the site. Mixture of boundary features: low hedges (some patchy) predominantly, timber fences to Pannal Green, Hillside Road and Milton Road. Fences to railway and Leeds Road. Vehicle access to nursery, footpath access elsewhere. The central portion of the site is flanked by Leeds Road forming the western boundary and the railway line forming the south eastern boundery. The northern boundary of this central portion of the site follows the line of the Crimple Beck. The south eastern portion of the site flanks the south side of the railway line and is bordered by Follifoot Road to the south. This portion of the site is adjacent to Pannal Golf Course practice ground on the south west side and an area of woodland known as Spacey Houses Whin on the east side. Mature trees and hedgerow line Follifoot Road. A footpath crosses this portion of the site linking Follifoot Road with Almsford Bridge to the north. Views across the site to Crimple Viaduct (II*) to the east. Mercedes-Benz car showroom, ATS tyres and BP garage adjacent to the southern edge of the site where The Carr (Leeds Road) crosses the railway line.

Conclusion

Will it contribute to local distinctiveness and countryside character? (Only applies to sites in Conservation Areas).

Rationale	Rating
Site is not within a Conservation Area.	n/a

Will it conserve those elements which contribute towards the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets?

Rationale	Rating
Development is likely to result in harm to elements which contribute to the significance of a heritage asset and the harm is not capable of mitigation.	Red

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

Rationale	Rating
The nature of the site means that built development will have a negative impact on local distinctiveness.	Red

Summary conclusion	Site boundary unacceptable as proposed, a smaller site could accommodate housing without harmful impacts. Setting of Listed Church and listed Crimple Valley Viaduct and Pannal conservation area would be significantly compromised by development on the site. Vista into and out of the settlement would be lost or severely compromised. In the same vain, the character of this important and well-used stretch of the Ringway footpath would be significantly altered. A solution might be to reduce the site to the area between the Beck and Leeds Road. Development here would be screened by the tree-lined banks of the Crimple, allowing the existing backdrop to the Church and approach to the village to be maintained. Very difficult to get a road access into the northern half of the site without significant tree felling / engineering over beck or demolition of buildings. A principal road access by the Church would significantly harm its setting and the character and appearance of the conservation area. Trees on site could be fairly easily retained. Ringway footpath would need to be retained / realigned / space left to maintain its character and views. The site could be integrated with the village by footbridges providing access to village via Ringway. Land rear of Pannal Primary School and to the north of Pannal Green extending to the northern boundary of the site, before the land rises up the valley side towards All Saints Court and the footpath, could potentially be developed- this land is comparatively low lying, it is well screened when viewed from the west by woodland on the site of the former quarry to the west. The developable area should not extend too far south, rather it could follow the existing field boundary, thereby being set back from the Ringway footpath in order to maintain its character and in order to main the setting of, the vista from, and the line of sight to the the listed Church. Very minor development of the area where existing buildings are located may be possible (subject to design, scale, layout, massing etc.) at the southern end of the site, adjacent to road and to the Mercedes-Benz car showroom, ATS tyres and BP garage. Harmful impact on the setting of designated and non-designated heritage assets, particularly the landscape setting of the grade II* listed Crimple Valley Viaduct and to St Robert's Church (LBII) . Harm caused by the introduction of development into this attractive rural edge to Harrogate and important landscape area. Harm caused by the proposed scale of development on this edge of settlement site. Development of the site would lead to coalescence with Harrogate and Pannel to the detriment of the identity of the two settlements.

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN13 (Land to the east and west of Leeds Road (larger site), Pannal)	
Natural and Built Heritage Assessments	**Type: Ecology**
Ecology Site Assessment	
SACs/SPAs	None likely to be impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	None likely to be impacted
SSSI Risk Zone	No requirement to consult NE over residential development in relation to SSSIs
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	Sandy Bank Wood (disused Quarry) part of site
BAP Priority Habitats	Woodland, Ponds, Rivers (Flowing Water) Arable Farmland
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None (check)
Sward	Improved pasture (check) with a large arable field in the SE corner
Trees and Hedges	Woodland at Sandy Bank Wood and Alsford bank, Corridor of riparian woodland along the banks of the river Crimple Beck. There are several mature field trees west of the river. There are hedges forming field boundaries to most of the site including a number of mature trees. Other mature trees line the Leeds Road and railway.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Above mature trees likely to benefit from TPO protection
Water/Wetland	River Crimple cuts through the eastern part of the site, Stone Rings Beck cuts through the north east by Almsford Bank Pond in Sandy Bank Wood
Slope and Aspect	The site slopes steeply down from Almsford bank towards the Crimple and moderately east to west towards the river on the western side. Relatively flat on the valley floor
Buildings and Structures	None
Natural Area	NCA 22: Pennines Dales Fringe
Environmental Opportunity	SEO4 Enhancing and connecting semi-natural habitats in river corridors to improve the wildlife movement corridors between lowland and upland. SE04: Supporting and encouraging the creation of grass/woodland buffer strips, in-field grass strips, sediment traps, ponds and wetland habitats to slow run-off and intercept sediments and pollutants from farmland
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 58 Middle Crimple Valley
Connectivity/Corridors	The River Crimple has been recognised by Natural England as a Strategic Green Corridor of District Importance which is well wooded to the SW through Pannal and to the NE through the fringes of Harrogate. The railway and the A61 also form narrow long-distance tree-lined corridors. The site as a whole, with its fields and hedgerows, forms part of the green wedge that separates Harrogate from Burn Bridge, Pannal and Spacey Houses.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	There may be the opportunity to create a SUDS wetland associated with the floodplain of the Crimple and to reinforce the wet woodland of the floodplain corridor. OS Epoch 1 maps show the site to be better treed in the late C19th than it is now so there may be an opportunity for planting of further hedgerow and field trees. The site is bisected by the Ringway Footpath and there may be the opportunity for more planting along its route.
Protected Species	Nesting birds are likely to be associated with the hedgerows and trees. Bats may roost in the mature trees. Nesting birds may also utilise some of the nursery buildings. Riparian birds may include kingfisher. There are old records of Water Vole in the area. Otter may occur along the River Crimple. Great Crested Newts were introduced to a small pond at Sandy Bank SINC quarry in the 1980s and may still be in the vicinity.
BAP Priority Species	Not known

Invasive Species	Himalayan balsam likely along the water courses
Notes	

Conclusion

Will it deliver net gains to biodiversity and protect and enhance existing networks of priority habitats and species and provide for long term management of wildlife habitats? Will it offer opportunities to enhance Green Infrastructure?

Rationale	Rating
Significant adverse effects on designated sites (Local Site, SSSI, LNR), the wider ecological network and/or priority habitats and species.	Red

Summary conclusion	This diverse landscape centred on the River Crimple contains a range of habitats; woodland including Sandy Bank Wood SINC, ripaarian woodland, scrub and arable farmland and pasture. It forms a valuable corridor along the river between the upper Crimple Valley to the west and Hookstone Wood and Rudding Park and the countryside to the SE of Harrogate. Large scale development would have an adverse impact on the landscape ecology to the south of Harrogate which would be intensified by the requirement to bridge the river.

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN13 (Land to the east and west of Leeds Road (larger site), Pannal)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.	According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the majority of the site is located within flood zone 1. However, Crimple Beck flows through the site that is known to have significant capacity issues both upstream & downstream. In my view, development adjacent to Crimple Beck should be avoided. We have received significantly increased levels of complaints over recent years from concerned residents affected by, and threatened by flooding in this area from sewers, watercourses & overland flows. Due to the number of major development proposals in the general area planning to discharge surface water to the same watercourses etc. it is essential that surface water discharge is kept to an absolute minimum. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) should always be any developer's first consideration and giving preference to soakaways. In my view, infiltration drainage is unlikely to be fully successful at this location due to ground conditions in the surrounding area being predominantly heavy clay soils. However, any potential developer would be expected to submit a detailed feasibility study showing the use of SuDS including soakaways permeable cellular pavements, grassed swales, infiltration trenches, wetlands, ponds and green roofs that assist in dealing with surface water at source, has been fully explored. Any proposed discharge of surface water from site should be restricted to Greenfield rates (1.4 l/s/ha for all storm scenarios or a minimum of 5 (five) l/s, whichever is the greater). The overall strategy should show that there is sufficient on site attenuation to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year rainfall event, to include for climate change & urban creep can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without increasing the restricted flows to the watercourse. Applicants would be expected to agree the outline drainage strategy with the LPA in principle before any planning consent is granted. The outline drainage information should include an assessment of flood risk to the site & surrounding area, topographical survey, feasibility of infiltration drainage, on site storage, rates of discharge, outfall location & condition survey results of existing watercourses (on or off site) and proposals for dealing with any identified remedial items. The proposed development land would be classed as major development due to the specified size of the site in terms of sustainable urban drainage systems (SuDS) . Accordingly, NYCC in its capacity as Lead Local Flood Authority should be consulted regarding the surface water drainage strategy (Statutory Consultee). Crimple Beck is classified Main River, as such, the Environment Agency who is a consultee with regards to matters attaining to Main River and development within the flood zones, should be consulted regarding development of this land.

Conclusion

Will it maintain and where possible improve surface water and groundwater quality?

