Harrogate District LOCAL PLAN

Built and Natural Environment Site Assessments
Volume 4: Boroughbridge, Masham and Pateley Bridge

October 2016

Harrogate BOROUGH COUNCIL

Contents

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 Boroughbridge, Masham and Pateley Bridge. Full detail of how sites have been selected can be found in Appendices 7 and 8 of the Harrogate District Draft Sustainability Appraisal (October 2016).[2]

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

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

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

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

2 Policy Context

National Policy Context

Introduction

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

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

Landscape

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

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

Conservation and Design

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

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

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

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

Ecology

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

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

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

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

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

Land Drainage

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

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

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

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

Emerging Local Policy Context

Introduction

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

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

2 Policy Context

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

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

Landscape

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

Conservation and Design

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

Ecology

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

Land Drainage

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

- Watercourse
- Surface water sewer
- Combined water sewer

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

3 Methodology

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

Landscape

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

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

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

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

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

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

Table 3.1 Landscape: Screened Out Sites

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3 Methodology

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

Table 3.2 Criteria for Landscape Susceptibility

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

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

Table 3.3 Criteria for Landscape Value

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

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

Table 3.4 Criteria of Visual Sensitivity

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Results

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

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

Conservation and Design

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3 Methodology

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

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

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

Table 3.5 Conservation and Design: Screened Out Sites

3 Methodology

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

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

Results

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

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

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

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

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

Ecology

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

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

Table 3.6 Ecology: Screened Out Sites

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3 Methodology

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

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

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

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

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

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

Results

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

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

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

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

3 Methodology

Land Drainage

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

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

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

3.50 Additionally, more site specific information was obtained from:

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

Results

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

4 Site Assessments

Boroughbridge

Site Ref	Site Name	Site Area		Page
B2	Land west of Leeming Lane, Langthorpe	2.3333	Draft Allocation - housing	23
B3	Land at Roecliffe Lane, Boroughbridge	3.671		28
B4	Land north of Aldborough Gate, Boroughbridge	8.8008	Draft Allocation - housing	33
B6	Land at Back Lane, Langthorpe	1.2162		38
B8	Land at Skelton Lane, Langthorpe	2.1011		41
B10	Old Hall Caravan Park, Langthorpe	3.0179		45
B11	Land at the Bungalow, Boroughbridge	0.3344	Draft Allocation - housing	49
B12	Land at Stump Cross, Boroughbridge	28.7048		51
B14	Northern section Three Arrows field, Boroughbridge	2.0537		54
B15	Land north of Milby Cut, Boroughbridge	5.5352		59
B18	Old Poultry Farm, Leeming Lane, Langthorpe	1.0424		65

Table 4.1 Boroughbridge Sites

Masham

Site Ref	Site Name	Site Area		Page
M1	Allotments at Leyburn Road, Masham	2.6208		67
M2	Land at Leyburn Road, Masham	3.1313		73
M3	Land to the south of Swinton Road, Masham	2.0723		78
M4	Land at Thorpe Road, Masham	4.3696		84
M5	King's Head Farm, Masham	0.7786		90
M6	Land south-east of King's Head Farm, Masham	5.0666		95
M7	Land east of King's Head Farm, Masham	0.6015		101
M8	Land north of Swinton Road, Masham	2.1951	Draft Allocation - housing	106
M11	Land at Westholme Road, Masham	2.661		111
M12	Land at Fearby Road, Masham	2.6572		116
M13	Land at Thorpe Road (smaller site), Masham	3.5725	Draft Allocation - housing	121

Table 4.2 Masham Sites

4 Site Assessments

Pateley Bridge

Site Ref	Site Name	Site Area		Page
P1	Land south of Ashfield Court (smaller site), Pateley Bridge	2.8576	Draft Allocation - housing	127
P2	Land south of Ashfield Court, Pateley Bridge	8.641		133
P4	Land off Church Lane, Pateley Bridge	1.1209		137
P5	Grassfield Court, Pateley Bridge	0.3661	Draft Allocation - housing	143
P6	Land opposite Nidderdale High School, Pateley Bridge	2.4432		147
P7	Former Highways Depot, Pateley Bridge	0.6102	Draft Allocation - housing	153
P10	Grassfield House, Pateley Bridge	0.286	Draft Allocation - housing	158

Table 4.3 Pateley Bridge Sites

Settlement: Boroughbridge

Site: B2 (Land west of Leeming Lane, Langthorpe)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site is situated to the west of Leeming Lane Langthorpe LCA81: Dishforth and surrounding farmland.
Landscape description	Area description: The wider area comprises large-scale arable land. Scattered diverse development punctuates the uniform and open agricultural landscape. Tree cover and hedgerows are intermittent affording long distance views. Generally the area is pleasant and particularly valued for its views into the North York Moors to the west Site description: The site consists of a broadly rectangular parcel of land which gently rises south to north from 16m to 19m AOD. The site is in pastoral use and bounded by hedgerows together with post and rail fencing.There are several mature trees within the centre of the site and within the hedgerow boundary along Leeming Lane wihich are covered by TPO's.
Existing urban edge	The site's northern, eastern and southern boundaries adjoin residential development with development now planned for land to the east of Leeming Lane (B17)
Trees and hedges	Hedgerow boundaries with several mature hedgerow trees and trees within open pasture area covered by TPO's
Landscape and Green Belt designations	TPO'd trees
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The site is a transitional open area between open countryside to the north and Boroughbridge. The siite also provides an open space buffer between Langthorpe and Kirby Hill
Visual Sensitivity	The site is overlooked from the Leeming Lane and conservation area to the south
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of open pastureland and further encroachment of built form to the north
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Mitigation would require green infrastructure initiatives and adequate built form set-back from Leeming Lane and conservation area
Likely level of landscape effects	Medium scale adverse due to loss of openness and setting
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	B18 to tthe north and B17 (planned) to the east of Leeming Lane likely to have adverse cumulative effects

Conclusion

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

Rationale	Rating
Sensitivity Rating: Medium – key distinctive characteristics are susceptible to change, typically a medium valued landscape where; landscape condition may be fair with some existing reference or context to the type of development being proposed. Landscapes may have components that are not easily replicated/replaced and will have medium susceptibility to change.	Yellow
Capacity Rating: Medium/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	Landscape has a medium susceptibilty to the development proposed due to its openness and location situated on the urban edge of the settlement The landscape has medium/ low capacity to accept the change proposed without detriment to landscape character.

Settlement: Boroughbridge

Site: B2 (Land west of Leeming Lane, Langthorpe)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Conservation and Design

Conservation and Design Site Assessment

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Boroughbridge Conservation Area.
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Opposite the site, within the conservation area boundary, is Langthorpe House, which is identified in the Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA) as a building of interest and merit and its boundary wall is noted as being important. The house and wall are non-designated heritage assets.
Commentary on heritage assets.	Development of the site would impact on the setting of the Boroughbridge CA. The site is just north of Boroughbridge Conservation Area (CA). Opposite the site, within the conservation area boundary, is Langthorpe House, which is identified in the Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA) as a building of interest and merit and its boundary wall is noted as being important. The house and wall are non-designated heritage assets.
Topography and views	Open views to the east and north. View of the Maltings to the south. Relatively flat.
Landscape context	Open fields to the north between Langthorpe and Kirkby Hill and to the east towards Milby. Relatively flat, arable landscape.
Grain of surrounding development	Delapidated poultry sheds to the north beyond the curtilage of a bungalow. Garden centre to the east.
Local building design	Residential to the north and west. Greenholme Close is a cul-de-sac with a tight grain and a notable absence of any landscaping. A peppering of dwelling between Langthorpe and Kirkby Hill. Brick predominates, some render.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The site is just north of Boroughbridge Conservation Area (CA). Opposite the site, within the conservation area boundary, is Langthorpe House, which is identified in the Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA) as a building of interest and merit and its boundary wall is noted as being important. The house and wall are non-designated heritage assets. Development of the site would impact on the setting of the CA. To the north of the site is a 20th century bungalow, of no architectural interest and merit. To the west is a 20th century housing estate. Some of the properties are quite close to the boundary. To the north of the estate is a caravan park, and north of the bungalow are poultry houses. The hedgerow boundaries contain some hedgerow trees. At present the site and the one opposite are open fields and form part of the countryside between the two settlements of Langthorpe and Kirby Hill. The site opposite on the east of Leeming Road has outline consent for 176 dwellings which would compromise the rural setting of heritage assets.

Conclusion

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

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

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

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

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

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

Summary conclusion	The development of this site would be detrimental to the setting of the conservation area and the non-designated heritage asset, Langthorpe House. Arguably, development of this site is likely to result in built form coalescence, significantly reducing the land between Langthorpe and Kirby Hill and thereby eroding the identity of Kirby Hill as a separate hamlet, to the detriment of the significance of this settlement and legibility of the same. Furthermore, the cumulative impact of the proposed development and the residential development approved to the east needs to be duly considered. Notwithstanding the above, it is acknowledged that a low built form density and the provision of green space and a buffer from the Boroughbridge Conservation Area to the south and from Leeming Lane would help to mitigate harm and maintain views of the conservation area when travelling into Langthorpe along Leeming Lane. Additional tree planting to be provided in generous back gardens backing onto Greenholme Close. Properties adjacent to the site in Greenholme Close currently benefit from the open land to the east of their rear boundaries- the open land that is the site in question, affords these properties a spacious, green and leafy character as well as a rural outlook. The loss of this open land and the resultant impact on the character and appearance of these existing properties could be mitigated, in part, by designing the layout to include perimeter blocks with rear gardens back-to- back and by creating rear gardens that are sufficiently large to accommodate mature trees without resulting in overshadowing to the detriment of the residents amenity- thereby increasing the likelihood of complaints and pressure to fell the trees in the future. Lower density should be stipulated at the northern corner of the site or single storey dwellings of cottage proportions (as opposed to being ‘bungaloid’ in form) to provide some relief in this part of the site. The building line set by North Road Cottage should be respected and reinforced in any development scheme. If development of the site is deemed acceptable in principle, the hedgerows and trees should be retained. The layout should make provision for strategic breaks in the built form, to be located where there are existing dwellings close to the boundary, hence those areas should be kept free of development to preserve the amenity of occupiers.

Settlement: Boroughbridge

Site: B2 (Land west of Leeming Lane, Langthorpe)

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	Horse-grazed pasture (improved 1992 P1HS)
Trees and Hedges	Boundary hedgerows with occassional trees, there are two field trees.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Majority of boundary and field trees already TPOed
Water/Wetland	None.
Slope and Aspect	Flat.
Buildings and Structures	Low insubstantial agricultural buildings in NW corner.
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)	Urban - not applicable
Connectivity/Corridors	Site likely to become part of suburban matrix on northern edge of Boroughbridge.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Retention of boundary hedges and additional planting of native trees will help maintain permeability of the landscape for wildlife.
Protected Species	Nesting birds likley to utilise trees and hedges and possibly buildings on site (which may possibly support bat roost potential).
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
No adverse impact, potential for enhancement and net gains to biodiversity.	Dark Green

Summary conclusion	Boundary and on-site trees and hedgerows should be protected and retained. Opportunities for new planting as part of Green Infrastructure provision between Langthorpe and Kirkby Hill

Settlement: Boroughbridge

Site: B2 (Land west of Leeming Lane, Langthorpe)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.	Whilst this site is situated just outside a drainage area administered by the Swale and Ure Internal Drainage Board, any surface water discharge will flow directly or indirectly into the drainage board district. Consequently the drainage board should be consulted regarding any proposals to develop this site According to the Environment Agency flood maps; the proposed development is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred. We are however, aware of flooding incidents in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide. We have received significantly increased levels of complaints over recent years from concerned residents affected by, and threatened by flooding from these watercourses. Due to the number of major development proposals in the general area planning to discharge surface water to the same watercourses, it is essential that surface water discharge is kept to an absolute minimum. The majority of this site is Greenfield land, consequently, the surface water drainage strategy should be assessed by any potential developer as follows: 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/IDB 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 and 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 outfall includes discharge to the River Ure 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: Boroughbridge

Site: B3 (Land at Roecliffe Lane, Boroughbridge)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site located on the western edge of town, south of Roecliffe Lane LCA70: River Tutt Arable Farmland
Landscape description	Area description: Generally flat landscape with very gradual slopes away from the River Tutt to adjacent LCA. Field pattern is diverse and includes remnants of historic enclosures with areas of modern improved enclosure. Traditional built form comprises farmsteads on the outer edges of the character area. A large scale distribution depot is a detractor to the east on the western side of Boroughbridge. Site description: Field that slopes gently south down to the River Tutt.
Existing urban edge	The site is mostly rural in character and provides an attractive open break between the edge of settlement and the A1 corridor. The site also contributes to the landscape setting for the Devils Arrows standing stones on the north side of Roecliffe Lane.
Trees and hedges	Hedgerow field boundary with some trees. Triangle of woodland to the northeast corner outside the site boundary may be worthy of TPO.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open countryside.
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The site contributes to the setting of the town and provides a buffer between the edge of town and the A1.
Visual Sensitivity	The site is fairly well contained by woodland, tree cover and housing to the east. There are open views from Roecliffe Lane to the north.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of open field on the urban edge.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Incorporation of green infrastructure and protection of boundary trees would be required as a minimum. The River Tutt corridor should be retained and enhanced as part of the landscape mitigation. The setting of the Devils Arrows scheduled monument should be protected.
Likely level of landscape effects	Medium scale adverse as the site is reasonable well contained visually and linked to the urban edge with some opportunities for mitigation to help integrate development.
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 – 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 site could be developed as a natural extension to built form assuming appropriate green infrastructure is incorporated and the setting of the Devils Arrows Scheduled monument is protected. Direct impacts would be limited to the immediate vacinity.

Settlement: Boroughbridge

Site: B3 (Land at Roecliffe Lane, Boroughbridge)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Conservation and Design

Conservation and Design Site Assessment

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Devil's Arrows standing stones SAM. Boroughbridge Conservation Area.
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	None.
Commentary on heritage assets.	Setting of Boroughbridge Conservation Area.The site comprises a field that includes one of the stone alignment known as the Devils Arrows, which are protected as a SAM. The stone alignment forms part of a wider complex of buried prehistoric remains of a high quality. The full nature and extent of this wider complex has yet to be confirmed and the scheduling therefore focuses on the stones.
Topography and views	Site is prominent on approach into the historic market town from the west along Roecliffe Lane. A1 is not a visual detractor from within the site but there is an audible traffic noise impact. Land falls away towards the River Tutt in the south. Views across the valley to the south.
Landscape context	Mature trees within and bordering site.
Grain of surrounding development	A168 and A1 to the west. River Ure to the north. 20th century housing estates to the east - nestles into the landscape and respects topography. Former hotel now substantially extended to form a residential care home borders site to the east- visually prominent.
Local building design	2 storey brick and pantile; detached and semi- detached houses, with chimneys on the ridge.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The site comprises a field that includes one of the stone alignment known as the Devils Arrows, which are protected as a SAM. The stone alignment forms part of a wider complex of buried prehistoric remains of a high quality. The full nature and extent of this wider complex has yet to be confirmed and the scheduling therefore focuses on the stones. Mature trees border the banks of the River Tutt and delineate the southern boundary of the site; a belt of woodland borders the eastern boundary of the site and a clump of woodland demarcates the north-east corner of the site. These mature trees provide the landscape setting for the SAM. Arable crop. Post and rail fence and verge borders the site to the north parallel with Roecliffe Lane.

