

# Built and Natural Environment Site Assessments Volume 12: Sawley – Summerbridge

---



October 2016



## Contents

<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2 Policy Context</b>	<b>3</b>
National Policy Context	3
Emerging Local Policy Context	5
<b>3 Methodology</b>	<b>8</b>
Landscape	8
Conservation and Design	13
Ecology	17
Land Drainage	20
<b>4 Site Assessments</b>	<b>21</b>
Sawley	23
Scotton	36
Sharow	52
Sicklinghall	66
South Stainley	78
Spofforth	82
Staveley	108
Summerbridge	125

## 1 Introduction

### 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.<sup>(1)</sup> This report looks at site options in:

- Sawley
- Scotton
- Sharow
- Sicklinghall
- South Stainley
- Spofforth
- Staveley
- Summerbridge

**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).<sup>(2)</sup>

**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](http://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, paragraph 156 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



## 2 Policy Context

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.

## Policy Context 2

### 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 of 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 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 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 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

## Methodology 3

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	<p>Landscapes where the loss of key characteristics would change.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Nature of land use- landscapes with no or little existing reference or context to the type of development being proposed.</p> <p>Nature of existing elements-landscapes with components that are not easily replaced or substituted (eg. ancient woodland , mature trees, historic parkland etc.)</p> <p>Nature of existing features- landscapes where detracting features or major infrastructure is not present or where present has limited influence on the landscape.</p>
Medium	<p>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.</p> <p>Nature of land use-landscapes with some existing reference or context to the type of development being proposed.</p> <p>Nature of existing elements-landscapes with components that are easily replaced or substituted.</p> <p>Nature of existing features-landscapes where detracting features or major infrastructure is present and has a noticeable influence on the landscape.</p>
Low	<p>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.</p> <p>Nature of land use- landscapes with extensive existing reference or context to the type of development being proposed.</p> <p>Nature of existing features- landscapes where detracting features or major infrastructure is present and has a dominating influence on the landscape.</p>

**Table 3.2 Criteria for Landscape Susceptibility**

Criteria for landscape value	
Value	
High	<p>International, National and local designated landscapes.</p> <p>Non-designated landscapes that clearly are valued locally for their distinctive landscape character.</p> <p>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 an important component of the country’s character, experienced by a high number of people.</p> <p>Landscape condition is good and components are generally maintained to a high standard.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Rare or distinctive elements and features are key components that contribute to the character of the area.</p>

## Methodology 3

Criteria for landscape value	
Value	
Medium	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Landscape condition is fair and components are generally well maintained.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Rare or distinctive features are notable components that contribute to the character of the area.</p>
Low	<p>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.</p> <p>No formal designations.</p> <p>Landscape condition may be poor and components poorly maintained or damaged.</p> <p>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</p> <p>Rare or distinctive features are not notable components that contribute to the character of the area.</p>

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



### 3 Methodology

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

## Methodology 3

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.



## Methodology 3

## 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

## Methodology 3

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.<sup>(3)</sup>

## 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).

## Site Assessments 4

## 4 Site Assessments

### Sawley

Site Ref	Site Name	Site Area	Page
SW1	Land adjacent to Hill Top Farm Cottage, Sawley	1.8732	23
SW2	Land north of Hill Top Farm, Sawley	1.62	28
SW3	Land to the south of Hill Top Farm, Sawley	1.1876	33

Table 4.1 Sawley Sites

### Scotton

Site Ref	Site Name	Site Area	Page
SC1	Land off Main Street, Scotton	1.3906	36
SC2	Land off New Road, Scotton	0.3055	43
SC4	Land at Low Moor Lane, Scotton	0.3552	48

Table 4.2 Scotton Sites

### Sharow

Site Ref	Site Name	Site Area	Page
SH1	Land at New Road, Sharow	2.7996	Draft Allocation - housing 52
SH2	Land north of Dishforth Road, Sharow	5.0671	56
SH3	Land to the west of Lister Farm, Sharow	14.9968	61

Table 4.3 Sharow Sites

### Sicklinghall

Site Ref	Site Name	Site Area	Page
SK1	Paddock, Longlands Lane, Sicklinghall	0.8853	66
SK2	Dairy Farm, Sicklinghall	0.2744	73

Table 4.4 Sicklinghall Sites

### South Stainley

Site Ref	Site Name	Site Area	Page
SS1	Land to the east of the A61, South Stainley	1.129	78

Table 4.5 South Stainley Site

### Spofforth

Site Ref	Site Name	Site Area	Page
SP2	Land to the rear of East Park Road, Spofforth	0.5705	82



## 4 Site Assessments

Site Ref	Site Name	Site Area	Page
SP3	Land south of Park Lane, Spofforth	3.5067	86
SP4	Land at Castle Farm, Spofforth	0.9859	Draft Allocation - housing 91
SP5	Land at Massey Garth, Spofforth	4.9958	97
SP6	Land at Massey Fold, Spofforth	4.3256	Draft Allocation - housing 103

**Table 4.6 Spofforth Sites**

### Staveley

Site Ref	Site Name	Site Area	Page
SV1	Land between Minskip Road and Low Field Lane, Staveley	4.798	Draft Allocation - housing 108

**Table 4.7 Staveley Site**

### Summerbridge

Site Ref	Site Name	Site Area	Page
SB1	Clough House Farm, Summerbridge	3.4236	Draft Allocation - housing 115
SB3	Land to rear of Elmwood Terrace, Summerbridge	0.6294	120
SB5	Land at Braisty Woods, Summerbridge	1.0938	Draft Allocation - housing 125

**Table 4.8 Summerbridge Sites**

**Settlement: Sawley****Site: SW1 (Land adjacent to Hill Top Farm Cottage, Sawley)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

<b>Location/HBC Landscape Character Area</b>	Site located north of the village in open countryside. LCA29: Sawley Moor Grassland and Forestry.
<b>Landscape description</b>	Area description: The site is located on the edge of a landscape character area that comprises upland parliamentary enclosure grass fields with stonewall boundaries on high ground between the Nidd and Skell valleys. Site description: Grass field with drystone wall and hedgerow boundaries.
<b>Existing urban edge</b>	No urban edge. Farmstead to the south.
<b>Trees and hedges</b>	Hedgerow boundary to south, west and north. Row of trees behind stone wall boundary with the old rectory to the south.
<b>Landscape and Green Belt designations</b>	Nidderdale AONB Open countryside. Public Right of Way on north boundary.
<b>Description of proposal for the site</b>	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
<b>Physical Sensitivity</b>	The elevated rural landscape in the AONB has high susceptibility to change particularly as a result of the introduction of built form.
<b>Visual Sensitivity</b>	Site is elevated although may not be widely visible due to slightly undulating landform.
<b>Anticipated landscape effects</b>	Loss of open countryside in AONB.
<b>Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement</b>	It would not be possible to mitigate the effects of development in this rural location.
<b>Likely level of landscape effects</b>	Large scale adverse.
<b>Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits</b>	Development with SW2 and SW3 would result in significant cumulative effects.

**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

<b>Summary conclusion</b>	The landscape has no capacity to accept uncharacteristic residential development without harming the special qualities and characteristics of the Nidderdale AONB landscape.
---------------------------	--

**Settlement: Sawley****Site: SW1 (Land adjacent to Hill Top Farm Cottage, Sawley)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

<b>Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	Hill Top Farmhouse and walls are listed grade II.
<b>Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	Former rectory and Highfield House.
<b>Commentary on heritage assets.</b>	<p>The listed farmhouse sits at the brow of the hill and faces southeast. It is a late eighteenth century stone building set perpendicular to the road, typical of rural buildings on roads that run north to south. The house faces south.</p> <p>Highfield House has been extended numerous times, however the original part of the house is nineteenth century and it is orientated as Hill Top House. The building contributes to the character of the AONB and has some significance, however trees prevent open views from the house across the site.</p> <p>The Old Rectory south of the site is a fine Victorian house set well back from the road in very generous grounds. The drive is between an avenue of trees, some of the southern row have been lost. The house has a hipped roof, and very generously proportioned. To the rear is a stable and coach house block, which has a clock on a ridge top ventilator. The former rectory is isolated from the village.</p>
<b>Topography and views</b>	Land rises to the northwest generally. There are open views to the east and west. The site is highly visible from the main road.
<b>Landscape context</b>	This site in the AONB is isolated from the village.
<b>Grain of surrounding development</b>	<p>With the exception of the former parsonage, which is set well back from the road, rural houses tend to be closer to the road and have their main frontage facing a southerly direction. Loose yards are created by closely grouped farm buildings and outbuildings. Grange Farm to the south has a number of twentieth century buildings creating more than one yard.</p> <p>In the villages buildings, both detached and in short rows, are set along the roads, the older buildings orientated southwards, gaps between them vary, as do the length of front gardens. A couple of buildings have their corners against the road. There are examples of infill development, and at the south end of the village are culs-de-sac, which do not reflect local character.</p>
<b>Local building design</b>	<p>The vernacular in the dale is robust and is characterised by two storey houses and barns, and lower outbuildings, with stone walls that have a low window ratio. Roofs are finished in stone or Welsh slates, and occasionally pantiles.</p> <p>Local to the site, the former parsonage is more generous in scale with larger windows than typical farmhouses. It also has a hipped roof, which differs from the traditional simple dual pitched roofs of other buildings.</p>
<b>Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.</b>	The boundary with the old parsonage is a stone wall, and the other boundaries to the site are hedges. There are large trees in a line outside the south boundary in the grounds of the parsonage. There are a number of trees along the northern boundary, which together with garden trees screen Highfield House from the site. There are overhead wires across 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 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
<b>Summary conclusion</b>	Any significant development of the site, which is isolated from the village, would be contrary to local distinctiveness. Development next to the quite isolated historic parsonage building would cause some harm to its setting.

**Settlement: Sawley****Site: SW1 (Land adjacent to Hill Top Farm Cottage, Sawley)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments                      Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

<b>SACs/SPAs</b>	None likely to be impacted
<b>Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)</b>	None likely to be impacted
<b>SSSI Risk Zone</b>	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs
<b>Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)</b>	None likely to be impacted
<b>BAP Priority Habitats</b>	Hedgerows
<b>Phase 1 Survey Target Notes</b>	None
<b>Sward</b>	Improved pasture; road verge may be valuable
<b>Trees and Hedges</b>	Hedgerows to east west and northern boundaries; lines of mature trees on northern boundary and southern boundaries
<b>Presence of Trees that Merit TPO</b>	Mature boundary trees may merit TPO protection
<b>Water/Wetland</b>	None
<b>Slope and Aspect</b>	Land gently undulating
<b>Buildings and Structures</b>	None
<b>Natural Area</b>	NCA 22: Pennines Dales Fringe
<b>Environmental Opportunity</b>	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...
<b>LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)</b>	LCA 29 Sawley Moor Promote the diversification of conifer woodland edges through native woodland planting. Develop links with existing mixed and deciduous woodland particularly in gills and dips in landform.
<b>Connectivity/Corridors</b>	Field boundaries provide some linkage through the landscape between Sawley High Moor the valley of the River Skell
<b>GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)</b>	Retain and enhance field boundaries and buffer with strips of enriched sward
<b>Protected Species</b>	Nesting birds may utilise boundary trees and hedgerows
<b>BAP Priority Species</b>	Potential for priority species of ground-nesting birds and brown hare
<b>Invasive Species</b>	None known
<b>Notes</b>	

**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.	<b>Yellow</b>
<b>Summary conclusion</b>	Field boundaries provide some linkage through the landscape between Sawley High Moor the valley of the River Skell. Retain and enhance field boundaries and buffer with strips of enriched sward

**Settlement: Sawley****Site: SW1 (Land adjacent to Hill Top Farm Cottage, Sawley)****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: Sawley****Site: SW2 (Land north of Hill Top Farm, Sawley)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

<b>Location/HBC Landscape Character Area</b>	Site is located in open countryside northwest of Sawley. LCA31: Upper Skell Valley.
<b>Landscape description</b>	Area description: The site is located on the western edge of a landscape character area that comprises the valley landscape of the Skell. The valley landscape comprises a random field pattern becoming more regular on the upper valley sides adjacent to LCA29: Sawley Moor Grassland and Forestry. Site description: Grass field with hedgerow and stone wall boundaries in elevated location above the Skell Valley.
<b>Existing urban edge</b>	None.
<b>Trees and hedges</b>	Hedgerow to east, south and west boundaries. Very few trees in hedgerow.
<b>Landscape and Green Belt designations</b>	Nidderdale AONB Open countryside. Public Right of Way on south boundary.
<b>Description of proposal for the site</b>	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
<b>Physical Sensitivity</b>	The elevated rural landscape in the AONB has high susceptibility to change particularly as a result of the introduction of built form.
<b>Visual Sensitivity</b>	Site is elevated although may not be widely visible due to slightly undulating landform.
<b>Anticipated landscape effects</b>	Loss of open countryside in AONB.
<b>Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement</b>	It would not be possible to mitigate the effects of development in this rural location.
<b>Likely level of landscape effects</b>	Large scale adverse due to the introduction of new settlement in AONB.
<b>Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits</b>	SW1 and SW3 would result in increased adverse effects due to scale of development.

**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

<b>Summary conclusion</b>	The AONB landscape has no capacity to accept new residential development of the type proposed in this location without resulting in harm to the special qualities and characteristics of the designation.
---------------------------	---



**Settlement: Sawley****Site: SW2 (Land north of Hill Top Farm, Sawley)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

<b>Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	Hill Top Farmhouse and walls are grade II listed.
<b>Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	Mires Farm and Highfield House.
<b>Commentary on heritage assets.</b>	<p>The listed farmhouse sits at the brow of the hill and faces southeast away from the site. It is a late eighteenth century building set perpendicular to the road, typical of rural buildings on roads that run north to south. Farm and outbuildings sit between the house and the site. The barn is gable onto the road.</p> <p>Highfield House has been extended numerous times, however the original part of the house is nineteenth century and orientated as Hill Top House, thus contributing to local character.</p> <p>Mires Farmhouse to the east is also a heritage asset, however it is visually separated from the site by farm buildings that are not of interest.</p>
<b>Topography and views</b>	Land rises gently to the southeast. There are open views to the north, east and southeast. The site is highly visible from the main road.
<b>Landscape context</b>	This site in the AONB is isolated from the village.
<b>Grain of surrounding development</b>	<p>With the exception of the former parsonage to the south, which is set well back from the road, rural houses tend to be closer to the road and have their main frontage facing a southerly direction. Loose yards are created by closely grouped farm buildings and outbuildings. Grange Farm to the south has a number of twentieth century buildings creating more than one yard.</p> <p>In the villages buildings, both detached and in short rows, are set along the roads. The older buildings are orientated southwards, gaps between them vary as do lengths of front gardens. A couple of buildings have their corners against the road. There are examples of infill development, and at the south end of the village are culs-de-sac, which do not reflect local character.</p>
<b>Local building design</b>	<p>The vernacular in the dale is robust and is characterised by two storey houses and barns, and lower outbuildings, with stone walls that have a low window ratio. Roofs are finished in stone or Welsh slates, and occasionally pantiles.</p> <p>Local to the site, the former parsonage is more generous in scale than typical houses. It also has a hipped roof, which differs from the traditional simple dual pitched roofs.</p>
<b>Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.</b>	There is a footpath, which passes along the southern boundary of the site. There are a few trees on the southern boundary and a couple on the northern boundary. There are hedges around 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 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**

Some development set away from Hill Top Farm could respect its setting. Any significant development on this site, which is isolated from the village, would not reflect local distinctiveness.

**Settlement: Sawley****Site: SW2 (Land north of Hill Top Farm, Sawley)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments** **Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

<b>SACs/SPAs</b>	None likely to be impacted
<b>Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)</b>	None likely to be impacted
<b>SSSI Risk Zone</b>	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs
<b>Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)</b>	None likely to be impacted
<b>BAP Priority Habitats</b>	Hedgerows
<b>Phase 1 Survey Target Notes</b>	None
<b>Sward</b>	Improved Pasture
<b>Trees and Hedges</b>	Hedgerows to western, eastern and southern boundaries; two mature trees to southern boundary
<b>Presence of Trees that Merit TPO</b>	Mature boundary trees may merit TPO protection
<b>Water/Wetland</b>	None on site
<b>Slope and Aspect</b>	Very gentle slope towards the east
<b>Buildings and Structures</b>	None
<b>Natural Area</b>	NCA 22: Pennines Dales Fringe
<b>Environmental Opportunity</b>	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...
<b>LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)</b>	LCA 29 Sawley Moor Promote the diversification of conifer woodland edges through native woodland planting. Develop links with existing mixed and deciduous woodland particularly in gills and dips in landform.
<b>Connectivity/Corridors</b>	Field boundaries provide some linkage through the landscape between Sawley High Moor the valley of the River Skell
<b>GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)</b>	Retain and enhance field boundaries and buffer with strips of enriched sward
<b>Protected Species</b>	Nesting birds may utilise boundary trees and hedgerows
<b>BAP Priority Species</b>	Potential for priority species of ground-nesting birds and brown hare
<b>Invasive Species</b>	None known
<b>Notes</b>	

**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.	<b>Yellow</b>
<b>Summary conclusion</b>	Field boundaries provide some linkage through the landscape between Sawley High Moor the valley of the River Skell. Retain and enhance field boundaries and buffer with strips of enriched sward

**Settlement: Sawley****Site: SW2 (Land north of Hill Top Farm, Sawley)****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: Sawley****Site: SW3 (Land to the south of Hill Top Farm, Sawley)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

<b>Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	Hill Top Farmhouse and walls are grade II listed.
<b>Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	Former parsonage.
<b>Commentary on heritage assets.</b>	<p>The listed farmhouse sits at the brow of the hill and faces southeast overlooking the site. It is a late eighteenth century stone building set perpendicular to the road, typical of rural buildings on roads that run north to south.</p> <p>The Old Rectory south of the site is a fine Victorian house set well back from the road in very generous grounds. The house has a hipped roof, and is very generously proportioned. To the rear is a stable and coach house block, which has a clock on a ridge top ventilator. The former rectory is isolated from the village.</p>
<b>Topography and views</b>	The site falls to the southeast. There are views to the north, east and west. Trees alongside the drain to the south restrict views southwards. The site is open to view from the main road.
<b>Landscape context</b>	This site in the AONB is isolated from the village. It is separated by a small field from Grange House Farm, which is just outside the village.
<b>Grain of surrounding development</b>	<p>With the exception of the former parsonage, which is set well back from the road, rural houses tend to be closer to the road and have their main frontage facing a southerly direction. Loose yards are created by closely grouped farm buildings and outbuildings. Grange Farm to the south has a number of twentieth century buildings creating more than one yard.</p> <p>In the villages buildings, both detached and in short rows, are set along the roads, the older buildings orientated southwards, gaps between them vary as do the lengths of front gardens. A couple of buildings have their corners against the road. There are examples of infill development, and at the south end of the village are culs-de-sac, which do not reflect local character.</p>
<b>Local building design</b>	<p>The vernacular in the dale is robust and is characterised by two storey houses and barns, and lower outbuildings, with stone walls that have a low window ratio. Roofs are finished in stone or Welsh slates, and occasionally pantiles.</p> <p>Local to the site, the former parsonage is more generous in scale with larger windows than typical farmhouses. It also has a hipped roof, which differs from the traditional simple dual pitched roofs.</p>
<b>Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.</b>	To the south of the site is a drain. The road boundary is a drystone wall, which rises up in height to form the coursed listed wall. Much of the north boundary is the listed garden wall, and the east boundary is a hedge.

