

Built and Natural Environment Site Assessments Volume 14: Open Countryside, Otley & Wetherby



October 2016

Contents

1 Introduction	2
2 Policy Context	3
National Policy Context	3
Emerging Local Policy Context	5
3 Methodology	8
Landscape	8
Conservation and Design	13
Ecology	17
Land Drainage	20
4 Site Assessments	21
Open Countryside	22
Otley	60
Wetherby	72

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.⁽¹⁾ This report looks at site options in:
- Open Countryside
 - Otley
 - Wetherby
- 1.2** Full details of how sites have been selected can be found in Appendices 7 and 8 of the Harrogate District Draft Sustainability Appraisal (October 2016).⁽²⁾
- 1.3** The council's consultancy team have undertaken studies of potential impacts of development on the following:
- Landscape;
 - Conservation and design;
 - Ecology; and
 - Land Drainage

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

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

2 Policy Context

National Policy Context

Introduction

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

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

Landscape

2.2 Paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is clear that the planning system should contribute to, and enhance, the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes. To help achieve this aim, 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 ecosystem 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.

Methodology 3

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 Scriftain 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.⁽³⁾

3 Methodology

Land Drainage

- 3.48** The council's land drainage engineer has reviewed the potential impact of development in terms of flood risk and whether development will increase flood risk elsewhere. The assessment provides an 'in-principle' assessment of the appropriateness of a site to assist in directing development away from areas at highest risk.
- 3.49** A land drainage assessment was undertaken for each site. All assessments were undertaken in a consistent manner, taking account of the following documents and procedures:
- National Planning Policy Framework
 - Flood Risk Regulations 2009
 - Flood and Water Management Act 2010
 - Land Drainage Act 1991
- 3.50** Additionally, more site specific information was obtained from:
- Environment Agency Flood Zone Maps;
 - Harrogate Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (Level 1);
 - Historic flooding records;
 - Yorkshire Water and sewer records; and
 - Local knowledge of the area.

Results

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

Site Assessments 4

4 Site Assessments

Open Countryside

Site Ref	Site Name	Site Area	Page
OC1	Land at south west of A1(M) junction 50 near Rainton	18.9711	22
OC2	Rudding Farm, near Kirk Deighton	28.7137	25
OC3	Oakwood Park Business Centre, near Bishop Thornton	4.7013	31
OC4	Land north of Racecourse Approach, near Wetherby	17.9397	35
OC5	New Settlement at Deighton Grange Farm, near Kirk Deighton	111.4014	41
OC6	Former Middleton Hospital	12.1247	46
OC7	Land west of A168, Kirk Deighton	0.4346	50
OC8	Land at Rowden Lane End, Skipton Road	22.7369	54

Table 4.1 Open Countryside Sites

Otley

Site Ref	Site Name	Site Area	Page
OT1	Land north of Throstle Nest Close 1, Otley	1.3479	60
OT2	Land north of Throstle Nest Close 2, Otley	1.1175	64
OT3	Land at Carr Bank, Newall Carr Road, Otley	8.17	67

Table 4.2 Otley Sites

Wetherby

Site Ref	Site Name	Site Area	Page
WB1	Land north west of Wetherby	23.2633	72
WB2	Land north of Sicklinghall Road, Wetherby	3.3999	76

Table 4.3 Wetherby Sites

Settlement: Open Countryside**Site: OC1 (Land at south west of A1(M) junction 50 near Rainton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Land at south west of A1M (junction 50) near Rainton LCA81: Dishforth and Surrounding Farmland
Landscape description	Area description: A large scale arable landscape comprising of arable fields beyond the A1 corridor to the east and west and in places extends as far as the Ure corridor to the west and the Swale corridor to the east.. Scattered diverse development punctuates the uniform and open agricultural landscape. Tree cover and hedgerows are intermittent affording long distance views. Generally this area is pleasant and particularly valued for its views into the North York Moors to the west. Site Description: The site is a large rectangular arable field to the east of the boundary with the A1(M) and the A61 to the south of junction 50. The site gently slopes down from south to north from 48m to 45m AOD. The site is bounded by roadside hedgerows together with post and rail fencing along the edge of the motorway, The southern edge of the site has no hedgerow with an access track defining part of this edge.
Existing urban edge	The site is remote from the urban edge with the village of Rainton 1.2km to the south east.
Trees and hedges	Hedgerows along roadside boundaries
Landscape and Green Belt designations	SG3 Settlement Growth: Conservation of the Countryside including Green Belt
Description of proposal for the site	Employment site
Physical Sensitivity	The landscape is considered of low value with presence of motorway and major intersection adjoining the site. Susceptibility to change is considered to be medium as the motorway corridor has a strong influence on the landscape.
Visual Sensitivity	Views of the site are partially filtered by surrounding hedgerows in the flat large scale landscape with views more prominent from more elevated sections of the mortorway and intersection
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of arable land in a flat open landscape
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	There would be potential to mitigate effects of development though perimeter screen planting
Likely level of landscape effects	Large adverse effects but effects could be reduced with appropriate landscape mitigation
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	None

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

Rationale	Rating
Sensitivity Rating: 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

Summary conclusion	Site is of medium sensitivity with limited reference to the type of development being proposed. However the presence of a major road corridor adjoining the site is a key detractor. Views of the site are partially filtered by surrounding hedgerows in the flat large scale landscape with views more prominent from more elevated sections of the mortorway and intersection
---------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Settlement: Open Countryside

Site: OC1 (Land at south west of A1(M) junction 50 near Rainton)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments

Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	None likely to be impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	None likely to be impacted
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likely to be impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerow, arable farmland, ponds
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Arable
Trees and Hedges	Boundary hedgerows along roadsides; existing scrubby trees and new tree planting associated with balancing pond
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	None
Water/Wetland	Balancing pond to north of site
Slope and Aspect	Generally flat but rises towards the A1 crossing in the north
Buildings and Structures	None on site other than associated with the motorway crossing to the north
Natural Area	NCA 24Vale of Mowbray
Environmental Opportunity	SE01 Conserving, extending and re-linking areas of semi-natural habitat (riparian meadows, unimproved wet grasslands, and semi-improved meadows and pastures) and other grasslands into a coherent habitat network, to enhance biodiversity
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 81: Dishforth and Surrounding Farmland <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Small woodland blocks associated with appropriately scaled development may help to integrate development with the landscape”. • “Encourage the reinstatement of hedges particularly in areas of pre-parliamentary enclosure”.
Connectivity/Corridors	Hedgerows and road verges provide some connectivity through the large-scale arable landscape but roads also act as barriers to terrestrial organisms
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Retain and enhance hedgerows and the balancing pond, new hedgerow to southern boundary with arable field margins exterior to development.
Protected Species	Nesting birds and perhaps bats may use the boundary hedgerows and roadside planting.
BAP Priority Species	Potential for amphibians associated with the balancing pond; potential for priority bird species of arable farmland and brown hare
Invasive Species	Not known
Notes	

Conclusion

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

Rationale	Rating
Some potential effects on designated sites (SINC, SSSI, LNR), the wider ecological network and/or priority habitats and species but relatively easy to mitigate for.	Yellow
Summary conclusion	Existing trees, hedgerows and the balancing pond should be retained and enhanced; there may be an opportunity for habitat creation in association with development of the site.

Settlement: Open Countryside

Site: OC1 (Land at south west of A1(M) junction 50 near Rainton)

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: Open Countryside

Site: OC2 (Rudding Farm, near Kirk Deighton)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments

Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site at Ruddings Farm between Kirk Deighton and Walshford Bridge LCA56: Plompton and South Knaresborough Arable Rolling Land
Landscape description	Area description: The undulating landform is scattered with various blocks of woodland that disperse views across an otherwise open landscape. Fields are large to accommodate modern and intensive farming practices for cereal production and improved grassland for grazing Site Description: The site comprises of three fields; a large arable field and two smaller fields in pastoral and arable use. A metalled access road bisects the site leading to Ruddings Farm. The site is relatively flat at around 25mAOD. A hedgerow runs along the site's western boundary with a gappy hedgerow along the east. which abuts the low embankment of the A1(M) motorway which is woodland planted
Existing urban edge	The site is remote from nearby settlements of North Deighton 1.8km to the south west and Hunsingore, 1.8km to the north east
Trees and hedges	Hedgerow along the western site boundary and gappy hedgerow along the east. Scattered trees along Wetherby Lane which forms the site's southern boundary
Landscape and Green Belt designations	SG3 Settlement Growth: Conservation of the Countryside including Green Belt
Description of proposal for the site	Part residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha) and part employment use
Physical Sensitivity	The landscape is considered of medium quality and of medium value with few landscape features of quality. The A1(M) motorway is a significant intrusion in the landscape affecting tranquility. Susceptibility to change is considered to be high as the large scale open landscape would be difficult to accommodate the type of development proposed. Overall sensitivity is considered to be high.
Visual Sensitivity	The site is open and visible from the A168 to the west and from Wetherby Lane to the south. Intermittent views are also likely from the A1 (M) motorway
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of arable and pastoral fields within the open countryside divorced from any nearby settlements with few references to the type of development being proposed
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	There would be some potential to mitigate effects of development by introduction of perimeter screen planting works
Likely level of landscape effects	Large adverse effects but effects could be reduced with appropriate landscape mitigation
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	Cumulative effects could be encountered if OC5 adjoining the site to the South was also developed

Conclusion

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

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

Will it increase the quality and quantity of tree or woodland cover?

Will it make use of opportunities wherever possible to enhance the environment as part of other initiatives?

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

Summary conclusion	The development would highly visible from the surrounding road network. Appropriate layout and mitigation could reduce visual impacts but would be in direct conflict with the open character of the area
---------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Settlement: Open Countryside**Site: OC2 (Rudding Farm, near Kirk Deighton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Ribston Hall (grade II registered park and garden). Kirk Deighton, and Hunsingore Conservation Areas.
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Ruddings Farm. Ox Close House.
Commentary on heritage assets.	Due to the size of the site and its position within the landscape, the site can be said to be located in the wider landscape setting of Ribston Hall registered park and garden (which forms the setting of Ribston Hall itself (grade II* listed) and a variety of listed structures). Also, it will be within the wider setting of Kirk Deighton and Hunsingore Conservation Areas. Ruddings Farm is located within the site – this comprises a farmhouse and farm buildings, with additional modern farm buildings. The buildings and their setting will be affected. The wider setting of Ox Close House (an altered, rendered and pan tile farmhouse with associated brick outbuildings) will be affected.
Topography and views	Views across the site to Cowthorpe / Hunsingore (the latter being a conservation area) and their general context (these settlements being set at a higher level than surrounding land - church spire visible). Generally, open views across the site with Ruddings Farm visible in context. Wider views available from raised road bridges over the A168 / A1M, distant hills visible in views - possible visual connection to Ribston Hall parkland.
Landscape context	Open countryside / farmland with hedgerows and trees to field boundaries and additional pockets of woodland.
Grain of surrounding development	Dispersed grain of open countryside, with farmsteads and villages set within the landscape.
Local building design	Varied but the site is located between areas typified by stone (to the west) and brick (to the east).
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	Ruddings Farm is located within the site, along with a field and access lane to the farm. Wetherby Lane (raised in parts due to the road bridges) forms the south boundary and the A1M forms part of the eastern boundary. The rest of the boundary is drawn around the farm, in part following a hedged field boundary, just touching the A168 at the north west corner. A bungalow is located on the southern edge, facing onto Wetherby Lane. Ox Close House is located near to the south west corner of the site but on the other side of the A168. A cycle way runs along the west side of the A168.