Conclusion

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

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

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

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

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

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

Summary conclusion	The Devil’s Arrows indicate the importance of the Ure Corridor in the distant past and may also link in with the henges found further upstream. The setting of the Devil’s Arrows should be preserved and opportunities sought to research their importance and enhance their setting appropriately. Any development that would encroach upon the setting of these stones needs to be given careful consideration in terms of any archaeological remains and the visual impact. Mature trees and woodland should be retained. Site is integral to the setting of the market town and provides buffer from the A1. Intervisibility between sites B3 and B14- the site to the north on the opposite side of Roecliffe Lane.

Settlement: Boroughbridge

Site: B3 (Land at Roecliffe Lane, Boroughbridge)

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, Flowing Water (River Tutt).
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	TN SE36 NE 11 [P1HS] - marginal vegetation along the River Tutt, clogged with bur-reed and water cress. Banks have areas of himalyan balsam and reed canary grass. An ecological survey for B12 also described the River Tutt in TN 8 (described in Barker Shepard and Gillespie, 2008)
Sward	Arable [P1HS 1992]
Trees and Hedges	There is a triangular clump of woodland to the NE corner of the site and well treed boundaries to gardens to the NW and the east. Mature trees border the banks of the River Tutt along the southern boundary of the site. There are hedgerows along the southern part of the western boundary and a field tree near the corner is a remnant of a former field boundary.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature trees on and bounding the site may be likely to benefit from TPO protection.
Water/Wetland	River Tutt and floodplain along the southern site boundary
Slope and Aspect	The site is mainly flat but gently falls towards the RiverTutt in the south.
Buildings and Structures	One of the prehistoric standing stones known as the Devils Arrows is in the NW corner.
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 70 River Tutt arable farmland • “Tree planting will help improve diversity but should be restricted to small clumps related to existing buildings and settlement…”
Connectivity/Corridors	The site is on the River Tutt, a Strategic Green Corridor of District importance, close to where it joins the River Ure Corridor, which is of regional importance.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	A wide buffer zone, consisting of at least the floodplain should be retained as semi-natural habitat alongside the River Tutt, possibly in association with a SUDs scheme. (Wet woodland may be most appropriate). It may be possible to create a green link between Roecliffe Lane and the River Tutt and beyond to the south, in association the development which has been approved to the south of the river. Off-site compensation should be implemented for loss of arable farmland. e.g. floodplain habitat re-creation around the Devils Arrows.
Protected Species	Otter – spraint was found under the A1 bridge over the River Tutt in 2006 Water Vole – potential signs found BSG 2008 survey for B12. Kingfisher may also possibly occur along the Tutt. Nesting Birds will utilise the hedgerows and trees bounding the site and Bats may utilise the mature trees for roosting. Badgers occur to the west of the A1
BAP Priority Species	May be BAP priority species of birds associated with arable farmland. A number of BAP fish species are likely to occur in the RiverTutt. (e.g. brown trout, river and brook lampreys, eels etc. plus white clawed crayfish)

Invasive Species	May be BAP priority species of birds associated with arable farmland. A number of BAP fish species are likely to occur in the Tutt. (e.g. brown trout, river and brook lampreys, eels, white clawed crayfish) etc
Notes	B2 2010 amber)

Conclusion

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

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

Summary conclusion	Development should be possible over much of the site, without significant ecological harm. All trees and woodland should be retained. A substantial buffer zone, including the floodplain should be retained as semi-natural habitat alongside the River Tutt. A green link should be maintained N-S across the western edge of the site.

Settlement: Boroughbridge

Site: B3 (Land at Roecliffe Lane, Boroughbridge)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.	The southern section of this site is situated in a drainage area administered by the Swale & Ure Internal Drainage Board. Any surface water discharge will flow directly or indirectly into the drainage board district. Consequently the drainage board should be consulted regarding any proposals to develop this site According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the southern section of the site is located within flood zone 2/3. Development should be avoided where possible in flood zones 2 or 3 We are aware of flooding incidents in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide. We have received significantly increased levels of complaints over recent years from concerned residents affected by, and threatened by flooding from these watercourses. Due to the number of major development proposals in the general area planning to discharge surface water to the same watercourses, it is essential that surface water discharge is kept to an absolute minimum. The majority of this site is Greenfield land, consequently, the surface water drainage strategy should be assessed by any potential developer as follows: 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/IDB 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 outfall includes discharge to the River Ure 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: Boroughbridge

Site: B4 (Land north of Aldborough Gate, Boroughbridge)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site located on the urban edge, southeast of town centre. LCA87: South Boroughbridge Farmland
Landscape description	Area description: The wider landscape is moderate scale and comprises rolling landform with some tree cover at the urban edge and a wider scattering of trees in the countryside to the south. This is a simple landscape with monochrome arable fields and occasional improved grass fields. Hedgerows are fragmented and some have been lost due to modern farming techniques. Site description: There is a pond in the centre of site. The site takes on the character of the simple landscape that surrounds it. There are some good hedgerows with some individual trees and occasional new tree planting at field edges. There are some distinctive mature trees on the east boundary in particular.
Existing urban edge	The site is contained by housing along its west boundary; otherwise the presence of the urban edge is not highly apparent. Development of this site would appear as an extension of settlement into open countryside since the site generally has a rural character.
Trees and hedges	Hedgerow field boundaries with several mature trees potentially worthy of TPO.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open countryside.
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The site provides the setting for the south east side of town and there is some susceptibilty to its loss to built form. However adjacent fields may take over the role providing the setting for the town.
Visual Sensitivity	Site is gently rolling but rising to south towards Stump Cross Field. The site is open and exposed because of the generally sparse tree and hedgerow cover. There are open views in particular to the south and east of the site.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of agricultural land and some hedgerows, which provide an attractive rural setting to the settlement.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	The overgrown hedges and tall hedgerow trees add to landscape character and should be retained. There are some distinctive individual trees e.g. sycamore, field maple and elder, which should be retained as mitigation. Retain and protect pond. Attractive views of open countryside to south and east including Stump Cross Hill from the urban edge will be lost. Consider TPO of landmark trees.
Likely level of landscape effects	Medium scale adverse due to the loss of fields that contribute to the setting of the town
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	B12 on the south side of Chapel Hill is a large site that could increase adverse effects of development.

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

Summary conclusion	The landscape has some capacity to accept development here assuming that mitigation incorporates existing vegetation and strengthens the integration of the urban edge with the countryside.

Settlement: Boroughbridge

Site: B4 (Land north of Aldborough Gate, Boroughbridge)

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. Upper Dunsforth Carrs approximatley 5 km to the SE.
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. Roecliffe Meadows approximatley 900m to west.
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows, Pond.
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	The two fields to the west arable, the two eastern fields 'improved pasture' P1HS 1992.
Trees and Hedges	There are some good overgrown hedges and tall hedgerow trees and occasional new tree planting at field edges. There are also some distinctive mature trees on the east boundary and NE corner in particular. Hedgerow trees and shrubs include sycamore, field maple and elder. All boundary hedgerows and significant trees should be retained.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Significant mature trees should be considered for protection with a TPO.
Water/Wetland	There is a pond north of centre of site which appears to be a relatively recent feature and may be a modern purpose-built fishing pond. A ditch runs towards Thorneycroft from the NE corner of the pond enclosure. Small pond to the NE.
Slope and Aspect	Relatively flat
Buildings and Structures	None except electricity sub station adjacent to 'The Ridings'. There may be a stable/agricultural shed along the eastern 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 87 South Boroughbridge Farmland • "Encourage the maintenance of field boundaries…and identify hedgerows that would be considered important under the hedgerow regulations criteria" • "New planting should be encouraged to diversify age structure of trees"
Connectivity/Corridors	The hedgerows follow a toft type field system orientated N-S, 1st edition OS maps show that these are remnants of field patterns which were once more extensive to the SE of Boroughbridge.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	There may be the opportunity to develop a SUDs wetland, perhaps in association with the existing pond, perhaps to provide a fish-free pond for amphibians and invertebrates. Boundary hedges should be reinforced with additional native tree and shrub planting. It may be possible to provide a green link between Aldborough Road and Ladywell Lane around the eastern boundary of the site.
Protected Species	Nesting birds are likely to utilise the hedgerows and trees and the pond. Bats may utilise the more mature trees as roosts. Water vole may utilise the pond and drain. It is unlikely that great crested newt would use the fishing pond but may utilise the smaller pond.
BAP Priority Species	Not known but there may be BAP species of birds of arable farmland.
Invasive Species	Not known.
Notes	B6 2010 (amber). The eastern-most field is in Entry Level Environmental Stewardship.

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	Existing trees and hedges and the ponds should be protected, retained and granted adequate space, which might impose a constraint on development of the site, especially for the eastern fields, which may be better excluded from development proposals. Opportunities to enhance Green Infrastructure, including SUDs wetland, could be taken in association with development of the western fields. Full ecological assessment required, to include bats, great crested newts and nesting birds.

Settlement: Boroughbridge

Site: B4 (Land north of Aldborough Gate, Boroughbridge)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

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

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: Boroughbridge

Site: B6 (Land at Back Lane, Langthorpe)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site is situated at Back Lane Langthorpe. LCA81: Dishforth and surrounding farmland
Landscape description	Area description: The wider area comprises large-scale arable land. Scattered diverse development punctuates the uniform and open agricultural landscape. Tree cover and hedgerows are intermittent affording long distance views. Generally the area is pleasant and particularly valued for its views into the North York Moors to the west Site description: The site consists of a small part of a large arable field bordering the northern edge of Langthorpe, The site is rectangular in shape with its southern and eastern boundaries formed by Back Lane. A gappy hedgerow forms the site's boundary with the lane. Landform gently rises to the north with long distance views interrupted by a mid distance horizon formed by arable fields and woodland
Existing urban edge	The site extends current built form limits into the open arable countryside
Trees and hedges	Hedgerow boundary along the urban edge to the south east and south
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open countryside
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The site lies beyond the urban limits of Langthorne extending development into open countyside wiith no physical edge to determine limits of development, the landscape as a consequence would be highly susceptible to change.
Visual Sensitivity	Views of the site would be apparent from the PRoW routed north along Back Lane before turning north east towards Leeming Lane
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of arable land and open countryside on the edge of development. Proposed new built form is likely to be visible particularly from open countryside to the north
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Mitigation screen planting should be carried out along the site's northern and western boundaries
Likely level of landscape effects	Large scale adverse effects due to extensoin of development into open countryside with no natural screening in place
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	B5, B9, B10 and B18 adjoining the site to the south and east - their devleopment in conjuction with this site would increase adverse effects on local landscape character. However should these site's be taken forward they should be planned collectively particulary with regard to green infrastructure initiatives

Conclusion

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

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

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

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

Summary conclusion	The site and its setting have a high susceptibilty to the development proposed due to its openness and extension into the open countyside

Settlement: Boroughbridge

Site: B6 (Land at Back Lane, Langthorpe)

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, arable farmland.
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None.
Sward	Part of large arable field (rapeseed).
Trees and Hedges	Scrappy hedgerows to the south and east boundaries; open field to the north and west.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	None on site.
Water/Wetland	None on site.
Slope and Aspect	Flat
Buildings and Structures	None on site.
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 81: Dishforth and Surrounding Farmland. • “Small woodland blocks associated with appropriately scaled development may help to integrate development with the landscape” • “Encourage the reinstatement of hedges particularly in areas of pre-parliamentary enclosure”
Connectivity/Corridors	Field boundary hedges link into the surrounding network which forms a green corridor between Boroughbridge/Langthorpe and Kirby Hill.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Provide strong boundary hedges with native tree planting. Compensation for loss of arable farmland habitats could be provided off-site through provision of arable field strips.
Protected Species	Nesting birds may utilise boundary shrubs or open ground.
BAP Priority Species	Potential for priority species birds of arable field margins.
Invasive Species	Himalayan balsam occurs in southern boundary hedge.
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	Enhance hedgerows with additional native planting to complement Green Infrastructure network between Langthorpe and Kirkby Hill.

Settlement: Boroughbridge

Site: B6 (Land at Back Lane, Langthorpe)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

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

Site: B8 (Land at Skelton Lane, Langthorpe)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site is situated to the south of Sketon Lane Langthorpe LCA81: Dishforth and surrounding farmland.
Landscape description	Area description: The wider area comprises large-scale arable land. Scattered diverse development punctuates the uniform and open agricultural landscape. Tree cover and hedgerows are intermittent affording long distance views. Generally the area is pleasant and particularly valued for its views into the North York Moors to the west Site description: The site consists of two large rectangular fields which gently fall south to the bank of the River Ure. The site lies at an average elevation of 15mAOD The land is in pastoral use with one field bounded by a post and rail fencing and the other a stone wall with occasional trees along Skelton Road. A remnant hedgerow with post and rail fencing sub-divide the fields with hedgerows defining the remaining boundaries together with mature trees along the river bank. A PRoW runs along the southern edge of the site along the bank of the river.
Existing urban edge	The site's northern, and eastern boundaries adjoin residential development with pasture contiuning south across the river. The corridor of the A1 M Motorway forms the site's western boundary with the carriageway elevated by a heavily treed embankement
Trees and hedges	The site has hedgerow boundaries in part with occasional mature trees along Skelton Road and banks of the River Ure
Landscape and Green Belt designations	R11 Right of Way Open Countryside
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The site is an important open area at the edge of the settlement. Tranquility is affected by motorway noise and visual disturbance, however the site is considered of high value and susceptible to change with the footpath along the river a high sensitive receptor
Visual Sensitivity	The site is overlooked from river bank PRoW, Skelton Lane and sequentially from the A1M Motorway
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of open pastureland and further encroachment of built form to the south west of the settlement
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Mitigation would require green infrastructure initiatives and adequate built form set back from Skelton Lane and the river.
Likely level of landscape effects	Large scale adverse effects due to loss of openness and village setting
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	

Conclusion

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

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

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

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

Summary conclusion	The site is of high value and has a high susceptibilty to the development proposed due to its openness and location situated on the river margins at the urban edge of the settlement The landscape has medium/ low capacity to accept the change proposed without detriment to landscape character.