**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

<b>Summary conclusion</b>	The development of this site would cause harm to the setting of the listed farmhouse. Significant development of the site, which is not at the immediate edge of the village, would be contrary to local distinctiveness.
---------------------------	---

**Settlement: Sawley****Site: SW3 (Land to the south of Hill Top Farm, Sawley)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments** **Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

<b>SACs/SPAs</b>	None likely to be impacted
<b>Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)</b>	None likely to be impacted
<b>SSSI Risk Zone</b>	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs
<b>Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)</b>	None likely to be impacted
<b>BAP Priority Habitats</b>	Hedgerows
<b>Phase 1 Survey Target Notes</b>	None
<b>Sward</b>	Improved Pasture
<b>Trees and Hedges</b>	Hedges mostly form southern and eastern boundaries
<b>Presence of Trees that Merit TPO</b>	None
<b>Water/Wetland</b>	A drain marks the southern site boundary
<b>Slope and Aspect</b>	The site slopes gently down towards the south
<b>Buildings and Structures</b>	Walls mostly form western and northern boundaries
<b>Natural Area</b>	NCA 22: Pennines Dales Fringe
<b>Environmental Opportunity</b>	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...
<b>LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)</b>	LCA 29 Sawley Moor Promote the diversification of conifer woodland edges through native woodland planting. Develop links with existing mixed and deciduous woodland particularly in gills and dips in landform.
<b>Connectivity/Corridors</b>	Field boundaries provide some linkage through the landscape between Sawley High Moor the valley of the River Skell
<b>GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)</b>	Retain and enhance field boundaries and buffer with strips of enriched sward
<b>Protected Species</b>	Nesting birds may utilise boundary hedgerows
<b>BAP Priority Species</b>	Potential for priority species of ground-nesting birds and brown hare
<b>Invasive Species</b>	Not known
<b>Notes</b>	

**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
<b>Summary conclusion</b>	Field boundaries provide some linkage through the landscape between Sawley High Moor the valley of the River Skell. Retain and enhance field boundaries and buffer with strips of enriched sward.

**Settlement: Sawley****Site: SW3 (Land to the south of Hill Top Farm, Sawley)****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: Scotton****Site: SC1 (Land off Main Street, Scotton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

<b>Location/HBC Landscape Character Area</b>	Land off Main Street Scotton. LCA52: North Knaresborough improved grassland
<b>Landscape description</b>	Area description; A diverse area that is well settled with the village of Scotton and Scriven plus several houses and farmsteads built relatively close together. Grassland fields are managed for livestock enclosed by a mixture of hedges and fences. Site description: The site comprises of two rectilinear fields in pastoral use bounded by hedgerows and hedgerow trees, There is also a farmhouse, ancillary farm buildings and parking areas. The site is accessed off both Smithy Lane to the north and via the farmhouse access from Main Street to the south, A hedgerow along rear gardens to residential properties fronting Main Street form the site's western boundary with open countryside extending out from the site boundary hedgerow to the east. A PRow is routed north to south through the site linking Main Street with Smithy Lane. The knaresborough Round PRow also runs along these two highways routed through the centre of the village.
<b>Existing urban edge</b>	The site is mainly backland area in pastoral use to the east of Main Street with open countryside beyond.
<b>Trees and hedges</b>	Hedgerow along boundaries and intervening field boundaries with occasional trees
<b>Landscape and Green Belt designations</b>	R11 Rights of Way
<b>Description of proposal for the site</b>	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
<b>Physical Sensitivity</b>	The loss of this pastoral backland site to development would be inappropriate and be out of keeping with the linear form and grain of the village affecting village character and setting. The development is likely to affect the route of the PRow travelling through the site.
<b>Visual Sensitivity</b>	The site is visually prominent within the open countryside at the edge of the village. The site is visible from site traversing and nearby PRows. The site is also likely to be visible from the surrounding road network and open countryside to the east.
<b>Anticipated landscape effects</b>	Development would result in the loss of pastoral fields by introducing development into a backland site which would adversely affect the landscape pattern and setting of the village with the site visible from many public vantage points. Any form of development would be out of character with the rural qualities of the surrounding area without extensive and effective planting as mitigation.
<b>Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement</b>	The retention of hedgerows and hedgerow trees would assist with some integration, but this would not be sufficient enough to reduce harmful visual effects. A large buffer along the site's eastern edge would be required to filter views from the east
<b>Likely level of landscape effects</b>	Large scale adverse landscape affects in this medium scale landscape with a combination of attractive landscape features, such as treed hedgerows and woodland. Any new development would result in high adverse effects on the rural landscape character of the area without extensive planting mitigation.
<b>Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits</b>	SC3 to the south west - development in conjunction with this site is likely to increase adverse effects on local landscape character by reducing the number of open areas remaining within 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: 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
<b>Summary conclusion</b>	This is a large backland site that is centrally located on the eastern edge of the village which is highly visible and important to the setting of Scotton. Therefore changes to the key characteristics in this area would have substantial adverse effectsThe landscape has very limited capacity to accept the type of development proposed due to its visual prominence and inappropriate location

**Settlement: Scotton****Site: SC1 (Land off Main Street, Scotton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

<b>Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	Manor House Farm (grade II).
<b>Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	Various traditional buildings located on New Road / Main Street.
<b>Commentary on heritage assets.</b>	Manor House Farm (former farmhouse dating back to 16th century, stone and pantile) is located to south of site facing New Road, but not in direct context with the site (as the new houses of Manor Farm Way are located to its north). Various traditional buildings are located on New Road / Main Street – row of stone cottages attached to Manor House Farm / Guy Fawkes Arms (stone / render) / other stone or rendered cottages in rows or pairs. Some modestly scaled, simple dwellings are located on the east side of Main Street where the site is located directly to the rear of the back gardens. Building at front (south side) of site is described below. The setting of these buildings will be affected to varying degrees by development of the site.
<b>Topography and views</b>	Partial views through site, looking north from south entrance, ground level drops towards barn. Glimpse views to north visible through gaps between Manor Farm Way houses. Glimpse views to site (rural view) possible between buildings fronting east side of Main Street. Open views across site and to buildings of New Road from footpath at north end of site, looking south / south east. Ground rises from north towards New Road.
<b>Landscape context</b>	Village in rural setting with established field patterns divided by hedgerows and trees.
<b>Grain of surrounding development</b>	On Main Street – buildings closely positioned and facing onto narrow road, some with gables facing onto road. Low stone walls to frontages. More recent / post war buildings tend to be set further back from road. Small, two storey buildings in rows, detached or pairs. Several bungalows. Building density reduces to the north end of Main Street. Linear form of development except for outbuildings / farm buildings and the modern development which all tend to be to the south of the village, e.g. Havikil Park.
<b>Local building design</b>	Old buildings are modestly scaled, simple dwellings, two storey, in rows, single or pairs. Stone / render. Slate or pan-tile roofs. Later buildings tend to be larger. Some bungalows.
<b>Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.</b>	Heritage asset located on south edge of site, gable faces directly onto road. Stone building with render to south and west elevations. Pan tile roof, chimney on south gable. Gates site access on south, to right hand side of this building. Low stone wall and hedge to road. Adjacent stone cottage and further stone wall (one of row) forms west boundary at entrance. To north of heritage asset, small, square building and further barn, both seem to be modern – concreted yard. Beyond, to north, site is agricultural land / paddocks. Hedge / fence to north and east boundary plus trees. Land divided into two strips (running north-south, hedge 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
<b>Summary conclusion</b>	Development would be out of character with existing, historic grain of village and potential remove evidence of historic field pattern. Impact on setting of heritage assets surrounding site. Development should be limited to the south end of the site where the existing buildings are located. Highways access appears problematic. The setting of Manor House Farm would be affected by the addition of more housing to the north, which would be visible through gaps between Manor Farm Way houses – although, setting is already harmed by these houses but density could be reduced in that part of the site.

**Settlement: Scotton****Site: SC1 (Land off Main Street, Scotton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments** **Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

<b>SACs/SPAs</b>	None likely to be impacted.
<b>Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)</b>	Farnham Mires 1.25km to NW.
<b>SSSI Risk Zone</b>	Natural England require consultaton on "residential development of 100 units or more."
<b>Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)</b>	Nidd Gorge Woodlands 650m to the south - unlikely to be adversely impacted.
<b>BAP Priority Habitats</b>	Hedgerows.
<b>Phase 1 Survey Target Notes</b>	None.
<b>Sward</b>	Improved pasture P1HS 1992 .
<b>Trees and Hedges</b>	There are hedgerows on the northern and eastern boundaries and another that runs the length of the site bisecting the two main fields. A number of mature trees are also scattered throughout the existing hedgerows and around the farm buildings. Trees and hedges on site form part of valuable network of small fields around village.
<b>Presence of Trees that Merit TPO</b>	Mature trees on site are likely to merit TPO protection.
<b>Water/Wetland</b>	None on site; there is a pond 150m to the east.
<b>Slope and Aspect</b>	The site falls gently from south to north.
<b>Buildings and Structures</b>	The southern part of the site contains a pantiled farmhouse and farm buildings.
<b>Natural Area</b>	NCA 30 Southern Magnesian Limestone.
<b>Environmental Opportunity</b>	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.
<b>LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)</b>	LCA 52 North Knaresborough improved grassland <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Encourage replanting in hedge gaps with appropriate species and the planting of hedgerow trees."</li> <li>• "New planting associated with development should respect local native vegetation cover..."</li> </ul>
<b>Connectivity/Corridors</b>	The network of small pastures with hedgerows provides a rich landscape for wildlife between Nidd Gorge to the south and important wetland near Farnham to the east.
<b>GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)</b>	Retain trees and boundary hedgerows which should be enhanced with new native planting.
<b>Protected Species</b>	Potential for great crested newt terrestrial habitat (within 500m of breeding pond to south). Some bat roost potential within buildings on site and mature trees. Nesting birds likley to utilise hedges, trees and buildings.
<b>BAP Priority Species</b>	Not known.
<b>Invasive Species</b>	None known.
<b>Notes</b>	RL125 2010 (not asseessed).

**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 hedgerows will require to be protected and retained during the course of any development. Potential to support protected species will require full ecological surveys. Strong green infrastructure links would be required, especially along the eastern and northern boundaries.

**Settlement: Scotton****Site: SC1 (Land off Main Street, Scotton)****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 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: Scotton****Site: SC2 (Land off New Road, Scotton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

<b>Location/HBC Landscape Character Area</b>	Land off New Road Scotton. LCA52: North Knaresborough improved grassland
<b>Landscape description</b>	Area description; A diverse area that is well settled with the village of Scotton and Scriven plus several houses and farmsteads built relatively close together. Grassland fields are managed for livestock enclosed by a mixture of hedges and fences. Site description: The site comprises of a small rectangular field in pastoral use bordering New Lane to the east. A tall hedgerow with hedgerow trees runs alongside the highway boundary which continues along the site's northern boundary. The site is relatively flat at about 80m AOD. To the west are pastoral fields and to the east across New Lane is Knaresborough Caravan Club park
<b>Existing urban edge</b>	The site fronts onto New Road with large properties set within large curtilages to the north and south and caravan park to the east.
<b>Trees and hedges</b>	Hedgerow and hedgerow trees along New Road and the site's northern boundary with the adjacent property
<b>Landscape and Green Belt designations</b>	SG3: Settlement Growth: Conservation of Countryside, including Green Belt
<b>Description of proposal for the site</b>	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
<b>Physical Sensitivity</b>	The loss of this site to development would be inappropriate affecting edge of village character and setting.
<b>Visual Sensitivity</b>	The site is visually prominent at the southern edge of the village.
<b>Anticipated landscape effects</b>	Development would result in the loss of a small pastoral field by introducing development onto a road frontage site which would adversely affect the setting of the village with the site visible from the public highway. Development would be out of character with the rural qualities of the surrounding area
<b>Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement</b>	The retention of hedgerows and hedgerow trees would assist with some integration, but this would not be sufficient enough to reduce harmful visual effects. Screen planting along the site's western edge would be required to filter views from the west
<b>Likely level of landscape effects</b>	Medium scale adverse landscape effects in this medium scale landscape with a combination of attractive landscape features, such as treed hedgerows and woodland. Any new development would result in medium adverse effects on the rural landscape character of the area without extensive and appropriate planting as landscape mitigation.
<b>Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits</b>	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/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

<b>Summary conclusion</b>	This is small frontage site that is located at the southern edge of the village. The site is visible particularly in winter and important to the setting of Scotton. Therefore changes to the key characteristics in this area would have adverse effects. The landscape has limited capacity to accept the type of development proposed due to its visual prominence
---------------------------	---

**Settlement: Scotton****Site: SC2 (Land off New Road, Scotton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

<b>Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	None.
<b>Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	Rockville House. Foxhounds.
<b>Commentary on heritage assets.</b>	Rockville House to the north is a late 19th century / early 20th century stone house set in spacious grounds, garden to south adjoins this site. 'Foxhounds' to the south of site – formerly The Fox & Hounds PH, mid 19th century or earlier is a simple stone house, hipped roof and outbuildings to north.
<b>Topography and views</b>	Views over hedge looking west to countryside beyond. Levels drop off from east to west.
<b>Landscape context</b>	Located on southern limit of Scotton where development has occurred, but surrounded by open countryside (grass fields with hedgerow /fence boundaries and trees).
<b>Grain of surrounding development</b>	Village of Scotton is located to the north, this site being on the southern edge. 20th century development has started to extend the village southwards, mainly linear along the road. Caravan Park to east of road.
<b>Local building design</b>	In vicinity of site – static caravans, bungalows and traditional stone dwellings. Roadside with verges / hedges/ trees. In village - Old buildings are modestly scaled, simple dwellings, two storey, in rows, single or pairs. Stone / render. Slate or pan-tile roofs. Later buildings tend to be larger. Some bungalows.
<b>Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.</b>	Site is a field /meadow. Hedge to roadside. Trees on boundary, e.g. at north east 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 but there are opportunities for mitigation and improvements.	Orange

**Summary conclusion**

Development could be linear to the road, as for other dwellings that have been added in a linear form out of the village to the south. The caravan park is an obvious exception however. Major concerns over coalescence between Scotton and development to the south of Ripley Road and about the loss the open field which adds to the rural setting of Scotton. However, if all other matters allowed it, the provision of approximately two dwellings, facing the road, built of locally distinctive form (modestly sized, stone buildings would be appropriate here) may be acceptable if it allowed the spacious and open quality of the site to be maintained. Ground levels may be problematic though.

**Settlement: Scotton****Site: SC2 (Land off New Road, Scotton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

<b>SACs/SPAs</b>	None likely to be impacted.
<b>Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)</b>	Farnham Mires c. 1.75 km to NE.
<b>SSSI Risk Zone</b>	Natural England require consultaton on "residential development of 100 units or more."
<b>Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)</b>	Nidd Gorge Woodlands c. 150m to the south.
<b>BAP Priority Habitats</b>	Hedgerows.
<b>Phase 1 Survey Target Notes</b>	SE 35 NW TN 33a - for species-rich semi-improved grassland; 25m to NW.
<b>Sward</b>	Improved P1HS 1992 - requires re-survey.
<b>Trees and Hedges</b>	Hedgerow to north and roadside contains significant trees, two or three field trees.
<b>Presence of Trees that Merit TPO</b>	Boundary trees likely to merit TPO protection.
<b>Water/Wetland</b>	None on site; pond 160m to west.
<b>Slope and Aspect</b>	Generally flat.
<b>Buildings and Structures</b>	None on site.
<b>Natural Area</b>	NCA 30 Southern Magnesian Limestone.
<b>Environmental Opportunity</b>	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.
<b>LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)</b>	LCA 52 North Knaresborough improved grassland <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Encourage replanting in hedge gaps with appropriate species and the planting of hedgerow trees."</li> <li>• "New planting associated with development should respect local native vegetation cover..."</li> </ul>
<b>Connectivity/Corridors</b>	The network of small pastures with hedgerows provides a rich landscape for wildlife between Nidd Gorge to the south and important wetland near Farnham to the east. The northern boundary hedge provides direct connectivity with the GCN breeding pond to the west. Ripley Road separates the site from Nidd Gorge Woodlands SINC.
<b>GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)</b>	Retain boundary trees and hedges; retain great crested newt terrestrial habitat.
<b>Protected Species</b>	The northern boundary hedgerow connects directly to a great crested newt breeding pond 160 m to the west. The site is likely to provide terrestrial habitat for GCN.
<b>BAP Priority Species</b>	Not known.
<b>Invasive Species</b>	None known.
<b>Notes</b>	

**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 small site is bounded by important trees and hedgerows and adjacent to a 'nature reserve' with species rich-grassland and great crested newt breeding pond. Trees and hedges require to be protected and retained with sufficient space including to retain terrestrial habitat corridor for GCN. On-site sward requires survey. The site would be unlikely to achieve housing density targets in the light of these constraints.

**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 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.

**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: Scotton****Site: SC4 (Land at Low Moor Lane, Scotton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

<b>Location/HBC Landscape Character Area</b>	Land east of Main Street Scotton. LCA52: North Knaresborough improved grassland
<b>Landscape description</b>	Area description; A diverse area that is well settled with the village of Scotton and Scriven plus several houses and farmsteads built relatively close together. Grassland fields are managed for livestock enclosed by a mixture of hedges and fences. Site description: The site comprises part of a large pastoral field consisting of a narrow strip of frontage and bordering the western edge of Main Street . A well maintained hedgerow forms the roadside boundary along part of this frontage with a mortared stone wall forming the remainder. Landform gently rises to the west
<b>Existing urban edge</b>	The site consists of frontage land in pastoral use to the west of Main Street at the northern limit of the village with Lawrence House Farm beyond. Open countryside extends out to the west
<b>Trees and hedges</b>	Hedgerow forms part of boundary with Main Street
<b>Landscape and Green Belt designations</b>	R11 Rights of Way
<b>Description of proposal for the site</b>	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
<b>Physical Sensitivity</b>	The loss of this pastoral frontage land to development would be inappropriate and impact on sensitive inter-relationship between village built form and open countryside.
<b>Visual Sensitivity</b>	The site is located in prominent location at the northern edge of the village and would extend the settlement limits. The site would be visible from the PRow crossing the site
<b>Anticipated landscape effects</b>	Development would result in the loss of a pastoral field by introducing development which would adversely affect the setting of the village
<b>Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement</b>	The retention of the frontage hedgerow within the site would assist with some integration. Hedgerow planting along the site's western boundary would be required to create a more appropriate village/ countryside interface.
<b>Likely level of landscape effects</b>	Large scale adverse landscape affects in this medium scale landscape with a combination of attractive landscape features, such as treed hedgerows and woodlands
<b>Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits</b>	SC5 to the south - development in conjunction with this site is likely to increase adverse effects on local landscape character by reducing the number of open areas remaining within the village and extending the village into open countryside

**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

<b>Summary conclusion</b>	This is a linear frontage site at the northern end of the village which is highly visible and which allows for medium distance views out to the west Therefore changes to the key characteristics in this area would have adverse effects. The landscape has very limited capacity to accept the type of development proposed. Mitigation planting is likely to be ineffective and would also be highly inappropriate in this location
---------------------------	---