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

Standard housing density and form across the whole site would be contrary to the dispersed grain and character and form of established villages in the surrounding area; the development would not be characteristic of the rural context. Wider landscape impact (such as that which may affect the setting of Ribston Hall and the nearby conservation areas) should be considered. The historic buildings of Ruddings Farm themselves may be affected by development of the site - some redevelopment of the farmstead would be possible if historic buildings are to be retained and any new buildings are appropriate to their context but wider development across the whole site would be harmful to the setting of Ruddings Farm. Cumulative effect to be considered in conjunction with site OC5 to the south.

Settlement: Open Countryside

Site: OC2 (Rudding Farm, near Kirk Deighton)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	None likely to be impacted.
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	None likely to be impacted.
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England have no requirement for consultation on residential development.
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likely to be impacted.
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows, arable farmland.
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None.
Sward	Arable.
Trees and Hedges	Very few internal hedges but external hedges with occasional mature trees (especially around the farmstead) or screen planting for A1M bound much of the site.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature boundary trees likely to merit TPO protection.
Water/Wetland	There is a small pond near the farm (half in the site) and another associated with a ditch near the A1M just north of the site boundary; fringes of the site lie within the flood zone of the River Nidd corridor.
Slope and Aspect	Generally flat.
Buildings and Structures	Ruddings Farms and associated farm buildings. Modern bungalows to southern boundary.
Natural Area	NCA 30 Southern Magnesian Limestone.
Environmental Opportunity	SEO 2: Protect and manage existing semi-natural habitats, including grasslands, wetlands and woodlands; and increase the area of semi-natural habitats, restore and create new areas, and create networks and links between habitats, to make their ecology more resilient and to afford increased movement of species.
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 56 Plompton and South Knaresborough Arable Land <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Encourage restoration and management of hedgerows along roadsides...” • “Tree planting and woodland planting can be used to complement the rolling landform...”
Connectivity/Corridors	Hedgerows provide some connectivity through the large-scale agricultural landscape. Drains link through to the River Nidd to the north. While the A1 (M) and A168 verges also provide a degree of connectivity they also form a barrier to terrestrial species.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Opportunities should be sought to enhance biodiversity in association with any development e.g. in association with Suds or habitat creation, in association with green infrastructure provision. River Nidd Corridor lies immediately to the north and could be enhanced in association with any development.
Protected Species	Nesting birds and bats may use trees, hedges and buildings, some potential for great crested newts.
BAP Priority Species	Potential for priority bird species of arable farmland and brown hares.
Invasive Species	Not known.
Notes	

Conclusion

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

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

Summary conclusion

This site is predominantly arable farmland with relatively low biodiversity interest; opportunities should be sought to enhance biodiversity in association with any development e.g. in association with Suds or habitat creation in association with green infrastructure provision.

Settlement: Open Countryside

Site: OC2 (Rudding Farm, near Kirk Deighton)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments

Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.

According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the majority of the proposed site is located within flood zone 1. However, a section of the site towards the north eastern boundary is located in flood zones 2/3. I recommend that this area of the site remains undeveloped

We are however, aware of flooding incidents in the general area & downstream of the site due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide. We have received significantly increased levels of complaints over recent years from concerned residents affected by, and threatened by flooding from these watercourses. Due to the number of major development proposals in the general area planning to discharge surface water to the same watercourses, it is essential that surface water discharge is kept to an absolute minimum.

Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) should always be any developer's first consideration and giving preference to soakaways. In my view, infiltration drainage is unlikely to be fully successful at this location due to ground conditions in the surrounding area being predominantly heavy clay soils. However, any potential developer would be expected to submit a detailed feasibility study showing the use of SuDS including soakaways permeable cellular pavements, grassed swales, infiltration trenches, wetlands, ponds and green roofs that assist in dealing with surface water at source, has been fully explored.

Any proposed discharge of surface water from the development site should be restricted to Greenfield rates (1.4 l/s/ha for all storm scenarios). The overall strategy should show that there is sufficient on site attenuation to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without increasing the restricted flows to the watercourse.

Applicants would be expected to agree the outline drainage strategy with the LPA in principle before any planning consent is granted. The outline drainage information should include an assessment of flood risk to the site & surrounding area, topographical survey, feasibility of infiltration drainage, on site storage, rates of discharge, outfall location & condition survey results of existing watercourses (on or off site) and proposals for dealing with any identified remedial items.

The proposed development land would be classed as major development due to the specified size of the site. Consequently, NYCC in its capacity as Lead Local Flood Authority should be consulted regarding the surface water drainage strategy (Statutory Consultee).

Conclusion

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

Rationale

Rating

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

Orange

Settlement: Open Countryside

Site: OC3 (Oakwood Park Business Centre, near Bishop Thornton)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments

Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site located on the east side of Fountains Abbey Road approximately 500m east of Bishop Thornton. LCA28: Bishop Thornton Vale Fringe farmland
Landscape description	Area description: The wider landscape is moderate scale with undulating landform becoming flat around Bishop Thornton. Medium to large scale parliamentary enclosure fields in grass and arable production with hedgerow boundaries. Woodland cover is intermittent. Site description: the northern part of the site includes Oak Park business centre and formal landscaping. To the south is a small area of open grassland with tree planting on three sides.
Existing urban edge	None. The site is in a rural area adjacent to a small scale employment use development.
Trees and hedges	Strip of woodland planting along south and west boundaries.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open countryside
Description of proposal for the site	Employment use.
Physical Sensitivity	The landscape does have susceptibility to change as a result of continued expansion of development for employment use that would introduce further uncharacteristic built form.
Visual Sensitivity	The site is visually well contained by existing woodland cover particularly to the east.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of open ground in rural landscape to built development and car parking for employment use.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Retention and strengthening of existing tree planting is essential.
Likely level of landscape effects	Medium to large scale adverse depending upon the type of built form.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	None

Conclusion

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

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

Will it increase the quality and quantity of tree or woodland cover?

Will it make use of opportunities wherever possible to enhance the environment as part of other initiatives?

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

Summary conclusion	The continued development for employment use in this area will affect landscape character. The capacity of the landscape to accept the development proposed will depend upon the scale and type of buildings. Smaller scale development would be easier to integrate.
---------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Settlement: Open Countryside**Site: OC3 (Oakwood Park Business Centre, near Bishop Thornton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	None.
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	None.
Commentary on heritage assets.	N/A
Topography and views	Open countryside with long range views.
Landscape context	Woodland bordering a disused quarry to the east. Cricket ground to the north west. Tree belt following a watercourse to the west.
Grain of surrounding development	A peppering of dwellings and buildings in open countryside. Paddock between Oakwood House- a 20th century bungalow- and farm dwelling and farm buildings associated with Thornton Moor Farm. Roundwood Grange business park to the north.
Local building design	Heterogeneity in style.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	Footpaths cross the landscape in the vicinity 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
There is no Conservation Area, designated or local heritage asset.	Neutral

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

Rationale	Rating
Site re-development provides an opportunity for high quality design.	Dark Green

Summary conclusion	The site presents an opportunity for high quality design.
---------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------

Settlement: Open Countryside

Site: OC3 (Oakwood Park Business Centre, near Bishop Thornton)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments

Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	None likely to be impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	None likely to be impacted
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likely to be impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Improved Pasture (P1HS 1992) and amenity grassland around the business park
Trees and Hedges	Developing tree belt along roadside and southern boundaries; ornamental planting on site
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature boundary and screen belt trees are likely to merit TPO protection
Water/Wetland	One onsite pond and 2 more just to east of boundary
Slope and Aspect	The land rises very gently to the north east
Buildings and Structures	Modern commercial units in stone with slate roofs
Natural Area	NCA 22: Pennines Dales Fringe
Environmental Opportunity	SE04: Supporting and encouraging the creation of grass/woodland buffer strips, in-field grass strips, sediment traps, ponds and wetland habitats to slow run-off and intercept sediments and pollutants...
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 28: Bishop Thornton Vale Fringe Farmland: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Explore opportunities to create woodland links" • "Promote the replacement of hedgerow trees" • "Promote land management for biodiversity..." • "Promote the enhancement of existing wildlife corridors such as hedgerows and water courses". • "Promote the creation of new wildlife corridors to link and improve existing".
Connectivity/Corridors	The landscaping and adjacent network of medium sized fields and hedgerows links into a mosaic of relatively well wooded countryside
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Retain and enhance native tree belts, hedgerows, ponds and wetlands on site; possibly in association with Suds. Plant a new native hedgerow along the NW site boundary.
Protected Species	Nesting birds and foraging bats are likely to utilise the trees, shrubs and hedgerows on site. Great crested newts may occur in ponds on and adjacent to the site.
BAP Priority Species	Not known
Invasive Species	None known
Notes	

Conclusion

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

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

Summary conclusion	The screen planting and adjacent network of medium sized fields and hedgerows links into a mosaic of relatively well wooded countryside. Retain and enhance native tree belts, hedgerows and ponds and wetlands on site; possibly in association with Suds. Plant a new native hedgerow along the NW site boundary.
---------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Settlement: Open Countryside

Site: OC3 (Oakwood Park Business Centre, near Bishop Thornton)

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.

Drainage strategies for Brownfield sites should provide characteristics, which are similar to Greenfield behaviour so far as possible. In line with current development control drainage standards in this and neighbouring councils, discharge of roof/surface water from Brownfield sites should be reduced by a minimum 30% of existing peak flows + 30% to account for future climate change.

Applicants would be expected to agree the outline drainage strategy with the LPA in principle before any planning consent is granted. The outline drainage information should include an assessment of flood risk to the site & surrounding area, on site storage requirements, existing peak flow rates, proposed peak flow rates, survey results showing existing drains/watercourses/sewers, outfall location and proposals for dealing with any identified remedial items.

The proposed development land would be classed as major development due to the specified size of the site. Consequently, NYCC in its capacity as Lead Local Flood Authority should be consulted regarding the surface water drainage strategy (Statutory Consultee).