Rationale	Rating
Some adverse effects of additional surface water discharge on nearby watercourses but appropriate mitigation should enable development.	Orange

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN14 (Land to the east and west of Leeds Road (smaller site), Pannal)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Land to the east and west of Leeds Road (smaller site) Pannal LCA58: Middle Crimple Valley
Landscape description	Area description: Gently undulating valley sides comprise rectilinear fields of improved grassland typical of parliamentary enclosures bound by an ecclectic mix of hedges, walls and fences with individual trees. Although the area is influenced by the urban edge of Harrogate and Pannal there is little built form in the Character Area itself except for several scattered farmsteads. Crimple valley is important to the setting of Harrogate and provides an essential green'rural corridor' separating Harrogate from the village of Pannal and others Site Description: The site comprises of two parcels of land separated by the A61 Leeds Road. Land to the west comprises principally of pastoral land through which is routed the Harrogate Ringway PRoW.The Crimple Beck flows to the north and then east beneath Almsford Bridge with the beck corridor accommodating TPO'd trees. There are dramatic views of the rising valley landform bounded by woodland to the northwest rising from 80m to 120metres with the site area located on the lower valley levels. To the east of the A61 there are open arable fields that allow medium and long distance views along the wooded valley landform.
Existing urban edge	The site comprises of two parcels of land situated between the southwestern edge of harrogate and the north eastern edge of Pannal. The Crimple Hall garden centre adjoins the site to the west
Trees and hedges	Mature trees and hedgerows define the site and intervening field boundaries.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	C9: Special Landscape Area. R11: Rights of Way GB1: Extent of the Green Belt TPO' d trees
Description of proposal for the site	Employment/residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	Open valley form would be interrupted by built development with loss of pastoral and arable landscape. Should built develpment take place there would be some loss of separation distance and built form coalescence between Harrogate and Pannal
Visual Sensitivity	All site areas are highly visible from the surrounding road network and inter-connected PRoWs including Harrogate Ringway
Anticipated landscape effects	Large scale adverse effects.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Any development to the west of Leeds Road should be set-back from the highway and also set-back from Crimple Beck and Harrogate Ringway PRoW with substantial woodlland screen planting incorporated into any layout. Development to the east should also be limited to the southern edge of the site to 'round-off ' development limits and filter views.
Likely level of landscape effects	Large scale adverse effects on the Special Landcape area interrupting the openness of the valley form with some loss of built form separation distance between Harrogate and Pannal
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	None

Conclusion

Will there be the opportunity for development to contribute to distinctiveness and countryside character?

Rationale	Rating
Sensitivity Rating: High – key distinctive characteristics are very vulnerable to change; typically a high valued landscape where landscape conditions is very good and where detracting features or major infrastructure is not present or where present has limited influence on the landscape resulting in a higher susceptibility to change.	Red
Capacity Rating: Medium/low – the area is not able to accommodate development of the scale and type proposed without detriment to landscape character and visual amenity and the opportunities for appropriate mitigation are limited.	Orange

Will it increase the quality and quantity of tree or woodland cover? Will it make use of opportunities wherever possible to enhance the environment as part of other initiatives?	
Rationale	Rating
Development need not result in the loss of existing woodland or trees.	Light Green
Summary conclusion	Any development to the west of Leeds Road should be set-back from the highway and also set-back from Crimple Beck and Harrogate Ringway PRoW with substantial woodlland screen planting incorporated into any layout. Development to the east should also be limited to the southern edge of the site to 'round-off ' development limits and filter views.

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN14 (Land to the east and west of Leeds Road (smaller site), Pannal)	
Natural and Built Heritage Assessments	**Type: Conservation and Design**
Conservation and Design Site Assessment	
Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Special Landscape Area. Site adjoins Pannal Conservation Area on southern edge. Site within setting of Grade II Listed St Robert's Church. Setting of Crimple Valley Viaduct (grade II* listed) to the north east.
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Surviving older eighteenth and nineteenth century buildings scattered between more recent development in Pannal.
Commentary on heritage assets.	Pannal Conservation Area is characterised by surviving older eighteenth and nineteenth century buildings scattered between more recent development- post-war demolition made way for new housing developments that have engulfed Pannal in recent years. There are distinct clusters of older buildings surviving at Woodcock Hill. Rural landscape setting of Crimple Valley Viaduct (GIILB*).
Topography and views	Site occupies the valley floor, with Crimple Beck running through the site, incised into the valley floor. West of the Beck there is a gentle fall from west to east, with more steeply rising land further west within the site. Flat land to the south, north and east, but the eastern bank of the Beck is higher than the western bank. Good views from within site up valley sides to fringes of Harrogate- houses in Stone Rings Close visible- and Pannal. Good views along Crimple valley to the east. Good views into the site from Crimple Meadows / Main Street by the Church. Good views from the site of the Church and churchyard. Tree lined banks of Crimple provide a screen between the east and western portions of site. Views across the site to Crimple Valley Viaduct (II*) to the east. The central portion of the site falls away from the railway line before rising steeply towards the edge of Harrogate to large detached houses in Fulwith Grove/Fulwith Road.
Landscape context	Rural 'edge-of town' landscape south of Harrogate. Pasture, but very well used for walking / amenity by locals. Open edge to the south, edge of Harrogate fringed by dense belts of trees. Significant area of woodland to the west at former quarry site. Openness of valley floor limited due to wooded banks of Crimple, and embankments of A61. Farmland. Fields.
Grain of surrounding development	Pannal Green – short terraces arranged around small grassed communal 'greens'. Cul de sac layout with roads serving rear elevations of houses. Gardens of varying sizes, not well enclosed. Clark Beck Close – tightly packed terraces, flats and semi detached houses. Cul de sac layout with houses facing road and lining it closely, giving hard street spaces. Small gardens. Trees limited to banks of becks. Hillside Road and Milton Road – well spaced semi-detached houses. Large gardens relative to sizes of houses. Houses face road behind shallow front gardens. Some trees and high hedges between buildings. Fulwith Road / Drive etc. to the north on the east side of Almsford Bank - generally later 20th century housing with additional early 20th century, large housing to the north and interspersed. Large detached later 20th century housing in Stone Rings development to the north on the west side of Almsford Bridge.
Local building design	St Roberts Church – C14th-C19th stone church in Gothic and Gothic Revival style. Locally distinctive landmark building. Pannal Green – brown brick and panel two storey terraced houses, mid-C20th. Shallow gabled forms with artificial tile roofs. Not locally distinctive. Clark Beck Close – C21st two and three storey pseudo vernacular houses and flats. Stone with slate roofs. Mix of moderate and shallow gabled forms. Attempts to pay concession to area, but not locally distinctive. Hillside Road & Milton Road – brick, render and brick and render two storey interwar semi detached houses. Hipped red tile roofs. Bay windows. Not locally distinctive.

Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The nursery site is adjacent to and on the west side of Leeds Road: two storey 'chalet style' shop / cafe / office and large greenhouses. The western portion of the site is bisected by Crimple Beck – its banks are at different levels and both have significant self sown tree cover. Mature trees dotted along north west boundary, plus other mature trees dotted along field boundaries within the site. Two freestanding mature trees by Ringway Footpath. Mixed species treeline along Leeds Road and railway. The site is bisected by Ringway Footpath with other less formal footpaths branching off to the beck and to the woodland to the north of the site. Mixture of boundary features: low hedges (some patchy) predominantly, timber fences to Pannal Green. Fences to railway and Leeds Road. Vehicle access to nursery, footpath access elsewhere. The eastern portion of the site flanks the south side of the railway line. Pannal Golf Course practice ground on the south side of the railway line. Mature trees and hedgerow line Follifoot Road. Views across the site to Crimple Valley Viaduct (II*) to the east. Mercedes-Benz car showroom, ATS tyres and BP garage adjacent to the southern edge of the site where The Carr (Leeds Road) crosses the railway line.

Conclusion

Will it contribute to local distinctiveness and countryside character? (Only applies to sites in Conservation Areas).

Rationale	Rating
Site is not within a Conservation Area.	n/a

Will it conserve those elements which contribute towards the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets?

Rationale	Rating
Development is likely to result in harm to elements which contribute to the significance of a heritage asset and the harm is not capable of mitigation.	Red

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

Rationale	Rating
The nature of the site means that built development will have a negative impact on local distinctiveness.	Red

Summary conclusion	Site boundary unacceptable as proposed, a smaller site could accommodate housing without harmful impacts. Setting of Listed Church (GIILB) and listed Crimple Valley Viaduct (GIILB*) and Pannal conservation area would be significantly compromised by development on the site. Vista into and out of the settlement would be lost or severely compromised. In the same vain, the character of this important and well-used stretch of the Ringway footpath would be significantly altered. Very difficult to get a road access into the northern half of the site without significant tree felling / engineering over beck or demolition of buildings. A principal road access by the Church would significantly harm its setting and the character and appearance of the conservation area. Trees on site could be fairly easily retained. Ringway footpath would need to be retained / realigned / space left to maintain its character and views. The site could be integrated with the village by footbridges providing access to the village via Ringway. If an access is to be provided to the north side of the nursery, the land must be kept tight up to the northern boundary of the nursery rather than extending further northwards as the land rises towards Almsford Bridge. It may be prefereable to contain the access to the south side of the nursery site. Land rear of Pannal Primary School and to the north of Pannal Green extending to the northern boundary of the site, before the land rises up the valley side towards All Saints Court and the footpath, could potentially be developed- this land is comparatively low lying, it is well screened when viewed from the west by woodland on the site of the former quarry to the west. The developable area should not extend too far south, rather it could follow the existing field boundary, thereby being set back from the Ringway footpath in order to maintain its character and in order to main the setting of, the vista from, and the line of sight to the the listed Church. Very minor development of the area where existing buildings are located may be possible (subject to design, scale, layout, massing etc.) at the southern end of the site, adjacent to road and to the Mercedes-Benz car showroom, ATS tyres and BP garage. Harmful impact on the setting of designated and non-designated heritage assets, particularly the landscape setting of the grade II* listed Crimple Valley Viaduct and to St Robert's Church (LBII) . Harm caused by the introduction of development into this attractive rural edge to Harrogate and important landscape area. Harm caused by the proposed scale of development on this edge of settlement site. Development of the site would lead to coalescence with Harrogate and Pannel to the detriment of the identity of the two settlements.