**Settlement: Scotton****Site: SC4 (Land at Low Moor Lane, Scotton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

<b>Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	Scotton Old Hall (grade II*) and barn (grade II listed). Burial ground with listed headstones.
<b>Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	Lawrence House Farm. Bluebell Cottage. Pair / row of stone cottages
<b>Commentary on heritage assets.</b>	Scotton Old Hall is located to the south west of the site (a 15th century stone hall and cross wing) along with an associated grade II barn (17th century stone with stone slate roof, 10 bays). A burial ground containing listed headstones is located to south of site along Chantry Lane. Lawrence House Farm is located to the north of the site (traditional stone farmhouse and farm buildings in isolated position at north edge of village. Bluebell Cottage to south of the site, traditional cottage, rendered. The pair / row of stone cottages is located on the other side of the road to the site. The site is located in the setting of these heritage assets.
<b>Topography and views</b>	Significant rise in ground level at south of site and immediately rising from road level. Generally, undulating levels. View across lower levels of site to trees in distance, giving sense of open countryside. Views looking north towards and in context of Lawrence Farm. Views at south end of the site, looking west, with Scotton Old Hall and barn visible. Views looking south, with open countryside visible (and Scotton Old Hall) beyond.
<b>Landscape context</b>	Village in rural setting with established field patterns divided by hedgerows and trees.
<b>Grain of surrounding development</b>	Linear. At this end of Main St, buildings plots are more spacious than the closely positioned buildings further south. Reduced density and some opens spaces (fields) between buildings and facing onto narrow road, some with gables facing onto road. Stone walls to frontages, also hedges. More recent / post war buildings tend to be set further back from road.
<b>Local building design</b>	Old buildings are modestly scaled, simple dwellings, two storey, in rows, single or pairs. Mostly stone and some render. Slate or pan-tile roofs. Later buildings tend to be larger.
<b>Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.</b>	Grassed, open field, part of farm land on north edge of village. Stone wall sections to road at north and south, hedge / fence in between. Site follows bend in road. Tree at south east corner of 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

<b>Summary conclusion</b>	Although development could be linear along the road, the setting of Old Scotton Hall and barn would be harmed by the introduction of housing here, blocking views of it from the road. The topography of the land means that any dwellings would be highly inappropriate at the south end of the site in any case. Development at the north end of the site may be possible without causing harm to the setting of the heritage assets, but may be problematic due to the open nature of the land and proximity to Lawrence Farm.
---------------------------	---



Settlement: Scotton

Site: SC4 (Land at Low Moor Lane, Scotton)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments

Type: Ecology

### Ecology Site Assessment

<b>SACs/SPAs</b>	None likely to be impacted.
<b>Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)</b>	Farnham Mires lies about 1 km to NE.
<b>SSSI Risk Zone</b>	Natural England require consultation on "residential development of 100 units or more."
<b>Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)</b>	None likely to be impacted.
<b>BAP Priority Habitats</b>	Hedgerows.
<b>Phase 1 Survey Target Notes</b>	None.
<b>Sward</b>	Improved pasture (P1HS 1992).
<b>Trees and Hedges</b>	Hedges to roadside to south east and gardens to the south; single hawthorn tree by roadside to south.
<b>Presence of Trees that Merit TPO</b>	Roadside hawthorn may merit TPO protection.
<b>Water/Wetland</b>	There is a pond about 250m to the south-west.
<b>Slope and Aspect</b>	The land rises to the south west.
<b>Buildings and Structures</b>	Stone wall along northern part of roadside boundary.
<b>Natural Area</b>	NCA 30 Southern Magnesian Limestone.
<b>Environmental Opportunity</b>	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.
<b>LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)</b>	LCA 52 North Knaresborough improved grassland • "Encourage replanting in hedge gaps with appropriate species and the planting of hedgerow trees." • "New planting associated with development should respect local native vegetation cover..."
<b>Connectivity/Corridors</b>	The network of small pastures with hedgerows provides a rich landscape for wildlife between Nidd Gorge to the south and important wetland near Farnham to the east.
<b>GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)</b>	Retain and extend boundary hedgerow; recreate areas of wildflower meadow.
<b>Protected Species</b>	Breeding birds may use hedge. Great crested newt known from wider area so pond to SW may require survey.
<b>BAP Priority Species</b>	Some potential for ground nesting priority bird species.
<b>Invasive Species</b>	None.
<b>Notes</b>	RL1113 2010 (not covered for ecology).

### 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
<b>Summary conclusion</b>	Likely low ecological sensitivity; opportunity for creation of habitats along boundaries in association with green-infrastructure e.g. along PROW to north.

**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 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.

**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: Sharow****Site: SH1 (Land at New Road, Sharow)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

<b>Location/HBC Landscape Character Area</b>	Site is located at the east end of Sharow south of Dishforth Road. LCA 76: East of Ripon Farmland
<b>Landscape description</b>	Area description: Small scale landscape with rolling landform accentuated by the diversity of agriculture and woodland land use and field pattern. Site description: Small - medium sized field with hedge boundaries. Residential property to the south boundary.
<b>Existing urban edge</b>	Rural village edge with low density development comprising bungalows and houses.
<b>Trees and hedges</b>	Hedgerow boundary to field. TPO on opposite side of the road.
<b>Landscape and Green Belt designations</b>	Open countryside.
<b>Description of proposal for the site</b>	Residential. Assume 30+ dwellings per ha
<b>Physical Sensitivity</b>	Loss of open field on the village edge would not on its own be adverse. However, introduction of built form that is dense in comparison to neighbouring development would be detrimental.
<b>Visual Sensitivity</b>	Visually the site is well contained by landform, hedges and existing development.
<b>Anticipated landscape effects</b>	Loss of field and introduction of housing.
<b>Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement</b>	Site offers opportunities for additional mitigation provided areas can be given over to green infrastructure and density is lowered.
<b>Likely level of landscape effects</b>	Medium scale adverse due to loss of field on village edge in a rural location
<b>Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits</b>	SH3 is located on the opposite side of Dishforth road and its development in conjunction with this site would significantly increase the adverse landscape effects.

**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

<b>Summary conclusion</b>	There is the opportunity to mitigate by ensuring built form density matches existing and incorporating green infrastructure to improve the urban edge. The area has medium capacity to accept the development proposed on this site.
---------------------------	--

**Settlement: Sharow****Site: SH1 (Land at New Road, Sharow)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

<b>Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	Site is almost wholly within the World Heritage Site Buffer Zone.
<b>Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	None.
<b>Commentary on heritage assets.</b>	Within the World Heritage Site Buffer Zone.
<b>Topography and views</b>	Views to open land to the north on the north side of Dishforth Road (site SH3). Visually the site is well contained by landform, hedges and existing development.
<b>Landscape context</b>	Open countryside. Undulating.
<b>Grain of surrounding development</b>	To the south, on the south side of Back Lane, well-spaced suburban 1 and 1½ storey dwellings surrounded by gardens and set back from the lane. Accessed by shared drives. East and far west: tighter vernacular 'village' and 'farmstead' type development. Buildings close to Sharow Lane or slightly set back, buildings closer together. Two-storey buildings dominate. Trees on north side of Sharow Lane provide a backdrop to the buildings. Trees on southern side of Sharow Lane are the dominant features. To the north east, on the north side of Dishforth Road is a lodge building at the entrance to the drive serving Lister Farm further north east. To the north east, on the south side Dishforth Road and adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site, is a white render 2 storey property angled to the road.
<b>Local building design</b>	To the south and west, brick and artificial stone slate, clay pantile and concrete pantile bungalows and dormer bungalows. No local distinctiveness. Suburban in character. Fences and hedges. South east: vernacular brick and render, slate and pantile roofs. Locally distinctive character, but some dormers. Stone boundary walls, hedges.
<b>Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.</b>	This is a medium sized field surrounded by hedgerows on the eastern edge of the village. To the north is Dishforth Road and on the opposite side of the road is a row of trees protected by a TPO. Part of New Road and Back Lane define the site to the west and south and separate the site from residential development. Sharow Hall Farm house and associated buildings are to the south-east. The site is almost completely included within the World Heritage Site Buffer Zone.

**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 unlikely to affect any elements which contribute to the significance of a heritage asset.	Yellow

**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

<b>Summary conclusion</b>	Subject to securing a development scheme that constitutes high quality design that is appropriate to its context in terms of built form density, building heights, layout, form and palette of materials. There is potential for the development to improve the urban edge. Tree planting within and bordering the site may help to assimilate the development into its context and consolidate the existing eastern boundary in order to soften the urban edge and screen, or at least filter, views of the houses on approaching the village from this direction.
---------------------------	---

**Settlement: Sharow****Site: SH1 (Land at New Road, Sharow)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

<b>SACs/SPAs</b>	None likely to be impacted
<b>Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)</b>	None likely to be impacted
<b>SSSI Risk Zone</b>	Natural England require consultation for residential development of 100 units or more
<b>Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)</b>	Sharow Mires c. 750m to the south
<b>BAP Priority Habitats</b>	Hedgerows, arable farmland
<b>Phase 1 Survey Target Notes</b>	None
<b>Sward</b>	Arable
<b>Trees and Hedges</b>	Strong hedgerows bound the field with occasional mature trees along the southern boundary
<b>Presence of Trees that Merit TPO</b>	The most significant boundary already have TPOs protection
<b>Water/Wetland</b>	Ponds or wetlands occur (or occurred until recently) in the field adjacent to the east
<b>Slope and Aspect</b>	Generally flat
<b>Buildings and Structures</b>	None on site
<b>Natural Area</b>	NCA 30 Southern Magnesian Limestone
<b>Environmental Opportunity</b>	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.
<b>LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)</b>	LCA 76: East of Ripon farmland: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Encourage the planting of gaps in hedgerows and the planting of hedgerow trees”.</li> <li>• “Promote good woodland management practices and new planting...”</li> <li>• “Protect fields and woodland important to village setting from development. Woodland and tree planting can be used to define development limits”.</li> </ul>
<b>Connectivity/Corridors</b>	The fields, trees and hedgerows around the village link into the strategic green infrastructure corridor of the River Ure
<b>GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)</b>	Retain and enhance boundary hedgerows. Potential for development of a suds wetland to the east.
<b>Protected Species</b>	Nesting birds are likely to utilise the hedgerows with some possibility of ground-nesting birds; semi natural wetlands in the fields to the east could support great crested newts. A bat roost has been recorded just to the NE across Dishforth Road.
<b>BAP Priority Species</b>	Potential birds of arable farmland and brown hare
<b>Invasive Species</b>	Not known
<b>Notes</b>	

**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
<b>Summary conclusion</b>	The boundary hedges and field margins are likely to be the most biodiverse aspects of this site and should be retained. Opportunities should be sought for biodiversity enhancement, which might include restoration of ponds to the east in association with Suds and planting of native trees within the boundary hedgerows

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.

I am opposed to the use of soakaways in Sharow that has been identified as a high risk area for gypsum dissolution. The soakaways will serve to concentrate the points of discharge and will act to increase the water table generally, which could affect the new development or neighbouring land. If permission for the use of infiltration drainage is granted on this site, it could set a precedent for future development in the area.

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, 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: Sharow****Site: SH2 (Land north of Dishforth Road, Sharow)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

<b>Location/HBC Landscape Character Area</b>	Site located between Dishforth Road and Berrygate Lane to the west end of Sharow. LCA76: East of Ripon Farmland
<b>Landscape description</b>	Area description: Small scale landscape with rolling landform accentuated by the diversity of agriculture and woodland land use and field pattern. Site description: Field north and west of Sharow recreation ground with hedgerow boundaries .
<b>Existing urban edge</b>	Site is largely detached from the village edge and where housing is very low density in the vicinity generally.
<b>Trees and hedges</b>	Hedgrows boundaries. TPO designations on east and west boundaries outside site boundary. One TPO in south west corner of site.
<b>Landscape and Green Belt designations</b>	Open Countryside. One single tree TPO
<b>Description of proposal for the site</b>	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha.)
<b>Physical Sensitivity</b>	Loss of field that contributes to the setting of Sharow and neighbouring rural property.
<b>Visual Sensitivity</b>	Ground slopes down to the south but tree cover helps to screen the site in close proximity.
<b>Anticipated landscape effects</b>	Uncharacteristic high density development in open countryside would change the character of Sharow and its contribution to local landscape character.
<b>Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement</b>	Size of the site offers opportunities for additional mitigation leaving large areas of the site free of development. However, still the potential to be visible in the wider landscape.
<b>Likely level of landscape effects</b>	medium to large scale adverse
<b>Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits</b>	RH4 to the north west of this site on the edge of Ripon would result in large scale cumulative effects due to reduction in separation between settlements.

**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 any existing woodland or trees and there is potential for significant woodland creation on site.	Dark Green

<b>Summary conclusion</b>	Capacity of the landscape to accept change without detriment is limited unless significant areas are left undeveloped and density is low.
---------------------------	---



**Settlement: Sharow****Site: SH2 (Land north of Dishforth Road, Sharow)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

<b>Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	TPO designations on east and west boundaries outside site boundary. One TPO in south west of site.
<b>Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	Sharow Cross. Sharow Cross House. Sharow Cross Villa.
<b>Commentary on heritage assets.</b>	Sharow Cross is a large, distinctive property that has been subdivided. It has a gabled frontage overlooking the site. The house is a detached property with painted white render, decorative timber work and finials.
<b>Topography and views</b>	Gently undulating open countryside. Land rises to the north. View of the church tower to the east.
<b>Landscape context</b>	Open fields which contribute positively to the character of Sharow and to the local landscape. Fields bound by hedgerow.
<b>Grain of surrounding development</b>	Residential.
<b>Local building design</b>	Former local authority housing to the north east in Church Close, comprising bungalows and semi-detached two storey dwellings with private gardens front and back, To the west, tight upto and parallel with the boundary is a substantial property, with a residential care home behind. It is a large, distinctive property with a gabled frontage overlooking the site. The house is a detached property with painted white render, decorative timber work and finials. To the rear of this distinctive property is a large detached building with a hipped roof, which is plain in style, lacking detail. Both of these properties have intervisibility with the site. To the north, on the north side of Berrygate Lane are two pair of semi-detached properties, which though not locally distinct, do benefit from long ranging down the site and beyond by virtue of the falling ground level and the open aspect across the site. To the east, the sports pavillion abuts the site boundary and the sports recreation ground extends further east. To the north east, accessed from Berrygate Lane, is The Holt, a substantial detached late villa-style house dating from c.1920-30. It is brick with red clay tile roofs and is in a domestic revival style with simple gabled forms. The site is well enclosed from the north by a high brick wall. The attractive lodge to the main house is built into this wall and is built in a similar style to the principal house. To the south of The Holt, its lodge and well-treed grounds, is a paddock, which is tree lined around its perimeter.
<b>Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.</b>	A roughly 'L' shaped site bound by hedgerow, located between Berrygate Lane to the North and Dishforth Road to the south. The widest part of the site borders Berrygate Lane where there are several houses on the opposite side of the road to the far north, separated from further houses at Church Close by open fields. There are TPO protected trees outside the site but adjacent to the site boundary in the north-west and east and a single tree within the site to the south-west. The site is grassed and slopes up to Berrygate Lane. To the north- west is Bishop Mount House and gardens and to the south-west a residential care home. Outside the site and to the south- east is the sports ground and pavillion. The Special Landscape Area and World Heritage Site Buffer cover the village to the south, west and east 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 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
<b>Summary conclusion</b>	The site is on the edge of the village. Low density development at the village edge ensures a pleasant transition from village to open countryside. The openness of the site is complimented by the playing fields to the east. Subject to securing a low density scheme of development that constitutes high quality design that is appropriate to its context in terms of built form density, building heights, layout, form and palette of materials. There is scope for some development on this site. Tree planting within and bordering the site may help to assimilate the development into its context and consolidate existing boundary planting in order to soften the urban edge and screen, or at least filter, views of the houses on approaching the village from this direction. Views down through the site from Berrygate Lane looking south should be maintained as should views to the east towards the church tower. The amenity of properties bordering and adjacent to the site and the impact of intervisibility should be duly respected and maintained.

**Settlement: Sharow****Site: SH2 (Land north of Dishforth Road, Sharow)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

<b>SACs/SPAs</b>	None likely to be impacted
<b>Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)</b>	None likely to be impacted
<b>SSSI Risk Zone</b>	Natural England require consultation for residential development of 100 units or more
<b>Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)</b>	None likely to be impacted
<b>BAP Priority Habitats</b>	Hedgerows
<b>Phase 1 Survey Target Notes</b>	None
<b>Sward</b>	Arable (western field) improved pasture (eastern field)
<b>Trees and Hedges</b>	here are TPO protected trees outside the site but adjacent to the site boundary in the north-west and east and a single tree within the site to the south-west
<b>Presence of Trees that Merit TPO</b>	Any mature boundary trees not already covered are likely to benefit from TPO protection
<b>Water/Wetland</b>	None
<b>Slope and Aspect</b>	The land slopes up gently to the north
<b>Buildings and Structures</b>	None on site
<b>Natural Area</b>	NCA 30 Southern Magnesian Limestone
<b>Environmental Opportunity</b>	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.
<b>LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)</b>	LCA 76: East of Ripon farmland: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Encourage the planting of gaps in hedgerows and the planting of hedgerow trees”.</li> <li>• “Promote good woodland management practices and new planting...”</li> <li>• “Protect fields and woodland important to village setting from development. Woodland and tree planting can be used to define development limits”.</li> </ul>
<b>Connectivity/Corridors</b>	The fields, trees and hedgerows around the village link into the strategic green infrastructure corridor of the River Ure
<b>GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)</b>	Existing trees and hedgerows should be retained and enhanced with new native planting of trees and hedgerows along boundaries lacking them, such as around the cricket club. Opportunities for green infrastructure to enhance the River Ure corridor may also include the creation of a small suds wetland
<b>Protected Species</b>	Potential birds of arable farmland and brown hare
<b>BAP Priority Species</b>	Nesting birds & bats may utilise trees and hedgerows
<b>Invasive Species</b>	Not known
<b>Notes</b>	

**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.	<b>Yellow</b>
<b>Summary conclusion</b>	Existing trees and hedgerows should be retained and enhanced with new native planting of trees and hedgerows along boundaries lacking them. Opportunities for green infrastructure to enhance the River Ure corridor may also include the creation of a small suds wetland

**Settlement: Sharow**

**Site: SH2 (Land north of Dishforth Road, Sharow)**

**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 adjacent fields. 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.

I am opposed to the use of soakaways in Sharow that has been identified as a high risk area for gypsum dissolution. The soakaways will serve to concentrate the points of discharge and will act to increase the water table generally, which could affect the new development or neighbouring land. If permission for the use of infiltration drainage is granted on this site, it could set a precedent for future development in the area.