Conclusion

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

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

Settlement: Open Countryside

Site: OC4 (Land north of Racecourse Approach, near Wetherby)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments

Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site situated to the north of Racecourse Approach and to the east of Wetherby Services and the A1(M) LCA100: Kirk Deighton to Tockwith Arable Farmland
Landscape description	Area description: Relatively flat and well wooded containing several woodland blocks. Fields are medium to large within a randomly arranged pattern suggesting early enclosure. Site Description: The site comprises of a large irregular shaped arable field bounded by the former Ingmanthorpe Hall access road to the south and Wetherby Services to the west. The site is flat at about 27mAOD. An intervening hedgerow along Racecourse Approach filters views of the site from the south with a hedgerow along the site's western and northern boundary and screen planting belt along the east.
Existing urban edge	The site adjoins Wetherby Services to the west
Trees and hedges	Hedgerows, hedgerow trees and shelterbelt woodlands define the site boundary
Landscape and Green Belt designations	SG3 Settlement Growth: Conservation of the Countryside including Green Belt
Description of proposal for the site	Assume part residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha) and part employment use.
Physical Sensitivity	The landscape is considered of medium quality and of medium value with few landscape features of quality. The A1(M) motorway and Wetherby Services is a significant intrusion in the landscape affecting tranquility. Susceptibility to change is considered to be high as the large scale open landscape would be difficult to accommodate the type of development proposed. Overall sensitivity is considered to be medium.
Visual Sensitivity	The site is open and visible from the A168 to the west and from Loshpot Lane to the south. Views are also likely from the A1 (M) motorway and directly visible from PRow crossing the site.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of arable and pastoral fields within the open countryside, loss of historic pattern with site divorced from any nearby settlements with few references to the type of development proposed
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	There would be some potential to mitigate effects of development by introduction of perimeter screen planting works
Likely level of landscape effects	Large adverse effects but effects could be reduced with appropriate landscape mitigation
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	N/A

Conclusion

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

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

Will it increase the quality and quantity of tree or woodland cover?

Will it make use of opportunities wherever possible to enhance the environment as part of other initiatives?

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

Summary conclusion	The development would be highly visible from the surrounding road network. Appropriate layout and mitigation could reduce visual impacts but would be in direct conflict with the open/wooded patchwork character of the area
---------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Settlement: Open Countryside**Site: OC4 (Land north of Racecourse Approach, near Wetherby)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Inmangthorpe Hall (grade II) and its associated curtilage listed buildings.
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Sandbeck House. Inmanthorpe Hall Farm. Swinnow Hill.
Commentary on heritage assets.	The site is located within the setting of Inmangthorpe Hall (grade II) and its associated curtilage listed buildings (includes listed gate piers) - the hall has been converted to apartments, with associated buildings (including new buildings), providing dwellings in the grounds. The site is located in the setting of Sandbeck House, an altered, historic stone barn with attached dwelling formed out of extensions to the side and rear - dwelling part is rendered, one elevation of barn still exposed stone. This is located to the south west corner of the site. There may also be heritage assets present at Inmangthorpe Hall Farm and Swinnow Hill (however, the presence of heritage assets has not been verified - old OS maps indicated the possibility of their presence). If present, their setting may be affected.
Topography and views	The site is relatively level. Views are possible looking over the site towards Inmangthorpe Hall and the woodland to the north - the tall hall building is visible in winter. Seen in context with Sandbeck House, e.g. on approach to site from the roundabout over the A1M. Also seen in context with the services and the road network at its west side. Some views possible when looking west from the access lane to the hall, when gaps in the hedge are present.
Landscape context	Open countryside with fields with hedgerow boundaries and pockets of woodland.
Grain of surrounding development	Dispersed grain in open countryside characterised by the presence of isolated farmsteads or larger houses in extensive grounds. The urban edge of Wetherby is located further to the south east and the A1M and the associated road bridges / services run through the countryside.
Local building design	Varied but the site is located between areas typified by stone (to the west) and brick (to the east).
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The site is a field located to the east of Wetherby Services by the A1M. Inmangthorpe Hall is located to the east of the site - a field separates the site from the hall, but woodland (protected) associated with the hall adjoins the site at its north east corner. The field in between was once part of the historic parkland of Inmanthorpe Hall. A tree belt has been planted on the eastern edge of the site, extending down from the woodland to the north. Sandback Lane runs along the southern edge of the site, trees (protected) present along / close to the boundary. To the north edge are a hedgerow and trees. Sandbeck House is located on the other side of the B1224, near the south west corner of the site. A public footpath runs from Wetherby, past Sandbeck House and along the western side of the site, northwards. There is also a bridleway running along the southern edge of the site.

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

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

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

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

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

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

Summary conclusion

Development across the whole site will impact harmfully on the setting of the grade II listed Inmangthorpe Hall. The field is part of an area of undeveloped land / countryside that forms a buffer zone between the hall and the A1M / services – these having already having had a negative impact on the setting of the hall and other heritage assets (through intrusion of uncharacteristic buildings / engineering works associated with the roads and the associated noise and activity). Whilst the provision of minor additional employment uses may be appropriate in the context of the services, housing located here would be divorced from any nearby settlements and be contrary to the dispersed grain.

Settlement: Open Countryside**Site: OC4 (Land north of Racecourse Approach, near Wetherby)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

SACs/SPAs	None likely to be impacted.
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	None likely to be impacted.
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England require consultation for residential development of 100 units or more.
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likely to be impacted.
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows, arable farmland.
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None.
Sward	Arable.
Trees and Hedges	Hedgerows along most field boundaries except the western. Mature Boundary trees and hedges; Sugden wood adjacent to the north east with recent planting belt along eastern boundary. There is a line of mature trees along the southern boundary.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature boundary trees are likely to merit TPO protection.
Water/Wetland	There are drains along the northern and western boundaries. The site lies on the fringe of the floodzone and there are several (balancing) ponds within 100m of the site.
Slope and Aspect	Generally flat.
Buildings and Structures	None.
Natural Area	NCA 30 Southern Magnesian Limestone.
Environmental Opportunity	SEO 2: Protect and manage existing semi-natural habitats, including grasslands, wetlands and woodlands; and increase the area of semi-natural habitats, restore and create new areas, and create networks and links between habitats, to make their ecology more resilient and to afford increased movement of species.
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 100 Kirk Deighton to Tockwith Arable Farmland
Connectivity/Corridors	Hedgerows provide some connectivity through the large-scale agricultural landscape. Drains link through to the River Nidd to the north. While the A1 (M) verges also provide a degree of connectivity they also form a barrier to terrestrial species.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Retain boundary trees and hedgerows, buffer boundaries with semi-natural habitats as part of green infrastructure provision. There may be an opportunity to develop suds wetland on site, possibly in association with existing drains.
Protected Species	Potential for birds to nest in boundary trees and hedgerows; and of ground nesting birds; amphibians may be present including great crested newt.
BAP Priority Species	Potential for priority bird species of arable farmland.
Invasive Species	Not known.
Notes	

Conclusion

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

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

Summary conclusion

Although arable farmland is not an intrinsically biodiverse habitat this site is set within a landscape rich in ponds, hedgerows and woodland; Retain boundary trees and hedgerows, buffer boundaries with seminatural habitats as part of green infrastructure provision. There may be an opportunity to develop suds wetland on site, possibly in association with existing drains.

Settlement: Open Countryside

Site: OC4 (Land north of Racecourse Approach, near Wetherby)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments

Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.

According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the majority of the proposed site is located within flood zone 1. However, a section towards the north western boundary is situated in flood zones 2/3. I recommend that this section of the site remains undeveloped.

We are aware of flooding incidents in the general area & downstream of the site due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide. We have received significantly increased levels of complaints over recent years from concerned residents affected by, and threatened by flooding from these watercourses. Due to the number of major development proposals in the general area planning to discharge surface water to the same watercourses, it is essential that surface water discharge is kept to an absolute minimum.

Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) should always be any developer's first consideration and giving preference to soakaways. In my view, infiltration drainage is unlikely to be fully successful at this location due to ground conditions in the surrounding area being predominantly heavy clay soils. However, any potential developer would be expected to submit a detailed feasibility study showing the use of SuDS including soakaways permeable cellular pavements, grassed swales, infiltration trenches, wetlands, ponds and green roofs that assist in dealing with surface water at source, has been fully explored.

Any proposed discharge of surface water from the development site should be restricted to Greenfield rates (1.4 l/s/ha for all storm scenarios). The overall strategy should show that there is sufficient on site attenuation to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without increasing the restricted flows to the watercourse.

Applicants would be expected to agree the outline drainage strategy with the LPA in principle before any planning consent is granted. The outline drainage information should include an assessment of flood risk to the site & surrounding area, topographical survey, feasibility of infiltration drainage, on site storage, rates of discharge, outfall location & condition survey results of existing watercourses (on or off site) and proposals for dealing with any identified remedial items.

The proposed development land would be classed as major development due to the specified size of the site. Consequently, NYCC in its capacity as Lead Local Flood Authority should be consulted regarding the surface water drainage strategy (Statutory Consultee).

Conclusion

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

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

Settlement: Open Countryside

Site: OC5 (New Settlement at Deighton Grange Farm, near Kirk Deighton)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments

Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site at Deighton Grange Farm, Kirk Deighton LCA100: Kirk Deighton to Tockwith Arable Farmland
Landscape description	Area description: Relatively flat and well wooded containing several woodland blocks. Fields are medium to large within a randomly arranged pattern suggesting early enclosure. Site Description: The site comprises of approximately 12 arable fields interspersed with woodland blocks and the Deighton Grange Farm Business complex. Broad Wath watercourse runs south to north through the centre of the site before joining the River Nidd. A PRoW runs east to west through the site with an overhead transmission line bisecting the site running north west to south east. The site is low lying at about 26mAOD..
Existing urban edge	The site is separated from the nearby settlement of North Deighton 0.6km to the south west
Trees and hedges	There are five woodland plantation areas within the site. There is a continuous hedgerow along the A168 which forms the western site boundary with a gappy hedgerow along Loshpot Lane which forms the site's southern boundary. There are few hedgerow trees
Landscape and Green Belt designations	SG3 Settlement Growth: Conservation of the Countryside including Green Belt R11: Rights of Way
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The landscape is considered of medium quality and of medium value with few landscape features of quality. The A1(M) motorway is a significant intrusion in the landscape affecting tranquility. Susceptibility to change is considered to be high as the large scale open landscape would be difficult to accommodate the type of development proposed. Overall sensitivity is considered to be high.
Visual Sensitivity	The site is open and visible from the A168 to the west and from Loshpot Lane to the south. Views are also likely from the A1 (M) motorway directly visible from PRoW crossing the site.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of arable and pastoral fields within the open countryside, loss of historic field pattern with site divorced from any nearby settlements with few references to the type of development being proposed
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	There would be some potential to mitigate effects of development by introduction of perimeter screen planting works
Likely level of landscape effects	Large adverse effects but effects could be reduced with appropriate landscape mitigation
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	Cumulative effects could be encountered if O2 adjoining the site to the north and OC7 to the west was also developed

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

Summary conclusion	The development would highly visible from the surrounding road network. Appropriate layout and mitigation could reduce visual impacts but would be in direct conflict with the open/wooded patchwork character of the area
---------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Settlement: Open Countryside

Site: OC5 (New Settlement at Deighton Grange Farm, near Kirk Deighton)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments

Type: Conservation and Design

Conservation and Design Site Assessment

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Ribston Hall (grade II registered park and garden). Kirk Deighton, North Deighton and Hunsingore Conservation Areas.
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Farmhouse and farm buildings of Deighton Grange and Deighton Banks. Small stone cottage located on the west side of the A168 (south of Deighton Banks Farm). Ox Close House. Former WW2 prisoner of war camp.
Commentary on heritage assets.	<p>Due to the size of the site and its position within the landscape, the site can be said to be located in the wider landscape setting of Ribston Hall registered park and garden (which forms the setting of Ribston Hall itself (grade II* listed) and a variety of listed structures). Also, it will be within the wider setting of Kirk Deighton and Hunsingore and possibly North Deighton Conservation Areas.</p> <p>Heritage assets are located within the site and therefore may be directly affected by development proposals – the farmhouse and farm buildings of Deighton Grange (though the site now comprises many modern farm buildings). Deighton Banks Farmhouse and farm buildings - partially within and partially outside the site, on its south west corner - those within appearing to more modern or in poor condition, with the traditional building being located just outside the site. The setting of these buildings will also be affected by development. Just outside of the site is the small stone cottage located on the west side of the A168 (south of Deighton Banks Farm). Also, Ox Close House, located on the west side of the A168, near to Wetherby Lane and also a former WW2 prisoner of war camp (site OC7) located on the west side of the A168 (though this site is derelict and is only included for reference). The site is located within the setting of these heritage assets.</p>
Topography and views	Views across the site to Cowthorpe / Hunsingore (the latter being a conservation area) and their general context (these settlements being set at a higher level than surrounding land - church spire visible). Generally, open views across the site, which is relatively level, with Deighton Grange visible in context. Wider views available from raised road bridges over the A168 / A1M, distant hills visible in views - possible visual connection to Ribston Hall parkland. Kirk Deighton (and its church) visible in contextual views as it is located at a higher level. Views possible from the A168 / cycle way due to it being set at a higher level than the site. Closer views of the site from there, such as views of Deighton Banks Farm buildings which are located close to the road.
Landscape context	Open countryside / farmland with hedgerows and trees to field boundaries and additional pockets of woodland.
Grain of surrounding development	Dispersed grain of open countryside, with farmsteads and villages set within the landscape.
Local building design	Varied but the site is located between areas typified by stone (to the west) and brick (to the east).
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The site is a group of fields adjacent to the west side of the A1M. The A168 forms the majority of the east boundary of the site (hedgerow and verge to road). A farm is located within the site - Deighton Grange. Also, some of the buildings of Deighton Banks Farm are also located within the site (south west corner). Loshpot Lane forms the south boundary (raised as it rises over the A1M). To the north, Wetherby Lane (raised in parts due to the road bridges) forms the boundary. A watercourse runs through the site. There are areas of woodland and other scattered trees, such as along the watercourse and on some field boundaries. A handful of individual dwellings also located within the site – one bungalow off Wetherby Lane and a dwelling located to the west of Deighton Grange (facing onto the A168). A cycle way runs along the west side of the A168.

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	Standard housing density and form across the whole site would be contrary to the dispersed grain and character and form of established villages in the surrounding area; the development would not be characteristic of the rural context. Impact, including wider landscape impact (such as that which may affect the setting of Ribston Hall and the nearby conservation areas) may be reduced by the adoption of a much smaller form of new settlement, designed to respect local settlement pattern and to integrate it appropriately with the surrounding countryside. Encroachment of development upon historic farmsteads will cause harm but this harm may be reduced by providing adequate spacing (within a smaller site). Redevelopment upon the farmsteads only may be possible without necessarily causing harm to the heritage assets or appearing out of character in the area (assuming historic buildings to be retained and converted and any new buildings to be complementary to the scale / form and density of the farmsteads). Cumulative affects should be considered due to OC2 located directly to the north.

Settlement: Open Countryside**Site: OC5 (New Settlement at Deighton Grange Farm, near Kirk Deighton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

SACs/SPAs	Within 1km of Kirk Deighton SAC to SE.
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	Within 1km of Kirk Deighton SSSI SE.
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England require consultation on "residential development of 100 units or more."
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None.
BAP Priority Habitats	Broad-leaved woodland, perhaps veteran trees & arable field margins.
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	SE45 SW TN1 - emergent and bankside plants where Broadwath crosses Loshpot Lane.
Sward	Arable.
Trees and Hedges	Several small woodlands - coniferous, mixed and deciduous; hedgerows widely spaced but well maintained where they occur, with occasional mature trees. There are a small number of mature field trees.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature trees and woodlands may merit TPOs.
Water/Wetland	Broad Wath runs through the centre of the site and large areas are within the floodzone ; two small ponds near SE corner; one near NW corner.
Slope and Aspect	Generally flat.
Buildings and Structures	Deighton Grange Farm and associated buildings within site.
Natural Area	NCA 30 Southern Magnesian Grassland.
Environmental Opportunity	SEO 2: Protect and manage existing semi-natural habitats, including grasslands, wetlands and woodlands; and increase the area of semi-natural habitats, restore and create new areas, and create networks and links between habitats, to make their ecology more resilient and to afford increased movement of species.
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 100 Kirk Deighton to Tockwith Arable Farmland
Connectivity/Corridors	Hedgerows provide some connectivity through the large-scale agricultural landscape. While the A1(M) and A168 verges also provide a degree of connectivity they also form a barrier to terrestrial species.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Opportunity to extend and better connect network of ponds and wetlands in the broader vicinity of the SAC in association with Suds; especially given the extent of the floodzone impacting on the site.
Protected Species	Bats recorded from Deighton Grange; Nesting birds and bats may utilise mature trees and hedgerows. Potential for GCN, Badgers, Red Kite; riparian species may utilise stream.
BAP Priority Species	Potential for priority bird species of arable farmland and brown hares.
Invasive Species	Not known.
Notes	

Conclusion

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

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

Summary conclusion	Although the site is predominantly arable it includes a number of potentially important habitats (woodland, trees, hedgerows, stream) which should be protected, buffered, inter-connected and enhanced as part of any development. Further opportunities should be sought for habitat enhancement in association with green infrastructure and Suds.
---------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Settlement: Open Countryside

Site: OC5 (New Settlement at Deighton Grange Farm, near Kirk Deighton)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments

Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.

According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the majority of the proposed site is located within flood zone 1. However, a section that runs through the central/eastern area adjacent to surface water tributaries is located in flood zones 2/3. I recommend that these flood risk sections of the site remain undeveloped.

We are aware of flooding incidents in the general area & downstream of the site due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide. We have received significantly increased levels of complaints over recent years from concerned residents affected by, and threatened by flooding from these watercourses. Due to the number of major development proposals in the general area planning to discharge surface water to the same watercourses, it is essential that surface water discharge is kept to an absolute minimum.

Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) should always be any developer's first consideration and giving preference to soakaways. In my view, infiltration drainage is unlikely to be fully successful at this location due to ground conditions in the surrounding area being predominantly heavy clay soils. However, any potential developer would be expected to submit a detailed feasibility study showing the use of SuDS including soakaways permeable cellular pavements, grassed swales, infiltration trenches, wetlands, ponds and green roofs that assist in dealing with surface water at source, has been fully explored.

Any proposed discharge of surface water from the development site should be restricted to Greenfield rates (1.4 l/s/ha for all storm scenarios). The overall strategy should show that there is sufficient on site attenuation to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without increasing the restricted flows to the watercourse.

Applicants would be expected to agree the outline drainage strategy with the LPA in principle before any planning consent is granted. The outline drainage information should include an assessment of flood risk to the site & surrounding area, topographical survey, feasibility of infiltration drainage, on site storage, rates of discharge, outfall location & condition survey results of existing watercourses (on or off site) and proposals for dealing with any identified remedial items.

The proposed development land would be classed as major development due to the specified size of the site. Consequently, NYCC in its capacity as Lead Local Flood Authority should be consulted regarding the surface water drainage strategy (Statutory Consultee).

Conclusion

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

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

Settlement: Open Countryside

Site: OC6 (Former Middleton Hospital)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments

Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Former Middleton Hospital, Ilkley. LCA 18: Wharfedale south-facing valley side.
Landscape description	Area Description; The wider landscape comprises the south facing valley side. The U-shaped valley is large scale and broad with sides that gently undulate as they slope down from the upland moor to the flat valley floor. Site Description: Within the site the majority of the former hospital buildings have been demolished, some structures still however remain at the northern end of the site. Building foundations and hardstandings are still in evidence, together with internal access roads. The site is bounded by Carters Lane to the west, with a woodland belt obscuring the site from the Lane. Trees within and adjacent to the site are protected by TPO's. There is a steep slope from north to south from about 135m to 105m AOD with views out across the valley. Mature woodland belts surround the site on the northern, western and southern boundaries, West Park Wood lies to the east. A PROW runs along the site's northern boundary.
Existing urban edge	The site lies to the east of Welville School and the hamlet of Middleton. The urban edge of Ilkley is situated 0.6km to the south across the River Wharfe
Trees and hedges	Extensive wooded areas both surround and lie within the site, some of which is TPO'd woodland. There are also large areas of woodland regeneration emerging within rough grassland areas within the site
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Nidderdale AONB. Green Belt. Policy SG3 Settlement Growth: Conservation of the Countryside including Green Belt.
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (Assume average 30 dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	Loss of institutional landscape associated with former hospital site with significant woodland areas within and surrounding the site. Site is of high value as it is within the Green Belt and AONB and highly susceptible to change. The site is therefore of high sensitivity
Visual Sensitivity	The site is heavily filtered by surrounding woodlands from near distance views particularly from Carters Lane to the west. Views would however be likely from the PROW routed along the northern boundary of the site. There would also be extensive views of the site from the southern margins of the Wharfe Valley.
Anticipated landscape effects	There would be loss of a grassland and treed landscape within a heavily screened and wooded setting
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Potential for some mitigation in the form of limiting development to lower areas of the site and retaining upper areas to the north as open space.
Likely level of landscape effects	Large adverse effects. The site occupies a prominent location within Green Belt and AONB. Development would impact on the wooded character of the area.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	N/A

Conclusion

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

Rationale	Rating
Sensitivity Rating: High/medium – key distinctive characteristics are vulnerable to change; typically a high to medium valued landscape where landscape conditions is good where detracting features or major infrastructure is not present or where present has limited influence on the landscape.	Orange
Capacity Rating: Medium/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
Summary conclusion	Highly valued landscape which is highly susceptible to change. Some development, particularly lower areas of the site could be appropriate after taking fully into consideration likely visual impacts.