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN14 (Land to the east and west of Leeds Road (smaller site), Pannal)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	None likely to be impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	None likely to be impacted
SSSI Risk Zone	No requirement to consult NE over residential development in relation to SSSIs
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likely to be impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	Woodland, Rivers (Flowing Water) Arable Farmland
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Improved pasture (check) with a large arable field in the SE corner and to the east of the A61
Trees and Hedges	Corridor of riparian woodland along the banks of the river Crimple Beck. There are several mature field trees west of the river. There are hedges forming field boundaries to most of the site including a number of mature trees. Other mature trees line the Leeds Road and railway.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Above mature trees likely to benefit from TPO protection
Water/Wetland	River Crimple cuts through the centre of the site,
Slope and Aspect	The site slopes moderately towards the Crimple but much of the valley floor and the eastern part of the site is relatively flat.
Buildings and Structures	None
Natural Area	NCA 22: Pennines Dales Fringe
Environmental Opportunity	SEO4 Enhancing and connecting semi-natural habitats in river corridors to improve the wildlife movement corridors between lowland and upland. SE04: Supporting and encouraging the creation of grass/woodland buffer strips, in-field grass strips, sediment traps, ponds and wetland habitats to slow run-off and intercept sediments and pollutants from farmland
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 58 Middle Crimple Valley
Connectivity/Corridors	The River Crimple has been recognised by Natural England as a Strategic Green Corridor of District Importance which is well wooded to the SW through Pannal and to the NE through the fringes of Harrogate. The railway and the A61 also form narrow long-distance tree-lined corridors. The site as a whole, with its fields and hedgerows, forms part of a green corridor that separates Harrogate from Burn Bridge, Pannal and Spacey Houses.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	There may be the opportunity to create a SUDS wetland associated with the floodplain of the Crimple and to reinforce the wet woodland of the floodplain corridor. OS Epoch 1 maps show the site to be better treed in the late C19th than it is now so there may be an opportunity for planting of further hedgerow and field trees. The site is bisected by the Ringway Footpath and there may be the opportunity for more planting along its route.
Protected Species	Nesting birds are likely to be associated with the hedgerows and trees. Bats may roost in the mature trees. Nesting birds may also utilise some of the nursery buildings. Riparian birds may include kingfisher. There are old records of Water Vole in the area. Otter may occur along the River Crimple. Great Crested Newts were introduced to a small pond at nearby Sandy Bank SINC quarry in the 1980s and may still be in the vicinity.
BAP Priority Species	Not known
Invasive Species	Himalayan balsam likely along the water courses
Notes	

Conclusion

Will it deliver net gains to biodiversity and protect and enhance existing networks of priority habitats and species and provide for long term management of wildlife habitats? Will it offer opportunities to enhance Green Infrastructure?

Rationale	Rating
Some potential adverse effects on designated sites (Local Site, SSSI, LNR, the wider ecological network and/or priority habitats and species but appropriate siting/scale or substantial mitigation should enable development.	Orange

Summary conclusion	This diverse landscape centred on the River Crimple contains a range of habitats; ripaarian woodland, scrub and arable farmland and pasture. It forms a valuable corridor along the river between the upper Crimple Valley to the west and Hookstone Wood and Rudding Park and the countryside to the SE of Harrogate. Large scale development may have an adverse impact on the landscape ecology north of Pannal, which would be intensified by the requirement to bridge the Crimple. If the site is developed, high quality landscaping and green infrastucture would be required to offset harm. This would be easier to accomodate if built development were confined to the east of the river.

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN14 (Land to the east and west of Leeds Road (smaller site), Pannal)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.	According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the majority of the site is located within flood zone 1. However, Crimple Beck flows through the site that is known to have significant capacity issues both upstream & downstream. In my view, development adjacent to Crimple Beck should be avoided. We have received significantly increased levels of complaints over recent years from concerned residents affected by, and threatened by flooding in this area from sewers, watercourses & overland flows. Due to the number of major development proposals in the general area planning to discharge surface water to the same watercourses etc. it is essential that surface water discharge is kept to an absolute minimum. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) should always be any developer's first consideration and giving preference to soakaways. In my view, infiltration drainage is unlikely to be fully successful at this location due to ground conditions in the surrounding area being predominantly heavy clay soils. However, any potential developer would be expected to submit a detailed feasibility study showing the use of SuDS including soakaways permeable cellular pavements, grassed swales, infiltration trenches, wetlands, ponds and green roofs that assist in dealing with surface water at source, has been fully explored. Any proposed discharge of surface water from site should be restricted to Greenfield rates (1.4 l/s/ha for all storm scenarios or a minimum of 5 (five) l/s, whichever is the greater). The overall strategy should show that there is sufficient on site attenuation to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year rainfall event, to include for climate change & urban creep can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without increasing the restricted flows to the watercourse. Applicants would be expected to agree the outline drainage strategy with the LPA in principle before any planning consent is granted. The outline drainage information should include an assessment of flood risk to the site & surrounding area, topographical survey, feasibility of infiltration drainage, on site storage, rates of discharge, outfall location & condition survey results of existing watercourses (on or off site) and proposals for dealing with any identified remedial items. The proposed development land would be classed as major development due to the specified size of the site in terms of sustainable urban drainage systems (SuDS) . Accordingly, NYCC in its capacity as Lead Local Flood Authority should be consulted regarding the surface water drainage strategy (Statutory Consultee). Crimple Beck is classified Main River, as such, the Environment Agency who is a consultee with regards to matters attaining to Main River and development within the flood zones, should be consulted regarding development of this land.

Conclusion

Will it maintain and where possible improve surface water and groundwater quality?

Rationale	Rating
Some adverse effects of additional surface water discharge on nearby watercourses but appropriate mitigation should enable development.	Orange

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN16 (Land to the west of A61, Pannal)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Land to the east and west of Leeds Road (smaller site) Pannal LCA58: Middle Crimple Valley
Landscape description	Area description: Gently undulating valley sides comprise rectilinear fields of improved grassland typical of parliamentary enclosures bound by an ecclectic mix of hedges, walls and fences with individual trees. Although the area is influenced by the urban edge of Harrogate and Pannal there is little built form in the Character Area itself except for several scattered farmsteads. Crimple valley is important to the setting of Harrogate and provides an essential green'rural corridor' separating Harrogate from the village of Pannal and others Site Description: The site comprises of two parcels of land separated by the A61 Leeds Road. Land to the west comprises principally of pastoral land through which is routed the Harrogate Ringway PRoW.The Crimple Beck flows to the north and then east beneath Almsford Bridge with the beck corridor accommodating TPO'd trees. There are dramatic views of the rising valley landform bounded by woodland to the northwest rising from 80m to 120metres with the site area located on the lower valley levels. To the east of the A61 there are open arable fields that allow medium and long distance views along the wooded valley landform. Area description: Gently undulating valley sides comprise rectilinear fields of improved grassland typical of parliamentary enclosures bound by an ecclectic mix of hedges, walls and fences with individual trees. Although the area is influenced by the urban edge of Harrogate and Pannal there is little built form in the Character Area itself except for several scattered farmsteads. Crimple valley is important to the setting of Harrogate and provides an essential green'rural corridor' separating Harrogate from the village of Pannal and others Site Description: The site comprises of two parcels of land separated by the A61 Leeds Road. Land to the west comprises principally of pastoral land through which is routed the Harrogate Ringway PRoW.The Crimple Beck flows to the north and then east beneath Almsford Bridge with the beck corridor accommodating TPO'd trees. There are dramatic views of the rising valley landform bounded by woodland to the northwest rising from 80m to 120metres with the site area located on the lower valley levels. To the east of the A61 there are open arable fields that allow medium and long distance views along the wooded valley landform.
Existing urban edge	The site comprises of two parcels of land situated between the southwestern edge of harrogate and the north eastern edge of Pannal. The Crimple Hall garden centre adjoins the site to the west
Trees and hedges	Mature trees and hedgerows define the site and intervening field boundaries.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	C9: Special Landscape Area. R11: Rights of Way GB1: Extent of the Green Belt TPO' d trees
Description of proposal for the site	Employment/residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	Open valley form would be interrupted by built development with loss of pastoral and arable landscape. Should built develpment take place there would be some loss of separation distance and built form coalescence between Harrogate and Pannal
Visual Sensitivity	All site areas are highly visible from the surrounding road network and inter-connected PRoWs including Harrogate Ringway
Anticipated landscape effects	Large scale adverse effects.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Any development to the west of Leeds Road should be set-back from the highway and also set-back from Crimple Beck and Harrogate Ringway PRoW with substantial woodlland screen planting incorporated into any layout. Development to the east should also be limited to the southern edge of the site to 'round-off ' development limits and filter views.
Likely level of landscape effects	Large scale adverse effects on the Special Landcape area interrupting the openness of the valley form with some loss of built form separation distance between Harrogate and Pannal

Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	None

Conclusion

Will there be the opportunity for development to contribute to distinctiveness and countryside character?