Settlement: Boroughbridge

Site: B8 (Land at Skelton Lane, Langthorpe)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Conservation and Design

Conservation and Design Site Assessment

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Boroughbridge Conservation Area.
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Many of the properties flanking Skelton Lane predate 1910 and are locally distinct.
Commentary on heritage assets.	Site is arguably within the setting of Boroughbridge Conservation Area. Many of the properties flanking Skelton Lane predate 1910 and are locally distinct.
Topography and views	Far-reaching views over a relatively flat, low-lying landscape.
Landscape context	Relatively flat, low-lying arable landscape.
Grain of surrounding development	Essentially linear village, with some 20th century housing developments arranged in cul-de-sacs, which represent a departure from the established form. Some development along Back Lane to the rear of frontage buildings on the north side of Skelton Lane. Detached houses predominate. Brick and pantile predominates, some render.
Local building design	Detached 2 storey brick built houses characteristically orientated with eaves to the road.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	Low- lying paddock. Bound by cobbled wall to the northern boundary which flanks Skelton Lane- a verge lined road through the village. River borders the site to the south. The A168 and the A1(M) flyover to the west resulting in audible and intrusive traffic noise within the site. Trees line the embankment up to the A1(M). Field divided into two by a fence and broken hedgerow running north to south through the centre of the site. Detached houses set back behind walls, verge and pavement on the opposite side of Skelton Lane to the north. To the east, a detached house is oreintated east to west and therefore faces into the site- properties on the south side of Skelton Road to the east of the site are characteristically orientated with eaves, rather than gable, to the street. Arable land beyond the village to the north.

Conclusion

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

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

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

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

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

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

Summary conclusion	The site contributes to the rural character of the village but it is noted that the site has been denuded by the A168 and A1(M) flyover. Subject to achieving high quality, locally distinctive design and appropriate density the impact of development on this site will, in part, be mitigated.

Settlement: Boroughbridge

Site: B8 (Land at Skelton Lane, Langthorpe)

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. Brickyard Farm SINC immediately south of the river.
BAP Priority Habitats	Flowing water (River Ure), hedgerows.
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Improved pasture, sheep-grazed
Trees and Hedges	Hedgerrows along eastern and western boundaries with occasional trees along field boundaries including road-frontage. Riverside trees beyond field boundary. Screen planting for A168 off site to west.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature boundary trees likely to merit TPO protection.
Water/Wetland	Two thirds of the site is within flood zone of the adjacent River Ure (except the NW third).
Slope and Aspect	Land slopes gently down towards thre river. Steep embankment to river beyond field boundary
Buildings and Structures	Slipway and moorings along the eastern field riverside. Section of wall on boundary of eastern field
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)	River side is LCA Area 73 River Ure Corridor (Newby Hall to Boroughbridge Road) • “Promote the extension of the river’s influence through diversification of the corridor and its immediate environs. Tree-planting and wetland creation will help to extend its influence in this arable landscape”
Connectivity/Corridors	The site forms part of the River Ure Regionally Important Green Infrastructure Corridor
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Opportunity for habitat recreation on the river floodplain -woodland, wild flower restoration etc.
Protected Species	Nesting birds and bats likely to utilise trees and shrubs on and around the site. Potental for riparian species - e.g otter, water vole, kingfisher
BAP Priority Species	Riparian priority species likely e.g. brown trout, lampreys
Invasive Species	Himalayan balsam likely to occur along the river
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	Ecosystem processes upon which riparian biodiversity depends, depends on the maintenance of the natural floodplain of the river, which could be compromised by intenisve develpmemt of this site. However, there may be an opportunity to enhance the riparian fringe of the River Ure Corridor with the creation of a substantial buffer of semi-natural habitats in association with some development of this site beyond the flood zone.

Settlement: Boroughbridge

Site: B8 (Land at Skelton Lane, Langthorpe)

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 this site is situated in flood zones 2 & 3. Development should be avoided where possible in areas susceptible to flooding. A sequential & risk based approach will need to be taken. In my view, this site should not be considered suitable for residential development. Whilst the site is situated just outside a drainage area administered by the Swale & Ure Internal Drainage Board, any surface water discharge will flow directly or indirectly into the drainage board district. Consequently the drainage board should be consulted regarding any proposals to develop this site. The Environment Agency is a consultee with regards to matters attaining to Main River and development within the flood zones. As such, the agency should be consulted regarding this application

Conclusion

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

Rationale	Rating
Very adverse effects of additional surface water discharge on nearby watercourse where mitigation would be unlikely.	Red

Settlement: Boroughbridge

Site: B10 (Old Hall Caravan Park, Langthorpe)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site is located at Old Farm Caravan Park Langthorpe. LCA81: Dishforth and surrounding farmland
Landscape description	Area description: The wider area comprises large-scale arable land. Scattered diverse development punctuates the uniform and open agricultural landscape. Tree cover and hedgerows are intermittent affording long distance views. Generally the area is pleasant and particularly valued for its views into the NorthYork Moors to the west Site description: The site consists of a large, flat, rectangular parcel of land at about 20m AOD. The site is currently occupied by the Old Caravan Park. There are substantial hedgerows (some ornamental) defining site boundaries that provide a good level of screening and enclosure. A PRoW runs along the site's western boundary before cutting across the north west corner of the site.
Existing urban edge	The site is contained by existing development. It appears well integrated within the urban edge and contains current development
Trees and hedges	Hedgerow boundaries with several mature trees within cental grassed areas
Landscape and Green Belt designations	R11 Right of Way
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The site is an integrated part of the urban fabric of the settlement Built form density is likely to increase as a result of development
Visual Sensitivity	Views of the site are heavily filtered by surrounding built form and perimeter hedgerow vegetation with glimpsed near distance views only likely
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of existing recreational use of caravan park with current development visibility hidden by hedgerows. Proposed new development is likely to be more visible particularly from open countryside to the north
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Mitigation screen planting should be carried out along the site's northern and western boundaries
Likely level of landscape effects	Small scale adverse due to increased massing and scale of built form
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	B2, B5,B6,B9, and B18 adjoining the site to the east and west - their devleopment in conjuction with this site would considerably increase the adverse effects on local landscape character. however should these site's be taken forward they should be planned collectively particulary with regard to green infrastructure initiatives.

Conclusion

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

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

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

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

Summary conclusion	The site and its setting have a low susceptibilty to the development proposed due to the absence of landcape sensitive features Any development should be restricted to a two storey limit with densities reduced along the countryside boundary

Settlement: Boroughbridge

Site: B10 (Old Hall Caravan Park, Langthorpe)

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	Amenity grassland.
Trees and Hedges	Boundary hedges and a number of scattered trees' on site including mature birches. Ornamental shrubbery.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature trees on site likely to merit TPO protection.
Water/Wetland	None
Slope and Aspect	Generally flat
Buildings and Structures	Caravans and brick and pantile reception and facility blocks.
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)	Not applicable - urban
Connectivity/Corridors	Northern boundary hedges link into the surrounding network which forms a green corridor between Boroughbridge/Langthorpe and Kirby Hill.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Native tree and wildflower planting to enhance boundaries and to provide a green buffer, especially to the north.
Protected Species	Nesting birds and bats may utilise hedges, trees, ornamental planting and buildings.
BAP Priority Species	Not known.
Invasive Species	None known.
Notes	B2002 2010 (green). David Bellamy silver star site.

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	Boundary hedgerows and on-site trees should be retained, protected and enhanced especially to the north of the site, as part of Green Infrastructure provision between Langthorpe and Kirkby Hill (in co-ordination with adjacent sites, should they be developed)

Settlement: Boroughbridge

Site: B10 (Old Hall Caravan Park, Langthorpe)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.	Whilst this site is situated just outside a drainage area administered by the Swale and Ure Internal Drainage Board, any surface water discharge will flow directly or indirectly into the drainage board district. Consequently, the drainage board should be consulted regarding any proposals to develop this site According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed development is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred. We are however, aware of flooding incidents in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide. We have received significantly increased levels of complaints over recent years from concerned residents affected by, and threatened by flooding from these watercourses. Due to the number of major development proposals in the general area planning to discharge surface water to the same watercourses, it is essential that surface water discharge is kept to an absolute minimum. 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. It is likely that a proportion of the existing caravans/dwellings etc. are not positively drained to either a watercourse or public sewer Consequently, a full survey of the existing surface water drainage systems should be undertaken to establish condition and outfall location. Should the site not currently be positively drained to watercourse or sewer, the following criteria would apply: 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. Any potential developer would be expected to agree the outline drainage strategy with the LPA/IDB in principle before any planning consent is granted. The outline drainage information should include an assessment of flood risk to the site and 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). The Environment Agency is responsible for administering matters attaining to Main River. As such, if the surface water outfall includes discharge to the River Ure the Agency should be consulted Please note: The IDB/EA/LLFA could have additional requirements to those suggested above.

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: Boroughbridge

Site: B11 (Land at the Bungalow, Boroughbridge)

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	NE 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	Small lawn at rear. Nearly all hard-standing for parking.
Trees and Hedges	Garden hedges bound most of the sote.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	None (2x TPOs exist just to south of the site)
Water/Wetland	None
Slope and Aspect	Flat
Buildings and Structures	Low modern brick 'bungalow' and caravan park.
Natural Area	NCA 30 Southern Magnesian Limestone.
Environmental Opportunity	Not applicable.
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	Not applicable - urban.
Connectivity/Corridors	Network of garden hedges and school field hedgrows.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Swift/bat bricks.
Protected Species	Nesting birds likely to use the boundary hedges. some potential for bats to utilise the bungalow.
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
No adverse impact, potential for enhancement and net gains to biodiversity.	Dark Green

Summary conclusion	Boundary hedges, which may provide habitat for nesting birds should be retained. Opportunity to incorporate swift and bat bricks into redeveloped buildings

Settlement: Boroughbridge

Site: B11 (Land at the Bungalow, Boroughbridge)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.	This site is situated in a drainage area administered by the Swale and Ure Internal Drainage Board. Consequently, the drainage board should be consulted regarding any proposals to develop the land. 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. The Environment Agency is responsible for administering matters attaining to Main River. As such, if the surface water outfall includes discharge to the River Ure the Agency should be consulted Please note: The IDB/EA could have additional requirements to those suggested above.

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: Boroughbridge

Site: B12 (Land at Stump Cross, Boroughbridge)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site is located at the southern end of Boroughbridge east of Junction 48 on the A1. LCA87: South Boroughbridge Farmland.
Landscape description	Area description: The wider landscape is moderate scale and comprises rolling landform with some tree cover at the urban edge and a wider scattering of trees in the countryside to the south. This is a simple landscape with monochrome arable fields and occasional improved grass fields. Hedgerows are fragmented and some have been lost due to modern farming techniques. Site description: Site comprises parliamentary enclosure fields with hedgerow boundaries and includes a small area of solar panels at the northern end and a residential property and chicken sheds at Gibbet Hill farm on the west boundary.
Existing urban edge	The built form of Boroughbridge extends linearly south along Wetherby Road at the northern end of the site which is essentially detached from the existing urban edge.
Trees and hedges	Hedgerow boundaries and several mature trees potentially worthy of TPO.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open countryside.
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The fields are characterisitic of the landscape character area and provide the setting for the southern extent of Boroughbridge.
Visual Sensitivity	The site is overlooked from the A168 and can be seen from minor roads in the wider landscape.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of open countryside and addition of uncharacteristic built form.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Mitigation would require significant green infrastructure to respect existing landscape pattern. However, loss of fields in open countryside detached from urban edge difficult to mitigate.
Likely level of landscape effects	Large scale adverse due to the potential loss of trees and impact of significant extension into open countryside.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	

Conclusion

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

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

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

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

Summary conclusion	Landscape has high susceptibilty to the development proposed due to its scale and lack of connection with the existing urban edge. The scale of the proposal in open countryside would be detrimental to rural character of the area. Development of a smaller area to the north end of the site and linked to B4 would increase landscape capacity.

Settlement: Boroughbridge

Site: B12 (Land at Stump Cross, Boroughbridge)

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. Upper Dunsforth Carrs approximately 5 km to the SE
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. Roecliffe Meadows about 900m to thte W. None likely to be impacted. Upper Dunsforth Carrs about 5 km to the SE
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Large improved pasture or arable fields
Trees and Hedges	Some large mature trees along field and roadside boundaries and field trees north of Gibbet Hill Farm. Low arable hedgerows and one leggy neglected hedgerow in pasture land,
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature hedgerow and other trees on site likely to benefit from TPO protection.
Water/Wetland	Possible small area of flooding NW corner. Spring marked south of Gibbet Hill Farm.
Slope and Aspect	None
Buildings and Structures	Brick farmhouse buildings and dilapidated agricultural buildings at Stump Cross and Gibbet Hill Farms.
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 87 South Boroughbridge Farmland • “Encourage the maintenance of field boundaries…and identify hedgerows that would be considered important under the hedgerow regulations criteria” • “New planting should be encouraged to diversify age structure of trees.”
Connectivity/Corridors	Roadside hedges and verges and field hedgerows offer some connectivity through the arable landscape.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Restore hedgerows and reinforce with native tree planting.
Protected Species	Some potential for bats in buildings and mature trees. Birds likely to nest in trees and hedgerows. Potentially birds of arable farmland (Brown long eared bat, nesting swallows and tree sparrow found iin 2015).
BAP Priority Species	Potential for priority species of arable farmland, including ground nesting birds and brown hare
Invasive Species	Not known
Notes	15/03562/OUT MAB survey of Stump Cross Farm buildings

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	Mature trees and hedgerows should be maintained and enhanced as part of Green Infrastructure provision. Provision of a SUDs wetland should also be considered, if the site is developed. Off-site provision of arable field margins should compensate for loss of arable habitats. Some potential for protected species to be present. Requires full ecological survey.

Settlement: Boroughbridge

Site: B12 (Land at Stump Cross, Boroughbridge)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

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

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: Boroughbridge

Site: B14 (Northern section Three Arrows field, Boroughbridge)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site located on the western edge of town on the south bank of the River Ure. LCA73: River Ure Corridor (Newby Hall to Boroughbridge)
Landscape description	Area description: The wider landscape comprises the linear floodplain of the River Ure. Woodland cover is random and occurs along the riverbank in patches. Settlement is sparse within the character area but for one or two large farmsteads and the urban edge of Boroughbridge. Site description: Northern part of a linear arable field on the west side of Boroughbridge. The Devil's Arrows are scheduled monuments in the southern part of the field outside the site boundary.
Existing urban edge	The site is rural in character and provides an attractive open break between Boroughbridge and the A1M corridor. Because of the abundance of peripheral tree and woodland cover, the site appears physically detached from the urban edge.
Trees and hedges	Hedgerow with trees on west boundary.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open countryside TPO trees on east boundary.
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	Landscape susceptible to the loss of open field and boundary trees and the extension of built form.
Visual Sensitivity	Flat site falling gradually north towards River Ure. The site is well contained by surrounding tree and woodland cover, but there are open views from Roecliffe Lane. The site is also visible from the PROW that passes along the eastern edge of the field to the south.
Anticipated landscape effects	Development would appear uncharacteristic in this rural location and significantly impact upon the landscape setting of the prehistoric Devil's Arrows standing stones.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Protect and retain landscape setting to Devil's Arrows (of local historic significance). The standing stones enhance river's influence and promote its presence through its immediate environs. It is critical to protect the character of farmland, which provides an appropriate setting for Arrows site.
Likely level of landscape effects	Medium to large scale adverse. An extension to the built development between the town and the A1M corridor should be resisted to recognise the importance of the river corridor to the setting of the town, the buffer it provides and the significance of the setting for the Devil's Arrows standing stones.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	B3 to the south is also a buffer and there would be cumulative effects if developed in conjunction with this site.