Settlement: Open Countryside**Site: OC6 (Former Middleton Hospital)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

SACs/SPAs	North Pennine Moors SAC and SPA 800m to north
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	West Nidderdale, Barden and Blubberhouses Moors SSSI 850m to north
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England require consultation on any residential developments with a total net gain in residential units
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	Middleton Hospital SINC covers most of the site. West Park/Stubbs Wood adjacent to the east
BAP Priority Habitats	Unimproved neutral grassland (lowland hay meadow), Woodland
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	Surveys by NYCC; Gemmel and Haycock & Jay
Sward	Species-rich unimproved neutral grassland
Trees and Hedges	Belts of woodland along the western, southern and northern boundaries; clumps of mature trees, ornamental planting and developing birch woodland in the centre of the site. Stubbs wood bounds the site to the east
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature trees on site benefit from TPO protection
Water/Wetland	None on site
Slope and Aspect	Site generally slopes southwards towards the river valley
Buildings and Structures	Most structures now removed from the site some
Natural Area	NCA 21 Yorkshire Dales
Environmental Opportunity	SEO 2: Protecting, enhancing, extending and linking semi-natural habitats, particularly upland hay meadows, calcareous grasslands and native woodland, to form resilient, well-functioning habitat networks.
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA Area 18 Wharfedale South Facing Valley Side <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Field boundaries require protection and maintenance" • "Aim: retain woodland and tree cover..."
Connectivity/Corridors	The site lies along a gillside which links the lower Wharfe Valley with the upland fringes to the north
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	A small amount of development, concentrated into the north-centre of the site might facilitate optimal conservation management across the majority of the site
Protected Species	Nesting birds and foraging bats utilise the trees and woodland of the site. Badger and otter may occur
BAP Priority Species	Not known
Invasive Species	Japanese knotweed has occurred on site in the past and may still be present
Notes	14/03916/FULMAJ permitted application

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 should be restricted to those areas outside of the SINC and should only be accepted where planning obligations entail bringing the SINC grasslands and woodlands into favourable management through an agreed plan. Accordingly, the site is scored 'red' because development would only be acceptable on a small part of the site; housing targets for the wider site could not be met without severely damaging the SINC.
---------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Settlement: Open Countryside

Site: OC6 (Former Middleton Hospital)

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.

Drainage strategies for mixed or brownfield sites should provide characteristics, which are similar to Greenfield behaviour. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) should always be any developer's first consideration and giving preference to soakaways. In my view, infiltration drainage is unlikely to be fully successful at this location due to ground conditions in the surrounding area being predominantly heavy clay soils. However, any potential developer would be expected to submit a detailed feasibility study showing the use of SuDS including soakaways permeable cellular pavements, grassed swales, infiltration trenches, wetlands, ponds and green roofs that assist in dealing with surface water at source, has been fully explored.

This site is of specific interest in terms of nature conservation, consequently, the Environment Agency should be consulted with regards to pollution control.

In line with current development control drainage standards in this and neighbouring councils, discharge of roof/surface water from the existing Brownfield areas of the site should be reduced by a minimum 30% of existing peak flows + 30% to account for future climate change. Areas of the site that have not been previously developed or positively drained will be classed as Greenfield land. Accordingly, any proposed discharge of surface water from these areas should be restricted to Greenfield rates (1.4 l/s/ha for all storm scenarios). The overall strategy should show that there is sufficient on site attenuation to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without increasing the restricted flows to the watercourse.

Applicants would be expected to agree the outline drainage strategy with the LPA in principle before any planning consent is granted. The outline drainage information should include an assessment of flood risk to the site & surrounding area, topographical survey, feasibility of infiltration drainage, on site storage, rates of discharge, outfall location, existing peak flow rates, proposed peak flow rates & condition survey results of existing watercourses (on or off site) and proposals for dealing with any identified remedial items.

The proposed development land would be classed as major development due to the specified size of the site. Consequently, NYCC in its capacity as Lead Local Flood Authority should be consulted regarding the surface water drainage strategy (Statutory Consultee).

Conclusion

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

Rationale

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

Rating

Orange

Settlement: Open Countryside**Site: OC7 (Land west of A168, Kirk Deighton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	land west of A168, Kirk Deighton LCA100: Kirk Deighton to Tockwith Arable Farmland
Landscape description	Area description: Relatively flat and well wooded containing several woodland blocks. Fields are medium to large within a randomly arranged pattern suggesting early enclosure. Site Description: The site is a small rectangular parcel of land to the west of the A168 and adjoining cycleway. There are a number of derelict buildings within the site and between them scattered areas of scrub regeneration within rough grassland. A hedgerow defines the eastern site boundary with open boundaries along arable fields to the south west and north.
Existing urban edge	The site lies within open countryside separated from the settlement of North Deighton to the south west
Trees and hedges	Hedgerow along the eastern boundary with some scrub regeneration within the site
Landscape and Green Belt designations	SG3 Settlement Growth: Conservation of the Countryside including Green Belt R11: Rights of Way
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The landscape is considered of medium quality and of medium value with few landscape features of quality. The A1(M) motorway is a significant intrusion in the landscape affecting tranquility. Susceptibility to change is considered to be high as the large scale open landscape would be difficult to accommodate the type of development proposed. Overall sensitivity is considered to be high.
Visual Sensitivity	The site is open and visible from the A168 to the east and adjacent cycleway/footpath
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of rough pasture, woodland scrub regeneration and derelict buildings
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	There would be some potential to mitigate effects of development by introduction of perimeter hedgerow and tree planting
Likely level of landscape effects	Large adverse effects but effects could be reduced with appropriate landscape mitigation
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	Cumulative effects could be encountered if OC5 adjoining the site to the east was also developed

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

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

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

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

Summary conclusion	Site is of high/medium sensitivity with limited reference to the type of development being proposed set within an open landscape. The development would be highly visible from the adjoining road network, footpath and cycleway. Appropriate layout and mitigation could reduce visual impacts to some extent
---------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Settlement: Open Countryside**Site: OC7 (Land west of A168, Kirk Deighton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	None
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	<p>The site is a former world war 2 prisoner of war hostel (a subsidiary site of a larger camp), dating from the 1940's. Derelict buildings still present. High significance in terms of 2nd WW military / social / local history (as prisoners mixed with the local community and worked on nearby farms). (Information advised by Roger Thomas of Historic England).</p> <p>Deighton Banks Farm, located to the south east, on the opposite side of the A168. This is a group of traditional stone building, comprising a farmhouse and farm building. A single storey outbuilding is located facing the road. The development would be within the setting of these buildings.</p>
Commentary on heritage assets.	As above
Topography and views	Located by the side of the A168, within an arable field, within open countryside. The land rises in level from south to north and from east to west, therefore the site is quite prominently located in the landscape, though there is some screening from the hedge on the roadside.
Landscape context	Open countryside.
Grain of surrounding development	Rural location, dispersed.
Local building design	Reference would be Kirk Deighton to the south and the traditional farm stead present on the other side of the road (largely, traditional stone buildings).
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	<p>Semi-derelict buildings are still present – probably an accommodation block, ablutions, equipment store etc, built of concrete frames and poss. former timber cladding (four or five), plus a brick tower / chimney (for heating / drying room). Known to be standard types, built across the country.</p> <p>There are no fences or other boundaries other than to the frontage. The site has some concrete hard surfacing but it otherwise overgrown with vegetation. There is a hedge and grass verge to the roadside.</p> <p>There is a telecoms mast located further to the north in close proximity.</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

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

Settlement: Open Countryside

Site: OC7 (Land west of A168, Kirk Deighton)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	None likely to be impacted.
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	None likely to be impacted.
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England require consultation for residential development of 100 units or more.
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likely to be impacted.
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows.
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None.
Sward	Verges may be relatively species-rich.
Trees and Hedges	There is a hedge along the road frontage; scrub developing on site.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	None.
Water/Wetland	Pond within 500m to west; drain c. 100m to south.
Slope and Aspect	The east part of the site slopes down towards the access road.
Buildings and Structures	Remnants of timber framed sheds with sheet roofs; a brick chimney like structure.
Natural Area	NCA 30 Southern Magnesian Limestone.
Environmental Opportunity	SEO 2: Protect and manage existing semi-natural habitats, including grasslands, wetlands and woodlands; and increase the area of semi-natural habitats, restore and create new areas, and create networks and links between habitats, to make their ecology more resilient and to afford increased movement of species.
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 56 Plompton and South Knaresborough Arable Land <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Encourage restoration and management of hedgerows along roadsides...” • “Tree planting and woodland planting can be used to complement the rolling landform...”
Connectivity/Corridors	Field hedgerows and the verges of the A168 provide a degree of connectivity through the large scale arable landscape.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Retain boundary hedges and elements of scrub and grassland. Seek opportunities to incorporate biodiversity within any redevelopment.
Protected Species	Potential for nesting birds and bats to utilise hedges, scrub and possibly the buildings.
BAP Priority Species	Not known.
Invasive Species	Not known.

Notes

Conclusion

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

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

Summary conclusion	Neglect is allowing the site to become naturalised. Retain boundary hedges and elements of scrub and grassland. Seek opportunities to incorporate biodiversity within any redevelopment potential for the presence of protected species - ecological survey required.
---------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Settlement: Open Countryside

Site: OC7 (Land west of A168, Kirk Deighton)

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.

Drainage strategies for Brownfield sites should provide characteristics, which are similar to Greenfield behaviour so far as possible. In line with current development control drainage standards in this and neighbouring councils, discharge of roof/surface water from Brownfield sites should be reduced by a minimum 30% of existing peak flows + 30% to account for future climate change.

Applicants would be expected to agree the outline drainage strategy with the LPA in principle before any planning consent is granted.

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: Open Countryside

Site: OC8 (Land at Rowden Lane End, Skipton Road)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments

Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Land at Rowden Lane End, Skipton Road LCA22: Menwith and Penny Pot Grassland LCA 23; Saltergate Valley Grassland
Landscape description	Area description: The wider landscape of LCA22 comprises the simple undulating plateau between the valley systems of Oak Beck and Nidderdale. The landform is large-scale and lack of woodland cover results in the landscape remaining open with extensive views. The heavily treed road corridor of Penny Pot Lane however and the new woodland plantation at High Moor Farm provide some degree of screening and enclosure. LCA 23 is consists of a small character area to the east of Burley Bank Road within which part of the site lies. this area is next to a diverse mix of undistinguished modern housing that brings discord to its balanced landscape of tended grassland fields managed for grazing stock. Site description: The site comprises of several pastoral fields which gently slope down to the south east. burley Band Road bisects the site east-west with Four Lane Ends Farm situated at the junction of Burley Bank Road and Skipton Road. Fields are defined by combination of low managed hedgerows dry stone walls and stock fencing with infrequent boundary trees.
Existing urban edge	The site is isolated from the urban edge of Harrogate and surrounded by open countryside.
Trees and hedges	Low managed hedgerows define many of the field boundaries with infrequent hedgerow trees.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open Countryside R11: Rights of Way
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The site is within a gently sloping pastoral landscape that is defined by hedgerows and drystone walls. The site is considered of high value in close proximity to the Nidderdale AONB with long distance views to the northwest and southeast. and would be highly susceptible to change from this type of development as there is limited reference to the type of built form being proposed
Visual Sensitivity	Upper parts of the site are highly visible from the surrounding road network and nearby PRoWs. There is a general lack of woodland and individual tree cover to assist in filtering views which results in the site appearing prominent in the landscape.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of pastoral fields in a highly visible location affecting openness of the countryside. Long distance views are likely to be interrupted by development and near distance horizons introduced by the proximity of built form
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Woodland structure planting and green infrastructure initiatives could provide some mitigation, this intervention would however affect openness of the landscape setting
Likely level of landscape effects	High adverse effects
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	Development of this site in conjunction with H32 to the south east could 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 is likely to result in the loss of ancient woodland, aged or veteran trees and/or trees protected by a TPO.	Red
Summary conclusion	Loss of pastoral fields in a highly visible location affecting openness of the countryside. Long distance views are likely to be interrupted by development and near distance horizons introduced by the proximity of built form