Rationale	Rating
Sensitivity Rating: High – key distinctive characteristics are very vulnerable to change; typically a high valued landscape where landscape conditions is very good and where detracting features or major infrastructure is not present or where present has limited influence on the landscape resulting in a higher susceptibility to change.	Red
Capacity Rating: Medium/low – the area is not able to accommodate development of the scale and type proposed without detriment to landscape character and visual amenity and the opportunities for appropriate mitigation are limited.	Orange

Will it increase the quality and quantity of tree or woodland cover?
Will it make use of opportunities wherever possible to enhance the environment as part of other initiatives?

Rationale	Rating
Development need not result in the loss of existing woodland or trees.	Light Green

Summary conclusion	Any development to the west of Leeds Road should be set-back from the highway and also set-back from Crimple Beck and Harrogate Ringway PRoW with substantial woodlland screen planting incorporated into any layout. Development to the east should also be limited to the southern edge of the site to 'round-off ' development limits and filter views.

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN16 (Land to the west of A61, Pannal)	
Natural and Built Heritage Assessments	**Type: Conservation and Design**
Conservation and Design Site Assessment	
Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Special Landscape Area. Site adjoins Pannal Conservation Area on southern edge. Site within setting of Grade II Listed St Robert's Church. Setting of Crimple Valley Viaduct (grade II* listed) to the north east.
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Surviving older eighteenth and nineteenth century buildings scattered between more recent development in Pannal
Commentary on heritage assets.	Pannal Conservation Area is characterised by surviving older eighteenth and nineteenth century buildings scattered between more recent development- post-war demolition made way for new housing developments that have engulfed Pannal in recent years. There are distinct clusters of older buildings surviving at Woodcock Hill. Rural landscape setting of Crimple Valley Viaduct (GIILB*
Topography and views	Site occupies the valley floor, with Crimple Beck running through the site, incised into the valley floor. West of the Beck there is a gentle fall from west to east, with more steeply rising land further west within the site. Flat land to the south, north and east, but the eastern bank of the Beck is higher than the western bank. Good views from within site up valley sides to fringes of Harrogate- houses in Stone Rings Close visible- and Pannal. Good views along Crimple valley to the east. Good views into the site from Crimple Meadows / Main Street by the Church. Good views from the site of the Church and churchyard. Tree lined banks of Crimple provide a screen between the east and western portions of site. Views across the site to Crimple Valley Viaduct (II*) to the east. The central portion of the site falls away from the railway line before rising steeply towards the edge of Harrogate to large detached houses in Fulwith Grove/Fulwith Road.
Landscape context	Rural 'edge-of town' landscape south of Harrogate. Pasture, but very well used for walking / amenity by locals. Open edge to the south, edge of Harrogate fringed by dense belts of trees. Significant area of woodland to the west at former quarry site. Openness of valley floor limited due to wooded banks of Crimple, and embankments of A61. Farmland. Fields.
Grain of surrounding development	Pannal Green – short terraces arranged around small grassed communal 'greens'. Cul de sac layout with roads serving rear elevations of houses. Gardens of varying sizes, not well enclosed. Clark Beck Close – tightly packed terraces, flats and semi detached houses. Cul de sac layout with houses facing road and lining it closely, giving hard street spaces. Small gardens. Trees limited to banks of becks. Hillside Road and Milton Road – well spaced semi-detached houses. Large gardens relative to sizes of houses. Houses face road behind shallow front gardens. Some trees and high hedges between buildings. Fulwith Road / Drive etc. to the north on the east side of Almsford Bank - generally later 20th century housing with additional early 20th century, large housing to the north and interspersed. Large detached later 20th century housing in Stone Rings development to the north on the west side of Almsford Bridge.
Local building design	St Roberts Church – C14th-C19th stone church in Gothic and Gothic Revival style. Locally distinctive landmark building. Pannal Green – brown brick and panel two storey terraced houses, mid-C20th. Shallow gabled forms with artificial tile roofs. Not locally distinctive. Clark Beck Close – C21st two and three storey pseudo vernacular houses and flats. Stone with slate roofs. Mix of moderate and shallow gabled forms. Attempts to pay concession to area, but not locally distinctive. Hillside Road & Milton Road – brick, render and brick and render two storey interwar semi detached houses. Hipped red tile roofs. Bay windows. Not locally distinctive.

Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The nursery site is adjacent to and on the west side of Leeds Road: two storey 'chalet style' shop / cafe / office and large greenhouses. The western portion of the site is bisected by Crimple Beck – its banks are at different levels and both have significant self sown tree cover. Mature trees dotted along north west boundary, plus other mature trees dotted along field boundaries within the site. Two freestanding mature trees by Ringway Footpath. Mixed species treeline along Leeds Road and railway. The site is bisected by Ringway Footpath with other less formal footpaths branching off to the beck and to the woodland to the north of the site. Mixture of boundary features: low hedges (some patchy) predominantly, timber fences to Pannal Green. Fences to railway and Leeds Road. Vehicle access to nursery, footpath access elsewhere. The eastern portion of the site flanks the south side of the railway line. Pannal Golf Course practice ground on the south side of the railway line. Mature trees and hedgerow line Follifoot Road. Views across the site to Crimple Valley Viaduct (II*) to the east. Mercedes-Benz car showroom, ATS tyres and BP garage adjacent to the southern edge of the site where The Carr (Leeds Road) crosses the railway line.

Conclusion

Will it contribute to local distinctiveness and countryside character? (Only applies to sites in Conservation Areas).

Rationale	Rating
Site is not within a Conservation Area.	n/a

Will it conserve those elements which contribute towards the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets?

Rationale	Rating
Development is likely to result in harm to elements which contribute to the significance of a heritage asset and the harm is not capable of mitigation.	Red

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

Rationale	Rating
The nature of the site means that built development will have a negative impact on local distinctiveness.	Red

Summary conclusion	Site boundary unacceptable as proposed, a smaller site could accommodate housing without harmful impacts. Setting of Listed Church (GIILB) and listed Crimple Valley Viaduct (GIILB*) and Pannal conservation area would be significantly compromised by development on the site. Vista into and out of the settlement would be lost or severely compromised. In the same vain, the character of this important and well-used stretch of the Ringway footpath would be significantly altered. Very difficult to get a road access into the northern half of the site without significant tree felling / engineering over beck or demolition of buildings. A principal road access by the Church would significantly harm its setting and the character and appearance of the conservation area. Trees on site could be fairly easily retained. Ringway footpath would need to be retained / realigned / space left to maintain its character and views. The site could be integrated with the village by footbridges providing access to the village via Ringway. If an access is to be provided to the north side of the nursery, the land must be kept tight up to the northern boundary of the nursery rather than extending further northwards as the land rises towards Almsford Bridge. It may be prefereable to contain the access to the south side of the nursery site. Land rear of Pannal Primary School and to the north of Pannal Green extending to the northern boundary of the site, before the land rises up the valley side towards All Saints Court and the footpath, could potentially be developed- this land is comparatively low lying, it is well screened when viewed from the west by woodland on the site of the former quarry to the west. The developable area should not extend too far south, rather it could follow the existing field boundary, thereby being set back from the Ringway footpath in order to maintain its character and in order to main the setting of, the vista from, and the line of sight to the the listed Church. Very minor development of the area where existing buildings are located may be possible (subject to design, scale, layout, massing etc.) at the southern end of the site, adjacent to road and to the Mercedes-Benz car showroom, ATS tyres and BP garage. Harmful impact on the setting of designated and non-designated heritage assets, particularly the landscape setting of the grade II* listed Crimple Valley Viaduct and to St Robert's Church (LBII) . Harm caused by the introduction of development into this attractive rural edge to Harrogate and important landscape area. Harm caused by the proposed scale of development on this edge of settlement site. Development of the site would lead to coalescence with Harrogate and Pannel to the detriment of the identity of the two settlements.

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN16 (Land to the west of A61, Pannal)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	None likely to be impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	None likely to be impacted
SSSI Risk Zone	No requirement to consult NE over residential development in relation to SSSIs
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likely to be impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	Woodland, Rivers (Flowing Water) Arable Farmland
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Improved pasture (check) with a large arable field in the SE corner and to the east of the A61
Trees and Hedges	Corridor of riparian woodland along the banks of the river Crimple Beck. There are several mature field trees west of the river. There are hedges forming field boundaries to most of the site including a number of mature trees. Other mature trees line the Leeds Road and railway.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Above mature trees likely to benefit from TPO protection
Water/Wetland	River Crimple cuts through the centre of the site,
Slope and Aspect	The site slopes moderately towards the Crimple but much of the valley floor and the eastern part of the site is relatively flat.
Buildings and Structures	None
Natural Area	NCA 22: Pennines Dales Fringe
Environmental Opportunity	SEO4 Enhancing and connecting semi-natural habitats in river corridors to improve the wildlife movement corridors between lowland and upland. SE04: Supporting and encouraging the creation of grass/woodland buffer strips, in-field grass strips, sediment traps, ponds and wetland habitats to slow run-off and intercept sediments and pollutants from farmland
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 58 Middle Crimple Valley
Connectivity/Corridors	The River Crimple has been recognised by Natural England as a Strategic Green Corridor of District Importance which is well wooded to the SW through Pannal and to the NE through the fringes of Harrogate. The railway and the A61 also form narrow long-distance tree-lined corridors. The site as a whole, with its fields and hedgerows, forms part of a green corridor that separates Harrogate from Burn Bridge, Pannal and Spacey Houses. England as a Strategic Green Corridor of District Importance which is well wooded to the SW through Pannal and to the NE through the fringes of Harrogate. The railway and the A61 also form narrow long-distance tree-lined corridors. The site as a whole, with its fields and hedgerows, forms part of a green corridor that separates Harrogate from Burn Bridge, Pannal and Spacey Houses.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	There may be the opportunity to create a SUDS wetland associated with the floodplain of the Crimple and to reinforce the wet woodland of the floodplain corridor. OS Epoch 1 maps show the site to be better treed in the late C19th than it is now so there may be an opportunity for planting of further hedgerow and field trees. The site is bisected by the Ringway Footpath and there may be the opportunity for more planting along its route.
Protected Species	Nesting birds are likely to be associated with the hedgerows and trees. Bats may roost in the mature trees. Nesting birds may also utilise some of the nursery buildings. Riparian birds may include kingfisher. There are old records of Water Vole in the area. Otter may occur along the River Crimple. Great Crested Newts were introduced to a small pond at nearby Sandy Bank SINC quarry in the 1980s and may still be in the vicinity.
BAP Priority Species	Not known

Invasive Species	Himalayan balsam likely along the water courses
Notes	

Conclusion

Will it deliver net gains to biodiversity and protect and enhance existing networks of priority habitats and species and provide for long term management of wildlife habitats? Will it offer opportunities to enhance Green Infrastructure?