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 is likely to result in the loss of ancient woodland, aged or veteran trees and/or trees protected by a TPO.	Red

Summary conclusion	Capacity of the landscape to accept the development proposed is limited due to the loss of part of an open field that provides the setting for the Devil's Arrows.

Settlement: Boroughbridge

Site: B14 (Northern section Three Arrows field, Boroughbridge)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Conservation and Design

Conservation and Design Site Assessment

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Devil's Arrows Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM).
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	None.
Commentary on heritage assets.	Setting of Boroughbridge Conservation Area.
Topography and views	Site is prominent on approach into the historic market town from the west along Roecliffe Lane. A1 is not a visual detractor from within the site but there is an audible traffic noise impact. Dense hedge screens housing to the east. Land is relatively flat with slight gradient down towards the river.
Landscape context	Open countryside. Mature trees.
Grain of surrounding development	A168 and A1 to the west. River Ure to the north. 20th century housing estates to the east
Local building design	2 storey brick and pantile; detached and semi- detached houses, with chimneys on the ridge.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The site comprises the northern portion of a field that includes the stone alignment known as the Devils Arrows, which are protected as a SAM. The stone alignment forms part of a wider complex of buried prehistoric remains of a high quality. The full nature and extent of this wider complex has yet to be confirmed and the scheduling therefore focuses on the stones. Mature trees delineate the west boundary of the site and provide landscape setting for the SAM. Arable crop.

Conclusion

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

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

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

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

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

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

Summary conclusion	The Devil’s Arrows indicate the importance of the Ure Corridor in the distant past and may also link in with the henges found further upstream. The setting of the Devil’s Arrows should be preserved and opportunities sought to research their importance and enhance their setting appropriately. Development would have a visual impact and encroach upon the setting of these stones and any archaeological remains. Mature trees should be retained. Site is integral to the setting of the market town and provides buffer from the A1. Development would separate the SAM from the river.

Settlement: Boroughbridge

Site: B14 (Northern section Three Arrows field, Boroughbridge)

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)	Brickyard Fields SINC across the disused railway to the NW.
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerow, arable farmland, potential veteran trees
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None.
Sward	Arable.
Trees and Hedges	Line of mature trees in hedgerow along western boundary include a number of mature oaks
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature boundary trees very likely to merit TPO potection.
Water/Wetland	None on site; marina and river Ure immediately to the north
Slope and Aspect	The land slopes very gently from south to north
Buildings and Structures	None on site - two of the Devils Arrows standing stones are off-site in the southern part of the same field
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 Area 73 River Ure Corridor (Newby Hall to Boroughbridge Road) • “Promote the extension of the river’s influence through diversification of the corridor and its immediate environs. Tree-planting and wetland creation will help to extend its influence in this arable landscape”
Connectivity/Corridors	The site is within the River Ure regionally important Strategic Green Corridor with the marina and the river immediately to the north; disused railway crosses north west tip of site and links into towards Roecliffe Meadows
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Enhancement of boundary hedgerows and re-creation of wildflower meadows, especially the northern margin. Compensatory arable field margins could be established off-site so development of the arable field should not have significant adverse ecological consequences. There may be an opportunity for floodplain habitat creation which might also enhance the setting of the Devil's Arrows.
Protected Species	Nesting birds and bats likley to utilise the boundary trees and hedgerows
BAP Priority Species	May be priority birds species of arable field margins and/or ground nesting birds present
Invasive Species	Himalyan balsam and giant hogweed occur along the river
Notes	part of B4 2010 (amber)

Conclusion

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

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

Summary conclusion	Healthily functioning river floodplains are essential to maintain the high ecological quality of rivers. Development may offer an opportunity for creation of inter-connecting floodplain habitat on the northern part of the site as part of Green Infrastructure provision linking in with the disused railway and the marina and enhance the landscape setting of the Devil's Arrows.

Settlement: Boroughbridge

Site: B14 (Northern section Three Arrows field, Boroughbridge)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.	This site is situated in a drainage area administered by the Swale and Ure Internal Drainage Board. Consequently, the drainage board should be consulted regarding any proposals to develop this site. According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed development is located within flood zone 1. However the northern end of the site is situated adjacent to flood zones 2 and 3. Development near the flood plain should be avoided where possible. We are aware of flooding incidents in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide. We have received significantly increased levels of complaints over recent years from concerned residents affected by, and threatened by flooding from these watercourses. Due to the number of major development proposals in the general area planning to discharge surface water to the same watercourses, it is essential that surface water discharge is kept to an absolute minimum. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) should always be any developer’s first consideration and giving preference to soakaways. In my view, infiltration drainage is unlikely to be fully successful at this location due to ground conditions in the surrounding area being predominantly heavy clay soils and the potential high water table. However, any 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/IDB in principle before any planning consent is granted. The outline drainage information should include an assessment of flood risk to the site and surrounding area, topographical survey, feasibility of infiltration drainage, on site storage, rates of discharge, outfall location and 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 outfall includes discharge to the River Ure the Agency should be consulted Please note: The IDB/EA/LLFA could have additional requirements to those suggested above.

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: Boroughbridge

Site: B15 (Land north of Milby Cut, Boroughbridge)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Land north of Milby Cut Boroughbridge Site is adjacent to LCA81: Dishforth and surrounding farmland.
Landscape description	Area description: The wider area comprises large-scale arable land. Scattered diverse development punctuates the uniform and open agricultural landscape. Tree cover and hedgerows are intermittent affording long distance views. Generally the area is pleasant and particularly valued for its views into the North York Moors to the west Site description: The site is elongated in shape aligned east to west and in industrial use occupied by a number of small premises.The site is bordered by arable land to the north with a residential and part industrial site to the east. A mature treed hedgerow forms the site's nothern boundary with the southerm boundary defined by Milby Cut, a canalised channel which is part of the River Ure navigation. The canal corridor is heavily treed. A PRoW/towpath runs along the southen bank of the cut. The Historic Boroughbridge Battlefied site boundary forms part of the site to the east with the town conservaton area boundary running along the site's southern boundary.
Existing urban edge	The Hamlet of Millby lies to the west with the main town of Boroughbridge situated across the River to the South west
Trees and hedges	Hedgerow and treed boundariess boundaries to the north and south
Landscape and Green Belt designations	None
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	This Brownfield site is well intetgrated into the fabric of the town with the site contained within treed boundaries to the north and south
Visual Sensitivity	Existing built form is heavily filtered by surrounding vegetation and development. Glimpsed partial upper views of the development would however be likely from open countryside to the north through the boundary tree belt
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of some areas of woodland regeneration along the southern boundary of the site
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Mitigation would require green infrastructure initiatives with possible linking into the surroundig footpath network.
Likely level of landscape effects	Small scale adverse effects due to the potential loss of trees and scrub woodland
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	B7 to the north and B17 (currently planned) to the north west should this site also be redeveloped tor residential use.

Conclusion

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

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

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

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

Summary conclusion	Landscape has a low value and low susceptibilty to the development proposed due to its current urban use with few landscape sensitive features. The landscape has high capacity to accept the change proposed without detriment to landscape character.

Settlement: Boroughbridge

Site: B15 (Land north of Milby Cut, Boroughbridge)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Conservation and Design

Conservation and Design Site Assessment

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Site partially within Boroughbridge CA; Southern boundary of site abuts the Historic Battlefield site of the Battle of Boroughbridge 1322. Within the site is a grade II LB, Station House.
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Buildings associated with the (former) railway station and goods yard occupy the site. Buildings associated with Maltings to the east of the site.
Commentary on heritage assets.	The site is within the setting of Boroughbridge Conservation Area and within the setting of listed buildings. The south eastern boundary of the site borders the Registered Historic Battlefield 'Battle of Boroughbridge 1322' and the site is within the setting of the Historic Battlefield. The site is a haulage depot and railway yard and industrial estate in the southern part of the site. The former railway station building was built in 1848 to service the main north to south line, which went to Pilmoor. The line was extended to Knaresborough in 1875 and a new station was built on the Kirkby Hill Road. The former station house exemplifies railway architecture- attractive stone building with noteworthy stone detailing: rusticated stone quoins; cornice; dressed stone window surrounds etc. The traditional warehouse buildings are brick built with blind arch and stone stringcourse. Brick built bays with dressed stone piers are the former coal shutes/stores and are evidence of the former coal/goods yard servicing the (dismantled) railway. There is also modern warehousing and associated car parking and gravel works. To the north and east is open agricultural land. To the west is twentieth century housing development, specifically, Market Hill, which is arranged in a cul-de-sac. The Maltings, now converted to residential use, is further to the west, as is Langthorpe- this site contains two listed buildings, specifically the Maltings and Kilns and the Laundry building.
Topography and views	Open countryside to the north. Individual farmsteads and the hamlet of Milby to the north east.
Landscape context	Open agricultural land- arable fields.
Grain of surrounding development	Market town of Boroughbridge to the south. Modern housing development of Market Hill to the west. Haulage depot and railway yard. Industrial estate in the southern part of the site.
Local building design	Modern housing development of Market Hill to the west.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	See above. The site is a haulage depot and railway yard and industrial estate in the southern part of the site.

Conclusion

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

Rationale	Rating
Development of the site within the Conservation Area will improve a poor quality site and contribute to local distinctiveness.	Dark Green

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

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

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

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

Summary conclusion	Development of this site would result in the loss of employment land. Development of this site will impact on the setting of the Registered Historic Battlefield and legibility and interpretation of the same. Development of the site would impact on the setting of the LB. Development of this site with the adjacent site B7 is likely to result in built form coalescence, significantly reducing the land between Boroughbridge and Milby and thereby eroding the identity of Milby as a separate hamlet, to the detriment of the significance of this settlement and legibility of the same. Furthermore, the cumulative impact of the proposed development and the residential development approved to the west needs to be duly considered. Development will impact on the historic environment and/or local character, but appropriate mitigation measures may enable some development to be achieveable on this brownfield site. An assessment of the archaeological potential of the site, as well as assessment of the significance of the heritage assets and the impact of the proposal on that significance would be necessary. The site is presently in industrial and commercial use. There is scope for enhancement. The setting of the LB could be improved. This part of the CA and indeed the setting of the same, could be improved. The setting of the Historic Battlefield and interpretation of the same could be improved.

Settlement: Boroughbridge

Site: B15 (Land north of Milby Cut, Boroughbridge)

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 on site; Flowing Water - Milby Cut and riparian woodland adjacent
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	SE36NE TN 09 and SE46NW TN 005 Tall herb ruderal vegetation on Milby Cut Island (Notes: giant hogweed) SE36NE TN and 10 note abundant yellow water lily on Milby Cut
Sward	Mostly hard-standing; small area of improved grassland to east (P1HS 1992) requires survey
Trees and Hedges	There is a row of trees along Milby Cut and a hedge along the northern boundary.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Existing boundary trees and hedges should be retained.
Water/Wetland	Milby Cut (canalised section of the River Ure) fronts the site to the south. Part of the site is within the River Ure floodplain.
Slope and Aspect	Generally flat
Buildings and Structures	Old Station building is brick/stone with a slate roof. Brick built bays with dressed stone piers are the former coal shutes/stores and are evidence of the former coal/goods yard servicing the (dismantled) railway. Modern warehousing and associated car parking. Gravel works.
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)	East of site within LCA 86 Swale/Ure Confluence Farmland • “Flood defence works…opportunities to enhance the wildlife value of the area should be considered, allowing for seasonal flooding and the possible reintroduction of water meadow management” • “Tree planting should respect the open nature of this character area and will help enhance existing wildlife corridors”
Connectivity/Corridors	Milby Cut (canalised section of the River Ure) fronts the site to the south, linking in with the regionally important River Ure Green Infrastructure Corridor. To the east is the confluence of the Swale and Ure. The route of the disused railway to Pilmoor appears to be mostly lost.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	There may be the opportunity to reinforce GI along the Milby Cut corridor. The south eastern part of the site, which floods, may have potential to contribute to flood defence wetlands near the Swale/Ure Confluence. Potential to eradication of giant hogweed.
Protected Species	Birds may breed in boundary trees and hedgerows and various buildings. Bat roost potential in old station buildings and trees fronting Milby Cut. Some potential for reptiles in old coal yards etc. May be riparian species associated with Milby Cut e.g. otter, kingfisher.
BAP Priority Species	May be riparian species associated with Milby cut (e.g. migratory fish)
Invasive Species	Giant hogweed and Himalayan balsam noted on Milby Cut Island (P1HS).
Notes	B8 2010 (green)

Conclusion

Will it deliver net gains to biodiversity and protect and enhance existing networks of priority habitats and species and provide for long term management of wildlife habitats? Will it offer opportunities to enhance Green Infrastructure?	
Rationale	Rating
Some potential effects on designated sites (SINC, SSSI, LNR), the wider ecological network and/or priority habitats and species but relatively easy to mitigate for.	Yellow
Summary conclusion	The main sensitivity of this site is the proximity of Milby Cut.Providing that ecological surveys are undertaken, bankside trees are retained and that the canal is adequately buffered against pollution, there are no ecological objections to redevelopment, which may offer some opportunity to enhance Green Infrastructure along the regionally important River Ure strategic GI corridor.

Settlement: Boroughbridge

Site: B15 (Land north of Milby Cut, Boroughbridge)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.	This site is situated mostly in a drainage area administered by the Swale and Ure Internal Drainage Board. Consequently the drainage board should be consulted regarding any proposals to develop this site. According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the lower section of the site is located within flood zones 2 and 3. Development in flood zones 2 and 3 should be avoided where possible. We are aware of flooding incidents in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide. We have received significantly increased levels of complaints over recent years from concerned residents affected by, and threatened by flooding from these watercourses. Due to the number of major development proposals in the general area planning to discharge surface water to the same watercourses, it is essential that surface water discharge is kept to an absolute minimum. 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/IDB in principle before any planning consent is granted. The outline drainage information should include an assessment of flood risk to the site and 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). The Environment Agency is responsible for administering matters attaining to Main River. As such, if the surface water outfall includes discharge to the River Ure the Agency should be consulted. Please note: The IDB/EA/LLFA could have additional requirements to those suggested above.