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, 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: Sharow****Site: SH3 (Land to the west of Lister Farm, Sharow)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

<b>Location/HBC Landscape Character Area</b>	The site is located on the north side of Sharow at its eastern end, between the church and Lister farm. LCA76: East of Ripon Farmland
<b>Landscape description</b>	Area description: Small scale landscape with rolling landform accentuated by the diversity of agriculture and woodland land use and field pattern. Site description: Medium/large field surround by trees that are TPO'd and smaller field north of the churchyard. To the east is a designed landscape at Lister Farm
<b>Existing urban edge</b>	Sharow is a rural village with a large proportion of late 20th century development that has impacted on its character in the rural setting.
<b>Trees and hedges</b>	Significant amount of tree planting to the boundaries.
<b>Landscape and Green Belt designations</b>	Open countryside. Grade 2 listed church adjacent to the site.
<b>Description of proposal for the site</b>	Residential development (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
<b>Physical Sensitivity</b>	Loss of field and the introduction of housing would change the character of the village within the character area.
<b>Visual Sensitivity</b>	Potential impact on views from Lister Farm designed landscape and its setting.
<b>Anticipated landscape effects</b>	Loss of field and introduction of high density built form.
<b>Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement</b>	The size of the site and the presence of trees offers the opportunity for additional mitigation in the form of significant green infrastructure and tree planting. Although to adequately mitigate would require large areas of green infrastructure.
<b>Likely level of landscape effects</b>	Large scale adverse due to the scale of the proposed development in relation to neighbouring settlement, the adverse impact on the setting of the listed building (church)
<b>Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits</b>	SH1 developed in conjunction with this site would increase the adverse effect 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: 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 is likely to result in the loss of ancient woodland, aged or veteran trees and/or trees protected by a TPO.	Red

<b>Summary conclusion</b>	The area has little capacity to accept change without detriment to landscape character through the loss of characteristic features and changes to the setting of heritage assets.
---------------------------	---

**Settlement: Sharow****Site: SH3 (Land to the west of Lister Farm, Sharow)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

<b>Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	World Heritage Site Buffer Zone. St John's Church (GIILB). TPOs.
<b>Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	Designed landscape associated with Lister Farm to the east.
<b>Commentary on heritage assets.</b>	World Heritage Site Buffer Zone - the southern third of the site. St John's Church adjacent to the western boundary of the site (GIILB)- site within its setting. TPO trees border the site.
<b>Topography and views</b>	Site affords views out into the open countryside. Views to and from the adjacent church (GIILB). Land rises to the north.
<b>Landscape context</b>	Substantial trees along the site boundaries compliment woodland blocks in the landscape. Rural. Undulating open countryside and farmland. Designed landscape associated with Lister Farm to the east.
<b>Grain of surrounding development</b>	To the south east, on the north side of Dishforth Road is a lodge building at the entrance to the drive serving Lister Farm further north east. To the south east, on the south side Dishforth Road, is a white rendered 2 storey property angled to the road. Site SH1 is located to the south of the site, on the south side of Dishforth Road. To the south, brick and artificial stone slate, clay pantile and concrete pantile bungalows and dormer bungalows. No local distinctiveness. Suburban in character. Fences and hedges. South east: vernacular brick and render, slate and pantile roofs. Locally distinctive character, but some dormers. Stone boundary walls, hedges. Former local authority housing to the west in Church Close, comprising bungalows and semi-detached 2 storey dwellings with private gardens front and back. The church and its associated church yard border the site to the south west. Adjacent to the church is the school, the playing fields for which border the west boundary and contain play equipment in the south eastern corner.
<b>Local building design</b>	Sharow is a rural village with a large proportion of late 20th century development that has impacted on its character in the rural setting. Piecemeal development.
<b>Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.</b>	The site is located to the north of the village and Dishforth Road between St Johns Church (GIILB) and Lister Farmstead. It comprises a larger field with TPO protected trees along the southern boundary and parts of the boundaries to the north and west. There is a smaller field to the north of the church. The site is gently undulating with grassland and crops. A dressed stone wall with coping stones provides the boundary between the site and Dishforth Road from which there are views across the site to the church. About a third of the southern part of the site is included in the World Heritage Site Buffer.

**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**

Cumulative impact of development SH3 and SH1. Site constitutes important open space within the village, allowing the open countryside (and access to and views of the same) to extend into the village. Impact on setting of St Johns church (GIILB). Potential impact on the setting of the designed landscape at Lister Farm. Impact on the World Heritage Site Buffer Zone. Loss of this important open space in the village would change the character of the village. Subject to securing a development scheme that constitutes high quality design that is appropriate to its context in terms of low built form density, building heights, layout, form and palette of materials, there may be potential for some development of a much smaller scale. Tree planting within and bordering the site may help to assimilate the development into its context and consolidate the existing tree planting in and around the site and the woodland blocks, which characterise the landscape, in order to soften the urban edge and screen, or at least filter, views of the houses. Important views to and from the church and out to open countryside, should be maintained. Development of this scale would fail to reflect the established grain of the settlement and would be disproportionate, to the detriment of the settlement's character.



**Settlement: Sharow****Site: SH3 (Land to the west of Lister Farm, Sharow)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments** **Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

<b>SACs/SPAs</b>	None likely to be impacted
<b>Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)</b>	None likely to be impacted
<b>SSSI Risk Zone</b>	Natural England require consultation for residential development of 100 units or more
<b>Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)</b>	None likely to be impacted
<b>BAP Priority Habitats</b>	Hedgerows, woodland, arable fields
<b>Phase 1 Survey Target Notes</b>	None
<b>Sward</b>	Arable - a very large field with a smaller one to the west
<b>Trees and Hedges</b>	Belts of trees bound much of the site, particularly the larger field, the smaller field is also bound by hedgerows with trees; occasional field trees in the larger field
<b>Presence of Trees that Merit TPO</b>	Many of the boundary trees of the larger field benefit from TPOs. Trees bounding the smaller field to the west may also benefit from TPO protection.
<b>Water/Wetland</b>	None on site (other than a well mapped on the boundary between the two fields)
<b>Slope and Aspect</b>	The site rises gently towards the north east
<b>Buildings and Structures</b>	None on site
<b>Natural Area</b>	NCA 30 Southern Magnesian Limestone
<b>Environmental Opportunity</b>	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.
<b>LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)</b>	LCA 76: East of Ripon farmland: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Encourage the planting of gaps in hedgerows and the planting of hedgerow trees”.</li> <li>• “Promote good woodland management practices and new planting...”</li> <li>• “Protect fields and woodland important to village setting from development. Woodland and tree planting can be used to define development limits”.</li> </ul>
<b>Connectivity/Corridors</b>	The wooded boundaries around the site link the fields, trees and hedgerows around the village link into the surrounding large-scale agricultural fields to the north and east.
<b>GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)</b>	Retain and buffer the boundary hedgerows and woodland
<b>Protected Species</b>	Nesting birds and bats are likely to utilise the trees and hedgerows; a bat roost has been identified to the east of this site.
<b>BAP Priority Species</b>	Potential for priority bird species of arable farmland and brown hare
<b>Invasive Species</b>	Not known
<b>Notes</b>	

**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

<b>Summary conclusion</b>	The most valuable aspect of this site is the boundary trees and woodland strips and hedges; these should be retained and buffered during the course of any development and supplemented by the creation of additional semi-natural habitat as part of green infrastructure provision on the site,
---------------------------	---

**Settlement: Sharow**

**Site: SH3 (Land to the west of Lister Farm, Sharow)**

**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 adjacent fields. 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.

I am opposed to the use of soakaways in Sharow that has been identified as a high risk area for gypsum dissolution. The soakaways will serve to concentrate the points of discharge and will act to increase the water table generally, which could affect the new development or neighbouring land. If permission for the use of infiltration drainage is granted on this site, it could set a precedent for future development in the area.

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, 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: Sicklinghall****Site: SK1 (Paddock, Longlands Lane, Sicklinghall)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

<b>Location/HBC Landscape Character Area</b>	Site located south of village, off Longlands Lane LCA65: South East Harrogate farmland
<b>Landscape description</b>	Area description: The wider landscape is moderate in scale and gently rolling. Landscape pattern is random due to a diverse mix of land management and field pattern. The area is important in separating Harrogate from Wetherby and the Leeds conurbation. Site description: The site comprises a narrow elongated field at the village edge, formerly the site of a plant nursery. There are tall outgrown hedgerows that contain some mature trees along three boundaries. The site has been recently cultivated and reseeded as grassland.
<b>Existing urban edge</b>	The site is contrary to the traditional linear development pattern of the village, however any potential development would be well integrated because of the abundance of hedgerows and tree cover surrounding the site. Some small scale and appropriate development would not appear out of character in this location.
<b>Trees and hedges</b>	Significant boundary vegetation with some trees that may be worthy of TPO.
<b>Landscape and Green Belt designations</b>	Green belt Open countryside.
<b>Description of proposal for the site</b>	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
<b>Physical Sensitivity</b>	The landscape of the green belt is valued for its openness and is susceptible to the loss of fields to development. Sensitivity is reduced where development related well to existing development and does not represent a significant extension.
<b>Visual Sensitivity</b>	The site is well contained by adjacent housing at its northern part and elsewhere the tall hedgerows and trees provide screening and enclosure. Surrounding woodland and tree cover also provide screening from near and mid distant views.
<b>Anticipated landscape effects</b>	Development would result in the loss of an open field at the village edge, however, there would be limited loss of landscape characteristics providing the boundary hedgerows were protected and retained.
<b>Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement</b>	All boundary hedgerows and hedgerow trees should be protected and retained. Access at the far end of Longlands Lane would be constrained due to its narrow width and potential loss of hedgerows.
<b>Likely level of landscape effects</b>	Medium scale adverse effects due to the loss of a field on the village edge in greenbelt and providing the retention of boundary hedgerows and trees. Development should be set well back from the lane frontage to preserve the rural character of the area. Housing should be constructed in traditional materials and designed to respect local vernacular.
<b>Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits</b>	None

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

**Summary conclusion**

The site is located in green belt and its development would represent an uncharacteristic extension of the village. However appropriate mitigation will help to integrate the site with the village and the surrounding countryside.

**Settlement: Sicklinghall****Site: SK1 (Paddock, Longlands Lane, Sicklinghall)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

<b>Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	The Church of St Mary Immaculate, with presbytery and former monastery attached (grade II listed). Glebe House grade II listed).
<b>Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	Traditional buildings located further to the north of the site (e.g. on The Crescent).
<b>Commentary on heritage assets.</b>	The Church of St Mary Immaculate, with presbytery and former monastery attached and former and Glebe House (18th century, stone house) are located further to the north of the site, as are non-designated traditional buildings such as those located around the green (for example, modestly scaled, stone cottages of The Crescent). The site is located in the wider setting of all of these heritage assets, which as a whole have significance in characterising the historic character and grain of the village.
<b>Topography and views</b>	Reasonably enclosed site due to the hedge / treed boundaries but forms part of rural context to southern edge of the village. The site level near the northern end is lower than the lane (Longlands Lane falls gently to the southeast), but the site is relatively flat.
<b>Landscape context</b>	Gently rolling hills with mix of field types - countryside that separates Harrogate from Wetherby and the Leeds area.
<b>Grain of surrounding development</b>	The village is linear along Main Street, but with 20th century addition tending to give rise to buildings set back behind frontage buildings, e.g. those buildings facing onto Back Lane. Properties are generally orientated with their eaves, rather than gable, to the street and are either against the pavement or are set back behind small walled front gardens. Typically, the detached houses have more generous gardens. The row of semi-detached dwellings on Longlands Lane is the most southerly form of development.
<b>Local building design</b>	Traditional form of two storey, stone buildings with mainly pan tile roofs. Some short rows of houses.
<b>Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.</b>	The site is a long, narrow grassed field on the southern edge of the village edge (formerly the site of a plant nursery). Tall overgrown hedgerows with groups of trees along three boundaries. The narrow, Longlands Lane forms the west boundary and an access lane to another property runs along the south and eastern sides. Dwellings adjoin at the north end and a row of semi-detached dwellings are located on the other side of Longlands 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**

It is not considered that standard forms and densities of housing are appropriate in this location (as this would be contrary to grain and local distinctiveness and this would cause harm to the character of the area and wider setting of the heritage assets present). However, harm could be mitigated by ensuring that development is well integrated with the rural context, the site being at the edge of the settlement and also should be complementary with existing grain - hence any development should be set well away from the southern hedge and should be linear in nature with generous gaps between buildings. Building types to be locally distinctive.

**Settlement: Sicklinghall****Site: SK1 (Paddock, Longlands Lane, Sicklinghall)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

<b>SACs/SPAs</b>	None likely to be impacted.
<b>Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)</b>	None likely to be impacted.
<b>SSSI Risk Zone</b>	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs.
<b>Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)</b>	None likely to be impacted.
<b>BAP Priority Habitats</b>	Hedgerows.
<b>Phase 1 Survey Target Notes</b>	None.
<b>Sward</b>	Arable/improved pasture - reseeded as grassland.
<b>Trees and Hedges</b>	There are tall outgrown hedgerows that contain some mature trees along three boundaries. The northern post and rail fence boundary has two trees and there is another near the southern corner, There is a small copse in the SE corner, including some large willows associated with the small stream.
<b>Presence of Trees that Merit TPO</b>	Mature on-site and boundary trees are likely to merit from TPO protection.
<b>Water/Wetland</b>	A small stream runs along the southeasterly boundary of the site. Low Flush Pond is about 125m to the NW.
<b>Slope and Aspect</b>	The site is relatively flat.
<b>Buildings and Structures</b>	Timber stable building near the northwest corner.
<b>Natural Area</b>	NCA 30 Southern Magnesian Limestone.
<b>Environmental Opportunity</b>	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.
<b>LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)</b>	LCA 65: South East Harrogate Farmland <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Encourage the continued maintenance of hedgerows and hedgerow trees and restoration in area of neglect and fragmentation”.</li> <li>• “Protect and manage all woodland especially registered Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland”</li> <li>• “Promote the management of roadside tree planting and links with woodland in the wider countryside...”</li> </ul>
<b>Connectivity/Corridors</b>	The boundary hedgerows are important in connecting the village with the field system of the wider countryside. The small stream which runs along the SE boundary, originates near the pond on Geecroft Lane feed Low Flush Pond via a culvert. The streams and hedgerows therefore form a short but important treed corridor, potentially connecting wetlands.
<b>GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)</b>	All existing trees and hedges should be retained. There may be the opportunity to create a small SUDS wetland in association with the stream near the SE corner.
<b>Protected Species</b>	Nesting birds and bats are likely to utilise the trees and hedgerows and possibly the stable building. Great crested newts breed within about 125m at Low Flush. Main Street may form a barrier between the site and the breeding pond but otherwise there does appear to be good connectivity through gardens. There may be suitable terrestrial habitat for GCN along the hedges and along the stream side on the site. Water vole may occur along the small stream.
<b>BAP Priority Species</b>	Not known.
<b>Invasive Species</b>	Himalayan Balsam is likely along the stream.
<b>Notes</b>	RL2017 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
<b>Summary conclusion</b>	All native trees and boundary hedgerows and hedgerow trees should be protected and retained. Highways access via the far end of Longlands Lane may be incompatible with the retention of the hedgerows. The stream should be buffered from development. Surveys would be required for GCN, water vole, bats and nesting birds.

**Settlement: Sicklinghall**

**Site: SK1 (Paddock, Longlands Lane, Sicklinghall)**

**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.

**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: Sicklinghall****Site: SK2 (Dairy Farm, Sicklinghall)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

<b>Location/HBC Landscape Character Area</b>	Site located on the east side of Sicklinghall north of Wetherby Road and Stockeld Lane. LCA65: South East Harrogate farmland
<b>Landscape description</b>	Area description: The wider landscape is moderate in scale and gently rolling. Landscape pattern is random due to a diverse mix of land management and field pattern. The area is important in separating Harrogate from Wetherby and the Leeds conurbation. Site description: Site comprises a farmstead on the village edge that contributes to the character of the farmed landscape.
<b>Existing urban edge</b>	The site is largely within the development limit of Sicklinghall.
<b>Trees and hedges</b>	Hedgerow of Stockeld Lane.
<b>Landscape and Green Belt designations</b>	Largely within development of the village. Green belt.
<b>Description of proposal for the site</b>	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
<b>Physical Sensitivity</b>	The landscape of the green belt is valued for its openness and is susceptible to the loss of fields to development. Sensitivity is reduced where development relates well to existing development and does not represent a significant extension.
<b>Visual Sensitivity</b>	The site is seen in the context with the village and the existing development edge is open.
<b>Anticipated landscape effects</b>	Change of character of farmstead to residential development.
<b>Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement</b>	Built form should respect the character of the village in green belt and the east boundary should be sensitively treated ensuring integration with the surrounding countryside.
<b>Likely level of landscape effects</b>	Small to medium scale adverse due to change in character of village edge in rural landscape.
<b>Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits</b>	

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

Rationale	Rating
Sensitivity Rating: Medium/low – key distinctive characteristics are resilient to change, typically a medium/low valued landscape where landscape condition may be fair with some existing reference to context to the type of development being proposed.	Light Green
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

<b>Summary conclusion</b>	The site is within the development limit and currently in use as a farmstead. As a result there is capacity for the landscape to accept development without significant harm.
---------------------------	---

**Settlement: Sicklinghall****Site: SK2 (Dairy Farm, Sicklinghall)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

<b>Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	None.
<b>Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	Historic farm buildings within the site. Possible associated farmhouse to the west of the site. Cottage and a house to the south.
<b>Commentary on heritage assets.</b>	Within the site are located several historic, stone buildings, two storey and single storey ranges. Cottage present that may be a converted farm building (historically). One or two buildings appear to be in a poor state of repair. Dwelling to the west is a two storey, detached stone house and may be the associated farm house to the farm. Small cottage to the south of the green, stone but with altered windows. Further to its east, a two storey house, probably stone but now rendered. The setting of all of these buildings will be affected by development of the site, as will the fabric of the buildings located within the site.
<b>Topography and views</b>	The farm is on the edge of the village and so comes into view on approach along Stockeld Lane.
<b>Landscape context</b>	Gently rolling hills with mix of field types - countryside that separates Harrogate from Wetherby and the Leeds area.
<b>Grain of surrounding development</b>	The village is linear along Main Street, but with 20th century addition tending to give rise to buildings set back behind frontage buildings, e.g. those buildings facing onto Back Lane. Properties are generally orientated with their eaves, rather than gable, to the street and are either against the pavement or are set back behind small walled front gardens. Typically, the detached houses have more generous gardens. The row of semi-detached dwellings on Longlands Lane is the most southerly form of development.
<b>Local building design</b>	Traditional form is two storey, stone buildings with mainly pan tile roofs. Some short rows of houses.
<b>Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.</b>	The site is Dairy Farm, which contains both historic and modern farm buildings. It is located on the eastern edge of the village, off Stockeld Lane but also being visible from the main road through. Stockeld Lane forms the southern boundary. The building line forms the east boundary, which adjoins a paddock / field, with further fields beyond. To the west, the site is open to the farmyard next to which the presumed farmhouse is located.

**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**

Clearance of the historic buildings would not be acceptable; neither would standard forms of housing / expectation of densities (as it would harm the significance of the buildings / site as a former farmstead). If the existing farm buildings have become redundant and no other use is possible, sensitive conversion to residential use can be explored (or potentially, other uses) - historic buildings should be retained and converted in line with accepted principles as set out in the council's guidance. The amount of new building possible would be minimal, but any allowed should be of a scale and form appropriate to the agricultural context and development should be appropriate to the location on the edge of the village.

**Settlement: Sicklinghall****Site: SK2 (Dairy Farm, Sicklinghall)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

<b>SACs/SPAs</b>	None likely to be impacted.
<b>Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)</b>	None likely to be impacted.
<b>SSSI Risk Zone</b>	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs.
<b>Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)</b>	None likely to be impacted.
<b>BAP Priority Habitats</b>	None.
<b>Phase 1 Survey Target Notes</b>	None.
<b>Sward</b>	Mostly hard standing small amount of improved pasture (P1HS 1992).
<b>Trees and Hedges</b>	Some garden shrubbery around frontage.
<b>Presence of Trees that Merit TPO</b>	None.
<b>Water/Wetland</b>	None on site.
<b>Slope and Aspect</b>	Generally flat.
<b>Buildings and Structures</b>	Farm buildings mostly modern steel framed structures but a number of traditional stone and tiles or pan-tiles barns.
<b>Natural Area</b>	NCA 30 Southern Magnesian Limestone.
<b>Environmental Opportunity</b>	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.
<b>LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)</b>	LCA 65: South East Harrogate Farmland <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Encourage the continued maintenance of hedgerows and hedgerow trees and restoration in area of neglect and fragmentation”.</li> <li>• “Protect and manage all woodland especially registered Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland”</li> <li>• “Promote the management of roadside tree planting and links with woodland in the wider countryside...”</li> </ul>
<b>Connectivity/Corridors</b>	The site lies between the village with its pond and gardens with the surrounding agricultural land.
<b>GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)</b>	Retain opportunities for bats and nesting birds within any redevelopment (e.g. bat and swift bricks). Retain some connectivity through the site for amphibians (e.g. boundary hedgerow).
<b>Protected Species</b>	Potential for bats and nesting birds in the buildings on site. Great Crested Newt recorded in Low Flush pond within 100m to south east.
<b>BAP Priority Species</b>	Not known.
<b>Invasive Species</b>	None known.
<b>Notes</b>	

**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

<b>Summary conclusion</b>	The main ecological issue would be the potential presence of European Protected Species (bats and great crested newts) but should be readily capable of mitigation and enhancement through provision of boundary hedgerows and bat/swift bricks.
---------------------------	--

**Settlement: Sicklinghall****Site: SK2 (Dairy Farm, Sicklinghall)****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.

Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) should always be any developer's first consideration and giving preference to soakaways. In my view, infiltration drainage may not be fully successful at this location due to ground conditions in the surrounding area being predominantly heavy clay soils.

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.

**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: South Stainley

### Site: SS1 (Land to the east of the A61, South Stainley)

#### Natural and Built Heritage Assessments

Type: Landscape

#### Landscape Site Assessments

<b>Location/HBC Landscape Character Area</b>	Land to the east of the A61 South Stainley LCA49: Stanley Beck Corridor
<b>Landscape description</b>	<p>Area description: This small-scale landscape follows the course of Stainley Beck from Markington to Copgrove generally in a south easterly direction. The rolling landform gradually slopes down towards the Beck and eastwards. Land use is simple with irregular shaped fields managed for permanent pasture plus the occasional fields given over to cereal crops.</p> <p>Site Description: The site consists of a grassed field/paddock with a field gate entrance in the south-west corner of the site. Hedgerows with hedgerow trees define site boundaries with a ditch also along the eastern boundary which flows into Stainley Beck to the south. Ripon Road (A61) borders the site to the west. A disused railway line embankment to the south and west remains. The site gently falls from north to south with an average elevation of 60m AOD. There are a number of PRow's crossing the site and a bridleway running along the access track bordering the site to the south</p>
<b>Existing urban edge</b>	The site is situated to the west of South Stainley with a number of residential properties bordering the site to the south
<b>Trees and hedges</b>	Hedgerow with hedgerow trees along all site boundaries
<b>Landscape and Green Belt designations</b>	SG3 Settlement Growth: Conservation of the Countryside including Green Belt R11: Rights of Way
<b>Description of proposal for the site</b>	Residential site (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
<b>Physical Sensitivity</b>	The landscape is considered to be of medium value. Susceptibility to change is also considered to be medium with large scale farm buildings and traffic noise from the A61 a key detractor in the landscape
<b>Visual Sensitivity</b>	The site is visible from Church Lane in the village and from the PRow's within and adjoining the site. Wider views are more limited due to intervening topography, vegetation and built form
<b>Anticipated landscape effects</b>	Loss of part of a pastoral field and expansion of development into the open countryside.
<b>Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement</b>	There would be potential to mitigate adverse effects of development by incorporating mitigation planting
<b>Likely level of landscape effects</b>	Medium adverse effects but effects could be reduced with appropriate landscape mitigation
<b>Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits</b>	None

#### 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/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

<b>Summary conclusion</b>	<p>Site is of medium sensitivity with some existing reference to the type of development being proposed.</p> <p>The development would extend built form into open countryside.</p> <p>Appropriate layout and mitigation could reduce impacts</p>
---------------------------	--

**Settlement: South Stainley****Site: SS1 (Land to the east of the A61, South Stainley)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

<b>Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	Manor Farm house (GIILB); Church (GIILB)
<b>Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	Cluster of built form development around the church, Church Farm and Manor Farm, linear residential development flanks the north side of Church Lane along much of its length. Brooklands Farm to the south. Meadow View cottage and School House to the south and the Old Village Institute further along the access track to the south. Public house at entrance to the village at the junction between Church Lane and Ripon Road (A61)
<b>Commentary on heritage assets.</b>	Setting of Manor Farm house (GIILB) to the east of the site. Setting of the church (GIILB) further east of the site.
<b>Topography and views</b>	Fairly enclosed site but views to the east of semi's in Church Lane and agricultural sheds and traditional stone built farm buildings behind associated with Manor Farm. Rising land to the south.
<b>Landscape context</b>	Open countryside peppered with woodland clumps and mature tree belts. Footpaths criss-cross the landscape within the vicinity of the site. Railway embankment to the south. Stainley Gill to the east.
<b>Grain of surrounding development</b>	Cluster of built form development around the church, Church Farm and Manor Farm, linear residential development flanks the north side of Church Lane along much of its length. Brooklands Farm to the south. Meadow View cottage and School House to the south and the Old Village Institute further along the access track to the south. Public house at entrance to the village at the junction between Church Lane and Ripon Road (A61). Individual country houses and associated ancillary buildings and curtilage- such as Cayton Hall (GIILB) to the west- characterise the landscape between Ripon and Harrogate.
<b>Local building design</b>	1930's semi's flanking the north side of Church Lane for much of its length to the north, red brick and render. Traditional stone built farm buildings, some of which have been converted to residential use. Modern agricultural sheds. 19th century brick built or stone and pantile or blue slate cottages. Heterogeneity in style and palette of materials.
<b>Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.</b>	Grassed field/paddock. Field gate entrance in the south-west corner of the site. Ripon Road (A61) borders the site to the west and despite the outgrown hedge and hedgerow trees along the western boundary, the audible road noise is a detractor. Disused railway line to the south and west, embankment remains. Site enclosed by hedgerow.

**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

<b>Summary conclusion</b>	Impact on setting of designated heritage assets and established form and character of the settlement. The site is fairly enclosed and subject to appropriate density, layout and design, the impact could be mitigated.
---------------------------	---

**Settlement: South Stainley****Site: SS1 (Land to the east of the A61, South Stainley)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

<b>SACs/SPAs</b>	None likely to be impacted
<b>Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)</b>	None likely to be impacted
<b>SSSI Risk Zone</b>	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs
<b>Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)</b>	None likely to be impacted
<b>BAP Priority Habitats</b>	Hedgerows
<b>Phase 1 Survey Target Notes</b>	None
<b>Sward</b>	Improved pasture P1HS 1992, Unimproved grassland occurs on the adjacent railway embankment.
<b>Trees and Hedges</b>	Good hedgerows with a number of mature trees bound the site
<b>Presence of Trees that Merit TPO</b>	Mature boundary trees are likely to merit TPO protection
<b>Water/Wetland</b>	A stream, which drains into Stainley Beck, forms the eastern boundary
<b>Slope and Aspect</b>	Generally flat
<b>Buildings and Structures</b>	None on site
<b>Natural Area</b>	NCA 30 Southern Magnesian Limestone
<b>Environmental Opportunity</b>	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.
<b>LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)</b>	LCA 49 Stainley Beck Corridor "Promote woodland management and appropriate tree-planting in partnership with the Forestry Commission". "Promote the maintenance of parkland areas and encourage replacement tree-planting to maintain parkland characteristics"
<b>Connectivity/Corridors</b>	The network of small fields with hedgrows and trees form a valuable corridor between the A61 and Stainley Beck
<b>GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)</b>	Retain and enhance the boundary trees and hedgerows, buffer the stream-side with semi-natural habitats
<b>Protected Species</b>	Nesting birds and bats are likely to utilise the boundary trees and hedgerows.
<b>BAP Priority Species</b>	Not known
<b>Invasive Species</b>	Himalayan balsam may occur along the stream, giant hogweed occurs along Stainley Beck
<b>Notes</b>	

**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.	<b>Yellow</b>
<b>Summary conclusion</b>	Retain trees and hedgerows; buffer the beck. Enhancement should include wildflower restoration to complement unimproved grassland which grows on adjacent railway cutting either side of A61

**Land Drainage Site Assessment**

**Land drainage: summary of issues.**

According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the majority of the proposed site is located within flood zone 1. However, a section of the site towards the south eastern boundary is located in flood zones 2. We have received past flooding complaints with regards to Markington Beck affecting the southern end of the site. I recommend that the lower end of the site remains undeveloped

We are 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 Environment Agency is responsible for administering matters attaining to Main River. Markington Beck has been re-classified from Ordinary Watercourse to Main River due to past flooding issues. Consequently, the Agency should be consulted regarding any proposals to develop this site.

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)

**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: Spofforth

### Site: SP2 (Land to the rear of East Park Road, Spofforth)

#### Natural and Built Heritage Assessments

Type: Landscape

#### Landscape Site Assessments

<b>Location/HBC Landscape Character Area</b>	Site is situated to the rear of East Park Road Spofforth LCA57: Crimple and Park Beck Corridor
<b>Landscape description</b>	Area description: The wider landscape is a shallow valley through which the Crimple Beck flows south east away from the urban edge of Harrogate. The settlement of Spofforth occupies the low ridge between Park Beck and Crimple Beck. Woodland cover is sparse except for occasional trees along field boundaries and where associated with Crimple Beck. The valley is relatively broad and partially enclosed and there are views across it from the east and, to a lesser extent, the west. Site description: The site is an area of unmanaged grassland situated to the rear of dwellings along East Park Road. The north west and northern site boundaries are defined by mature trees and areas of scrub regeneration. A Local Nature Reserve and play area adjoin the site's south east boundary with arable land to the north and pasture to the north west together with rear garden areas to the south and south west.
<b>Existing urban edge</b>	Site projects out from the settlement edge in a northeasterly direction
<b>Trees and hedges</b>	Mature treed boundaries to the north and north west with area of scrub regeneration within the site.
<b>Landscape and Green Belt designations</b>	SG3: Settlement Growth: Conservation of the Countryside, including Green Belt
<b>Description of proposal for the site</b>	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
<b>Physical Sensitivity</b>	Landscape susceptible to harm as a result of built development in open countryside.
<b>Visual Sensitivity</b>	Site is visible from A661 approach road to the village from the north. Trees along field boundaries and Crimple Beck would help to screen some views particularly in summer
<b>Anticipated landscape effects</b>	Loss of small area of pasture and introduction of housing development extending into open countryside.
<b>Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement</b>	Mitigation planting would help to integrate new development into adjoining settlement. However, the uncharacteristic nature of the proposal could not be fully mitigated.
<b>Likely level of landscape effects</b>	Large scale adverse due to the introduction of uncharacteristic development projecting out into open countryside
<b>Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits</b>	SP5 to the north adjoining the site is extensive, the adverse cumulative effects could therefore 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: 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

<b>Summary conclusion</b>	Small scale pastoral and arable landscape surrounding the settlement susceptible to introduction of uncharacteristic development into open countryside No capacity to accept development proposed without substantial harm to landscape character.
---------------------------	---



**Settlement: Spofforth****Site: SP2 (Land to the rear of East Park Road, Spofforth)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

<b>Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	Spofforth Conservation Area. Chantry House and Massey Garth (grade II listed). All Saints Church (grade II* listed). The Old Rectory (grade II listed).
<b>Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	Traditional buildings located along the High Street.
<b>Commentary on heritage assets.</b>	The site is located adjacent to, but outside of the edge of the Spofforth Conservation Area. It is therefore located within its setting. It can also be said to be within the wider setting of listed buildings located further to the north (Chantry House and Massey Garth located at a lower level to the south of the main road and the church and Old Rectory set higher, on the north side of the road). There are a few traditional buildings located along the High Street that are marked as 'buildings of local interest' within the conservation area appraisal – the site may be seen in the context of the rear of these building so there will be a slight impact on their setting.
<b>Topography and views</b>	Relatively level site but lies at a lower level to East Park Road. Views of the church / buildings to the south of the A661 possible across the meadows when looking from the parking area by the play park. Consequently, views of the site possible when looking from the A661.
<b>Landscape context</b>	Meadow land / flood plain area to the west of Crimple Beck, on village edge.
<b>Grain of surrounding development</b>	20th century housing along East Park Road which breaks from the historic broadly linear pattern of development along High Street.
<b>Local building design</b>	Buildings are built typically of Spofforth stone (pinkish sandstone). Traditional roofing materials are sandstone flags or clay pantiles, usually with a stone ridge. The majority of dwellings are fairly small with relatively narrow gable spans, with gabled roofs. Single storey outbuildings and a variety of farm buildings present also.
<b>Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.</b>	The site is an area of un-managed grassland located to the rear of the dwellings on the north edge of East Park Road. Trees and hedgerows border it. A play park is located to east of the site. Nature reserve also to the east. The site is included as part of both SP5 and SP6 also. Access would presumably be via the access to the play park, off East Park Road, as recent planning applications have indicated.

**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 part of the meadowland area on the east side of Spofforth which forms an important part of the rural landscape setting of the village and the conservation area. Development would be contrary to existing grain (breaking out uncharacteristically into the meadow land and also being contrary to the broadly linear form of development) and also harm that rural setting, which makes a highly positive contribution the character and setting of the conservation area and also the wider setting of the designated and non-designated heritage assets present.

**Settlement: Spofforth****Site: SP2 (Land to the rear of East Park Road, Spofforth)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

<b>SACs/SPAs</b>	None likely to be impacted.
<b>Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)</b>	None likely to be impacted.
<b>SSSI Risk Zone</b>	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs.
<b>Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)</b>	None likely to be impacted.
<b>BAP Priority Habitats</b>	Hedgerows.
<b>Phase 1 Survey Target Notes</b>	None but see Smeeden Formen Ecology Report 2014.
<b>Sward</b>	Species poor semi-improved grassland and tall ruderal vegetation.
<b>Trees and Hedges</b>	Hedgerow to northern boundary and scattered scrub.
<b>Presence of Trees that Merit TPO</b>	None.
<b>Water/Wetland</b>	A wet ditch runs along northern boundary.
<b>Slope and Aspect</b>	Generally flat.
<b>Buildings and Structures</b>	None on site.
<b>Natural Area</b>	NCA30 Southern Magnesian Limestone.
<b>Environmental Opportunity</b>	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.
<b>LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)</b>	LCA 57: Crimble and Park Beck Corridor <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Encourage woodland management and new planting, connecting isolated clumps of trees to create and enhance wildlife corridors”.</li> <li>• “Encourage reinstatement of riverside meadows along the valley floor to create buffer zone...”</li> </ul>
<b>Connectivity/Corridors</b>	River Crimble (Strategic Green Infrastructure Corridor of District Importance) Connects with adjacent informal nature reserve at Ginny Green Fields.
<b>GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)</b>	Significant habitat buffer of the adjacent nature reserve and enhancement of the corridor of the River Crimble possibly in association with Suds.
<b>Protected Species</b>	Nesting birds and foraging bats may utilise hedges and scrub.
<b>BAP Priority Species</b>	Toads occur in nearby pond.
<b>Invasive Species</b>	Himalayan Balsam likely to occur along Crimble.
<b>Notes</b>	See 15/04477/OUT (refused) but not on ecological grounds.

**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.	<b>Red</b>
<b>Summary conclusion</b>	This is a sensitive site adjacent to an informal local nature reserve and play area. However, it may be possible to develop part of the site while enhancing the biodiversity of the locality through the creation of generous green infrastructure in association with a Suds scheme. This would impact on the overall housing density achievable on the site so the site is scored 'red' on that basis.



**Settlement: Spofforth****Site: SP2 (Land to the rear of East Park Road, Spofforth)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Land Drainage****Land Drainage Site Assessment****Land drainage: summary of issues.**

This site is situated in a drainage area administered by the Swale & Ure Internal Drainage Board. Consequently the drainage board should be consulted regarding any proposals to develop 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: Spofforth

### Site: SP3 (Land south of Park Lane, Spofforth)

#### Natural and Built Heritage Assessments

Type: Landscape

#### Landscape Site Assessments

<b>Location/HBC Landscape Character Area</b>	Site located on the south side of Spofforth west of the A661. LCA57: Crimple and Park Beck Corridor.
<b>Landscape description</b>	Area description: The wider landscape is a shallow valley through which the Crimple Beck flows south east away from the urban edge of Harrogate. The settlement of Spofforth occupies the low ridge between Park Beck and Crimple Beck. Woodland cover is sparse except for occasional trees along field boundaries and where associated with Crimple Beck. The valley is relatively broad and partially enclosed and there are views across it from the east and, to a lesser extent, the west. Site description: Grass field at the back of housing. A modern development extends into the site along the east boundary.
<b>Existing urban edge</b>	Site surrounds existing development on Park Row to the east and is detached from the main village by Park Lane.
<b>Trees and hedges</b>	Hedgerow boundaries to south and west.
<b>Landscape and Green Belt designations</b>	Green belt Open countryside Public Right of Way
<b>Description of proposal for the site</b>	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
<b>Physical Sensitivity</b>	Landscape susceptible to harm as a result of built development in open countryside of the green belt and impact on the setting of the village
<b>Visual Sensitivity</b>	Site visible on the approach to the village from the south and would represent a significant extension to built form when viewed from the south.
<b>Anticipated landscape effects</b>	Loss of field on the edge of settlement
<b>Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement</b>	Retention and strengthening boundary hedgerows is essential and sufficient space required for tree planting. However site protrudes into countryside and loss of openness cannot be mitigated.
<b>Likely level of landscape effects</b>	Medium to large scale adverse due to the loss of open countryside and visual prominence of the site.
<b>Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits</b>	

#### 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

<b>Summary conclusion</b>	The capacity of the landscape is medium to low due to the location of the site in open countryside, in greenbelt on the village edge.
---------------------------	---

**Settlement: Spofforth****Site: SP3 (Land south of Park Lane, Spofforth)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

<b>Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	Spofforth Conservation Area.
<b>Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	The Railway Inn. Park House.
<b>Commentary on heritage assets.</b>	The site is located outside, but within the setting of, Spofforth Conservation Area, the southern boundary of it being located just to the north of this site. The Railway Inn and Park House are located on the other side of the A661 but as there is no direct visual link to the site, impact on their setting is very limited.
<b>Topography and views</b>	The site is at a higher level than Park Lane and appears to be of undulating level across the site. Views along Park Lane with the verge and treed boundary in context, looking out to the countryside to the west. Views looking into the site at the access point, though high level of land restricts views. Access gated off as 'private land.' View over site at end of Park Mount. Site visible from approach to the village from the south, visible in context of surrounding countryside, also from glimpse views between gaps in dwelling fronting the A661.
<b>Landscape context</b>	Countryside / farmland on the south western edge of the village. Green Belt.
<b>Grain of surrounding development</b>	The site is located outside of the developed edge of the village, within an area of countryside comprising fields. 20th century residential development present ,adjoining the site on its eastern edge.
<b>Local building design</b>	Buildings are built typically of Spofforth stone (pinkish sandstone). Traditional roofing materials are sandstone flags or clay pantiles, usually with a stone ridge. The majority of dwellings are fairly small with relatively narrow gable spans, with gabled roofs. Single storey outbuildings and a variety of farm buildings present also.
<b>Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.</b>	The site is a grassed field. An access track runs south through the field. Although not in the conservation area, the appraisal maps mark the Park Lane, east and west edges of the site with a 'significant field boundary.' 20th century residential development present, adjoining the site on its eastern edge (the village railway station was previously located adjacent to the north east corner of the site). That to the roadside is a very wide grass verge with trees on edge of site, which is set at a much higher level than the road. Small scale commercial / industrial buildings are located adjacent to the site on the north western corner (possible current use as a blacksmiths) – site of a former quarry (and generally, several quarries formerly in this area – which may have resulted in the undulating landform). Small building (possibly a stable) is located at the south east of the site - possible use of land for grazing. High point of the site marked as 'Furmard Hill' on maps.

**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 forms part of the rural edge to village - development would encroach into that edge. The village is broadly linear and this would create further development to the rear of that lining the A661 in a manner that would be contrary to existing grain. The nature of the site, in terms of form and topography, is very likely to be highly constraining to achieving development that is not harmful.