Rationale	Rating
Some potential adverse effects on designated sites (Local Site, SSSI, LNR, the wider ecological network and/or priority habitats and species but appropriate siting/scale or substantial mitigation should enable development.	Orange

Summary conclusion	This diverse landscape centred on the River Crimple contains a range of habitats; ripaarian woodland, scrub and arable farmland and pasture. It forms a valuable corridor along the river between the upper Crimple Valley to the west and Hookstone Wood and Rudding Park and the countryside to the SE of Harrogate. Large scale development may have an adverse impact on the landscape ecology north of Pannal, which would be intensified by the requirement to bridge the Crimple. If the site is developed, high quality landscaping and green infrastucture would be required to offset harm. This would be easier to accomodate if built development were confined to the east of the river.

Settlement: Pannal

Site: PN16 (Land to the west of A61, Pannal)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.	According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the majority of the site is located within flood zone 1. However, Crimple Beck flows through the site that is known to have significant capacity issues both upstream & downstream. In my view, development adjacent to Crimple Beck should be avoided. We have received significantly increased levels of complaints over recent years from concerned residents affected by, and threatened by flooding in this area from sewers, watercourses & overland flows. Due to the number of major development proposals in the general area planning to discharge surface water to the same watercourses etc. it is essential that surface water discharge is kept to an absolute minimum. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) should always be any developer's first consideration and giving preference to soakaways. In my view, infiltration drainage is unlikely to be fully successful at this location due to ground conditions in the surrounding area being predominantly heavy clay soils. However, any potential developer would be expected to submit a detailed feasibility study showing the use of SuDS including soakaways permeable cellular pavements, grassed swales, infiltration trenches, wetlands, ponds and green roofs that assist in dealing with surface water at source, has been fully explored. Any proposed discharge of surface water from site should be restricted to Greenfield rates (1.4 l/s/ha for all storm scenarios or a minimum of 5 (five) l/s, whichever is the greater). The overall strategy should show that there is sufficient on site attenuation to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year rainfall event, to include for climate change & urban creep can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without increasing the restricted flows to the watercourse. Applicants would be expected to agree the outline drainage strategy with the LPA in principle before any planning consent is granted. The outline drainage information should include an assessment of flood risk to the site & surrounding area, topographical survey, feasibility of infiltration drainage, on site storage, rates of discharge, outfall location & condition survey results of existing watercourses (on or off site) and proposals for dealing with any identified remedial items. The proposed development land would be classed as major development due to the specified size of the site in terms of sustainable urban drainage systems (SuDS) . Accordingly, NYCC in its capacity as Lead Local Flood Authority should be consulted regarding the surface water drainage strategy (Statutory Consultee). Crimple Beck is classified Main River, as such, the Environment Agency who is a consultee with regards to matters attaining to Main River and development within the flood zones, should be consulted regarding development of this land.

Conclusion

Will it maintain and where possible improve surface water and groundwater quality?

Rationale	Rating
Some adverse effects of additional surface water discharge on nearby watercourses but appropriate mitigation should enable development.	Orange

Settlement: Rainton

Site: RN1 (The Grange, Rainton)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Conservation and Design

Conservation and Design Site Assessment

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	The Grange Farmhouse (IILB).
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Vernacular farm buildings constructed of stone and cobble interlaced with brick arches.
Commentary on heritage assets.	Within the setting of the 18th century Grange Farmhouse (GIILB). Vernacular farm buildings constructed of stone and cobble interlaced with brick arches occupy the site and are associated with Grange Farm.
Topography and views	Views into the site from Sleights Lane and from Back Lane. Views out of the site to the west.
Landscape context	Rural agricultural settlement. Predominantly linear village.
Grain of surrounding development	Predominantly detached cottages and farmhouses. Semi-detached bungalows to the south. Farm groups. Properties generally have a street frontage though set back behind front gardens and wide verges, with outbuildings at the rear.
Local building design	18th C Grange Farm House is constructed of squared rubble, swept pantile roof, 2 storeys, 3 bays with rear service wing. Vernacular farm buildings constructed of stone and cobble interlaced with brick arches. Stone slate roof and asbestos sheeting. Blockwork and sheeted modern agricultural buildings within site and on the west side of Back Lane. 20th C bungalows border the eastern side of Back Lane to the south of the site. Modern stone and pantile house to the north on the eastern side of Back Lane- steep roof pitch.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	Site of redundant farmstead comprising a range of traditional stone and cobble barns arranged around a courtyard and some modern blockwork and sheeted agricultural buildings beyond. To the west of the site on the opposite side of Back Lane are additional modern blockwork agricultural buildings. The site is bordered by attractive fold yard stone walls with flat copings. Access is off Sleights Lane and is flanked by stone walls. Secondary access off Back Lane.

Conclusion

Will it contribute to local distinctiveness and countryside character? (Only applies to sites in Conservation Areas).

Rationale	Rating
Site is not within a Conservation Area.	n/a

Will it conserve those elements which contribute towards the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets?

Rationale	Rating
Development is likely to harm elements which contribute to the significance of a heritage asset but the harm is capable of mitigation.	Orange

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

Rationale	Rating
The nature of the site means that built development will have a negative impact on local distinctiveness but there are opportunities for mitigation and improvements.	Orange

Summary conclusion	All vernacular stone and cobble built barns, stables, cowsheds and outbuildings, should be retained and sensitively incorporated into development proposal for the site- these buildings may be suitable for sensitive residential conversion that respects their agricultural character and appearance. The stone and cobbled interlaced (with flat copings) fold yard boundary walls should be retained in their entirety and where necessary, repaired. Setting and curtilage of LB- Grange Farm House grade II listed: late 18thC with 19th C alterations.

Settlement: Rainton

Site: RN1 (The Grange, Rainton)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	None likley to be impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	None likley to be impacted
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likley to be impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	None
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Not applicable
Trees and Hedges	There are a couple of bushes on Back Lane
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	None
Water/Wetland	None
Slope and Aspect	Generally flat
Buildings and Structures	Numerous single storey sheet fibre-roofed farm buildings
Natural Area	NCA 24 Vale of Mowbray
Environmental Opportunity	SE01 Conserving, extending and re-linking areas of semi-natural habitat (riparian meadows, unimproved wet grasslands, and semi-improved meadows and pastures) and other grasslands into a coherent habitat network, to enhance biodiversity
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 81: Dishforth and Surrounding Farmland • “Small woodland blocks associated with appropriately scaled development may help to integrate development with the landscape”. • “Encourage the reinstatement of hedges particularly in areas of pre-parliamentary enclosure”.
Connectivity/Corridors	Currently poor landscape permiability through the surrounding large-scale field system hedgerows network by provision of a perimeter hedge around the site.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	There may be the opportunity to incorporate bat/swift bricks into a redevelopment
Protected Species	potential for nesting birds e.g. house sparrows, swallows and possibility of bats using buildings
BAP Priority Species	Not known
Invasive Species	Not known
Notes	RL3031 2010 (green)

Conclusion

Will it deliver net gains to biodiversity and protect and enhance existing networks of priority habitats and species and provide for long term management of wildlife habitats? Will it offer opportunities to enhance Green Infrastructure?

Rationale	Rating
No adverse impact, potential for enhancement and net gains to biodiversity.	Dark Green

Summary conclusion	Very limited current opportunities for biodiversity on site- can be enhanced through the provision of swift and bat bricks incorporated into redevelopment.

Settlement: Rainton

Site: RN1 (The Grange, Rainton)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.	Whilst this site is situated just outside a drainage area administered by the Swale & Ure Internal Drainage Board, any surface water discharge could potentially affect the drainage board district. Consequently the drainage board should be consulted regarding any proposals to develop this site. According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed development is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred. We are however, aware of flooding incidents in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide. We have received significantly increased levels of complaints over recent years from concerned residents affected by, and threatened by flooding from these watercourses. Due to the number of major development proposals in the general area planning to discharge surface water to the same watercourses, it is essential that surface water discharge is kept to an absolute minimum. Drainage strategies for Brownfield sites should provide characteristics, which are similar to Greenfield behaviour so far as possible. In line with current development control drainage standards in this and neighbouring councils, discharge of roof/surface water from Brownfield sites should be reduced by a minimum 30% of existing peak flows + 30% to account for future climate change. Applicants would be expected to agree the outline drainage strategy with the LPA in principle before any planning consent is granted. The outline drainage information should include an assessment of flood risk to the site & surrounding area, on site storage requirements, existing peak flow rates, proposed peak flow rates, survey results showing existing drains/watercourses/sewers, outfall location and proposals for dealing with any identified remedial items. The proposed development land would be classed as major development due to the specified size of the site. Consequently, NYCC in its capacity as Lead Local Flood Authority should be consulted regarding the surface water drainage strategy (Statutory Consultee).