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: Boroughbridge

Site: B18 (Old Poultry Farm, Leeming Lane, Langthorpe)

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 grassland (P1HS 1992) partly grown rank.
Trees and Hedges	Boundary hedges with trees to roadside frontage and the western boundary.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature boundary trees likely to merit TPO protection.
Water/Wetland	None
Slope and Aspect	Flat
Buildings and Structures	Numerous dilapdated insubstantial poultry sheds.
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)	Urban - not applicable
Connectivity/Corridors	Northern boundary hedges link into the surrounding network which forms a green corridor between Boroughbridge/Langthorpe and Kirby Hill
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Native tree and wildflower planting to enhance boundaries and to provide a green buffer, especially to the north
Protected Species	Nesting birds and bats may utilise hedges, trees and dilapidated buildings.
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	Existing boundary trees and hedges should be protected, retained and enhanced as an element of green infrastructure between Langthorpe and Kirkby Hill, (possibly co-ordinated with adjacent sites, should these sites be developed).

Settlement: Boroughbridge

Site: B18 (Old Poultry Farm, Leeming Lane, Langthorpe)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.	Whilst this site is situated just outside a drainage area administered by the Swale and Ure Internal Drainage Board, any surface water discharge will flow directly or indirectly into the drainage board district. Consequently the drainage board should be consulted regarding any proposals to develop this site According to the Environment Agency flood maps; the proposed development is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred. We are however, aware of flooding incidents in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide. We have received significantly increased levels of complaints over recent years from concerned residents affected by, and threatened by flooding from these watercourses. Due to the number of major development proposals in the general area planning to discharge surface water to the same watercourses, it is essential that surface water discharge is kept to an absolute minimum. 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. It is likely that a proportion of the existing buildings etc. are not positively drained to either a watercourse or public sewer, consequently, A full survey of the drainage systems from currently developed areas should be undertaken to establish condition and outfall location. Applicants should also provide calculations showing the existing peak flow rates from site and the proposed rates. 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 and surrounding area, on site storage requirements, existing peak flow rates, proposed peak flow rates, survey results showing existing drains/watercourses/sewers, outfall location and proposals for dealing with any identified remedial items.

Conclusion

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

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

Settlement: Masham

Site: M1 (Allotments at Leyburn Road, Masham)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site located on the north side of Masham and currently comprises allotments. LCA 41: River Ure Corridor
Landscape description	Area description: Masham is a historic market town situated on the west side of the Ure Valley on ground rising above the river corridor comprising a landscape of mixed arable and grass fields with predominantly hedgerow boundaries. Trees along the river corridor and field boundaries contribute to the setting of the town. Site description: Allotments (Bellfield Gardens) in use comprising a mix of planting plots and garden structures. Appear to have been created between WW1 and WW2. Victorian building (Bellfield) to the west of the site and Black sheep Brewery to the southeast are of historic importance.
Existing urban edge	To the east is a post war housing estate comprising semi detached with large gardens and miscelleneous 20th century housing. Also site of Black Sheep Brewery. To the west is Leyburn Road and Bellfield.
Trees and hedges	Hedgerow boundaries
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Local plan recreation open space (Policy R2) Public Rights of Way.
Description of proposal for the site	Residential development.
Physical Sensitivity	The allotments provide the setting for the north side of Masham and the historic brewery buildings resulting in higher sensitivity.
Visual Sensitivity	The site is not widely visible but is important to the approach from the north. Two public rights of way cross the site.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of allotments and introduction of built form uncharacteristic of the settlement edge.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Possible potential to retain an area of allotments and incorporate green infrastructure.
Likely level of landscape effects	Medium scale affects. However loss of allotments would change the charcter of the setting of the town.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	M2, M9, M12 cumulative impacts would be considerable with the development on these adjacent sites.

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 capacity of the landscape to accept development of this site is low. Effects may be reduced by lowering housing density and allocating part of the site for retention of allotments and additional green infrastructure. .

Settlement: Masham

Site: M1 (Allotments at Leyburn Road, Masham)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Conservation and Design

Conservation and Design Site Assessment

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Masham Conservation Area
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	The historic brewery buildings east of the site and the row of houses to the southeast of the site. Outside the conservation area: Marfield House north of the site, Bellfield west of the site.
Commentary on heritage assets.	The southeast corner of the site adjoins Masham Conservation Area, any development of the site will affect the setting of the conservation area, which is sensitive to development. The historic brewery buildings east of the site are designated in the conservation area appraisal as local landmark buildings, and the row of houses to the southeast are of local interest and merit. Outside the conservation area: Marfield House is of historic and architectural interest, and;Bellfield is a grand Victorian country residence of historic and architectural interest set in generous grounds. Both of these houses sit visually outside the edge of settlement. All these buildings are non-designated heritage assets. The brewery buildings are of greatest significance because of the importance of the brewery to the town; development should not diminish the prominence of the largest brewery buildings. The row of houses is of lower significance and its setting is not very sensitive. The settings of the Marfield House and particularly Bellfield are more sensitive.
Topography and views	Land falls towards the river. Whilst there are no key views shown in the conservation area appraisal, views from the Leyburn Road towards the brewery are important, and views from the conservation over the site are sensitive to development.
Landscape context	The site is outside of the settlement, and is separated from the main part of the town by the vacant auction mart site. The conservation area appraisal shows the hedgerow to the north of the site is a significant field boundary
Grain of surrounding development	Grain in the immediate context of the site is mixed; houses on Gun Bank are set behind small front gardens; the houses are a mixture of detached, semi-detached and short rows, some with narrow gaps between, and the road is extremely narrow, consequently the grain is tight; the historic row is set back from the lane, which is rural in character; housing southwest of the site on Leyburn Road are in short rows with modest gaps between typical of council housing, and; housing on the road to Fearby are detached, many are bungalows, set in good sized gardens behind hedges such that they have reduced impact on the streetscene.
Local building design	Building design in the context of the site is varied. Housing is mainly two storey, but there are bungalows. Certain of the brewery buildings are of greater scale, some are historic stone buildings with slate roofs, the more recent buildings are clad in profiled sheets. Housing on Gun Bank and on Leyburn Road is mainly rendered with slate roofs, and housing on the road to Fearby is of a varied palette The row of housing in the conservation area and Marfield House reflect the vernacular and are of simple form, built of stone with slate roofs. Bellfield, the victorian villa, is of similar materials, but very generously proportioned and features bay windows and a greater complexity of form.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The footpath alongside a historic boundary running east to west across the site is noted in the conservation area appraisal as a strategic pedestrian route. The site is used for allotments. This footpath on site, the fact the site is within the flood zone 3 and the brewery have immediate impact on 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 but there are opportunities for mitigation and improvements.	Orange
Summary conclusion	Development will affect the setting of the conservation area. Provided that buildings are modest in height and density is relatively low to allow key areas of the site to be left open, development of this site would be appropriate. Development would conserve those elements that contribute to the significance of heritage assets if the field to the south is developed, buildings are low in height, views of the brewery retained and setting of the other assets protected.

Settlement: Masham

Site: M1 (Allotments at Leyburn Road, Masham)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	North Pennines SPA/SAC c, 5km to the west.
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	Marfield Fen SSSI approximately 400m to the north.
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England would require consultation for residential development of 100 units or more.
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None
BAP Priority Habitats	HDBAP Gardens & Urban Wildspace'
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Allotments
Trees and Hedges	Mixed hawthron hedges along Leyburn Road and Gun Bank, hedge with semi mature trees along northern boundary, scattered semi-mature trees on site
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	None
Water/Wetland	None on site.
Slope and Aspect	Generally flat
Buildings and Structures	Sheds & poly tunnels.
Natural Area	NCA 22: Pennine Dales Fringe
Environmental Opportunity	SEO4 Enhancing and connecting semi-natural habitats in river corridors to improve the wildlife movement corridors between lowland and upland. SEO3: Enhancing provision of new off-road linear and circular routes suitable for horses, cyclists and walkers, and increasing promotion of existing and new routes to further promote outdoor recreation in the area.
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 41 River Ure Corridor (Charlcot to Aldburgh Hall) • “Encourage the repair and management of existing hedgerows and hedgerow trees prioritising the areas contributing to the setting of Masham”. • “Promote appropriate woodland planting along the river corridor and planting of hedgerow trees”
Connectivity/Corridors	The hedgerows of the surrounding medium sized fields form an important network which helps link the Green Infrastructure corridors of the rivers Burn and Ure to the west of Masham.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	There may be some potential, especially if adjacent sites are also developed, to contribute towards the creation of a new green infrastructure corridor between the Ure to Swinney Beck north of Masham to recreate semi-natural habitats and provide alternative recreational outlets.
Protected Species	None known.
BAP Priority Species	Likely to support local BAP species of birds and possibly amphibians and reptiles.
Invasive Species	None known.
Notes	Site likely to support rich biodiversity of common species invertebrates, amphibians and birds.

Conclusion

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

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

Summary conclusion	This site is likely to support a rich biodiversity of common species including invertebrates, amphibians and birds. These contribute to the wider ecological network and would require to be fully mitigated for in order to compensate for any redevelopment.There may be some potential, especially if adjacent sites are also developed, to contribute towards the creation of a new Green Infrastructure corridor between the River Ure to Swinney Beck north of Masham to recreate semi-natural habitats and provide alternative recreational outlets.

Settlement: Masham

Site: M1 (Allotments at Leyburn Road, Masham)

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 wholly within flood zones 2/3. We are aware of significant flooding events in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses including Swinney Beck & the River Ure. 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. 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/ flood zones 2/3. As such, the Agency should be consulted regarding this site.

Conclusion

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

Rationale	Rating
Very adverse effects of additional surface water discharge on nearby watercourse where mitigation would be unlikely.	Red

Settlement: Masham

Site: M2 (Land at Leyburn Road, Masham)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site located on north side of Masham, east of Leyburn road and north of the allotments (M1) LCA41: River Ure Corridor
Landscape description	Area description: Masham is a historic market town situated on the west side of the Ure Valley on ground rising above the river corridor comprising a landscape of mixed arable and grass fields with predominantly hedgerow boundaries. Trees along the river corridor and field boundaries contribute to the setting of the town. Site Description: Grass field with hedgerow boundaries. Trees in the hedgerows. Historically it appears field has been a football pitch. Site provides setting for Marfield House which is of historic interest.
Existing urban edge	Site detached from urban edge by allotments.
Trees and hedges	Hedge to east, south and west boundaries. Access road and fencing to north boundary.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open countryside.
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	Field provides setting for Masham on approach from Leyburn Road but is reasonably well contained although detached from the town.
Visual Sensitivity	Potential views of Masham Church Spire across the site. The site itself is not widely visible in the landscape however it is important on the approach to Masham. Views from several PRoW.
Anticipated landscape effects	Medium to large scale adverse as the site is detached from the town and development would change the setting of the town.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	May be opportunities for appropriate mitigation if sufficient space allowed for green ionfrastructure and housing density reduced. Views to the church spire should be retained.
Likely level of landscape effects	Medium to large scale adverse as the site is detached from the town and development would change the setting of the town and its character.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	M1, M9, M12 cumulative effects would be greater if developed in conjuction with these sites in part due to the scale of development that would result on the north side of town.

Conclusion

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

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

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

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

Summary conclusion	Landscape capacity to accept development on this site is limited. There is an opportunity to mitigate some impacts with substanital allocation for green infrastructure.

Settlement: Masham

Site: M2 (Land at Leyburn Road, Masham)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Conservation and Design

Conservation and Design Site Assessment

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Masham Conservation Area.
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	The brewery buildings southeast of the site; Bellfield to the southwest and Marfield House east of the site.
Commentary on heritage assets.	The site is seperated from the conservation area by a field. Development would affect the approach to the conservation area. The brewery buildings are noted as important landmark buildings in the conservation area appraisal, any new development should retain views to the larger historic buildings; the brewery is an important asset of the town and the buildings should retain their visual dominance. The setting of Marfield House, a historic building of some architectural merit is sensitive to development. The grand Victorian villa of Bellfield is a historic and architectural interest set in generous grounds, sits visually outside the edge of settlement; historically it was well outside Masham town; development northeast of the villa would impact on its significance.
Topography and views	Land is reasonably flat, but is lower to the south and southeast.The site benefits from views out, the views to the brewery should be protected.
Landscape context	The site is seperated from the edge of town by proposed site M1 and the vacant field to its south (the former auction mart). The roadside boundary is a hedge. The outgrown hedge to the site add to the visual isolation of the site.
Grain of surrounding development	There is no surrounding development. Nearby the site grain is mixed; houses on Gun Bank are set behind small front gardens, houses are a mixture of detached, semi-detached and short rows, some with narrow gaps between, and the road is extremely narrow consequently the grain is tight; housing southwest of the site on Leyburn Road is in short rows with modest gaps between typical of council housing, and; housing on the road to Fearby is detached, many properties are bungalows, set in good sized gardens behind hedges such that they have reduced impact on the streetscene.
Local building design	Building design in the context of the site is varied, housing is mainly two storey, but there are bungalows. Certain of the brewery buildings are of greater scale, some are historic stone buildings with slate roofs, the more recent buildings are clad in profiled sheets. Housing on Gun Bank and on Leyburn Road is mainly rendered with slate roofs, and housing on the road to Fearby is of a varied pallette Marfield House reflects the vernacular and is of simple form, built of stone with slate roofs. Bellfield, the victorian villa is of similar materials, but very generously proportioned and features bay windows and greater complexity of form.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	Much of the site is within the flood zone 3, which would result in floor levels of housing being lifted. The site is surrounded by fields and open countryside.

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 could conserve those elements that contribute to the significance of Marfield House and the Brewery if density is relatively low, views of the brewery retained and setting of the other assets protected. However development of the site would impact detrimentally to the setting of Bellfield and harm the historic significance of this country residence. In any event, development of this site would be harmful to the countryside setting of the historic town of Masham unless the fields to its south were developed.

Settlement: Masham

Site: M2 (Land at Leyburn Road, Masham)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	North Pennines SPA/SAC c. 5km to the W.
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	Marfield Fen approximately 300m to NE.
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England require consultation on residential development of 100 units or more.
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	Marfield Gravel Pits approximately 450m to the north.
BAP Priority Habitats	Arable Farmland.
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Arable
Trees and Hedges	Mature trees along Leyburn Road and low hedges.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature boundary trees may merit consideration.
Water/Wetland	None on site.
Slope and Aspect	Generally flat.
Buildings and Structures	None
Natural Area	NCA 22 Pennine Dales Fringe
Environmental Opportunity	SEO4 Enhancing and connecting semi-natural habitats in river corridors to improve the wildlife movement corridors between lowland and upland. SEO3: Enhancing provision of new off-road linear and circular routes suitable for horses, cyclists and walkers, and increasing promotion of existing and new routes to further promote outdoor recreation in the area.
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 41 River Ure Corridor (Charlcot to Aldburgh Hall) • “Encourage the repair and management of existing hedgerows and hedgerow trees prioritising the areas contributing to the setting of Masham”. • “Promote appropriate woodland planting along the river corridor and planting of hedgerow trees”
Connectivity/Corridors	The hedgerows of the surrounding medium sized fields form an important network which helps link the Green Infrastructure corridors of the rivers Burn and Ure to the west of Masham.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	There may be some potential, especially if adjacent sites are also developed, to create a new Green Infrastructure corridor between the River Ure to Swinney Beck north of Masham to recreate semi-natural habitats and provide alternative recreational outlets.
Protected Species	None known.
BAP Priority Species	Possibly birds of arable farmland.
Invasive Species	None known.
Notes	

Conclusion

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

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

Summary conclusion	The arable field is of relatively minor intrinsic biodiversity value, although any cumulative impact on designated sites to the north may need to be taken into consideration. There may also be some potential to contribute towards the creation of a Green Infrastructure corridor between the River Ure and Swinney Beck north of Masham to provide alternative recreational outlets and to recreate semi-natural habitats.