Settlement: Open Countryside

Site: OC8 (Land at Rowden Lane End, Skipton Road)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments

Type: Conservation and Design

Conservation and Design Site Assessment

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Saltergate Hill Farmhouse, a grade II listed building.
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Historic Buildings of Saltergate Hill Farm, Heather House Farm, Burley Bank Farm and Four Lane Ends Farm. Also the property north of the Skipton Road and nearby the Nelson Inn.
Commentary on heritage assets.	<p>Development of the eastern part of the site would impact on the wider setting of the listed farmhouse.</p> <p>It is unlikely that development of the site would harm the setting of the inn.</p> <p>South of the historic core of Burley Bank Farm are the industrial buildings of Saltergate Business Park, which have affected the setting of the older buildings, but generally the industrial buildings appear as modern farm buildings in the countryside.</p> <p>Heather House Farm was known as Moor Farm and some of the buildings are nineteenth century. The property north of Skipton Road is of similar age. The house faces south across the site, this building is of interest due to the stone steps leading to a loft area to the west side, this has since been converted for residential use. The brick barn to the east of the stone building is of no value.</p> <p>Development of the site would affect the setting of the farmsteads, principally because the area between them would be urbanised, whereas at present it is farmland.</p> <p>Four Lane Ends farmhouse is directly onto Burley Bank Road at the junction with Skipton Road. It is nineteenth century and forms a landmark at the junction. The northern part, now in domestic use, has large areas of unbroken wall, which adds to its attractiveness. This building, and ideally the stone outbuilding behind, should be retained, and its setting respected.</p> <p>Any development of site H32 should ensure that the farm buildings maintain their historic association with farmland in order to protect their setting.</p>
Topography and views	The site is quite flat, it is in an open landscape and there are views out in all directions. To the west there are views to the wind turbines. The site is highly visible from all sides.
Landscape context	The site is in open countryside, although it is quite close to the Barracks.
Grain of surrounding development	<p>Farm buildings are in small groups, Four Lane Ends farm is against the road, but others are set well back. Some rural housing is set close to the main road.</p> <p>South of the site, the housing of the barracks is mainly in the form of terraces set close to the road, although there are a few semi-detached pairs set back forming a semi-circular space in front.</p>
Local building design	<p>The farm houses and buildings are of stone with stone and slate roofs, and robust in nature. The inn is of the same materials, but opposite the inn is a rendered house. Houses and inn are two storeys in height, the heights of the farm buildings vary according to their function. A number of twentieth century agricultural buildings have been erected close to historic farm buildings. These have wider spans and are clad either in vertical timber boarding or profiled sheeting.</p> <p>The housing south of the site is two storey in height, the walls are finished in a deep cream render and there are red tiled roofs, such that they do not reflect the vernacular and are highly visible in the countryside.</p>

Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.

The site is of two parts, each on either side of Burley Bank Road and each has a frontage along Skipton Road. The east site is one large field, it has a dry stone wall to Skipton Road, post and wire fence to Burley Bank Road and there are overhead wires diagonally across the site. Otherwise it is quite featureless. The site to the west incorporates the buildings of Four Lane Ends Farm. The historic buildings are near the road junction. Other buildings are a variety of twentieth century farm buildings clad in profiled cement fibre or metal cladding. Most are grey with grey roofs, one has sage green cladding and another is a darker green. All are low single span buildings. There are also a couple of portacabins on site. None of the recent buildings is of interest and there would be no objection to demolition. The stone house and attached former barn should be retained and its setting respected. There are two fields of average size outside the building group and one smaller field. Most boundaries of the west site are hedges, and there is a ditch alongside Burley Bank Road. The north boundary of the southern field is a dilapidated dry stone wall. Southeast of this site there is a gas valve compound, which is partially hidden from the site by trees on the boundary. There are overhead cables across the 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

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

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

Summary conclusion

Development of any but small scale in this sensitive area between farmsteads is likely to cause harm to the setting of the historic buildings. The location of this large site would result in development that would not reflect traditional settlement pattern.

Settlement: Open Countryside**Site: OC8 (Land at Rowden Lane End, Skipton Road)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments** **Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

SACs/SPAs	None likely to be impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	None likely to be impacted
SSSI Risk Zone	No requirement to consult Natural England for residential development in relation to SSSIs
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likely to be impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Improved pasture
Trees and Hedges	hedgerows to north western boundaries, and around the farm otherwise drystone walls or fences with occasional hawthorn shrubs
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	None
Water/Wetland	None
Slope and Aspect	Gentle slope to the south west
Buildings and Structures	Stone-built, slated roofed Four Lane Ends Farm with mostly insubstantial large farm buildings
Natural Area	NCA 22 Pennine Dales Fringe
Environmental Opportunity	SEO 1: Protect and connect native broadleaved woodland, parkland and veteran trees to maximise their value for wildlife, flood risk alleviation, water quality, climate regulation, recreation, sense of place and sense of history.
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 22 Menwith and Penny Pot Grassland "Encourage the protection and restoration of stone wall and hedge field boundaries". "Promote diversity of grassland communities through management".
Connectivity/Corridors	Roadside hedges and verges provide a modicum of connectivity through intensive pastoral agricultural landscape
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	There may be some opportunity to create a Suds wetland and buffer field boundaries.
Protected Species	Nesting birds and bats may utilise hedgerows and farm buildings and barns
BAP Priority Species	Some potential for priority species of ground nesting birds
Invasive Species	Not known
Notes	

Conclusion

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

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

Summary conclusion	The site currently offers limited biodiversity interest although there may be ground nesting birds such as lapwing and bats and nesting birds may utilise the farm buildings. There would be some opportunity for biodiversity enhancement in association with development.
---------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Settlement: Open Countryside

Site: OC8 (Land at Rowden Lane End, Skipton Road)

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 and downstream of the site due to capacity issues in local sewers, watercourses and overland flows. 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. However, any potential developer would be expected to submit a detailed feasibility study showing the use of SuDS including soakaways permeable cellular pavements, grassed swales, infiltration trenches, wetlands, ponds and green roofs that assist in dealing with surface water at source, has been fully explored.

Any proposed discharge of surface water from site should be restricted to Greenfield rates (1.4 l/s/ha for all storm scenarios or a minimum of 5 (five) l/s, whichever is the greater). The overall strategy should show that there is sufficient on site attenuation to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year rainfall event, to include for climate change & urban creep can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without increasing the restricted flows to the watercourse.

Applicants would be expected to agree the outline drainage strategy with the LPA in principle before any planning consent is granted. The outline drainage information should include an assessment of flood risk to the site & surrounding area, topographical survey, feasibility of infiltration drainage, on site storage, rates of discharge, outfall location & condition survey results of existing watercourses (on or off site) and proposals for dealing with any identified remedial items.

The proposed development land would be classed as major development due to the specified size of the site in terms of sustainable urban drainage systems (SuDS) . Accordingly, NYCC in its capacity as Lead Local Flood Authority should be consulted regarding the surface water drainage strategy (Statutory Consultee).

Conclusion

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

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

Settlement: Otley**Site: OT1 (Land north of Throstle Nest Close 1, Otley)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Land to the north of the Throstle Nest Close residential development and bordering Weston Lane to the west. The site is situated on the north-west edge of Otley. LCA 18: Wharfedale south-facing valley side.
Landscape description	Area Description; The wider landscape comprises the south facing valley side. Weston Park conservation area is situated to the west including Weston Lane with its dry stone walls and tree lined avenue of sycamores. The town of Otley extends along the valley to the south and east. Site Description: The site comprises of a rectangular parcel of land used for grazing. A mature gappy hedgerow forms the sites's eastern boundary with pasture and scrub woodland beyond. Boots Beck issues at the north-east corner of the site producing an area of soft rush/wet grassland to the south-east. A distinctive dry stone wall forms the western boundary with rear property boundaries bordering the site to the south
Existing urban edge	Residential development to the south, pasture land to the east and north and parkland associated with Weston Park to the west side of Weston Lane The openness of the site makes a positive contribution to the landscape character of the area and the setting of the conservation area
Trees and hedges	An overgrown hedgerow consisting principally of hawthorn forms part of the site's north-eastern and eastern boundary. This hedgerow is un-managed and gappy. An avenue of mature sycamore trees is situated along Weston Lane within the site bordered by a dry stone wall.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Nidderdale AONB. Green Belt. Policy SG3 Settlement Growth: Conservation of the countryside including Green Belt.
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The landscape is considered of high value with the site set within a prominent location within an AONB. Susceptibility to change is also considered to be high with a low capacity to accommodate the type of development proposed extending development into open countryside impacting on openness
Visual Sensitivity	The site gently rises from south to north with both near distance views from the conservation area and long distance views from the south across the valley. There is evidence of a well used footpath running diagonally through the site.
Anticipated landscape effects	There would be loss of a field on the edge of the town, new built form would extend the urban edge into open countryside
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Potential for some mitigation in the form of perimeter screen planting and if limit of development was set back from road frontage
Likely level of landscape effects	Large adverse effects. The site occupies a locally prominent location adjacent to a conservation area. Development would impact on openness and landscape character of the area.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	OT2

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

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

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

Rationale	Rating
Development need not result in the loss of existing woodland or trees.	Light Green
Summary conclusion	Site situated within a highly valued landscape within a prominent location which is highly susceptible to change. There is very little capacity to accommodate the type and scale of development at the edge of the settlement extending built form into open countryside

Settlement: Otley**Site: OT1 (Land north of Throstle Nest Close 1, Otley)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments** **Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

SACs/SPAs	None likely to be impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	None likely to be impacted
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likely to be impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	None
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Semi-improved grassland; potentially marshy in the NE
Trees and Hedges	Lines of tree along the roadside; out-grown mature hedges with trees in the north-east corner
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature boundary trees are likely to merit TPO protection
Water/Wetland	Issues and possibly marshy area in the NE of the site
Slope and Aspect	land rises gently towards the north
Buildings and Structures	None on site except stone wall roadside boundaries
Natural Area	NCA36 South Pennines
Environmental Opportunity	SE02 Encouraging the expansion and creation of a more ecologically connected patchwork of grasslands – unimproved pastures, rushy pastures, species-rich pastures and meadows
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA Area 18 Wharfedale South Facing Valley Side <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Field boundaries require protection and maintenance” • “Aim: retain woodland and tree cover...”
Connectivity/Corridors	Corridor of the River Wharfe and Otley gravel pits reserve to the south, lower Washburn Valley to the north
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Retain boundary trees and hedgerows, buffer marshy areas possibly in association with Suds
Protected Species	Nesting birds and foraging bats may utilise boundary trees and hedges
BAP Priority Species	Potential for priority species of ground nesting birds
Invasive Species	Not known
Notes	