Conclusion

Will it maintain and where possible improve surface water and groundwater quality?

Rationale	Rating
Some adverse effects of additional surface water discharge on nearby watercourses but appropriate mitigation should enable development.	Orange

Settlement: Rainton

Site: RN2 (Former Agricultural Buildings, Rainton)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Land at Brakehill Farrm,Rainton LCA81: Dishfortth and surrounding farmland
Landscape description	Area description: The wider landscape is large-scale with arable fields. There is scattered diverse development and tree cover, hedgerows are intermittent affording long distance views to the North York Moors National Park. Site Description:The site comprises various barns and outbuildings north east of the farmhouse at Brakehill Farm. Some of the buidings are of an attractive brick and cobble construction and contribute to the historic character of the area. A large surfaced parking area forms the eastern edge of the site. The site is flat at an elevation of 32mAOD
Existing urban edge	The site is a rural farmstead that lies at the eastern edge of the settlement with open countyside to the east and south
Trees and hedges	There are no trees or hedgerows wihin the site
Landscape and Green Belt designations	SG3 Settlement Growth: Conservation of the Countryside including Green Belt
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume30+dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The site comprises various barns and outbuildings. Some ot the buildings are of an attractive brick and cobble construction and contribute to the historic character of the area.The landscape is considered to be medium value. Susceptibility to change is also considered to be medium wiith some of the farm buildings of large scale and not pariticularly attractive. Overall sensitivity is judged to be medium
Visual Sensitivity	The site lies at an open and exposed location at the village edge. It is visible from the north and east in particular.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of some large scale built form and area of hardstanding used for storage and vehicle parking,
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	There would be potential to mitigate effects of development though screen planting particulary along the open boundaries to the east and south. Retention of more small scale elements of built form should be included particularly along the road frntage to conserve settlement character.
Likely level of landscape effects	Medium adverse effects but effects could be reduced with appropriate landscape mitigation
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	Cumulative effects could be encountered if RN4 to the south west was also developed

Conclusion

Will there be the opportunity for development to contribute to distinctiveness and countryside character?

Rationale	Rating
Sensitivity Rating: Medium – key distinctive characteristics are susceptible to change, typically a medium valued landscape where; landscape condition may be fair with some existing reference or context to the type of development being proposed. Landscapes may have components that are not easily replicated/replaced and will have medium susceptibility to change.	Yellow
Capacity Rating: High/medium – the area is able to accommodate the type and scale of development proposed with some minor detriment to landscape character and visual amenity that could be reduced with appropriate mitigation and enhancement.	Light Green

Will it increase the quality and quantity of tree or woodland cover?
Will it make use of opportunities wherever possible to enhance the environment as part of other initiatives?

Rationale	Rating
Development need not result in the loss of existing woodland or trees.	Light Green

Summary conclusion	Site is of medium sensitivity with some existing reference to the type and scale of development being proposed both within and adjacent to the site to the south west and north. Development would not significantly extend the built form footprrint of the settlement. Opportunity to reduce in scale some of the existing buildings and carry out screen planting measures would be of benefit

Settlement: Rainton

Site: RN2 (Former Agricultural Buildings, Rainton)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Conservation and Design

Conservation and Design Site Assessment

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	None.
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Brakehill Farmhouse
Commentary on heritage assets.	Brakehill farmhouse is a double fronted stone built property with two 2 storey canted bays flanking the principal entrance on the facade. On site, to the rear of the farmhouse is a group of predominantly traditional farm buildings constructed of stone and cobble interlacing with pantile roofs.
Topography and views	Open countryside and distant hedgerows and trees beyond the site to the south and east. Views from Main street looking east. Site prominent on approaching the village from the east.. Land falls slightly to the east and south.
Landscape context	Gently undulating arable landscape. Stone walling for boundary treatments within the built form of the village- flat coping along the north western boundary wall and triangular copings to the south side of Sleights Lane. Street trees and those in gardens give the village a rural character. The site is set back off Sleights Lane by a wide verge. The area has a rural character.
Grain of surrounding development	Properties tend to front the roads through the village with later backland development behind. Properties are set back from the road by small front gardens. Development has occurred in an ad-hoc and unplanned manner over time.
Local building design	Residential development to the west. Residential development and a public house on the north side of Sleights Lane.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	Site of Brakehill Farm located on the south side of Sleights Lane adjacent to and on the north east side of Brakehill Farmhouse. The farmhouse is a double fronted stone built property with two 2 storey canted bays flanking the principal entrance on the facade. On site, to the rear of the farmhouse is a group of single storey, elongated traditional, farm buildings constructed of stone and cobble interlacing with pantile roofs. There is also a two storey barn of the same construction and an asymmetrical block work and sheeted building. To the west of the site, fronting the road is a two storey, stone built converted barn, to the rear of this barn is a brick built bungalow the gable end of which faces the site. Opposite the site, on the north side of Sleight's Lane there are traditional stone built detached cottages with pantile and slate roofs. Walled paddock, which is important open space, to the west. Overhead wires and electricity poles border the eastern boundary of the site and extend southwards. Open countryside to the south and east- field boundaries denoted by hedges and hedgerow trees. Sewage works across fields to the south.

Conclusion

Will it contribute to local distinctiveness and countryside character? (Only applies to sites in Conservation Areas).

Rationale	Rating
Site is not within a Conservation Area.	n/a

Will it conserve those elements which contribute towards the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets?

Rationale	Rating
Development is likely to harm elements which contribute to the significance of a heritage asset but the harm is capable of mitigation.	Orange

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

Rationale	Rating
The nature of the site means that built development will have a negative impact on local distinctiveness but there are opportunities for mitigation and improvements.	Orange

Summary conclusion	Site intrudes into open countryside. Restricted visibility from the existing access, though the existence of a wide, grassed verge may aid visibility. Development should respect the established character and form of the village in terms of its layout and design. Site very prominent on approaching the village from the east. Opportunity to re-use redundant vernacular, stone and cobble agricultural buildings thereby securing their longevity and retention of the rural agricultural village scene. Opportunity to improve the appearance of the site and soften the urban edge to the east and south. Density of development should be reduced towards the village edges to aid transition from built settlement into open countryside.

Settlement: Rainton

Site: RN2 (Former Agricultural Buildings, Rainton)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	None likley to be impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	None likley to be impacted
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likley to be impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	None (may be opportunity to provide Arable Margins adjacent to any development).
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Mostly hardstanding; except road verge
Trees and Hedges	There are a few bushes and section of hedgerow/overgrown wall to road frontage
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	None
Water/Wetland	None
Slope and Aspect	Generally flat
Buildings and Structures	Brick and pantiles roofed barns in addtion to less substantial low fibre roofed and larger panelled buildings
Natural Area	NCA 24Vale of Mowbray
Environmental Opportunity	SE01 Conserving, extending and re-linking areas of semi-natural habitat (riparian meadows, unimproved wet grasslands, and semi-improved meadows and pastures) and other grasslands into a coherent habitat network, to enhance biodiversity
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 81: Dishforth and Surrounding Farmland: • “Small woodland blocks associated with appropriately scaled development may help to integrate development with the landscape”. • “Encourage the reinstatement of hedges particularly in areas of pre-parliamentary enclosure”.
Connectivity/Corridors	Currently poor landscape permiability through the surrounding large-scale field system hedgerows network by provision of a perimeter hedge around the site.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	There may be an opportunity to enhance connectivity with the large scale field system hedgerows network by provision of a perimeter hedge around the site.
Protected Species	Potential for buildings and hedgerows to support bats and nesting birds, including the possibility of barn owl.
BAP Priority Species	None known
Invasive Species	None known
Notes	RL1092 2010 (green)

Conclusion

Will it deliver net gains to biodiversity and protect and enhance existing networks of priority habitats and species and provide for long term management of wildlife habitats? Will it offer opportunities to enhance Green Infrastructure?

Rationale	Rating
Some potential effects on designated sites (SINC, SSSI, LNR), the wider ecological network and/or priority habitats and species but relatively easy to mitigate for.	Yellow

Summary conclusion	There may be some potential for the site to support protected or BAP priority species but it should be possible to mitigate for any harm in the course of development.