Settlement: Masham

Site: M2 (Land at Leyburn Road, Masham)

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 mostly within flood zones 2/3. We are aware of significant flooding events in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses including Swinney Beck & the River Ure. 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. 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/ flood zones 2/3. As such, the Agency should be consulted regarding this site.

Conclusion

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

Rationale	Rating
Very adverse effects of additional surface water discharge on nearby watercourse where mitigation would be unlikely.	Red

Settlement: Masham

Site: M3 (Land to the south of Swinton Road, Masham)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site located on the south east side of town south off Swinton Road. LCA 41: River Ure Corridor
Landscape description	Area description: Masham is a historic market town situated on the west side of the Ure Valley on ground rising above the river corridor comprising a landscape of mixed arable and grass fields with predominantly hedgerow boundaries. Trees along the river corridor and field boundaries contribute to the setting of the town. Site Description: Grass strip fields. The site includes a field barn on the southern boundary. The west boundary runs through the middle of a linear field. The field to the east is generally flat. Landform rises along the west side of the site.
Existing urban edge	Swinton Terrace and Fisher Row provide histroric urban edge to the east boundary of the site and are in the Conservation Area.
Trees and hedges	Hedgerow to north boundary with Swinton Road contains mature trees and has a TPO.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open Countryside. TPO on the north boundary. Conservation area to the east boundary.
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	Swinton Terrace and Fisher Row provide historic urban edge to the east boundary of the site and are in the Conservation Area.
Visual Sensitivity	High sensitivity due to views from the conservation area. Although limited views from wider landscape assuming no building on higher ground to the west.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of strip field that provides historic setting for Conservation Area and the town. Potential change to landform on the edge of town to accommodated development would be detrimental.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Limited opportunities for effective mitigation.
Likely level of landscape effects	Large scale effect on setting of town and conservation area due to loss of characterisitic setting for the conservation area.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	M8 to the north west of M3 but additional cumulative affect minimal if both developed.

Conclusion

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

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

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

Rationale	Rating
Development is likely to result in the loss of ancient woodland, aged or veteran trees and/or trees protected by a TPO.	Red

Summary conclusion	Site important to the setting and character of the conservation area and the historic town. Therefre the landscape has high susceptibility to change. It would not be possible to mitigate adverse effects effectively although substantial areas of green infrastructure and low density housing may reduce harm but not significantly.

Settlement: Masham

Site: M3 (Land to the south of Swinton Road, Masham)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Conservation and Design

Conservation and Design Site Assessment

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Masham Conservation Area.
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	The housing adjacent the site on Swinton Road.
Commentary on heritage assets.	The site is adjacent to Masham Conservation Area and development would affect its setting.The housing adjacent the site, which front onto Swinton Road are designated as being of local interest in the conservation area appriasal, they are non-designated assets of historic and architectural significance.The landscape concept map of the conservation area appriasal shows the trees along the north boundary of the site as landmark trees and the view through the gate as a key view.
Topography and views	The part of the field to the west (presumably outside the site boundary) banks steeply up to a poorly kept hedgerow, otherwise there is a gentle fall to a watercourse to the south. The view through the gate is a key view.
Landscape context	The site is at the edge of the settlement.
Grain of surrounding development	Within the conservation area in the context of the site, two storey buildings are in terraces or arranged in rows closely related to the highway; most against the back of the footway. The later development northeast of the site is set back behind private gardens. North of the site, are semi-detached houses set behind modest front gardens. Dwellings on and at the corners of Swinburn Road are bungalows, many in the road are semi-detached, set behind modest front gardens.The area north of the site is not locally distinctive.
Local building design	The bungalows are built of random stone and have concrete slate roofs, the semi-detached houses opposite the site are of brick. Neither in terms of materials or style reflect local distinctiveness. The terraces to the east are Victorian, they are of stone and have stone slate roofs (some Welsh slate), they have vertical emphasis and many feature bay windows. Swinton Court is a late twentieth century development that the reflects Victorian style and built in stone with concrete slates to the roofs. To the southwest, I'ansons' builldings are clad in profiled metal sheeting, building heights vary, but one element is very tall.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The trees alongside the northern boundary are protected by an order. There are some modest stone agricultural buildings on the site, the smaller ones have fibre cement roofs, the larger ones have slate roofs. All have some historic value, the larger ones have greater architectural value, but they are not of sufficient significance to be considered non-designated heritage assets. Ideally the larger ones should be reused if practicable.The east side of the site is in the floodzone so floor levels would be lifted. To the southeast of the site is I'ansons, an animal feed supplier.

Conclusion

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

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

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

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

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

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

Summary conclusion	Development would not conserve those elements that contribute to the significance of heritage assets, particularly because it would result in the loss of the key view over agricultural land and detract from the protected trees and hedgerow. Additionally, the existance of the protected trees and hedgerow to the road would prevent housing being built alongside the road in a manner that would reflect local distinctiveness.

Settlement: Masham

Site: M3 (Land to the south of Swinton Road, Masham)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	North Pennnines SPA/SAC about 5 km to the W.
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	Marfield Fen spproximately1.2 km to the N.
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England require consultation on residential units of 100 or more.
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	River Ure (Masham to Mickley) approximatley 1km to the SSE
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerow (including mature trees).
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Species-poor semi-improved grassland (1992 P1HS)
Trees and Hedges	Hedgerows with trees along N, E and W boundaries of site
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	TPO'd trees along Swinton Road hedgerow (including ash). Trees along other boundaries may merit TPO
Water/Wetland	Swinney Beck runs alongsie southern part of site. (possibly culverted to the north).
Slope and Aspect	Site slopes gently eastwards towards Swinney Beck which occasionally floods around a third of the site.
Buildings and Structures	Small agricultural buildings to south of site.
Natural Area	NCA 22: Pennine Dales Fringe.
Environmental Opportunity	SEO3: Enhancing provision of new off-road linear and circular routes suitable for horses, cyclists and walkers, and increasing promotion of existing and new routes to further promote outdoor recreation in the area. SEO4 Enhancing and connecting semi-natural habitats in river corridors to improve the wildlife movement corridors between lowland and upland.
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 41 River Ure Corridor (Charlcot to Aldburgh Hall) • “Encourage the repair and management of existing hedgerows and hedgerow trees prioritising the areas contributing to the setting of Masham”. • “Promote appropriate woodland planting along the river corridor and planting of hedgerow trees”
Connectivity/Corridors	The treed hedgerows form an important network in a small-scale pasture field system, which form important green links for wildlife (and for people) along footpaths between Masham, Swinney Beck, which runs alongside the eastern boundary of this site, and the River Burn.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	New native tree-planting along Swinney Beck corridor could buffer site and help reduce run-off. There may be the opportunity to create new footpaths along the western countryside edge of Masham, linking proposed developments.
Protected Species	Nesting birds likley to use boundary hedgerows, and agricultural buildings; bats may uttilise mature trees and possibly buildings.
BAP Priority Species	None known.
Invasive Species	None known.
Notes	.

Conclusion

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

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

Summary conclusion	The treed hedgerows form an important network in a small-scale pasture field system, which form important green links for wildlife (and for people) along footpaths between Masham, Swinney Beck, which runs alongside the eastern boundary of this site, and the River Burn. The main ecological constraint to development of the site is to ensure the integrity of the Swinney Beck corridor and of trees and hedgeerows on site and to identify opportunities for enhancement of the floodplain corridor.

Settlement: Masham

Site: M3 (Land to the south of Swinton Road, Masham)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.	According to the Environment Agency flood maps, at least half of the site is located within flood zones 2/3. We are aware of significant flooding events in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses including Swinney Beck & the River Ure. 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/ flood zones 2/3. As such, the Agency should be consulted regarding this site.

Conclusion

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

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

Settlement: Masham

Site: M4 (Land at Thorpe Road, Masham)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site located on the south side of Masham off Thorpe Road opposite I'Anson's mill. LCA41: River Ure Corridor
Landscape description	Area description: Masham is a historic market town situated on the west side of the Ure Valley on ground rising above the river corridor comprising a landscape of mixed arable and grass fields with predominantly hedgerow boundaries. Trees along the river corridor and field boundaries contribute to the setting of the town. Site Description: The site currently comprises an agricultural field and rough grass area to the north (adjacent residential development) with a track that is a PRoW crossing the site. The area extends into the neighbouring field to the east. The well used PRoW crosses the site and links to Ripon Rowel walk.
Existing urban edge	20th century semi detached housing with fragmented hedgerow boundary for the urban boundary to the north. To the west is an industrial site (mill)
Trees and hedges	Field boundary hedgerows with trees. TPO'd trees on the track.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open countryside TPO
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	Loss of field on approach to Masham. Field and associated trees and hedgerows soften appearance of the urban edge and I'Anson mill increasing sensitivity of the landscape to the loss of these features.
Visual Sensitivity	Views of Masham church would be affected. However, the mill is already a detractor and there may be an opportunity to improve appearance of urban edge providing built development of the site does not extend beyond the Mill and adequate green infrastructure is incorporated. Views from PRoW across the site would be affected.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of field and introduction of new built form.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	The site extends south and there is the potential for additional mitigation in the form of tree planting and green infrastruture to soften the urban edge. Existing views of the church spire should be retained on the approach to the town (on foot or in a vehicle) where appropriate.
Likely level of landscape effects	Medium scale assuming adequate mitigation integrated with the scheme and reduced area for development.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	M5, M6, M7 the cumulative impact of developing any of these sites alongside M4 would the large.

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 is likely to result in the loss of ancient woodland, aged or veteran trees and/or trees protected by a TPO.	Red

Summary conclusion	There is some capacity for the landscape to accept change with appropriate mitigation and layout concentrated on the northern half of the site.

Settlement: Masham

Site: M4 (Land at Thorpe Road, Masham)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Conservation and Design

Conservation and Design Site Assessment

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Masham Conservation Area, Church of St Mary, a grade II* listed building, and the Cross to the south of the church, which is a scheduled ancient monument.
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	None in the immediate vicinity.
Commentary on heritage assets.	The northern boundary of the site abuts the conservation area. Development of the south eastern part of the site would impact on the setting of St Mary's Church and the cross. Additionally, the conservation area appraisal notes that the hedge running southwards from the corner of the conservation area is an important hedgerow, and alongside this runs a strategic footpath from the conservation area. The footpath runs through the site M5, which if left as open land could cause the development of this land to have an adverse impact on the footpath. Development of the site will impact on the approach to the conservation area, consequently any development should be sensitively designed.
Topography and views	The land falls fairly gently towards the river, which is at its closest southwest of the site. Views are available from the site over the open fields, views to east are limited by I'ansons' buildings. Generally hedgerows and trees provide some screening of the southern part of the site from the road, although the smaller field south of Ibbetson Close is more open to view from Thorpe Road.
Landscape context	Although at the southern edge of the town, the site lies opposite I'Ansons, which is characterised by industrial type buildings, one of which is particularly tall and is a landmark on the approach to town. To the south and east are open fields. The southern part of the site is not contiguous with a field boundary. Hedgerows and trees are important to the character of the area because they screen views of the town from various approaches.
Grain of surrounding development	Grain is mixed: Immediately north of the site is Kings Head Farm and Gregory: south facing detached houses in large gardens. To the west of the northern area is Ibbetson Close: here modest semi-detached houses are in a cul-de-sac. Houses face the road behind small open gardens. There is little space between sides of buildings. Modest houses, and bungalows with accomodation in the roof to the west of Thorpe Road are set back from the road and are generously spaced. West of the main area of the site, the large buildings of I'Ansons are set behind a small open area and service courts.
Local building design	Kings Head Farm, although not early, reflects the vernacular having a simple form, dual pitched roof, low window to wall ratio,in stone with stone slated roof. Gregory: an interwar house (possible presbytery for catholic church) is in brick and has a hipped pantile roof. Ibbetson Close: features gabled reconstituted stone houses with reconstituted slate roofs; their basic form and massing reflects local distinctiveness, but not the architectural detail. Dwellings opposite the site on Thorpe Road are not locally distinctive. I'ansons has green coloured metal clad industrial buildings, some with profiled metal roofs, others in fibre cement.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The site marks the entrance to Masham, therefore any development would have to be sensitive to this and be of the highest quality. There are hedgerows to the field boundaries with hedgerow trees, and a number of trees just inside the site along the boundary with the main road. There is a footpath running through 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 but there are opportunities for mitigation and improvements.	Orange
Summary conclusion	Provided the pedestrian approach from the conservation area is through open space and area to its east left open, and density is low at the south and eastern parts of the site, and the development positively enhanced the approach to the settlement, the setting of the heritage assets could overall be conserved. There would be no detriment to local distinctiveness, provided density is low and buildings are not tall.

Settlement: Masham

Site: M4 (Land at Thorpe Road, Masham)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	North Pennnines SPA/SAC about 5 km to the W.
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	Marfield Fen approximately 1 km to the N.
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England require consultation on residential units of 100 or more.
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	River Ure (Masham to Mickley) approximately 1km SSE.
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerow (including mature trees), Arable Farmland.
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None.
Sward	The NW part of the site which was white (species-poor) semi-improved grassland [1992 P1HS} is now dominated by coarse unmanaged grassland. The rest of the site comprises arable fields (part of which was once a cricket pitch and tennis courts).
Trees and Hedges	Boundary and intermal hedgerows are mostly mature and dense, containing a number of significant mature trees. There is also a group of trees around the dilapidated farm buildings. The hedge along Thopre Road in the NW is very gappy.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	The northen part of the site includes trees TPO'd in 2012 for M3001. The larger site now extends southwards and includes additional field boundary trees which should also be considered for protection by TPO.
Water/Wetland	None
Slope and Aspect	Generally flat topography.
Buildings and Structures	Two buildings on site: dilapidated stone / corrugated sheet cow shed & dilapidated timber / corrugated sheet implement shed.
Natural Area	NCA 22: Pennine Dales Fringe.
Environmental Opportunity	SEO3: Enhancing provision of new off-road linear and circular routes suitable for horses, cyclists and walkers, and increasing promotion of existing and new routes to further promote outdoor recreation in the area. SEO4 Enhancing and connecting semi-natural habitats in river corridors to improve the wildlife movement corridors between lowland and upland.
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 41 River Ure Corridor (Charlcot to Aldburgh Hall) • “Encourage the repair and management of existing hedgerows and hedgerow trees prioritising the areas contributing to the setting of Masham”. • “Promote appropriate woodland planting along the river corridor and planting of hedgerow trees”
Connectivity/Corridors	The hedgerows with mature oaks form an important network in a medium-scale arable field system, which form important green links for wildlife (and for people along footpaths between Masham, the River Ure and the River Burn
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Existing trees and hedgerows on site should be retained and breaks in the hedgerows should be planted up and reinforced with tree-planting. New native hedges with trees should be planted along any open boundaries.These hedgerows should have arable field margins on the fieldwards side to compensate for loss of arable habitat for BAP species of birds. There may be the possibility to create a new treed avenue approach into Masham along the footpath or the eastern site boundary.
Protected Species	Nesting birds likely to use boundary hedgerows and trees; bats may utilise mature trees. Barn Owl has been recorded roosting in the barns.
BAP Priority Species	This site is likely to support BAP priority species of birds of arable farmland.
Invasive Species	Himalayan balsam occurs on a small patch of waste ground near the Thorpe Road entrance.
Notes	Part of M3001 now extends southwards.The site is in Entry Level Environmental Stewardship.