**Settlement: Spofforth****Site: SP3 (Land south of Park Lane, Spofforth)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

<b>SACs/SPAs</b>	None likely to be impacted.
<b>Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)</b>	None likely to be impacted.
<b>SSSI Risk Zone</b>	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs.
<b>Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)</b>	None likely to be impacted.
<b>BAP Priority Habitats</b>	Hedgerows.
<b>Phase 1 Survey Target Notes</b>	None.
<b>Sward</b>	Furmard Hill Semi-improved grassland (mostly species-poor small area spp-rich around the forge); improved pasture to south.
<b>Trees and Hedges</b>	Strong treed hedgerow along Park Lane; hedgerows also form other external site boundaries.
<b>Presence of Trees that Merit TPO</b>	Boundary trees may merit TPO protection.
<b>Water/Wetland</b>	None on site.
<b>Slope and Aspect</b>	The land rises to Furnard Hill in the north of the site.
<b>Buildings and Structures</b>	Some small sheds in the south east corner of the site.
<b>Natural Area</b>	NCA30 Southern Magnesian Limestone.
<b>Environmental Opportunity</b>	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.
<b>LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)</b>	LCA 57: Crimple and Park Beck Corridor <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Encourage woodland management and new planting, connecting isolated clumps of trees to create and enhance wildlife corridors”.</li> <li>• “Encourage reinstatement of riverside meadows along the valley floor to create buffer zone...”</li> </ul>
<b>Connectivity/Corridors</b>	Fields form part of displaced link connecting corridor of disused railway from SE to NW of the village.
<b>GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)</b>	Potential to restore hedgerows and species-rich grassland.
<b>Protected Species</b>	Nesting birds and foraging bats likely to utilise hedgerows on site.
<b>BAP Priority Species</b>	Not known.
<b>Invasive Species</b>	None known.
<b>Notes</b>	

**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
<b>Summary conclusion</b>	There may be an opportunity to restore species-rich grassland around Furmand Hill in association with development to south and to reinforce boundary hedgerows with new native planting.

**Settlement: Spofforth****Site: SP3 (Land south of Park Lane, Spofforth)****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 including Toad Hole Beck, which is under the board's direct control. Consequently, the drainage board should be consulted regarding any proposals to develop 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: Spofforth

### Site: SP4 (Land at Castle Farm, Spofforth)

#### Natural and Built Heritage Assessments

#### Type: Landscape

#### Landscape Site Assessments

<b>Location/HBC Landscape Character Area</b>	Land at Castle Farm Spofforth LCA57: Crimple and Park Beck Corridor
<b>Landscape description</b>	Area description: The wider landscape is a shallow valley through which the Crimple Beck flows south east away from the urban edge of Harrogate. The settlement of Spofforth occupies the low ridge between Park Beck and Crimple Beck. Woodland cover is sparse except for occasional trees along field boundaries and where associated with Crimple Beck. The valley is relatively broad and partially enclosed and there are views across it from the east and to a lesser extent, the west. Site description: The site is a former farmstead and contains a mixture of historic buildings and garden areas sub-divided by stone walls. The site lies within Spofforth CA and is very much urban in context. A former railway line embankment forms the site's south western boundary which is heavily treed, covered by a TPO. There are also a number of mature trees in garden areas within the site. A PRoW runs along the site's northern boundary
<b>Existing urban edge</b>	Site is an integral part of the urban fabric of the settlement
<b>Trees and hedges</b>	Several mature trees within the site and TPO'd trees on the disused railway embankment forming the southwest boundary of the site
<b>Landscape and Green Belt designations</b>	SG3:Settlement Growth: Conservation of the Countryside, including Green Belt HD3: Control of Development in Conservation Areas
<b>Description of proposal for the site</b>	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
<b>Physical Sensitivity</b>	Site consists of an intimate mix of built form and open spaces within an urban setting and has a low susceptibility to change in landscape terms as there are extensive references within the site to the type of development proposed.
<b>Visual Sensitivity</b>	Glimpsed views from surrounding areas of the settlement are possible. Views are however close distance and do not impact on the wider landscape
<b>Anticipated landscape effects</b>	Negligible landscape effects anticipated
<b>Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement</b>	Mitigation planting and enhancement of footpath route along the site's northern boundary
<b>Likely level of landscape effects</b>	Small scale adverse effects
<b>Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits</b>	

#### Conclusion

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

Rationale	Rating
Sensitivity Rating: Low – key distinctive characteristics are robust; typically a low valued landscape where landscape condition may be poor with few notable components that contribute to the character of the area. There may be existing reference or context to the type of development being proposed resulting in a lower susceptibility to change.	Dark Green
Capacity Rating: High – the area is able to accommodate the type and scale of development proposed without detriment to landscape character and visual amenity taking into account the opportunities for appropriate mitigation and enhancement.	Dark 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** Negligible impact on open countryside to the south west. Essential to retain existing trees on site and to provide additional tree planting.



**Settlement: Spofforth****Site: SP4 (Land at Castle Farm, Spofforth)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

<b>Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	Spofforth Conservation Area. Castle Farmhouse (grade II listed). Possible curtilage listed outbuildings to the rear of Castle Farmhouse. 26 and 28 High Street (grade II listed).
<b>Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	Beren Lodge and other farm buildings associated with it. Also, numerous other traditional buildings in the vicinity of the site (e.g. The Castle Inn). Railway bridge located adjacent to the south west edge of the site.
<b>Commentary on heritage assets.</b>	The site is located within the Spofforth Conservation Area. Where the site adjoins High Street, the grade II listed Castle Farmhouse (no. 33 High Street) is located, which was formerly two houses but is now a single property (possibly a timber framed house with later stone facing). Possible curtilage listed outbuildings to the rear of no. 33 – redundant farm buildings associated with the former farm. If they are not curtilage listed, they will be considered to be non-designated heritage assets. 26 and 28 High Street, grade II listed, are located on the other side of the road to no. 33 (therefore possible impact on setting). Non-designated heritage assets are located within the site - Beren Lodge and other farm buildings associated with it. Also, numerous other traditional buildings in the vicinity of the site (e.g. The Castle Inn and the railway bridge located adjacent to the south west edge of the site), the setting of which may be affected by development.
<b>Topography and views</b>	Relatively level site with embankment of railway line rising at the south west edge of the site. Views possible of the existing buildings when looking south west through the gaps in the buildings facing onto High Street. Views possible across the site. View looking south west towards the railway bridge with countryside beyond. At some points, views possible looking back up to the church.
<b>Landscape context</b>	The semi-rural settlement of Spofforth occupies a shallow valley landform, the low ridge between Park Beck and Crimble Beck.
<b>Grain of surrounding development</b>	The site is located within, but on the edge of, the residential context of the village, which largely follows a linear form but with some development added to the rear of frontage buildings. The site is within the historic core of the village with additional 20th century residential development in the vicinity.
<b>Local building design</b>	Buildings are built typically of Spofforth stone (pinkish sandstone). Traditional roofing materials are sandstone flags or clay pantiles, usually with a stone ridge. The majority of dwellings are fairly small with relatively narrow gable spans, with gabled roofs. Single storey outbuildings and a variety of farm buildings present also.
<b>Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.</b>	The site is a former farmstead - perhaps two farmsteads (the relationship between the various buildings is unclear but old maps indicate access between the buildings). A listed, former farmhouse fronts High Street with former out / farm buildings to the rear. Access to the side of the farmhouse leads to these buildings. Land to the south west corner is a paddock with stone wall boundaries. The land wraps around the south west boundary of the Castle Inn (access possible via the Castle Inn). To the south east of the site is 'Beren Lodge,' an attractive 2 storey stone built former dwelling with decorative bargeboards on both gable ends, now thought to be used for agricultural purposes (old maps indicate it dates from end of the 19th century / beginning of the 20th century). Other old farm buildings present to the north of Beren Lodge. Access also possible from the entrance located between 19 and 21 High Street. The well treed, former railway line embankment and a bridge is located along the south west edge of the site. Trees possibly extending into site on that edge (marked as landmark trees in the conservation area appraisal); mature trees present in north west corner of site.

**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
<b>Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?</b>	
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
<b>Summary conclusion</b>	Development of the site in order to save the historic buildings from loss due to future dereliction should be encouraged. The buildings, whether curtilage listed or non-designated heritage assets, should be retained and converted and any additional development kept to a minimum / be designed so as to protect and enhance the setting of the designated and non-designated heritage assets present (i.e. former farm context within the conservation area) / be of high quality, locally distinctive design. Development that involved the unjustified demolition of heritage assets and / or comprised standard forms of dwelling types / layouts / densities would be harmful to significance and character. Access arrangements could be problematic, with existing access to side of existing dwellings.

**Settlement: Spofforth****Site: SP4 (Land at Castle Farm, Spofforth)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

<b>SACs/SPAs</b>	None likely to be impacted.
<b>Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)</b>	None likely to be impacted.
<b>SSSI Risk Zone</b>	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs.
<b>Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)</b>	None likely to be impacted.
<b>BAP Priority Habitats</b>	None.
<b>Phase 1 Survey Target Notes</b>	None.
<b>Sward</b>	Improved grassland around farm.
<b>Trees and Hedges</b>	There is a significant mature sycamore in NW corner of site and several large mature trees at the northern part of the sit and a small orchard.
<b>Presence of Trees that Merit TPO</b>	Mature trees likely to benefit from protection of a TPO.
<b>Water/Wetland</b>	None.
<b>Slope and Aspect</b>	Generally flat.
<b>Buildings and Structures</b>	The site includes 2 storey Castle Farmhouse, built of coursed gritstone with pantile roof plus various vernacular stone built barns, stables, cowsheds and outbuildings. Most of the buildings are stone built with slate roofs and in poor condition. There are stone boundary walls. The footpath leads under an arch under the adjacent railway embankment to the rear.
<b>Natural Area</b>	NCA 30 Southern Magnesian Limestone.
<b>Environmental Opportunity</b>	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.
<b>LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)</b>	LCA 57: Crimple and Park Beck Corridor <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Encourage woodland management and new planting, connecting isolated clumps of trees to create and enhance wildlife corridors”.</li> <li>• “Encourage reinstatement of riverside meadows along the valley floor to create buffer zone...”</li> </ul>
<b>Connectivity/Corridors</b>	The disused railway forms a tree-lined corridor north-west of the village. It is largely lost within the village but forms the Harland Way to Wetherby to the SE. This section is managed as a cycleway and for wildlife.
<b>GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)</b>	Connectivity along disused railway through the village could be enhanced.
<b>Protected Species</b>	The farm buildings are likely to support nesting birds and/or roosting bats (building by High Street). A number of small trees and shrubs in site may also support nesting birds and mature trees may also support roosting bats.
<b>BAP Priority Species</b>	None known.
<b>Invasive Species</b>	None known.
<b>Notes</b>	RL2043 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 buildings and mature trees may support bats and nesting birds which should be surveyed for prior to redevelopment. The disused railway line forms a key corridor which should be protected and enhanced where possible. Significant trees (potentially including orchard trees) on site should be protected and retained.

**Settlement: Spofforth****Site: SP4 (Land at Castle Farm, Spofforth)****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 including Toad Hole Beck, which is under the board's direct control. Consequently, the drainage board should be consulted regarding any proposals to develop 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: Spofforth

### Site: SP5 (Land at Massey Garth, Spofforth)

#### Natural and Built Heritage Assessments

#### Type: Landscape

#### Landscape Site Assessments

<b>Location/HBC Landscape Character Area</b>	Land at Massey Garth Spofforth LCA57: Crimple and Park Beck Corridor
<b>Landscape description</b>	Area description: The wider landscape is a shallow valley through which the Crimple Beck flows south east away from the urban edge of Harrogate. The settlement of Spofforth occupies the low ridge between Park Beck and Crimple Beck. Woodland cover is sparse except for occasional trees along field boundaries and where associated with Crimple Beck. The valley is relatively broad and partially enclosed and there are views across it from the east and, to a lesser extent, the west. Site description: The site consists of several small areas of pasture and one large arable field to the south of Harrogate Road and east of Spofforth High Street . There are several mature hedgerows with hedgerow trees sub-dividing and defining the pattern of fields. the northern edge of the site lies within the Spofforth Conservation Area. The CAA appraisal shows an important view across the site with two areas of the site adjacent to Harrogate Road noted as being important open spaces. The Crimple Beck forms the site's eastern bounday alongside of which is routed a PRow
<b>Existing urban edge</b>	Site projects development out from the settlement edge in a north easterly direction
<b>Trees and hedges</b>	Mature hedgerow and treed field boundaries subdivide the site. The banks of the Crimple Beck are also heavily treed.
<b>Landscape and Green Belt designations</b>	SG3: Settlement Growth: Conservaton of the Countryside including Green Belt HD3: Control of Development in Conservation Areas
<b>Description of proposal for the site</b>	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
<b>Physical Sensitivity</b>	Landscape susceptible to harm as a result of built development in open countryside and impact on the setting of the village
<b>Visual Sensitivity</b>	The site is highly visibe from the A661 Harrogate Road approaching the settlerment and PRow alongside Crimple Beck to the east. Trees along field boundaries and beck help to filter some views of the site.
<b>Anticipated landscape effects</b>	Loss of pasture and arable land and introduction of modern housing development into open countryside, loss of two important open spaces identified in the CAA and harm to the rural setting of the village .
<b>Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement</b>	Mitigation planting would help to integrate new development. into adjoining settlement. The uncharacterisitic nature of the proposal however could not be adequately mitigated.
<b>Likely level of landscape effects</b>	Large scale adverse effects due to the introduction of uncharacterisitic development projecting out into open countryside
<b>Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits</b>	SP2 to the south, adjoining the site is likley to contribute to adverse 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: 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

<b>Summary conclusion</b>	Small scale pastoral and arable landscape surrounding the settlement susceptible to introdroduction of development into open countryside.No capacity to accept development proposed without significant harm to landscape character.
---------------------------	--

## Settlement: Spofforth

### Site: SP5 (Land at Massey Garth, Spofforth)

#### Natural and Built Heritage Assessments

#### Type: Conservation and Design

#### Conservation and Design Site Assessment

<b>Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	Spofforth Conservation Area. Chantry House and Massey Garth (grade II listed). All Saints Church (grade II* listed). The Old Rectory (grade II listed).
<b>Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	Generally, traditional buildings located along the High Street.
<b>Commentary on heritage assets.</b>	The site is located partially within and partially outside of the Spofforth Conservation Area. It is also located adjacent to the grade II listed buildings of Chantry House and Massey Garth. It is within the setting of other heritage assets – generally, most that are located on the east side of High Street and the north side of Harrogate Road, including the grade II* listed church and grade II listed The Old Rectory.
<b>Topography and views</b>	Key views are marked on the conservation area appraisal analysis maps, looking from the A661 which runs east-west (to the north of Chantry House / Massey Garth) over the site. The appraisal states: 'The village is surrounded by a green envelope of open fields, which are important to its setting and rural character. The capacity of this settlement, which is surrounded by floodplain, to absorb new development is limited if the rural pastoral landscape is to be retained and not lost.' Views also looking into the site from High Street, between gaps in buildings, e.g. via the access track. Views of the site from the area of the play park (to the rear of East Park Road) looking towards the church / Chantry House / Massey Garth and other buildings in that location.
<b>Landscape context</b>	Undeveloped meadow land / flood plain area to the west of Crimple Beck, on village edge.
<b>Grain of surrounding development</b>	To the north and west edge of the site is an historic, broadly linear pattern of development along the A661 / High Street. Numerous traditional buildings present. Further to the south, 20th century development of East Park Road which breaks out from the linear form.
<b>Local building design</b>	Buildings are built typically of Spofforth stone (pinkish sandstone). Traditional roofing materials are sandstone flags or clay pantiles, usually with a stone ridge. The majority of dwellings are fairly small with relatively narrow gable spans, with gabled roofs. Single storey outbuildings and a variety of farm buildings present also.
<b>Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.</b>	<p>The site is generally formed of fields / meadow land adjacent to Crimple Beck and extending westwards to the east edge of the village. On the northern corner, the site extends up to the A661 and to the side of Massey Fold. This part of the site is marked as 'important open space' within the conservation area appraisal maps. A small part of the site extends to the A661 / the side of Chantry House and Massey Garth. The conservation area appraisal states that 'the small field to the south west of Massey Garth, distinguishes the church and its setting from the more intensively built up parts of the village.' This area is also marked as 'important open space' within the conservation area appraisal maps. Stone walls to the A661 are marked as important boundaries. Hedgerow boundaries within the site are marked as 'significant field boundaries' also. Mature trees present on or near field boundaries.</p> <p>The site has a potential access to the side of what may be named as Low Lane Farm. Redundant farm buildings are present on the land to the side of the access (not part of the site) – this area is shown as area for enhancement within the Spofforth conservation area appraisal. The group of buildings makes a positive contribution to the conservation area. This site includes the land of site SP2 on the south end of the site, in the location of a play park and nature reserve.</p>

#### 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 result in harm to elements which contribute to the significance of a heritage asset and the harm is not capable of mitigation.		Red
<b>Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?</b>		
Rationale		Rating
The nature of the site means that built development will have a negative impact on local distinctiveness.		Red
<b>Summary conclusion</b>	The site forms an important part of the rural landscape setting of the village and the conservation area. Development would be contrary to existing grain and also harm that rural setting, which makes a highly positive contribution the character and setting of the conservation area and also the setting of the designated and non-designated heritage assets present. It affects land that is marked as important open space in the conservation area appraisal.	

**Settlement: Spofforth****Site: SP5 (Land at Massey Garth, Spofforth)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

<b>SACs/SPAs</b>	None likely to be impacted.
<b>Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)</b>	None likely to be impacted.
<b>SSSI Risk Zone</b>	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs.
<b>Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)</b>	None likely to be impacted.
<b>BAP Priority Habitats</b>	Rivers and streams (Flowing Waterr), pond, hedgerows.
<b>Phase 1 Survey Target Notes</b>	None.
<b>Sward</b>	Improved grassland and arable (riverside) P1HS 2010.
<b>Trees and Hedges</b>	There are several mature trees that provide a park-like character to the field in NE, other trees in south east and riverside trees and shrubs.
<b>Presence of Trees that Merit TPO</b>	Mature trees likely to benefit from TPO protection.
<b>Water/Wetland</b>	Small pond within site, River Crimple forms eastern site boundary.
<b>Slope and Aspect</b>	Generally flat .
<b>Buildings and Structures</b>	An old stone wall encloses 3 sides on the north and western boundaries and post and rail fence on S boundary. Site includes a modern stone bungalow.
<b>Natural Area</b>	NCA30 Southern Magnesian Limestone.
<b>Environmental Opportunity</b>	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.
<b>LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)</b>	LCA 57: Crimple and Park Beck Corridor <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Encourage woodland management and new planting, connecting isolated clumps of trees to create and enhance wildlife corridors”.</li> <li>• “Encourage reinstatement of riverside meadows along the valley floor to create buffer zone...”</li> </ul>
<b>Connectivity/Corridors</b>	River Crimple (Strategic Green Infrastructure Corridor of District Importance) Connects with informal nature reserve at Ginny Green Fields
<b>GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)</b>	Limited development may be acceptable in return for a habitat significant buffer and enhancement of the corridor of the River Crimple.
<b>Protected Species</b>	Nesting birds and bats may utilise the bridge under A661, mature trees, or buildings for roosting. Birds may also utilise these feature plus hedges and riverbank for nesting. The pond may support great crested newts (although it may hold ornamental fish). River Crimple likely to support otter and kingfisher, may support water vole, white clawed crayfish.
<b>BAP Priority Species</b>	Crimple may support priority species of fish; possible birds of arable farmland.
<b>Invasive Species</b>	Himalayan Balsam likely to occur along Crimple.
<b>Notes</b>	RL68 2010 (only small part in NE of current larger site) - 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
Significant adverse effects on designated sites (Local Site, SSSI, LNR), the wider ecological network and/or priority habitats and species.	Red

**Summary conclusion**

Development of such a large site along the river would have an adverse impact on the sensitive biodiversity of the river corridor unless a substantial buffer of enhanced habitat were provided as a contribution to generous on-site green infrastructure, potentially also utilising Suds. Support would not be possible for any development closer to the river than the Bungalow at Massey Fold. This may however impact on the overall housing density which could be achieved across the site. Existing mature trees and hedgerows would also need to be given adequate space within any scheme.