Settlement: Rainton

Site: RN2 (Former Agricultural Buildings, Rainton)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.	Whilst this site is situated just outside a drainage area administered by the Swale & Ure Internal Drainage Board, any surface water discharge could potentially affect the drainage board district. Consequently the drainage board should be consulted regarding any proposals to develop this site. According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed development is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred. We are however, aware of flooding incidents in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide. We have received significantly increased levels of complaints over recent years from concerned residents affected by, and threatened by flooding from these watercourses. Due to the number of major development proposals in the general area planning to discharge surface water to the same watercourses, it is essential that surface water discharge is kept to an absolute minimum. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) should always be any developer's first consideration and giving preference to soakaways. In my view, infiltration drainage is unlikely to be fully successful at this location due to ground conditions in the surrounding area being predominantly heavy clay soils. However, any potential developer would be expected to submit a detailed feasibility study showing the use of SuDS including soakaways permeable cellular pavements, grassed swales, infiltration trenches, wetlands, ponds and green roofs that assist in dealing with surface water at source, has been fully explored. Any proposed discharge of surface water from the development site should be restricted to Greenfield rates (1.4 l/s/ha for all storm scenarios). The overall strategy should show that there is sufficient on site attenuation to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without increasing the restricted flows to the watercourse. Applicants would be expected to agree the outline drainage strategy with the LPA in principle before any planning consent is granted. The outline drainage information should include an assessment of flood risk to the site & surrounding area, on site storage requirements, existing peak flow rates, proposed peak flow rates, survey results showing existing drains/watercourses/sewers, outfall location and proposals for dealing with any identified remedial items.

Conclusion

Will it maintain and where possible improve surface water and groundwater quality?

Rationale	Rating
Some adverse effects of additional surface water discharge on nearby watercourses but appropriate mitigation should enable development.	Orange

Settlement: Rainton

Site: RN3 (Village Farm, Sleights Lane, Rainton)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Village Farm Sleights Lane, Rainton LCA81: Dishfortth and surrounding farmland
Landscape description	Area description: The wider landscape is large-scale with arable fields. There is scattered diverse development and tree cover, hedgerows are intermittent affording long distance views to the North York Moors National Park. Site Description:The site consists of an irregular shaped pastoral field at the southern edge of the settlement. The landform gently falls from south west to north east towards the village at an average elevation of 38mAOD. Field boundaries are mainly mortared stone walls with a short length of hedgerow along Spring Hill
Existing urban edge	The site adjoins the residential edge of the settlement on three sides with open pastoral landscape gently rising to the south.
Trees and hedges	Short section of hedgerow along Spring Hill
Landscape and Green Belt designations	SG3 Settlement Growth: Conservation of the Countryside including Green Belt
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume30+dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The site is an irregular shaped pastoral field bounded by stone walls at the southwest edge of the settlement. The landscape is considered to be of medium value. Susceptibility to change is also considered to be medium as the site is surrounded by built form. Overall sensitiivity is therefore judged to be medium
Visual Sensitivity	The site lies in an open and exposed location at the village edge, visible from both Springs Hill and Sleights Lane
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of pastoral field at the edge of the village with impact on setting
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	There would be some potential to mitigate effects of development through screen planting particulary along the southern boundary of the site
Likely level of landscape effects	Large adverse effects but could be mitigated to some extent with adequate screen planting measures being carried out
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	N/A

Conclusion

Will there be the opportunity for development to contribute to distinctiveness and countryside character?

Rationale	Rating
Sensitivity Rating: Medium – key distinctive characteristics are susceptible to change, typically a medium valued landscape where; landscape condition may be fair with some existing reference or context to the type of development being proposed. Landscapes may have components that are not easily replicated/replaced and will have medium susceptibility to change.	Yellow
Capacity Rating: Medium – the area is able to accommodate some development of the type and scale proposed with some adverse impacts on landscape and visual amenity that may only be mitigated in part. Opportunities for enhancement are limited.	Yellow

Will it increase the quality and quantity of tree or woodland cover?
Will it make use of opportunities wherever possible to enhance the environment as part of other initiatives?

Rationale	Rating
Development need not result in the loss of existing woodland or trees.	Light Green

Summary conclusion	Site is of medium sensitivity with some surrounding reference to the type and scale of development being proposedDevelopment would extend built form into open countryside. Some development could be acceptable provided that the scale of development is appropriate together wiith screen planting measures being put in place

Settlement: Rainton

Site: RN3 (Village Farm, Sleights Lane, Rainton)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Conservation and Design

Conservation and Design Site Assessment

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Village Farm (LBII).
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	None.
Commentary on heritage assets.	Site is within the setting of Village Farm (GIILB) to the north west of the site.
Topography and views	Undulating. Land rises to the east- Hill Garth, a bungalow adjacent to the site boundary in the south eastern corner, is at the highest point. Land falls to the south away from the south boundary of the site. Views eastwards across the site to houses on the east side of Dishforth Road. Open countryside and distant hedgerows and trees beyond the site to the south. Site prominent on approaching the village from the south.
Landscape context	Gently undulating arable landscape. Stone walling for boundary treatments within the built form of the village- flat coping along the north western boundary wall and triangular copings to the south side of Sleights Lane. Street trees and those in gardens give the village a rural character. The site is set back off Sleights Lane by a wide verge. The area has a rural character. Open fields extend upto the village street and affords views out into open countryside.
Grain of surrounding development	Development is more dispersed at the village edges along the routes into/out of the village.Properties tend to front the roads through the village with later backland, small-scale development behind. Properties are set back from the road by small front gardens. Development has occurred in an ad-hoc and unplanned manner over time.
Local building design	Residential development to the west. Residential development and a public house on the north side of Sleights Lane.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	Field enclosed on three sides by built form and roads. Open fields to the south. Grass verges flank Sleights Lane. Two red brick and pantile bungalows adjacent to the western boundary of the site and fronting Sleights Lane- enclosed by front gardens and stone walls, stone and cobble with flat stone copings.Newlands, a 2 storey detached red brick and pantile dwelling set in a large garden borders the site the north, adjacent to which is Village Farm- a grade II listed farmhouse, fronting Sleights Lane. The eastern boundary is defined by a hedgerow which is parallel with and adjacent to Dishforth Road.

Conclusion

Will it contribute to local distinctiveness and countryside character? (Only applies to sites in Conservation Areas).

Rationale	Rating
Site is not within a Conservation Area.	n/a

Will it conserve those elements which contribute towards the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets?

Rationale	Rating
Development is likely to harm elements which contribute to the significance of a heritage asset but the harm is capable of mitigation.	Orange

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

Rationale	Rating
The nature of the site means that built development will have a negative impact on local distinctiveness but there are opportunities for mitigation and improvements.	Orange

Summary conclusion	The break in the building line fronting Sleights Lane compliments the orchard on the opposite side of the lane. Subject to ensuring a landscaped edge to the southern boundary of the site, to aid transition from the built form of the village to open countryside, development on the site is likely to be viewed as being within the village envelop rather than protruding out from it. Density should be low at site edge in order to soften urban edge. Development should make provision for larger gardens and planting of mature trees to soften the built form and to filter views. Development should constitute high quality, locally distinctive design and appropriate palette and application of materials. Built form development should avoid the high ground to avoid undue prominence.

Settlement: Rainton

Site: RN3 (Village Farm, Sleights Lane, Rainton)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	None likley to be impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	None likley to be impacted
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likley to be impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	None
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Improved pasture
Trees and Hedges	Some small sections of hedge along SE boundary
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	None
Water/Wetland	None
Slope and Aspect	Generally flat
Buildings and Structures	None on site other than some stone wall boundaries
Natural Area	NCA 24 Vale of Mowbray
Environmental Opportunity	SE01 Conserving, extending and re-linking areas of semi-natural habitat (riparian meadows, unimproved wet grasslands, and semi-improved meadows and pastures) and other grasslands into a coherent habitat network, to enhance biodiversity
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 81: Dishforth and Surrounding Farmland • “Small woodland blocks associated with appropriately scaled development may help to integrate development with the landscape”. • “Encourage the reinstatement of hedges particularly in areas of pre-parliamentary enclosure”.
Connectivity/Corridors	This field forms part of a network of smaller fields around the village, between the settlement and the surrounding large-scale arable farmland
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	The field currently contributes little of ecological value so landscaping in association with development could be beneficial
Protected Species	Nesting birds may utilise the small sections of hedgerow
BAP Priority Species	Not known
Invasive Species	None known
Notes	

Conclusion

Will it deliver net gains to biodiversity and protect and enhance existing networks of priority habitats and species and provide for long term management of wildlife habitats? Will it offer opportunities to enhance Green Infrastructure?

Rationale	Rating
No adverse impact, potential for enhancement and net gains to biodiversity.	Dark Green

Summary conclusion	The site currently contributes little of ecological value, so sensitive landscaping in association with development could be beneficial.

Settlement: Rainton

Site: RN3 (Village Farm, Sleights Lane, Rainton)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.	Whilst this site is situated just outside a drainage area administered by the Swale & Ure Internal Drainage Board, any surface water discharge could potentially affect the drainage board district. Consequently the drainage board should be consulted regarding any proposals to develop this site. According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed site is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred. We are however, aware of flooding incidents in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide. We have received significantly increased levels of complaints over recent years from concerned residents affected by, and threatened by flooding from these watercourses. Due to the number of major development proposals in the general area planning to discharge surface water to the same watercourses, it is essential that surface water discharge is kept to an absolute minimum. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) should always be any developer’s first consideration and giving preference to soakaways. In my view, infiltration drainage is unlikely to be fully successful at this location due to ground conditions in the surrounding area being predominantly heavy clay soils. However, any potential developer would be expected to submit a detailed feasibility study showing the use of SuDS has been fully explored. Any proposed discharge of surface water from the development site should be restricted to Greenfield rates (1.4 l/s/ha for all storm scenarios). The overall strategy should show that there is sufficient on site attenuation to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without increasing the restricted flows to the watercourse. Applicants would be expected to agree the outline drainage strategy with the LPA in principle before any planning consent is granted. The outline drainage information should include an assessment of flood risk to the site & surrounding area, topographical survey, feasibility of infiltration drainage, on site storage, rates of discharge, outfall location & condition survey results of existing watercourses (on or off site) and proposals for dealing with any identified remedial items.