Conclusion

Will it deliver net gains to biodiversity and protect and enhance existing networks of priority habitats and species and provide for long term management of wildlife habitats? Will it offer opportunities to enhance Green Infrastructure?	
Rationale	Rating
Some potential adverse effects on designated sites (Local Site, SSSI, LNR, the wider ecological network and/or priority habitats and species but appropriate siting/scale or substantial mitigation should enable development.	Orange
Summary conclusion	The hedgerows with mature oaks form an important network in a medium-scale arable field system, which form important green links for wildlife (and for people) along footpaths between Masham, the Ure and the Burn.The main ecological constraint to development of the site is to ensure the retention of trees and hedgerows on site and their enhancement with significant new planting and enhancement of arable field margins aong the site boundaries. The southern site limit might therefore better utilise the field boundary. Habitat improvements e.g field hedges should be sought along the River Ure nearby to offset increased disturbance as a result of residential expansion.

Settlement: Masham

Site: M4 (Land at Thorpe Road, Masham)

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 aware of significant flooding events in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses including Swinney Beck & the River Ure. 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: Masham

Site: M5 (King's Head Farm, Masham)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Small site located on south site of Masham and includes Kings Head Farm. LCA41: River Ure Corridor.
Landscape description	Area description: Masham is a historic market town situated on the west side of the Ure Valley on ground rising above the river corridor comprising a landscape of mixed arable and grass fields with predominantly hedgerow boundaries. Trees along the river corridor and field boundaries contribute to the setting of the town. Site Description: Kings Head Farm house in the middle of the small grass field. Hedgerow field boundaries and narrow garden to the front(south) of the house. PRoW crosses the site.
Existing urban edge	Site contributes to rural setting of urban edge which comprises a mix of garden boundaries to the north and west.
Trees and hedges	Boundary trees and hedgerow to south and east.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Conservation Area.
Description of proposal for the site	Residnetial (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	Loss of this field would impact on the setting of the town and church and would affect the conservation area. Assume the loss of the farm house or at the very least a change to its traditional setting in a grass field.
Visual Sensitivity	Views from PRoW. Site is on rising ground although reasonably well screened by existing vegetation. Views of church spire may be affected.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of field and historic setting to farm house and its contribution to the Conservation Area.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	No opportunity to mitigate the loss of this field and historic farmhouse.
Likely level of landscape effects	Large scale impact due to change in character of the Conservation Area and the loss of a farmhouse with its setting grass field on the edge of town.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	M4, M6 and M7 significant adverse impacts if sites developed side by side.

Conclusion

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

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

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

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

Summary conclusion	High sensitivity due to location in the Conservation Area and the importance to the setting of the town. Landscape has no capacity to accept change resulting from the development of this site without significant adverse affects on character of the Conservation Area and the setting of the town.

Settlement: Masham

Site: M5 (King's Head Farm, Masham)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Conservation and Design

Conservation and Design Site Assessment

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Masham Conservation Area
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	None
Commentary on heritage assets.	The site is within the conservation area, this field contributes to the setting of the tight urban grain behind the buildings of the market place, particularly due to the footpath running to the south of the site.
Topography and views	The site falls gently towards the river.
Landscape context	The site is open, but much is garden to the farmhouse of Kings Head Farm and there are modest farm buildings in the northwest corner. To the east and south are fields. To the north and west is the edge of settlement.
Grain of surrounding development	Grain is mixed: Immediately southwest is Gregory, a south facing detached house in large garden. To the southwest of the site is Ibbetson Close, where there are modest semi-detached houses in a cul-de-sac. Houses face the road behind small open gardens. There is little space between sides of buildings. Park Drive to the west is a cul-de-sac, houses alongside Park Street have back gardens against this main approach to town. Most of the houses on the cul-de-sac are eaves on, those in the northern part are gable on to enjoy a southern aspect. Most properties are detached, but there are short rows here. To the north is the tighter grain of outbuildings lining courts accessed through passages between larger buildings fronting the market place.
Local building design	Gregory is an interwar house (possible presbytery for catholic church) in brick and has a hipped pantile roof. Ibbetson Close has gabled reconstituted stone houses with reconstituted slate roofs. Their basic form and massing reflects local distinctiveness, but not their architectural detail. Most houses on Park Drive, similar to Ibbetson, have materials and form that gemerally reflect the appearance of the vernacular, but not their architectural detail. In the town centre building heights vary, outbuildings are single and two storey, houses generally two storey, but many of the buildings of the market place are three storey. The palette of materials is very limited, buildings have stone walls and predominantly stone slate or welsh slate roofs; also they have a small window to wall ratio,
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	Kings Head Farm, although not early, reflects the vernacular having a simple form, dual pitched roof, is built in stone with stone slated roof, and has a low window to wall ratio. Because it is not pre1900 and not of exceptional architectural interest, it is not a non-designated heritage asset, but none the less should be retained unless it is in poor structural condition. The smaller buildings on site should be retained if they could be utilised as outbuildings.The footpath across the site should be retained.

Conclusion

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

Will it conserve those elements which contribute towards the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets?	
Rationale	Rating
Development is likely to result in harm to elements which contribute to the significance of a heritage asset and the harm is not capable of mitigation.	Red
Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?	
Rationale	Rating
The nature of the site means that built development will have a negative impact on local distinctiveness.	Red

Summary conclusion	Although not designated as important open space in the conservation area appraisal, development of the site would impact on the strategic footpath running through the site and the setting of the farmhouse and some of the buildings of the small stead, which contribute to the character and appearance of the area.

Settlement: Masham

Site: M5 (King's Head Farm, Masham)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	North Pennnines SPA/SAC about 6km to the W.
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	Marfield Fen approximatley 1 km to the N.
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England require consultation on residential units of 100 or more.
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	River Ure (Masham to Mickley) approximately 1.2 km SSE.
BAP Priority Habitats	Boundary hedgerows.
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None.
Sward	Species poor semi-improved grassland (P1HS 1992).
Trees and Hedges	Boundary hedges to N,S and E and surrounding Farm.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Not known.
Water/Wetland	None
Slope and Aspect	Kings Head Farm on slight hill.
Buildings and Structures	Kings Head Farm, new build to NW of site.
Natural Area	NCA 22: Pennine Dales Fringe.
Environmental Opportunity	SEO3: Enhancing provision of new off-road linear and circular routes suitable for horses, cyclists and walkers, and increasing promotion of existing and new routes to further promote outdoor recreation in the area. SEO4 Enhancing and connecting semi-natural habitats in river corridors to improve the wildlife. movement corridors between lowland and upland.
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 41 River Ure Corridor (Charlcot to Aldburgh Hall). • “Encourage the repair and management of existing hedgerows and hedgerow trees prioritising the areas contributing to the setting of Masham”. • “Promote appropriate woodland planting along the river corridor and planting of hedgerow trees”
Connectivity/Corridors	Part of fringe of small pasture fields linking to churchyard which separate Masham Town from extensive arable land to SE.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	potential to reinforce boundary hedgerows, may be potential to develop avenue of trees through site from Gregory Hill to rear entrance to Kings Head.
Protected Species	Likely nesting birds in hedgerows, potential for bats at Kings Head Farm.
BAP Priority Species	None known
Invasive Species	None known
Notes	

Conclusion

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

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

Summary conclusion	Development would entail loss of fringing pasture which separates Masham Town from extensive arable land to the SE. However there may be an opportunity to mitigate for this with new native tree and hedgerow planting.

Settlement: Masham

Site: M5 (King's Head Farm, Masham)

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

Conclusion

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

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

Settlement: Masham

Site: M6 (Land south-east of King's Head Farm, Masham)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site located south of Masham south of the chruch yard and Church Farm. LCA41: River Ure Corridor
Landscape description	Area description: Masham is a historic market town situated on the west side of the Ure Valley on ground rising above the river corridor comprising a landscape of mixed arable and grass fields with predominantly hedgerow boundaries. Trees along the river corridor and field boundaries contribute to the setting of the town. Site desciption: Arable field surrounded by hedgerows with mature trees along boundaries. Contributes to setting and views of the church.
Existing urban edge	Churchyard and M7 separates the site from the urban edge which is rural and well screened on this side of town
Trees and hedges	Hedges and trees on field boundary.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open countryside. Conservation Area on northern boundary.
Description of proposal for the site	Housing (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	Loss of agricultural field characteristic of the setting of the town and the landscape character area.
Visual Sensitivity	Views across the field from well used PRoW of the church spire. Built form of the settlement currently well screened by trees and hedgerows.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of field would affect local landscpe character. The scale of development would be large in the context of Masham.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	There is potential for additional mitigation to integrate development by allocating significant areas to green infrastructure. However the site is detached from the urban edge and M4 is more suited.
Likely level of landscape effects	Large scale adverse affect due to scale of development on the edge of Masham and the impact of the setting of the historic town and church.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	M4, M5 and M7 - cumulative impacts would be very large scale.

Conclusion

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

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

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

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

Summary conclusion	The landscape character and setting of the town has high sensitivity to the development of this site. There is no capacity to develop this site in isolation without detriment to landscape character.

Settlement: Masham

Site: M6 (Land south-east of King's Head Farm, Masham)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Conservation and Design

Conservation and Design Site Assessment

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Masham Conservation Area, Church of St Mary, a grade II* listed building and the cross to its south, which is a scheduled ancient monument.The Old Rectory and Buildings on the south of Market Place are listed grade II. The churchyard walls and pre-1948 gravestones and the outbuildings in the curtilage of the listed properties are protected as listed buildings.
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	None
Commentary on heritage assets.	The north of the site abuts the conservation area, and forms an important approach for pedestrians. The open site contributes particularly to the setting of the grade II* listed church and its churchyard, and the scheduled cross.
Topography and views	Generally land falls to the river, but the site appears to fall more from north to south. Views to and from the churchyard are important. Views to the south and east are attractive.
Landscape context	The site is an open field on the edge of the town, to its northeast is the churchyard and to the north is an open area of land within the conservation area that is bounded to its west by Kingshead farmhouse garden and open land. To the west of the site are fields and to the south is open countryside.
Grain of surrounding development	Grain is mixed: Kingshead Farmhouse and Gregory are south facing detached houses in large gardens. To the west of the site is Ibbetson Close where modest semi-detached houses are in a cul-de-sac. Houses face the road behind small open gardens. There is little space between sides of buildings. To the north is the tighter grain of outbuildings lining the courts, which are accessed through passages between the larger buildings fronting the wide market place.
Local building design	Kings Head Farm, although not early, reflects the vernacular having a simple form and is built in stone with stone slated roof, also it has a low window to wall ratio. Because it is not pre-1900 and not of exceptional architectural interest, it is not a non-designated heritage asset, but none the less contributes positively to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Gregory, an interwar house (possible presbytery for catholic church), is brick with a hipped pantile roof. Ibbetson Close has gabled reconstituted stone houses with reconstituted slate roofs. Their basic form and massing reflects local distinctiveness, but not their architectural detail. In the town centre building heights vary; outbuildings are single and two storey, houses generally two storey, but many of the buildings of the market place are three storey. The palette of materials is very limited, buildings have stone walls and predominantly stone slate or welsh slate roofs; also they have a small window ratio,
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	Hedgerows around the site and hedgerow trees.

Conclusion

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

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

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

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

Rationale	Rating
The nature of the site means that built development will have a negative impact on local distinctiveness.	Red
Summary conclusion	Development of this field will affect the setting of the conservation area and would be particularly detrimental to the setting of the listed church and the church yard. Development would detract from the character of the open field and farmstead that sits between the centre of town and the edge of the conservation area, and if developed in isolation of site M4 would be contrary to settlement pattern.

Settlement: Masham

Site: M6 (Land south-east of King's Head Farm, Masham)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	North Pennnines SPA/SAC about 6km to the W.
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	Marfield Fen approximately 1 km to the N.
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England require consultation on residential units of 100 or more
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	River Ure (Masham to Mickley) approximately 1km SSE.
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerow (Including mature trees), Arable Farmland.
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Arable
Trees and Hedges	Hedgerows to N and E boundaries.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Oaks along NE boundary likely to merit TPO.
Water/Wetland	None
Slope and Aspect	Generally flat.
Buildings and Structures	None
Natural Area	NCA 22: Pennine Dales Fringe.
Environmental Opportunity	SEO3: Enhancing provision of new off-road linear and circular routes suitable for horses, cyclists and walkers, and increasing promotion of existing and new routes to further promote outdoor recreation in the area. SEO4 Enhancing and connecting semi-natural habitats in river corridors to improve the wildlife movement corridors between lowland and upland.
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 41 River Ure Corridor (Charlcot to Aldburgh Hall) • “Encourage the repair and management of existing hedgerows and hedgerow trees prioritising the areas contributing to the setting of Masham”. • “Promote appropriate woodland planting along the river corridor and planting of hedgerow trees”
Connectivity/Corridors	The network of footpaths and hedgerows around SE Masham are important green links between the town, the churchyard and the two rivers, which should be improved and enhanced.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Existing trees and hedgerows on site should be retained and reinforced with tree-planting and any new boundaries should be planted up with native hedges with trees. These hedgerows should have arable field margins on the fieldwards side to compensate for loss of arable habitat for BAP species of birds.
Protected Species	Nesting birds likley to use boundary hedgerows; bats may utilise mature trees.
BAP Priority Species	This site is likely to support BAP priority species of birds of arable farmland. Barn owl seen foraging over this site,
Invasive Species	None known
Notes	

Conclusion

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

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

Summary conclusion	The network of footpaths and hedgerows around SE Masham are important green links between the town, the churchyard and the two rivers, which should be improved and enhanced. The main ecological constraint to development of the site is to ensure the retention of trees and hedgerows on site and their enhancement with significant new planting and enhancement of arable field margins aong the site boundaries and to secure habitat improvements e.g field hedges along the River Ure nearby to offset increased disturbance caused by reisdential expansion.