**Settlement: Spofforth****Site: SP5 (Land at Massey Garth, Spofforth)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Land Drainage****Land Drainage Site Assessment****Land drainage: summary of issues.**

This site is situated in a drainage area administered by the Swale & Ure Internal Drainage Board. Consequently, the drainage board should be consulted regarding any proposals to develop 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: Spofforth****Site: SP6 (Land at Massey Fold, Spofforth)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

<b>Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	Spofforth Conservation Area. Chantry House and Massey Garth (grade II listed). All Saints Church (grade II* listed). The Old Rectory (grade II listed).
<b>Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	Generally, traditional buildings located along the High Street.
<b>Commentary on heritage assets.</b>	The site is located partially within and partially outside of the Spofforth Conservation Area. It is also located adjacent to the grade II listed buildings of Chantry House and Massey Garth. It is within the setting of other heritage assets – generally, most that are located on the east side of High Street and the north side of Harrogate Road, including the grade II* listed church and grade II listed The Old Rectory.
<b>Topography and views</b>	Three key views are marked on the conservation area appraisal analysis maps, looking from the A661, for example, over the land to the side of Chantry House / Massey Garth towards the site. The appraisal states: 'The village is surrounded by a green envelope of open fields, which are important to its setting and rural character. The capacity of this settlement, which is surrounded by floodplain, to absorb new development is limited if the rural pastoral landscape is to be retained and not lost.' Views also when looking into the site from High Street, between gaps in buildings, e.g. via the access track. Views also of the site from the area of the play park (to the rear of East Park Road) looking towards the church / Chantry House / Massey Garth and other buildings in that location.
<b>Landscape context</b>	Undeveloped meadow land / flood plain area to the west of Crimple Beck, on village edge.
<b>Grain of surrounding development</b>	To the north and west edge of the site is an historic, broadly linear pattern of development along the A661 / High Street. Numerous traditional buildings present. Further to the south, 20th century development of East Park Road which breaks out from the linear form.
<b>Local building design</b>	Buildings are built typically of Spofforth stone (pinkish sandstone). Traditional roofing materials are sandstone flags or clay pantiles, usually with a stone ridge. The majority of dwellings are fairly small with relatively narrow gable spans, with gabled roofs. Single storey outbuildings and a variety of farm buildings present also.
<b>Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.</b>	The site is generally formed of fields / meadow land adjacent to Crimple Beck and extending westwards to the east edge of the village. On the northern corner, the site extends up to the A661. This northern part of the site is marked as 'important open space' within the conservation area appraisal maps. Stone walls to the A661 are marked as important boundaries. Hedgerow boundaries within the site are marked as 'significant field boundaries' also. Mature trees present on or near field boundaries. The site has a potential, but very constrained access to the side of what may be named as Low Lane Farm. Redundant farm buildings are present on the land to the side of the access (not part of the site) – this area is shown as area for enhancement within the Spofforth conservation area appraisal. The group of buildings makes a positive contribution to the conservation area. This site includes the land of site SP2 on the south end of the site, in the location of a play park and nature reserve.

**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 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
<b>Summary conclusion</b>	<p>The site forms an important part of the rural landscape setting of the village and the conservation area. Development would be contrary to existing grain and also harm that rural setting, which makes a highly positive contribution the character and setting of the conservation area and also the setting of the designated and non-designated heritage assets present. It partly affects land that is marked as important open space in the conservation area appraisal though this revised site excludes the land to the west of Massey Fold (whereas it is included within site SP5).</p> <p>Harm could be reduced by avoiding development upon the identified open space, by providing appropriate spacing to the western edge of the site where it adjoins the beck, by providing only very low density in the area to the south of Massey Fold, by providing high quality, locally distinctive dwellings and by providing appropriate landscaping / tree planting as is required throughout the site; however, due to the expected dwelling numbers for this site, it is not considered that such mitigation measures would be sufficient to reduce harm to a degree that would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area and local area.</p>

**Settlement: Spofforth****Site: SP6 (Land at Massey Fold, Spofforth)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

<b>SACs/SPAs</b>	None likely to be impacted.
<b>Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)</b>	None likely to be impacted.
<b>SSSI Risk Zone</b>	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs.
<b>Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)</b>	None likely to be impacted.
<b>BAP Priority Habitats</b>	Rivers and streams (Flowing water), pond, hedgerows.
<b>Phase 1 Survey Target Notes</b>	None.
<b>Sward</b>	Improved grassland and arable (riverside) P1HS 2010.
<b>Trees and Hedges</b>	There are several mature trees that provide a park-like character to the field in NE, other trees in south east and riverside trees and shrubs, internal field boundary hedgerows.
<b>Presence of Trees that Merit TPO</b>	Mature trees likely to benefit from TPO protection.
<b>Water/Wetland</b>	Small pond within site, a wet ditch crosses the site. River Crimple forms eastern site boundary.
<b>Slope and Aspect</b>	Generally flat .
<b>Buildings and Structures</b>	An old stone wall encloses 3 sides on the north and western boundaries and post and rail fence on S boundary. Site includes a modern stone bungalow.
<b>Natural Area</b>	NCA30 Southern Magnesian Limestone.
<b>Environmental Opportunity</b>	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.
<b>LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)</b>	LCA 57: Crimple and Park Beck Corridor <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Encourage woodland management and new planting, connecting isolated clumps of trees to create and enhance wildlife corridors”.</li> <li>• “Encourage reinstatement of riverside meadows along the valley floor to create buffer zone...”</li> </ul>
<b>Connectivity/Corridors</b>	River Crimple (Strategic Green Infrastructure Corridor of District Importance). Connects with adjacent informal nature reserve at Ginny Green Fields.
<b>GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)</b>	Limited development may be acceptable in return for a significant habitat buffer and enhancement of the corridor of the River Crimple.
<b>Protected Species</b>	Nesting birds and bats may utilise the bridge under A661, mature trees, or buildings for roosting. Birds may also utilise these feature plus hedges and riverbank for nesting. The pond has a low Habitat Suitability Index score for great crested newts. River Crimple likely to support otter and kingfisher, may support water vole, white clawed crayfish.
<b>BAP Priority Species</b>	Crimple may support priority species of fish; possible birds of arable farmland.
<b>Invasive Species</b>	Himalayan Balsam likely to occur along Crimple.
<b>Notes</b>	RL68 2010 (only small part in NE of current larger site) - 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
Significant adverse effects on designated sites (Local Site, SSSI, LNR), the wider ecological network and/or priority habitats and species.	Red



**Summary conclusion**

Development of such a large site along the river would have an adverse impact on the sensitive biodiversity of the river corridor unless a substantial buffer of enhanced habitat were provided as a contribution to generous on-site green infrastructure, potentially also utilising Suds. Support would not be possible for any development closer to the river than the Bungalow at Massey Fold. This may however impact on the overall housing density which could be achieved across the site. Existing mature trees and hedgerows would also need to be given adequate space within any scheme.

**Settlement: Spofforth****Site: SP6 (Land at Massey Fold, Spofforth)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Land Drainage****Land Drainage Site Assessment****Land drainage: summary of issues.**

Whilst this site is situated partially outside a drainage area administered by the Swale & Ure Internal Drainage Board, any additional surface water discharge could potentially affect the drainage board district including Crimple Beck, which is under the board's direct control. Consequently, the drainage board should be consulted regarding any proposals to develop 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: Staveley****Site: SV1 (Land between Minskip Road and Low Field Lane, Staveley)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

<b>Location/HBC Landscape Character Area</b>	Land between Minskip Road and Low Field Lane Staveley LCA69: East Knaresborough Arable Farmland
<b>Landscape description</b>	Area description: The wider landscape comprises moderate to large-scale arable land. Tree cover is moderate and patchy partially enclosing the landscape in places and maintaining extensive views elsewhere. Hedgerows are managed to various heights and bushiness and have considerable impact, compensating for lack of tree cover. Site Description: The site comprises an irregular shaped parcel of land at the village edge occupying an arable field, small woodland and wetland area at the south west corner of the site and wooded former railway line along the eastern site boundary. These wooded areas contribute to the setting of the settlement. The hedgerow that forms the boundary to Minskip Road is up to 5m high in places and provides a leafy setting and approach to the village. The hedgerow contains a wide mix of species including hawthorn, alder and hazel. There are some gaps at the lower level but is generally a substantial hedge which visually contains the site. A PRoW runs along the south west boundary of the site. The site is flat at an elevation of about 30mAOD
<b>Existing urban edge</b>	The site adjoins the residential edge of Staveley to the south west and scattered properties along the south west end of Minskip Road and two properties bordering the northern end of the site
<b>Trees and hedges</b>	Hedgerow along Minskip Road and woodland areas. TPO'd trees along site's western boundary
<b>Landscape and Green Belt designations</b>	SG3 Settlement Growth: Conservation of the Countryside: including Green Belt R11: Rights of Way
<b>Description of proposal for the site</b>	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
<b>Physical Sensitivity</b>	The landscape is considered of medium value. Susceptibility to change is also considered to be medium with some adjoining reference and context to the type of development being proposed. Overall sensitivity is judged to be medium
<b>Visual Sensitivity</b>	The site is visually contained by the railway line and the housing to the south west and tall hedgerow along Minskip Road
<b>Anticipated landscape effects</b>	Loss of open grassland fields that contribute to the rural setting of the settlement.
<b>Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement</b>	The disused railway line screens and encloses the site, further structure planting would be required to assist with integration along the Minskip Road boundary.
<b>Likely level of landscape effects</b>	Medium adverse effects but effects could be reduced with appropriate landscape mitigation
<b>Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits</b>	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: 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 of development being proposed predominantly along the site's south western boundary.

The site is visually contained along the edge of the settlement and screened by vegetation along Minskip Road and disused railway line.

Built form should be limited to the western margins of the site to minimise the extent of development into open countryside

**Settlement: Staveley****Site: SV1 (Land between Minskip Road and Low Field Lane, Staveley)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

<b>Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	Staveley Conservation Area.
<b>Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	Traditional buildings located at the east end of the conservation area.
<b>Commentary on heritage assets.</b>	The site is within the wider setting of the Staveley Conservation Area, there being a sense of separation from the eastern boundary of the conservation area due to the presence of 20th century housing there. The site is located within the wider setting of non-designated heritage assets located at the east end of the conservation area.
<b>Topography and views</b>	The site is well enclosed on its eastern side due to the presence of the tree covered railway embankment. To the northern / western side it has a presence on the rural approach into the village, though it is well separated from the conservation area by the 20th century housing present on the east side of the village. Some views across the site possible where gaps in the hedge allow it. Fairly level site apart from the rise of the embankment.
<b>Landscape context</b>	Countryside comprising fairly flat, mostly arable farmland.
<b>Grain of surrounding development</b>	Historic, linear grain of the conservation area to the west. This site adjoins an area of mid / late 20th century housing located on the east side of the village, comprising cul de sacs and no through roads.
<b>Local building design</b>	The village is typified by gabled buildings with eaves running parallel to the road. Buildings are well spaced and set behind small gardens with boundary walls. Range of building materials but traditionally brick used. Pan tile of slate roofs.
<b>Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.</b>	The site is a field on the eastern edge of the village. There is a small parcel of land adjoining Spellow Crescent that is grassed, with an access off Minskip Road but with no particular boundary to the rest of the field. Mid / late 20th century housing located to its western edge - fence, partial hedge and trees on the boundary. Minskip Road forms the northern boundary (hedge and verge to roadside). Railway embankment, treed, to the western boundary. Two bungalows adjoin the site at the northern tip. To the north of Minskip Road are more fields, which adjoin individual properties on the north side of the 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 site extends across the whole of the field on the south side of Minskip Road. Although the edge of the existing housing is currently visible, it is seen in the context of the field (the site), which reduces its impact. This site would extend well beyond the extent of development on the northern side of the road (where the character is rural due to the presence of fields). Provision of appropriate landscaping and reductions on standard densities, to allow for integration into the rural context would help mitigate the impact of this large site, but it is recommended that consideration be given to a smaller site and development be designed so as to positively enhance this part of the village, with buildings respecting the existing building line and should be in keeping with surrounding buildings.

**Settlement: Staveley****Site: SV1 (Land between Minskip Road and Low Field Lane, Staveley)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

<b>SACs/SPAs</b>	None likely to be affected.
<b>Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)</b>	None likely to be affected.
<b>SSSI Risk Zone</b>	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development relating to a SSSI, although Staveley Nature Reserve is of clear SSSI quality.
<b>Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)</b>	Staveley Nature Reserve (YWT) is a SINC and lies north of the Minskip Road (within 150 m). Moor End Meadow lies 150m to the south.
<b>BAP Priority Habitats</b>	Hedgerows, Woodland, Ponds, Arable Farmland.
<b>Phase 1 Survey Target Notes</b>	None.
<b>Sward</b>	Arable [P1HS 1992]. There is an informal car-park and a strip of amenity style grassland (with a double row of ribes bushes) adjacent to the housing.
<b>Trees and Hedges</b>	There is maturing woodland dominated by ash which has grown up along the disused railway track. The pond is surrounded by woodland including willow scrub but also many mature trees (Ash, poplar, oak, weeping willow and pine). The hedge along Minskip road is a valuable and high (up to 5m) and relatively species-rich hedge and should be retained. There are garden fences and hedges along the western boundary which contain some trees and shrubs, including significant trees in the southwest corner of site.
<b>Presence of Trees that Merit TPO</b>	Mature trees on site e.g. around pond and along disused railway and garden boundaries likely to merit protection.
<b>Water/Wetland</b>	There is a large pond in the southern corner of the site.
<b>Slope and Aspect</b>	Generally flat other than raised railway embankment.
<b>Buildings and Structures</b>	None.
<b>Natural Area</b>	30. Southern Magnesian Limestone.
<b>Environmental Opportunity</b>	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". "Securing expansion of wetland habitats such as lowland fen, flood plain grazing and wet woodlands, to make them more robust and to develop ecological networks, corridors and stepping stones".
<b>LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)</b>	LCA 69 East Knaresborough Arable Farmland <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Encourage the maintenance and restoration of field hedgerows and hedgerow trees."</li> <li>• "Explore opportunities for habitat diversity through changes in management practices in line with Harrogate District Biodiversity Action Plan".</li> </ul>
<b>Connectivity/Corridors</b>	The hedgerows along Minskip road and the western boundary link into the wooded disused railway embankment and wooded pond area and form part of the wider field network of the area. The pond is one of a network of varied waterbodies and wetlands in the vicinity. The site forms an important stepping stone linking SINCs to the north and south
<b>GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)</b>	Opportunity for generous green infrastructure corridors to strengthen links between SINCs to the north and south of the site. It may be possible to create a circular green link around the site boundaries to relieve recreation pressure on the nearby nature reserve.
<b>Protected Species</b>	Nesting birds probably utilise the hedgerows and trees. Bats may utilise some of the more mature trees. Great Crested Newt is reputed to occur in the pond in the wood.
<b>BAP Priority Species</b>	Some potential for priority bird species of arable farmland.
<b>Invasive Species</b>	None known.



<b>Notes</b>	RL1113 2010 (red).	
<b>Conclusion</b>		
<b>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?</b>		
<b>Rationale</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
Significant adverse effects on designated sites (Local Site, SSSI, LNR), the wider ecological network and/or priority habitats and species.	<b>Red</b>	
<b>Summary conclusion</b>	The pond, woodland and hedges on and bounding the site should be protected from development. Large scale development immediately surrounding these features would be likely to cause their degradation. Generous on-site green infrastructure would be required on the site in order to offset increased recreational pressure on the YWT reserve. This would impact on the housing density which can be achieved over the site as a whole which, is why the site is currently categorised as 'red' rather than orange, although more limited development may be acceptable.	

**Land Drainage Site Assessment**

**Land drainage: summary of issues.**

This site appears to be situated just on the periphery of a drainage area administered by the Swale & Ure Internal Drainage Board. Any surface water discharge will potentially flow directly or indirectly into 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, 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: Summerbridge**

**Site: SB1 (Clough House Farm, Summerbridge)**

**Natural and Built Heritage Assessments**

**Type: Landscape**

**Landscape Site Assessments**

<b>Location/HBC Landscape Character Area</b>	Site located on the southwest side of Summerbridge immediately east of the River Nidd. LCA13:Nidderdale Valley (Summerbridge to Newbridge, Birstwith)
<b>Landscape description</b>	Area description:Diverse character area with well wooded valley floors. Gently rising valley sides become more open with patches of rock outcrops and extensive views along the rim of the valley. Site description: Site comprises parliamentary enclosure grass fields with stone wall boundaries. Land slopes gradually down westwards towards the river.
<b>Existing urban edge</b>	The eastern edge of the site backs onto a row of low density development on the B6165. However generally speaking the site is detached from the existing urban edge and contributes to separation of Summerbridge and Dacre Banks to the west of the river.
<b>Trees and hedges</b>	Trees on the west boundary with the river and on the north boundary with the B6451.
<b>Landscape and Green Belt designations</b>	Nidderdale AONB.
<b>Description of proposal for the site</b>	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
<b>Physical Sensitivity</b>	Loss of the fields would extend built form and 'harden' the appearance of the urban edge in the village. The landscape is sensitive to change as a result of increasing built form.
<b>Visual Sensitivity</b>	Views of the site on the approach to Summerbridge from the south. Views of the site from across the valley are extensive and susceptible to change.
<b>Anticipated landscape effects</b>	Loss of field in the valley bottom that contributes to the setting of the village and the key characteristics of the Nidderdale AONB.
<b>Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement</b>	Loss of open field in the Nidd valley would be difficult to mitigate. Any development would require significant green infrastructure and low density development to integrate with the surrounding countryside.
<b>Likely level of landscape effects</b>	Large scale adverse due to the loss of a field in the valley bottom, the proposed extension of built form, the increased coalescence with Dacre Banks and the visibility of the site in the wider context.
<b>Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits</b>	

**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

<b>Summary conclusion</b>	The landscape has no capacity to accept development on this site without detriment to landscape character as any mitigation measures could not adequately compensate for the effects of extending the built form of the village in this location.
---------------------------	---

**Settlement: Summerbridge****Site: SB1 (Clough House Farm, Summerbridge)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

<b>Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	Summer Bridge, grade II listed building, and Summerbridge House, walls and railings which are grade II listed.
<b>Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	House to north of site and terraces to east of site.
<b>Commentary on heritage assets.</b>	<p>The bridge is a seventeenth century listed bridge, it forms a gateway into the settlement. Summerbridge House is a late eighteenth century house, which together with its walls and railings further add to the significance of the gateway. The bridge, river and undeveloped land nearby contribute to its setting.</p> <p>The unlisted victorian house is prominent at the corner of the main street and B6451. The northern part of the site contributes to its setting, and the building enjoys views to its southwest.</p> <p>The terraces enjoy the views across the site, but development would not affect its significance.</p>
<b>Topography and views</b>	The site is in the valley of the Nidd, and land rises up steeply on this side of the river, however the sports ground on the other side is on flat land (a floodplain). The key views from the site are from higher ground to the west. Riverside trees limit view from and to the lower parts of the site.
<b>Landscape context</b>	The site in the AONB adjoins the edge of the settlement on the valley side.
<b>Grain of surrounding development</b>	Traditionally development is linear along main routes, however local to the site is the Whinfields Estate, where development does not relate to the main road, but is arranged in a series of linear cul-de-sacs, within which semi-detached houses and short terraces are set parallel to the road behind small front gardens. Buildings here are in the main parallel with contours and have reasonably generous spacing side to side. The older development along the main roads take the form of rows or individual buildings set along the back edge of the footway near the site, but further away most houses are set behind small front gardens. There is an area of detached houses set in more generous grounds further north, but the majority of homes are terraces.
<b>Local building design</b>	<p>The vernacular in the dale is robust and is characterised by two storey houses with stone walls having low window ratio, and stone slate roofs. The use of roofs for accommodation is fairly limited, notably in Summerbridge the post office has dormers and a terrace has semi-circular second floor windows and rooflights. Full height three storey houses are not present, and the vast majority of houses in the village are two storey. Windows are in the main of vertical proportions and most roofs of the village are of Welsh slate.</p> <p>The housing of Whinfields differs from traditional buildings, some are in brick and the majority rendered, roofs are hipped, rather than simple dual pitch, and window openings are wider. Additionally some of the detached homes further north do not reflect local distinctiveness.</p>
<b>Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.</b>	To the northeast of the site is a car park for the public house, here there are views across the site to the other side of the river, and these should be protected. The fall of the land, the riverside trees and the houses to the north of the site will constrain development. To the boundary of the B6451 is an attractive high stone wall.