Conclusion

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

Rationale	Rating
Some potential effects on designated sites (SINC, SSSI, LNR), the wider ecological network and/or priority habitats and species but relatively easy to mitigate for.	Yellow
Summary conclusion	Retain and enhance trees and hedgerows with native planting and buffer and enhance the area of marshy grassland near the eastern boundary, potentially in association with shrubs

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). The Environment Agency is responsible for administering matters attaining to Main River. As such, if the surface water strategy includes discharge to the River Wharfe (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: Otley**Site: OT2 (Land north of Throstle Nest Close 2, Otley)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Land to the north of the Throstle Nest Close residential development and bordering Weston Lane to the west. The site is situated on the north-west edge of Otley. LCA 18: Wharfedale south-facing valley side.
Landscape description	Area Description; The wider landscape comprises the south facing valley side. Weston Park conservation area is situated to the west including Weston Lane with its dry stone walls and tree lined avenue of sycamores. The town of Otley extending along the valley to the south and east. Site Description: The site comprises of a rectangular parcel of land used for grazing separated by pasture from the residential edge of Otley. A distinctive dry stone wall forms the western boundary.
Existing urban edge	The site is separated from the residential edge of Otley by intervening pasture.
Trees and hedges	A hedgerow forms the northern and eastern site boundary with an undefined boundary to the south. An avenue of mature sycamore trees is situated along Weston Lane within the site bounded by a dry stone wall
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Nidderdale AONB. Green Belt. Policy SG3 Settlement Growth: Conservation of the countryside including Green Belt.
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The landscape is considered of high value with the site set within a prominent location within an AONB. Susceptibility to change is also considered to be high with a low capacity to accommodate the type of development proposed extending built form into open countryside.
Visual Sensitivity	Site elevation rises from south to north to a height of 85m AOD which is approximately 10m higher than the residential edge of the town below. There are both near distance views from the conservation area and long distance views from the south across the valley. Evidence of a well used footpath running diagonally through the site.
Anticipated landscape effects	There would be loss of a field on the edge of the town, new built form extending the urban edge into open countryside
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Limited potential for mitigation within such an open and elevated location
Likely level of landscape effects	Large adverse effects. The site occupies a locally prominent location adjacent to a conservation area. Development would impact on openness and landscape character of the area.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	OT1

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

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

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

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

Summary conclusion	The landscape is considered of high value with the site set within a prominent location within an AONB. Susceptibility to change is also considered to be high with a low capacity to accommodate the type of development proposed extending built form into open countryside.
---------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Settlement: Otley**Site: OT2 (Land north of Throstle Nest Close 2, Otley)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

SACs/SPAs	None likely to be impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	None likely to be impacted
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likely to be impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	None
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Semi-improved grassland; potentially marshy in the SE
Trees and Hedges	Lines of tree along the roadside; out-grown mature hedges with trees form the northern and eastern boundaries.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature boundary trees are likely to merit TPO protection
Water/Wetland	Possibly issues and marshy area in the SE of the site
Slope and Aspect	The land falls from the north/north east to the south.
Buildings and Structures	None on site except stone wall roadside boundaries
Natural Area	NCA36 South Pennines
Environmental Opportunity	SE02 Encouraging the expansion and creation of a more ecologically connected patchwork of grasslands – unimproved pastures, rushy pastures, species-rich pastures and meadows
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA Area 18 Wharfedale South Facing Valley Side <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Field boundaries require protection and maintenance” • “Aim: retain woodland and tree cover...”
Connectivity/Corridors	Corridor of the River Wharfe and Otley gravel pits reserve to the south, lower Washburn Valley to the north
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Retain boundary trees, buffer marshy areas possibly in association with Suds in the SE corner
Protected Species	Nesting birds and foraging bats may utilise boundary trees and hedges
BAP Priority Species	Potential for priority species of ground nesting birds
Invasive Species	Not known
Notes	

Conclusion

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

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

Summary conclusion	Retain and enhance trees and hedgerows with native planting and buffer and enhance the area of marshy grassland near the eastern boundary, potentially in association with shrubs
---------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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). The Environment Agency is responsible for administering matters attaining to Main River. As such, if the surface water strategy includes discharge to the River Wharfe (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: Otley**Site: OT3 (Land at Carr Bank, Newall Carr Road, Otley)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Land to the north of The Whartons residential development and bordering Newall Carr Road to the west. The site is situated on the northern edge of Otley. LCA 18: Wharfedale south-facing valley side.
Landscape description	Area Description; The wider landscape comprises the south facing valley side of the river Wharfe. Otley town extends along the low slopes of the valley to the south-east and south-west. Site Description: The site comprises of two large fields used for grazing separated by a gappy hedgerow with post and wire fencing. A dense hedgerow forms the site boundary with Newell Carr Road to the west.
Existing urban edge	The site adjoins the northern limit of Otley and the curtilage of The Whartons Primary School
Trees and hedges	The site is bounded by hedgerows and occasional hedgerow trees with a row of poplars running along the western boundary of the site adjoining the school curtilage
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Nidderdale AONB. Green Belt. Policy SG3 Settlement Growth: Conservation of the countryside including Green Belt.
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The landscape is considered of high value with the site set within a highly prominent location within an AONB. Susceptibility to change is also considered to be high with a low capacity to accommodate the type of development proposed extending built form into the upper valley side and open countryside
Visual Sensitivity	There are extensive views towards the site across the valley with more near distance views from Farnley Lane to the east and from the public footpath at Copmanroyd Farm to the north.
Anticipated landscape effects	There would be loss of fields on the edge of the town, new built form extending the urban edge into the upper valley site and open countryside
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Limited potential for mitigation within such an open and elevated location particularly from across the valley
Likely level of landscape effects	Large scale impact as a result of a significant extension of built development into the open countryside on the northern valley side of the River Wharfe
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	No likely cumulative impacts anticipated

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

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

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

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

Summary conclusion	Highly valued landscape which is highly susceptible to change. There is very little capacity to accommodate development without significant harm to landscape character and visual amenity
---------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Settlement: Otley**Site: OT3 (Land at Carr Bank, Newall Carr Road, Otley)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	None
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Copmanroyd Farmhouse and historic agricultural buildings.
Commentary on heritage assets.	This nineteenth century farmhouse has been extended in the early twentieth century and now is a row of cottages. The dwellings reflect the vernacular and typically they face southwards over the farmland. The site falls within its setting to the south. The historic farmbuildings are all but subsumed by larger twentieth century buildings.
Topography and views	The site is on the northern side of the Wharf valley, and land rises to the north. The site is highly visible from Newall Carr Road, the school grounds and from the end of culs-de-sac of the Whartons housing estate. Views out are extensive, although more limited to the southern areas of the site near existing housing.
Landscape context	The site is adjacent to a housing estate and school in Otley.
Grain of surrounding development	North of the site there are bungalows parallel to Copmanroyd (lane), those to the north side have longer front gardens. Near the junction of Copmanthorpe with Newall Carr Road there is a short terrace and a couple of detached houses set parallel to the road behind small front gardens. All are modestly spaced. West of the site on Newall Carr Road is a bungalow set back from the road. South of the site, the Whartons, typical of its era, is an estate of mainly detached and semi-detached houses set close side to side behind small front gardens, and near the site are short culs-de-sacs.
Local building design	The historic houses are two storey and built of stone, some with stone or Welsh slated roofs and small window to wall ratio. There are a number of bungalows in the vicinity of the site. Their materials vary; some are rendered and painted white, some are of brick and all have tiled roofs. Some feature dormers. Southwest of the site, there are some historic houses at the edge of Otley, built of stone. The Whartons are mainly two storey. There are bungalows, some of which have rooms in the roof. Some houses are gable onto the roads. Walling materials are brick and render, and roofs are finished in concrete tiles. Windows are wide. The historic farm buildings are of stone, but are all but subsumed by larger agricultural buildings that are clad in profiled sheeting. The school comprises large linked flat roofed blocks.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The site comprises open fields. There are a number of large trees, particularly in the south field along Newall Carr Road and the school boundary. There are some trees on lost historic boundaries. There is a ditch alongside the road next to the hedge. A drain runs between the fields running to the south. Many boundaries are hedges. To the south houses and school grounds back onto the site. The land undulates, although the general landfall is to the south.

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

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

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

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

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

Rationale	Rating
The nature of the site means that built development will have a negative impact on local distinctiveness but there are opportunities for mitigation and improvements.	Orange
Summary conclusion	A considerable area of the field south of Copmanroyd Farm should not be developed in order to mitigate the harm to the setting of this historic farmstead.

Settlement: Otley**Site: OT3 (Land at Carr Bank, Newall Carr Road, Otley)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

SACs/SPAs	None likely to be impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	None likely to be impacted
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likely to be impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Semi-Improved (species-poor) (w) improved eastern field
Trees and Hedges	Hedges bound the two fields; many grown out/gappy
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Good roadside hedge with mature trees and good hedgerows along eastern boundary. Central hedgrows is somewhat gappy. Southern boundary is garden hedges.
Water/Wetland	There is a ditch runs N-S along the central field boundary
Slope and Aspect	The site slopes gradually from north to south, falling away gently from the centre towards the eastern boundary.
Buildings and Structures	None on site
Natural Area	NCA 22: Pennines Dales Fringe
Environmental Opportunity	SEO4 Enhancing and connecting semi-natural habitats in river corridors to improve the wildlife movement corridors between lowland and upland. SE04: Supporting and encouraging the creation of grass/woodland buffer strips, in-field grass strips, sediment traps, ponds and wetland habitats to slow run-off and intercept sediments and pollutants...
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA Area 18 Wharfedale South Facing Valley Side <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Field boundaries require protection and maintenance" • "Aim: retain woodland and tree cover..."
Connectivity/Corridors	Corridor of the River Wharfe and Otley gravel pits reserve to the south, lower Washburn Valley to the north
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Retain boundary trees and hedgeows and the central drain, buffer with semi-natural habitats as part of green-infrastructure provision possibly in association with Suds
Protected Species	Nesting birds and foraging bats may utilise boundary trees and hedges
BAP Priority Species	Potential for priority species of ground nesting birds
Invasive Species	
Notes	
Conclusion	
Will it deliver net gains to biodiversity and protect and enhance existing networks of priority habitats and species and provide for long term management of wildlife habitats? Will it offer opportunities to enhance Green Infrastructure?	
Rationale	Rating
Some potential effects on designated sites (SINC, SSSI, LNR), the wider ecological network and/or priority habitats and species but relatively easy to mitigate for.	Yellow
Summary conclusion	Retain boundary trees and hedgeows and the central drain, buffer with semi-natural habitats as part of green-infrastructure provision possibly in association with Suds

Settlement: Otley

Site: OT3 (Land at Carr Bank, Newall Carr Road, Otley)