Conclusion

Will it maintain and where possible improve surface water and groundwater quality?

Rationale	Rating
Some adverse effects of additional surface water discharge on nearby watercourses but appropriate mitigation should enable development.	Orange

Settlement: Rainton

Site: RN4 (Land at Brakehill Farm, Rainton)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Land at Brakehill Farrm,Rainton LCA81: Dishfortth and surrounding farmland
Landscape description	Area description: The wider landscape is large-scale with arable fields. There is scattered diverse development and tree cover, hedgerows are intermittent affording long distance views to the North York Moors National Park. Site Description:The site consists of a rectangular part of a large arable field which extends to the east. This part field is at an elevation of about 32mAOD sloping gently to the east. A hedgerorw runs along Tithe Barn Avenue to the north set back from the road by a grassed verge. A hedgerow also forms part of the site's western boundary together with a PRoW.
Existing urban edge	The site is part of a large arable field separating built form along the village edge enabling extensive views out into the open countryside to the south
Trees and hedges	Site boundaries part defined by hedgerows
Landscape and Green Belt designations	SG3 Settlement Growth: Conservation of the Countryside including Green Belt R11: Rights of Way
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume30+dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The site is an open arable field which forms a gap on the southern edge of the settlement . The landscape is considered to be of medium value. Susceptibility to change however is considered to be of high value as the site forms an important gap on the edge of the settlement wiith extenive views to the south. Overall sensitiivity is therefore judged to be high
Visual Sensitivity	The site lies at an open and exposed location at the village edge. It is visible from the north and east in particular.
Anticipated landscape effects	The site is highly visible from from Tithe Barn Lane adjoining the site to the north and from Carr Lane 0.8km to the south. Visiblitiy will also be experienced from the PRoW along the western boundary of the site.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	There would be some potential to mitigate effects of development though screen planting particulary along the open boundaries to the east and south.
Likely level of landscape effects	Large adverse effects which would be difficult to mitigate with such a significant extension into the open landscape
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	Cumulative effects could be encountered if RN2 to the north east also also developed

Conclusion

Will there be the opportunity for development to contribute to distinctiveness and countryside character?

Rationale	Rating
Sensitivity Rating: High – key distinctive characteristics are very vulnerable to change; typically a high valued landscape where landscape conditions is very good and where detracting features or major infrastructure is not present or where present has limited influence on the landscape resulting in a higher susceptibility to change.	Red
Capacity Rating: Medium/low – the area is not able to accommodate development of the scale and type proposed without detriment to landscape character and visual amenity and the opportunities for appropriate mitigation are limited.	Orange

Will it increase the quality and quantity of tree or woodland cover?
Will it make use of opportunities wherever possible to enhance the environment as part of other initiatives?

Summary conclusion	Site is of high sensitivity with limited reference to the type and scale of development being proposed. Development would significantly extend the built form footprrint of the sellement into open countryside. Some limited development along Tithe Barn Avenue could be acceptable and more consistent with the linear grain of the settlement

Settlement: Rainton

Site: RN4 (Land at Brakehill Farm, Rainton)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Conservation and Design

Conservation and Design Site Assessment

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	None.
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Brakehill Farm and Tithe Barn.
Commentary on heritage assets.	Site is within the setting of Brakehill Farm to the north and Tithe Barn (converted to residential use) to the west.
Topography and views	Open countryside and distant hedgerows and trees beyond the site to the south and east. Views from Main street looking east. Site prominent on approaching the village from the east. Land falls slightly to the east and south.
Landscape context	Gently undulating arable landscape. Stone walling for boundary treatments within the built formof the village- flat coping along the north western boundary wall and triangular copings to the south side of Sleights Lane. Street trees and those in gardens give the village a rural character. The site is set back off Sleights Lane by a wide verge. The area has a rural character. Open fields extend upto the village street and affords views out into open countryside.
Grain of surrounding development	Properties tend to front the roads through the village with later backland, small-scale development behind. Properties are set back from the road by small front gardens. Development has occurred in an ad-hoc and unplanned manner over time.
Local building design	Residential development to the west. Residential development and a public house on the north side of Sleights Lane.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	Large, arable field. Site of Brakehill Farm to the north east of the site, located on the south side of Sleights Lane. The farmhouse is a double fronted stone built property with two 2 storey canted bays flanking the principal entrance on the facade, which is orientated east to west, facing west down Sleights Lane. To the rear, north side, of the farmhouse is a group of single storey, elongated traditional, farm buildings constructed of stone and cobble interlacing with pantile roofs. There is also a two storey barn of the same construction and an asymmetrical block work and sheeted building. Opposite the site, on the north side of Sleight's Lane there are traditional stone built detached cottages with pantile and slate roofs. Overhead wires and electricity poles cross the site north to south and extend southwards. Open countryside to the south and east- field boundaries denoted by hedges and hedgerow trees. Sewage works across fields to the south. Stabling and paddocks across the fields to the south. Pedestrian gate in the north western corner of the site. Bus stop adjacent to the site in the north western corner.

Conclusion

Will it contribute to local distinctiveness and countryside character? (Only applies to sites in Conservation Areas).

Rationale	Rating
Site is not within a Conservation Area.	n/a

Will it conserve those elements which contribute towards the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets?

Rationale	Rating
Development is likely to harm elements which contribute to the significance of a heritage asset but the harm is capable of mitigation.	Orange

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

Rationale	Rating
The nature of the site means that built development will have a negative impact on local distinctiveness.	Red

Summary conclusion	Large site, which intrudes into open countryside. . Development of this scale would fail to respect the established character and form of the village in terms of its layout . Site is prominent on approaching the village from the east. May be scope to develop a smaller portion of the site, but the established layout of the village and the open, rural character and views and this eastern end of the village should be respected.

Settlement: Rainton

Site: RN4 (Land at Brakehill Farm, Rainton)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	None likely to be impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	None likely to be impacted
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likely to be impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	Arable farmland, hedges
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Arable
Trees and Hedges	Hedges bound field except to the east; there are a couple of small trees on the road frontage
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Roadside trees may merit TPO protection
Water/Wetland	None
Slope and Aspect	Generally flat
Buildings and Structures	None on site
Natural Area	NCA 24 Vale of Mowbray
Environmental Opportunity	SE01 Conserving, extending and re-linking areas of semi-natural habitat (riparian meadows, unimproved wet grasslands, and semi-improved meadows and pastures) and other grasslands into a coherent habitat network, to enhance biodiversity
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 81: Dishforth and Surrounding Farmland: • “Small woodland blocks associated with appropriately scaled development may help to integrate development with the landscape”. • “Encourage the reinstatement of hedges particularly in areas of pre-parliamentary enclosure”.
Connectivity/Corridors	Hedgerows offer some element of connnectivity through the large-scale arable landscape
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Hedgerows could be reinforced by planting with native tree species.
Protected Species	Potential for trees and hedgerows to support nesting birds and foraging bats
BAP Priority Species	Potential for priority bird species of arable farmland and brown hare
Invasive Species	None known
Notes	

Conclusion

Will it deliver net gains to biodiversity and protect and enhance existing networks of priority habitats and species and provide for long term management of wildlife habitats? Will it offer opportunities to enhance Green Infrastructure?

Rationale	Rating
No adverse impact, potential for enhancement and net gains to biodiversity.	Dark Green

Summary conclusion	Hedgerows should be retained and could be reinforced by planting with native tree species.

Settlement: Rainton

Site: RN4 (Land at Brakehill Farm, Rainton)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.	Whilst this site is situated just outside a drainage area administered by the Swale & Ure Internal Drainage Board, any surface water discharge could potentially affect the drainage board district. Consequently the drainage board should be consulted regarding any proposals to develop this site. According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed site is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred. We are however, aware of flooding incidents in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide. We have received significantly increased levels of complaints over recent years from concerned residents affected by, and threatened by flooding from these watercourses. Due to the number of major development proposals in the general area planning to discharge surface water to the same watercourses, it is essential that surface water discharge is kept to an absolute minimum. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) should always be any developer's first consideration and giving preference to soakaways. In my view, infiltration drainage is unlikely to be fully successful at this location due to ground conditions in the surrounding area being predominantly heavy clay soils. However, any potential developer would be expected to submit a detailed feasibility study showing the use of SuDS including soakaways permeable cellular pavements, grassed swales, infiltration trenches, wetlands, ponds and green roofs that assist in dealing with surface water at source, has been fully explored. Any proposed discharge of surface water from the development site should be restricted to Greenfield rates (1.4 l/s/ha for all storm scenarios). The overall strategy should show that there is sufficient on site attenuation to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without increasing the restricted flows to the watercourse. Applicants would be expected to agree the outline drainage strategy with the LPA in principle before any planning consent is granted. The outline drainage information should include an assessment of flood risk to the site & surrounding area, topographical survey, feasibility of infiltration drainage, on site storage, rates of discharge, outfall location & condition survey results of existing watercourses (on or off site) and proposals for dealing with any identified remedial items. The proposed development land would be classed as major development due to the specified size of the site. Consequently, NYCC in its capacity as Lead Local Flood Authority should be consulted regarding the surface water drainage strategy (Statutory Consultee)

Conclusion

Will it maintain and where possible improve surface water and groundwater quality?

Rationale	Rating
Some adverse effects of additional surface water discharge on nearby watercourses but appropriate mitigation should enable development.	Orange