**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
<b>Summary conclusion</b>	Whilst it might be possible to erect some houses on the site in a manner that would not impact detrimentally on the heritage assets and be screened from some long distance views by trees, mitigation would result in very low dwelling density. Development over the whole site even at moderate density would be detrimental to the setting of heritage assets and local distinctiveness.

**Settlement: Summerbridge**

**Site: SB1 (Clough House Farm, Summerbridge)**

**Natural and Built Heritage Assessments** **Type: Ecology**

**Ecology Site Assessment**

<b>SACs/SPAs</b>	North Pennine Moors SPA/SAC c. 3km to West
<b>Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)</b>	Brimham Rocks c. 2k NE
<b>SSSI Risk Zone</b>	Natural England require consultation on residential development of 100 units or more
<b>Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)</b>	Braisty Woods c. 500m to north
<b>BAP Priority Habitats</b>	Rivers and Riparian Woodland (adjacent)
<b>Phase 1 Survey Target Notes</b>	none
<b>Sward</b>	improved pasture (P1HS 1992)
<b>Trees and Hedges</b>	Treed bankside of River Nidd and roadside trees to west(external to site boundary)
<b>Presence of Trees that Merit TPO</b>	Riparian and possibly roadside trees may benefit from TPOs
<b>Water/Wetland</b>	River Nidd along western bounadry of site, potential movement of water downslope
<b>Slope and Aspect</b>	land slopes down moderately westwards towards the River Nidd, with lower slopes slightly flatter
<b>Buildings and Structures</b>	Drystone wall field boundaries, fenced along B6165
<b>Natural Area</b>	22 Pennine Dales Fringe
<b>Environmental Opportunity</b>	SEO 4: "Protect and enhance the area's many major rivers, riparian habitats and wetlands to reduce flood risk, improve water quality and conserve the valuable contribution they make to ...biodiversity, recreation..." "Enhancing and connecting semi-natural habitats in river corridors to improve the wildlife movement corridors between lowland and upland".
<b>LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)</b>	LCA 13 Nidderdale Valley <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Protect natural and semi-natural habitats: promote creation of appropriate new habitats and management of existing ones..."</li> <li>• "Promote repair and maintenance of stone walls and hedges..."</li> <li>• "Encourage woodland, tree and forestry management to respect and enhance landscape pattern and landform"... "and replacement of individual trees..."</li> </ul>
<b>Connectivity/Corridors</b>	Regionally Important Strategic GreenInfrastructure Corridor of the Nidd on western boundary
<b>GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)</b>	Enhancement of River Nidd Corridor
<b>Protected Species</b>	River Nidd Corridor likely to support otter, kingfisher etc. Riparian woodland will support bats
<b>BAP Priority Species</b>	Some potential for ground-nesting birds
<b>Invasive Species</b>	Himalyan balsalm likley along Nidd
<b>Notes</b>	

**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.	<b>Orange</b>

<b>Summary conclusion</b>	Any development would require ecological enhancement of the River Nidd Green Infrastructure Corridor, requiring a substantial buffer of semi-natural habitat to be created along the western boundary of the site. This would be likely to impact on the housing density achievable across the whole site.
---------------------------	--

**Settlement: Summerbridge**

**Site: SB1 (Clough House Farm, Summerbridge)**

**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 issues in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers, watercourses & overland flows from adjacent fields. 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 sources. 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 & the sloping nature of the site. 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) The Environment Agency is responsible for administering matters attaining to Main River. As such, if the surface water strategy includes discharge to the River Nidd (directly or indirectly) the Agency should be consulted.

**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: Summerbridge**

**Site: SB3 (Land to rear of Elmwood Terrace, Summerbridge)**

**Natural and Built Heritage Assessments                      Type: Landscape**

**Landscape Site Assessments**

<b>Location/HBC Landscape Character Area</b>	Site located north of the village centre at the back of development east of the B6165. LCA11: Nidderdale Valley (Pateley Bridge to Summerbridge)
<b>Landscape description</b>	Area description: The wider landscape comprises the broad well-wooded valley landscape of the river Nidd. This is a busy area, intensively farmed and important to tourism within the Nidderdale AONB. Site description: The site comprises a long narrow sheep grazed field to the rear of Elmwood Terrace. The land rises sharply to the northeast and there are a few scattered dwellings higher up the valley side in close proximity to the site.
<b>Existing urban edge</b>	The site is well related to the urban edge since it closely follows the typical linear development pattern of the village.
<b>Trees and hedges</b>	Trees to north outside the site boundary.
<b>Landscape and Green Belt designations</b>	Open countryside Nidderdale AONB Public Right of Way to south boundary.
<b>Description of proposal for the site</b>	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
<b>Physical Sensitivity</b>	The landscape is sensitive to the loss of fields at the village edge that contribute to character and setting. Susceptibility reduces with scale of development.
<b>Visual Sensitivity</b>	The site occupies the mid to higher valley side but is mostly contained by surrounding topography, woodland cover and housing to the southwest.
<b>Anticipated landscape effects</b>	Development would result in the loss of a pastoral field at the village edge. However there are notable detractors, which affect its rural character. The site is closely related to the urban edge and small-scale development would not appear out of character.
<b>Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement</b>	Structure planting along the northeast boundary would assist with integration.
<b>Likely level of landscape effects</b>	Medium scale adverse effect due to impacts on the semi-natural landscape setting of the village. However there is scope for a discrete traditional terrace providing sufficient structure planting along northeast boundary.
<b>Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits</b>	

**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

<b>Summary conclusion</b>	This is an attractive field providing a semi-natural setting to this part of the village, Landscape capacity is limited but small-scale development would decrease the adverse effects.
---------------------------	---

**Settlement: Summerbridge****Site: SB3 (Land to rear of Elmwood Terrace, Summerbridge)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

<b>Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	None
<b>Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	Methodist Church and Sunday School, and historic housing southwest of site.
<b>Commentary on heritage assets.</b>	<p>The church is of architectural, historic and communal value. It has a spire on top of its corner tower, which is seen against the sky or trees on the hillside, dependant on viewpoint. The setting of the church contributes to its significance.</p> <p>Beside the church is Elmwood Terrace, an attractive Edwardian terrace of some significance. Next to this is Elmtree Cottage, an older but significantly altered building, so it is of little architectural merit. Further south are the properties of Ivy Dene and Belle Vue Cottage, which face southeast and are gable onto the road, an uncommon orientation in the village, but typical of rural housing. The historic housing southwest of the site is seen against rising land, which contributes to the character of this linear village in the AONB.</p>
<b>Topography and views</b>	Land falls down to the river Nidd. The buildings alongside the site reduce the views from, and of, the site with the exception of the northern and southern ends.
<b>Landscape context</b>	The site is directly northeast of the linear settlement in the AONB.
<b>Grain of surrounding development</b>	<p>The village of Summerbridge has developed alongside the main road to Pateley Bridge and is, in general, of linear form. The approach to the church from the north is marked by the long terraces on the south side close to the road. Low Row closer to the church is set back behind small front gardens and contrasts with the detached homes (both houses and bungalows) set well back and at a lower level than the road.</p> <p>On the north side of the road beside the church is a short terrace set back behind small front gardens, then Elmtree Cottage, an older building is set against the highway. Further south are the properties of Ivy Dene and Belle Vue Cottage, which face southeast and are gable onto the road, an uncommon orientation in the village. Oakridge, a detached property north of the site, is at present an isolated house set behind a small field.</p>
<b>Local building design</b>	<p>The terraces have stone walls and low-pitched stone slate roofs. The older terraces have a low proportion of window to wall and a robust character typical of the vernacular. Elmwood Terrace is Edwardian and features bay windows with roofs linked to provide porch canopies. The other buildings adjacent to the site reflect the vernacular, although one has been altered and another extended.</p> <p>The properties on the south side of the road are very different in character, the thatched cottage is unique. and although not very visible from the road, there are two bungalows with tiled roofs, between which is Rostellan, a brick house. Behind the single storey low-pitched roof of the filling station is a 1970s house built of random stone. None of these properties reflect the vernacular, but fortunately due to the topography do not detract from the street scene.</p>
<b>Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.</b>	<p>The site is behind the frontage development along the main village street. The ground rises to the northeast, and hence the ground level is higher than the existing residential properties southwest of the site.</p> <p>Summerbridge Methodist Church is situated southwest of the northern part of the site. The church is not listed, but is a significant landmark, and the northern part of the site contributes to its rural setting.</p> <p>The site has a few trees along the eastern boundary.</p> <p>Access to the site could be achieved via the lane giving access to White House, a narrow road further restricted by the garage to Ivy Dene, or via the private drive to Oakridge, which is narrower.</p>

**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
<b>Will it conserve those elements which contribute towards the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets?</b>	
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
<b>Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?</b>	
Rationale	Rating
The nature of the site means that built development will have a negative impact on local distinctiveness.	Red
<b>Summary conclusion</b>	<p>Backland development on this land, which is higher than historic properties that front the road, would detrimentally impact on rural village character. It also would be likely to impact on the amenity of the existing properties unless set well back. The development of the northern end of the site would impact on the setting of the church.</p> <p>Access to the site is very restricted.</p> <p>Any development should be restricted to the south part of the site along the lane to White House, therefore the majority of the site should not be developed.</p>

**Settlement: Summerbridge****Site: SB3 (Land to rear of Elmwood Terrace, Summerbridge)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

<b>SACs/SPAs</b>	North Pennine Moors SAC/SPA 3km to east
<b>Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)</b>	Brimham Rocks 1.5m to NE
<b>SSSI Risk Zone</b>	Natural England require consultation for residential development of 100 units or more
<b>Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)</b>	Within 30m of Birch Wood SINC - semi-natural ancient woodland
<b>BAP Priority Habitats</b>	None
<b>Phase 1 Survey Target Notes</b>	None
<b>Sward</b>	Improved grassland [P1HS 1992]
<b>Trees and Hedges</b>	The site has a few trees along the eastern and northern boundaries, which should be retained, including a very significant mature tree to the rear of Elmtree cottage.
<b>Presence of Trees that Merit TPO</b>	Boundary trees may benefit from TPO protection
<b>Water/Wetland</b>	There is fragment of beck adjacent to the site to the rear of Elmtree cottage and a pond 110m to the east
<b>Slope and Aspect</b>	The site is undulating/uneven and slopes to the west and the north
<b>Buildings and Structures</b>	None
<b>Natural Area</b>	NCA 22: Pennines Dales Fringe
<b>Environmental Opportunity</b>	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
<b>LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)</b>	LCA 11 Nidderdale Valley <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Encourage diversification of management of improved grasslands to improve habitat diversity...”</li> <li>• “Maintain individual tree cover for the long term by promoting the planting of native field boundary trees...”</li> </ul>
<b>Connectivity/Corridors</b>	Boundary trees contribute to link two areas of ancient woodland Birch and Braisty Woods.
<b>GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)</b>	Tree planting and hedgerow creation along the northern boundary could help connect the ancient woodland SINCs of Birch and Braisty Woods. There may be the opportunity to create a small SUDS wetland close to ditch to the south.
<b>Protected Species</b>	Nesting birds and bats may utilise the boundary trees for breeding and foraging
<b>BAP Priority Species</b>	None known
<b>Invasive Species</b>	None known
<b>Notes</b>	RL3009 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

<b>Summary conclusion</b>	The site lies close to belts of trees, which link the ancient woodland SINCs of Birch and Braisty Woods. Over-development might render this link less permeable to wildlife and increase pressure particularly on Birch wood. However, the creation of a wooded buffer along the northern site boundary could help improve connectivity between the two woodlands
---------------------------	---

**Settlement: Summerbridge**

**Site: SB3 (Land to rear of Elmwood Terrace, Summerbridge)**

**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 issues in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers, watercourses & overland flows from adjacent fields. 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 sources. 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 & the sloping nature of the site. 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.

**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: Summerbridge

### Site: SB5 (Land at Braisty Woods, Summerbridge)

#### Natural and Built Heritage Assessments

Type: Landscape

#### Landscape Site Assessments

<b>Location/HBC Landscape Character Area</b>	Site located at the north end of the village east of the B6165. LCA11: Nidderdale Valley (Pateley Bridge to Summerbridge).
<b>Landscape description</b>	Area description: Broad well wooded valley of the River Nidd. Built form generally concentrated in valley bottom and on lower slopes. Views filtered by woodland and trees in valley bottom which is overlooked from the higher slopes of the valley sides. Site description: irregular shaped grass field with woodland to the east boundary and a group of trees in the southern corner. The site is relatively flat.
<b>Existing urban edge</b>	The site is rural and not well connected to the village edge. Residential development present on the opposite side of the B6165. Rural character of the site with trees contributes to the integration of linear development on the B6165 with the surrounding countryside.
<b>Trees and hedges</b>	Mature trees to boundaries and a group of trees in the southern corner possibly worthy of TPO.
<b>Landscape and Green Belt designations</b>	Nidderdale AONB Open countryside
<b>Description of proposal for the site</b>	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
<b>Physical Sensitivity</b>	The landscape of the Nidderdale AONB is highly valued and susceptible to the loss of characteristic fields and the extension of builtform.
<b>Visual Sensitivity</b>	The site is well contained in close proximity due to existing woodland and landform. However there are views from the approach on the B6165 and extensive views of the site are likely from across the valley.
<b>Anticipated landscape effects</b>	Loss of open field on the village edge along with potential loss of trees that aid integration of settlement and the extension of built form in the AONB.
<b>Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement</b>	Limited potential to mitigate the loss of an open field in this location. Significant proportion of the site would be required to be given over to green infrastructure and housing density lowered.
<b>Likely level of landscape effects</b>	Large scale adverse.
<b>Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits</b>	SB2 to the south has planning consent and if this site were developed in conjunction then the cumulative effects could be considerable.

#### 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

<b>Summary conclusion</b>	The landscape has no capacity to accept development on this site without detriment to the landscape of the AONB.
---------------------------	--

**Settlement: Summerbridge****Site: SB5 (Land at Braisty Woods, Summerbridge)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

<b>Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	None
<b>Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.</b>	Woodfield House, Birchfield Cottage and Summerbridge Methodist Church.
<b>Commentary on heritage assets.</b>	Although separated from site SB2 by a group of trees, the site contributes to the rural setting of the church. If SB2 is developed, this site would have minimal impact on the setting of the church. Woodfield House and Birchfield Cottage are nineteenth century buildings of some architectural interest. Their main frontages face the northern part of the site. Notwithstanding some individual trees, the open land here contributes to their setting.
<b>Topography and views</b>	The land rises to the northeast away from the river Nidd. Views out are limited by groups of trees and buildings, the views to the northeast are the most attractive. The site is visible from the main Pateley Bridge Road.
<b>Landscape context</b>	The site is on the opposite side of the main road to existing buildings, and is isolated from buildings on the eastern side of the road by the adjacent field (SB2).
<b>Grain of surrounding development</b>	Traditionally development is linear along main routes; near the site at Orchard Close, and beyond, housing is set behind and parallel to the terraces on the main road. The older development along the main roads take the form of rows or individual buildings set along the back edge of the footway near the site. Southeast of the site are later built detached houses set in larger gardens. The majority of homes in Summerbridge are terraces.
<b>Local building design</b>	The vernacular in the dale is robust and is characterised by two storey houses with stone walls having a low window ratio, and stone slate roofs. Use of roofspace for accommodation is fairly limited, notably in Summerbridge the post office has dormers and a terrace near the site has semi-circular second floor windows and rooflights. Full height three storey houses are not present, and the vast majority of houses are two storey, although the terrace near New York Mills utilises the topography and is three storey at the rear. Windows are in the main of vertical proportions and most roofs of the village are of Welsh slate. Some of the detached homes south of the site do not reflect local distinctiveness.
<b>Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.</b>	The site level is higher than the road, and the boundary wall is in part retaining. There is a public footpath along the drive west of the site. The entrance to the drive is limited in width, here there are curved walls back to gatepiers.

**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**

If developed in isolation without the adjacent land being developed, it would be detrimental to settlement pattern and would have a negative impact on local distinctiveness.

The north west part of the site should be kept free of development in order to respect the setting of the historic houses.

**Settlement: Summerbridge****Site: SB5 (Land at Braisty Woods, Summerbridge)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

<b>SACs/SPAs</b>	North Pennine Moors SAC/SPA 3km to east
<b>Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)</b>	Brimham Rocks 1.5m to NE
<b>SSSI Risk Zone</b>	Natural England require consultation for residential development of 100 units or more
<b>Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)</b>	Adjacent to Birch Wood SINC - an ancient woodland site immediately adjacent to north east.
<b>BAP Priority Habitats</b>	Woodland (adjacent)
<b>Phase 1 Survey Target Notes</b>	None but see ecological survey for development site to south east 15/01382/FULMAJ
<b>Sward</b>	Semi-improved (species poor) pasture P1HS 1992 Sward requires resurvey
<b>Trees and Hedges</b>	Copse of wet woodland in SE corner; semi mature boundary trees to south and west; mature woodland on northern boundary
<b>Presence of Trees that Merit TPO</b>	Copse in SE corner and boundary trees may merit TPO protection
<b>Water/Wetland</b>	Ditch along edge of woodland, issues towards southern part of field
<b>Slope and Aspect</b>	Generally flat
<b>Buildings and Structures</b>	Drystone wall along roadfrontage
<b>Natural Area</b>	NCA 22: Pennines Dales Fringe
<b>Environmental Opportunity</b>	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
<b>LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)</b>	LCA 11 Nidderdale Valley <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Encourage diversification of management of improved grasslands to improve habitat diversity...”</li> <li>• “Maintain individual tree cover for the long term by promoting the planting of native field boundary trees...”</li> </ul>
<b>Connectivity/Corridors</b>	Boundary trees contribute to link the ancient SINC woodland at Birch Wood with woodland to the north
<b>GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)</b>	Buffer the SINC woodland with seminatural habitats including native tree and shrub planting and wildflower meadows
<b>Protected Species</b>	Five species of bats were noted using the trees along the site boundary with the development site to the south east (Smeeden Foreman Bat Survey for 15/01382/FULMAJ)
<b>BAP Priority Species</b>	Not known
<b>Invasive Species</b>	None known
<b>Notes</b>	

**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.	<b>Red</b>

<b>Summary conclusion</b>	Development would add further pressure (recreational disturbance, lighting, cats etc.) to the Birch Wood ancient woodland SINC, which has already been subjected to fragmentation. Should development be permitted a substantial buffer of semi-natural habitat should separate it from the SINC woodland to the north
---------------------------	--

**Settlement: Summerbridge**

**Site: SB5 (Land at Braisty Woods, Summerbridge)**

**Natural and Built Heritage Assessments**

**Type: Land Drainage**

**Land Drainage Site Assessment**

**Land drainage: summary of issues.**

Frequent complaints of flooding have been received from residents in the surrounding area and downstream of the proposed development land. The watercourse to the rear of the site and to the rear of the Methodist church suffers from capacity issues in times of heavy persistent rain. The public highway also regularly floods due to capacity/blockage problems in highway gullies and public sewers. It is the owner/developers responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide.

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 & the sloping nature of the site. 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)

**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