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). The Environment Agency is responsible for administering matters attaining to Main River. As such, if the surface water strategy includes discharge to the River Wharfe (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: Wetherby**Site: WB1 (Land north west of Wetherby)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site is situated to the north west of Wetherby and north of the A661 Harrogate Road. LCA56: Plompton and South Knaresborough Arable Rolling Land
Landscape description	Area description: The wider landscape comprises the large-scale area situated between the valley landscapes of the River Nidd and the River Crimple. The undulating landform is scattered with various blocks of woodland that disperse views across an otherwise open landscape. Site Description: The site consists mainly of large to medium-scale arable fields bounded by hedgerows. A group of small pastoral fields also form part of the site clustered around Kingbarrow and Ingbarrow farmsteads. The heavily wooded dis-used Spofforth to Wetherby railway corridor bisects the site. This corridor now forms part of the National Cycle Network NCN:67. A bridleway also runs through the site connecting the A661 with North Deighton.
Existing urban edge	The site is unconnected to the urban edge of Wetherby, albeit with a small separation distance of some 50 metres
Trees and hedges	Areas of woodland mainly around Ingbarrow Farm and along the railway corridor. Fields are bounded by managed hedgerows with infrequent hedgerow trees.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	SG3 Settlement Growth: Conservation of the Countryside including Green Belt R11 Rights of Way
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The site is considered of high value adjoining Green Belt to the south with the site used for recreational purposes with the cycleway forming part of the national cycle network. Susceptibility to change is considered to be high as loss of open countryside would impact on setting. Overall it is considered that sensitivity to change is high.
Visual Sensitivity	Wide open views of the site are experienced from both sides of the railway corridor which forms a visual watershed. Views would be experienced by recreational users using NCN:67, nearby bridleways and surrounding road network
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of agricultural landscape and open character. Loss of near and long distance views.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Potential for mitigation is limited as large scale screening would be difficult to achieve as well as being inappropriate replacing openness with screened views
Likely level of landscape effects	Large scale adverse effects which would be difficult to mitigate
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	N/A

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

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

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

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

Summary conclusion	Large scale screening mitigation would not be appropriate for a development separated from the urban edge of Wetherby
---------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Settlement: Wetherby**Site: WB1 (Land north west of Wetherby)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Stockeld Park (house, grade I listed and other associated grade II buildings, located in managed estate / grounds). Stockeld Lodge Farm (grade II listed). Wetherby Lodge (grade II listed).
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Ingbarrow and Kingbarrow Farms.
Commentary on heritage assets.	The site is located in the setting of Stockeld Park, Stockeld Lodge Farm and Wetherby Lodge, which are all located to the south / south west of the site, though the site may be within the Stockeld Estate. Ingbarrow and Kingbarrow Farms are located within the site and therefore the buildings themselves may be affected by proposal but otherwise their setting will be affected. The former farmhouse to Ingbarrow Farm (closest to A661) is now a residential dwelling (built end of the 19th / beginning of the 20th century, stone, slate roof, sash windows).
Topography and views	Land rises from road level - Kingbarrow Farm located on 'Malmbury Hill.' Extensive views in this area - for example, views possible looking to Harrogate / Spofforth. Exiting Wetherby, the land forms part of the context for views looking in all directions due to the elevated level.
Landscape context	Open countryside, farmland, rolling hills.
Grain of surrounding development	Rural, dispersed development, near to western edge of residential development of Wetherby.
Local building design	Gritstone buildings are traditional but varied building types contained within the urban edge of Wetherby.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The site comprises fields and two farms, one no longer active. The site straddles the former railway line - now tree covered and a public cycleway. Site adjoins the A661 at Ingbarrow Farm. Wide verge, hedge and trees to the roadside. Hedgerow field boundaries within the site. Several trees near Ingbarrow Farm and near Kingbarrow Farm. Public Bridleway runs through site.

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

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

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

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

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

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

Summary conclusion	Development on this site would encroach into open countryside in a harmful manner and would be contrary to the established pattern of housing growth associated with the edges of Wetherby, combined with a harmful impact on the rural / countryside setting of the designated and non-designated heritage assets present.
---------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Settlement: Wetherby**Site: WB1 (Land north west of Wetherby)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

SACs/SPAs	Within approx. 750 to SW of Kirk Deighton SSSI - may require appropriate assessment.
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	Kirk Deighton SSSI.
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England require consultation on "residential development of 100 units or more."
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	The cycleway is a potential magnesian limestone grassland SINC and outcrops a Local Geological Site.
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows.
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	TN 19 along cutting of disused railway; TN 18 just beyond Stockeld beck.
Sward	Mostly arable - except improved pasture fields to west of the farms.
Trees and Hedges	Mature tree belts around the farm buildings; wooded cutting of railway crosses site; good hedgerows with occasional trees.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature Trees likely to merit TPOs.
Water/Wetland	Stockeld Beck to north east of site.
Slope and Aspect	The land rises gently towards the SE.
Buildings and Structures	Two farms and associated buildings.
Natural Area	NCA 30 Southern Magnesian Limestone.
Environmental Opportunity	SEO 2: Protect and manage existing semi-natural habitats, including grasslands, wetlands and woodlands; and increase the area of semi-natural habitats, restore and create new areas, and create networks and links between habitats, to make their ecology more resilient and to afford increased movement of species.
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 56 Plompton and South Knaresborough Arable Land <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Encourage restoration and management of hedgerows along roadsides..." • "Tree planting and woodland planting can be used to complement the rolling landform..."
Connectivity/Corridors	Harland Way cycleway provides corridor through centre of site.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	The site links the suburban gardens of Wetherby with the wider countryside along the corridor between the disused railway line and the A661.
Protected Species	Nesting birds and bats likely to be associated with the trees, hedgerows and farm buildings; potential for barn owl; GCN SAC within 750m.
BAP Priority Species	May be potential for priority species of birds of arable farmland and brown hare.
Invasive Species	Not known.
Notes	

Conclusion

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

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

Summary conclusion	Majority of site is arable farmland of relatively low intrinsic biodiversity value but set within a landscape supporting valuable Harland Way corridor and within 750m of a Special Area of Conservation for great crested newt. Full ecological assessment required and generous buffers of habitat creation around the boundaries.
---------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Settlement: Wetherby**Site: WB1 (Land north west of Wetherby)****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 regarding any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred. Stockeld Beck is controlled by the Swale & Ure Internal Board, consequently, the board should be consulted regarding any proposals to develop this land.

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: Wetherby**Site: WB2 (Land north of Sicklinghall Road, Wetherby)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site located on the west side of Wetherby north of Sicklinghall Road. LCA65: South east Harrogate Farmland
Landscape description	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 modern improved grass fields on the edge of town with hawthorn hedgerow boundaries.
Existing urban edge	The urban edge to the east comprises low density residential development with gardens containing trees and a hedgerow boundary that screens the urban edge. The site itself has a rural character.
Trees and hedges	Hedgerow boundaries with some hedgerow trees. Several trees on the site and in gardens adjacent may be worthy of TPO. Fragmented hedge on the west boundary.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Green Belt Open Countryside.
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	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.
Visual Sensitivity	The site is visually well contained by existing vegetation cover and residential development on the edge of Wetherby. Where the site is seen in wider views it is seen in context with the town.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of open fields on the urban edge to development.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	The west boundary would require mitigation planting to strengthen the hedge and introduce trees. Built form density would also need to be lowered on the western edge of development to allow for trees in gardens.
Likely level of landscape effects	Medium scale adverse due to the loss of fields in green belt on the urban edge. Residential development could be integrated with the landscape if appropriate green infrastructure provided.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	

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 loss of fields on the urban edge can be mitigated to some extent with appropriate boundary treatment to help integrate development with the wider landscape. Therefore landscape capacity is medium.
---------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Settlement: Wetherby**Site: WB2 (Land north of Sicklinghall Road, Wetherby)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	None.
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Converted barn adjacent to eastern edge of site. Linton Hills Farm.
Commentary on heritage assets.	The site is located in the setting of the heritage assets described above. The converted, stone barn has lost its former rural context and is now seen as part of Wetherby housing. Linton Hills historic farmstead which comprises historic and modern farm buildings, is located to the south west of the site within the surrounding countryside.
Topography and views	The land drops from west to east heading towards Wetherby - this gives rise to extensive views looking east over the surrounding countryside and the fields are seen in this context - but also seen in the context of the existing urban edge, though this has some screening through tree planting.
Landscape context	Countryside of gently rolling hills of varying field pattern. The area separates Harrogate from Wetherby and the Leeds area. Green Belt.
Grain of surrounding development	Minimal, dispersed grain due to the rural context. Farmsteads, or former farmsteads present. In contrast, the urban edge of Wetherby is located adjacent to the site.
Local building design	Stone buildings are traditional, as seen in the historic farmsteads but varied building types are seen within the urban edge.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The triangular site comprises fields with hedgerow boundaries with trees. Verge also to Sicklinghall Road, which forms the southern boundary. Located on the western edge of Wetherby, the gardens of the existing housing form the eastern edge 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
Site re-development provides an opportunity for high quality design.	Dark Green

Summary conclusion	Development of the site will cause an encroachment into the rural setting of the town but if designed to be well integrated with the surrounding countryside (and that designed to limit encroachment of a built up edge in the setting of Linton Hills Farm), harm will be reduced. Otherwise, development will be seen in the context of the existing urban edge of Wetherby which is of similar form to the type of development that would be forthcoming on this site.
---------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Settlement: Wetherby**Site: WB2 (Land north of Sicklinghall Road, Wetherby)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

SACs/SPAs	Kirk Deighton SAC approx. 2km to NE.
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	Kirk Deighton SSSI approx. 2km to NE.
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England require consultation for residential development of 100 units or more.
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likely to be impacted.
BAP Priority Habitats	Arable farmland, hedgerows.
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None.
Sward	Arable (P1HS 1992) field margins beneath tree line separating two fields.
Trees and Hedges	The site itself comprises two fields with hedges on all sides except fencing to gardens of adjacent housing to the west. The hedge on the eastern boundary is rather gappy, as is that between the two fields. There are a number of trees within the hedges, the large trees in the field boundary between the two fields being particularly significant.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature field boundary trees are likely to merit TPO protection.
Water/Wetland	None.
Slope and Aspect	The site slopes downwards from the west to the east.
Buildings and Structures	None.
Natural Area	NCA 30 Southern Magnesian Limestone.
Environmental Opportunity	SEO 2: Protect and manage existing semi-natural habitats, including grasslands, wetlands and woodlands; and increase the area of semi-natural habitats, restore and create new areas, and create networks and links between habitats, to make their ecology more resilient and to afford increased movement of species.
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 65: South East Harrogate Farmland <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Encourage the continued maintenance of hedgerows and hedgerow trees and restoration in area of neglect and fragmentation”. • “Protect and manage all woodland especially registered Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland” • “Promote the management of roadside tree planting and links with woodland in the wider countryside...”
Connectivity/Corridors	The site connects suburban gardens of Wetherby with the large-scale arable farmland to the west.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Retain and enhance the trees and hedgerows on site; buffer with semi-natural habitats.
Protected Species	Potential for nesting birds and bats to utilise trees and hedgerows.
BAP Priority Species	Potential for priority bird species of arable farmland and brown hare.
Invasive Species	Not known.
Notes	None known.

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	Mature trees and hedgerows are an important ecological asset in the context of surrounding suburban gardens and large arable fields. These should be protected, retained and generously buffered using semi-natural habitats e.g. wild flower strips and additional native planting
---------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