Settlement: Masham

Site: M6 (Land south-east of King's Head Farm, Masham)

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 aware of significant flooding events in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses including Swinney Beck & the River Ure. 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: Masham

Site: M7 (Land east of King's Head Farm, Masham)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site located on the south side of town west of the church yard. LCA41: River Ure Corridor
Landscape description	Area description: Masham is a historic market town situated on the west side of the Ure Valley on ground rising above the river corridor comprising a landscape of mixed arable and grass fields with predominantly hedgerow boundaries. Trees along the river corridor and field boundaries contribute to the setting of the town. Site Description: Small grass field adjacent to the church yard. Post and rail boundary with church yard. Ground is humocky and rises to the north west.
Existing urban edge	Boundaries of large gardens comprise mix of hedgerows, trees and walls. Built form softened by trees and shrubs. Rising landform contributes to the urban edge.
Trees and hedges	Trees on boundaries.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Conservation Area
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	Development of the site would require changes to landform and creation of new access.
Visual Sensitivity	Site important to views to and from the church. PRoW crossing the site is well used.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of field and change in character of the Conservation Area. Change in landform and boundaries.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	No potential for mitigation of landscape affects.
Likely level of landscape effects	Large scale harm to character of the conservation area, the setting of the church and views of Masham and the church from the south, in particular from PRoW.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	M4, M5 and M6 - very large scale affects if developed in conjuction with any of these sites.

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	High sensitivity due to Conservation Area designation and setting of church and town. The landscape has no capacity for development of this site without significant harm to landscape character.

Settlement: Masham

Site: M7 (Land east of King's Head Farm, Masham)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Conservation and Design

Conservation and Design Site Assessment

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Masham Conservation Area, Church of St Mary, a grade II* listed building and the cross to its south, which is a scheduled ancient monument. The Old Rectory and buildings south of the Market Place are grade II listed. The church walls, pre-1948 gravestones and outbuildings in the curtilage of the listed buildings are also protected as listed buildings.
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	It may be that an ancient manor house was sited in this area.
Commentary on heritage assets.	The site is within the conservation area, whilst not shown as an important open space in the conservation area appraisal, there is a well-used footpath from the churchyard running to the southwest across the site. The open site contributes particularly to the setting of the grade II* listed church and its churchyard, and the scheduled cross.
Topography and views	Generally land falls to the river, but on the site the land falls from north to south and there is an un-natural raised area over a buried chamber within the central area of the site. Views to and from the churchyard are important. Views to the south at low level are limited by the hedge and views to the west to Kingshead Farmhouse are restricted in part by hedge and trees.
Landscape context	Despite the buried chamber, the site appears as an open field on the edge of the town, to its east is the churchyard and to the west the open area of Kingsmead farmstead. To the south is open countryside.
Grain of surrounding development	Grain is mixed: West is Kingshead Farm and southwest is Gregory, which are both south facing detached houses in large gardens. To the southwest of the site is Ibbetson Close where modest semi-detached houses are in a cul-de-sac. Houses face the road behind small open gardens and there is little space between sides of buildings. Park Drive to the west is a cul-de-sac, houses alongside Park Street have back gardens against this main approach to town. Most of the houses on the cul-de-sac are eaves on, those in the northern part are gable on to the road and enjoy a southern aspect. Most properties are detached, but there are short rows here. To the north is the tighter grain of outbuildings lining the courts that are accessed through passages between buildings on market place.
Local building design	Kings Head Farm, although not early, reflects the vernacular having a simple form with dual pitched roof. It is built in stone with stone slated roof, and has a low window to wall ratio. Because it is not pre-1900 and not of exceptional architectural interest, it is not a non-designated heritage asset. Gregory, an interwar house (possible presbytery for catholic church) is brick with hipped pantile roof. Ibbetson Close has gabled reconstituted stone houses with reconstituted slate roofs. Their basic form and massing reflects local distinctiveness, but not their architectural detail. Most houses on Park Drive, similar to Ibbetson, have materials and form generally reflecting the appearance of the vernacular, but not their architectural detail. In the town centre building heights vary, outbuiildings are single and two storey, houses generally two storey, but many of the buildings of the market place are three storey. The palette of materials is very limited, buildings have stone walls and predominantly stone slate or welsh slate roofs; also have small window ratio,
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	There is e a buried WWII air raid shelter in the central area of the site; its access is still visible. To the churchyard is a post and rail fence, with gate providing access to the footpath running down to the southwest.The south boundary is a hedgerow, the other boundaries have hedges. There are two substantial trees on the west boundary. There should be investigation to ascertain if there was an ancient manor house on the site, and if any remains are likely to be in situ.

Conclusion

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

Will it conserve those elements which contribute towards the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets?	
Rationale	Rating
Development is likely to result in harm to elements which contribute to the significance of a heritage asset and the harm is not capable of mitigation.	Red
Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?	
Rationale	Rating
The nature of the site means that built development will have a negative impact on local distinctiveness.	Red
Summary conclusion	Development of this field in the conservation area will detract from the conservation area generally and substantially detract from the setting of the grade II* listed church and the churchyard. Development of this field to the south of open land would be harmful to the rural setting of the town and hence local distinctiveness.

Settlement: Masham

Site: M7 (Land east of King's Head Farm, Masham)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	North Pennnines SPA/SAC about 6km to theW.
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	Marfield Fen approximately1 km to the N.
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England require consultation on residential units of 100 or more.
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	River Ure (Masham to Mickley) approximately 1.2 km SSE.
BAP Priority Habitats	Boundary hedgerows.
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Species poor semi-improved grassland (P1HS 1992) Currently horse-grazed.
Trees and Hedges	Boundary hedgerows to NS and W - some are overgrown and contain small trees. Shrub developing in SE corner of site.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Not known.
Water/Wetland	None
Slope and Aspect	Slopes down towards Sand E.
Buildings and Structures	There is an underground structure beneath the hill which may be a disused air-raid shleter.
Natural Area	NCA 22: Pennine Dales Fringe.
Environmental Opportunity	SEO3: Enhancing provision of new off-road linear and circular routes suitable for horses, cyclists and walkers, and increasing promotion of existing and new routes to further promote outdoor recreation in the area. SEO4 Enhancing and connecting semi-natural habitats in river corridors to improve the wildlife movement corridors between lowland and upland.
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 41 River Ure Corridor (Charlcot to Aldburgh Hall) • “Encourage the repair and management of existing hedgerows and hedgerow trees prioritising the areas contributing to the setting of Masham”. • “Promote appropriate woodland planting along the river corridor and planting of hedgerow trees”
Connectivity/Corridors	Part of a fringe of small pasture fields linking to churchyard which separate Masham Town from extensive arable land to SE.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Potential to reinforce boundary hedgerows,
Protected Species	nesting birds and bats may utilise boundary trees & hedgerows. Bats may also use the underground structure.
BAP Priority Species	Barn owl recorded hunting over site (DMcA 16.10.2015)
Invasive Species	None known
Notes	

Conclusion

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

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

Summary conclusion	This site forms part of a fringe of small pasture fields with hedgerows, which separates Masham town from extensive arable land to the SE. Development of this site would entail the loss of a buffer to the wildlife-friendly churchyard and loss of part of a network of small fields around Masham. However, were the site to be developed, there may also be an opportunity to mitigate for these losses through substantial native tree and hedgerow planting

Settlement: Masham

Site: M7 (Land east of King's Head Farm, Masham)

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

Conclusion

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

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

Settlement: Masham

Site: M8 (Land north of Swinton Road, Masham)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site located on the west side of Masham north of Swinton Road. LCA41:River Ure Corridor
Landscape description	Area description: Masham is a historic market town situated on the west side of the Ure Valley on ground rising above the river corridor comprising a landscape of mixed arable and grass fields with predominantly hedgerow boundaries. Trees along the river corridor and field boundaries contribute to the setting of the town. Site Description: Grass fields with hedgerow boundaries. To the east is the boundary with a late 20th century housing estate and a small POS to the north east corner outside the site boundary.
Existing urban edge	Adjacent to the site is low density housing comprising bungalows and semi detached properties with a range of boundary treatments that can be seen on the approach to the town.The site supports many attractive landscape features which contribute to the rural setting and approach to the town.
Trees and hedges	TPO trees in hedgerow on south boundary of the site with Swinton Road make an important contribution to the approach.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open countryside TPO
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ per hectare.)
Physical Sensitivity	Landscape sensitive to loss of green field and hedgerows at the urban edge.
Visual Sensitivity	The site is reasonably well contained visually by the urban edge to the east and rising ground to the west.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of green field site on the edge of town and the extension of built form further into the countryside.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	There is potential to improve integration of the urban edge with open countryside if the site were to be developed with sufficient appropriate green infrastructure that includes space for large trees.The aim is to protect the character and approaches to Masham by avoiding inappropriate development.
Likely level of landscape effects	Medium to large scale adverse effects due to the size of the proposed site in relation to the town and potential harm to the character of the approach to town.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	M10 and M11 immediately to the north and M3 to the southeast. The development of any of these sites along side each other would increase the scale of potential adverse effects to large or very large.

Conclusion

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

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

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

Rationale	Rating
Development is likely to result in the loss of ancient woodland, aged or veteran trees and/or trees protected by a TPO.	Red

Summary conclusion	The landscape has high/medium sensitivity to loss of fields that contribute to the rual setting and character of the appraoch to town. There is some capacity for the landscape to accept development at this site assuming low density development and protection and enhancement of the tree lined approach to town.

Settlement: Masham

Site: M8 (Land north of Swinton Road, Masham)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Conservation and Design

Conservation and Design Site Assessment

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Masham Conservation Area
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Houses south of Swinton Road.
Commentary on heritage assets.	The protected trees and hedgerows contribute to the rural approach to the conservation area and lesson the visual impact of the atypical bungalows and brick housing opposite the site. Housing on the south side of Swinton Road are designated buildings of local interest and merit in the conservation area appraisal and are of sufficient interest to be non-designated heritage assets.
Topography and views	Views of the site from the road are limited by the protected trees. Views from the site to the west are more open.
Landscape context	The site is on the edge of the settlement.
Grain of surrounding development	Within the conservation area in the context of the site,two storey buildings are in terraces or arranged in rows closely related to the highway, most against the back of the footway. Later development at the edge of the conservation area is set back behind private gardens. To the west of this are semi-detached houses set behind modest front gardens. Dwellings on and at the corners of Swinburn Road are bungalows, many on that road are semi-detached, set behind modest front gardens.This area just east of the site is not locally distinctive.
Local building design	The bungalows are built of random stone and have concrete slate roofs, and the semi-detached houses to their east are of brick. Neither in terms of materials or style reflect local distinctiveness. The terraces to the southeast are Victorian, they are of stone and have stone slate roofs (some Welsh slate), they have vertical emphasis and many feature bay windows. Swinton Court is a late twentieth century development that the reflects Victorian style and built in stone with concrete slates to the roofs.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The site and area to the north, west and south are in agricultural use. The trees, protected by order, and hedgerow contribute to the approach to the settlement.

Conclusion

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

Will it conserve those elements which contribute towards the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets?	
Rationale	Rating
Development is likely to harm elements which contribute to the significance of a heritage asset but the harm is capable of mitigation.	Orange
Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?	
Rationale	Rating
The nature of the site means that built development will have a negative impact on local distinctiveness but there are opportunities for mitigation and improvements.	Orange
Summary conclusion	The existence of the protected trees and the hedgerow to the road would prevent a development of housing alongside the road that would reflect local distinctiveness. However, provided the access into the site is designed to minimise tree loss, any harm to the setting of the conservation area could be minimised.

Settlement: Masham

Site: M8 (Land north of Swinton Road, Masham)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	North Pennine Moors SPA/SAC about 5 km to the W.
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	Marfield Fen about 1 km to the NNE.
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England require consultation on residential units of 100 or more.
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None close by.
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows (with mature trees).
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Species-poor semi-improved grassland (1992 P1HS).
Trees and Hedges	Mature trees (ash. lime) in poor hedgerow along Swinton Rd. have TPO. E-W hedgerow gappy to W. Garden hedgerows bound Swinburn Rd.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature trees in other boundaries in E-W hedge crossing site may merit TPO.
Water/Wetland	None, but the eastern portion of the site falls within EA floodzone 2, due to flooding of the floodplain of Swinney Beck.
Slope and Aspect	Gently slopes down to SE from the west.
Buildings and Structures	None on site.
Natural Area	NCA 22: Pennine Dales Fringe.
Environmental Opportunity	SEO4 Enhancing and connecting semi-natural habitats in river corridors to improve the wildlife movement corridors between lowland and upland. SEO3: Enhancing provision of new off-road linear and circular routes suitable for horses, cyclists and walkers, and increasing promotion of existing and new routes to further promote outdoor recreation in the area.
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 41 River Ure Corridor (Charlcot to Aldburgh Hall) • “Encourage the repair and management of existing hedgerows and hedgerow trees prioritising the areas contributing to the setting of Masham”. • “Promote appropriate woodland planting along the river corridor and planting of hedgerow trees”
Connectivity/Corridors	The treed hedgerows form an important network in a small-scale pasture field system, which form important green links for wildlife (and for people) along footpaths between Masham, Swinney Beck and the River Burn. Swinton Road forms a significant tree-lined corridor which links directly with that of the River Burn.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	There may be the opportunity to create a small SUDS wetland on the area of flood zone 2 to the east of the site, to reinforce hedgerows and to create new footpaths/green links along the western countryside edge of Masham, linking proposed developments.
Protected Species	Nesting birds likley to use trees and hedgerows, bats may uttilise mature trees.
BAP Priority Species	None known.
Invasive Species	None known.
Notes	Fallen tree/large pile of logs near children's play area. This site was part of M3000 in 2010.

Conclusion

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

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

Summary conclusion	The well-treed hedgerows of this site form an important network in a small-scale pasture field system, which form important green links for wildlife (and for people) along footpaths between Masham, Swinney Beck and the River Burn. Swinton Road forms a significant tree-lined corridor which links directly with that of the River Burn. All mature trees require to be retained and protected. (This may exclude access from Swinton Road). Should development of this site be considered, there may be an opportunity for planting of native hedgerows and trees to buffer the flood zone and for creation of new green links around west of Masham,

Settlement: Masham

Site: M8 (Land north of Swinton Road, Masham)

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 aware of significant flooding events in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses including Swinney Beck & the River Ure. 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: Masham

Site: M11 (Land at Westholme Road, Masham)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site located on the west side of Masham off Westholme Road and at the back of housing on The Oaks. LCA41: River Ure Corridor
Landscape description	Area description: Masham is a historic market town situated on the west side of the Ure Valley on ground rising above the river corridor comprising a landscape of mixed arable and grass fields with predominantly hedgerow boundaries. Trees along the river corridor and field boundaries contribute to the setting of the town. Site Description:The site comprises a medium sized parcel of land consisting of an open field to the south and a further parcel of land to the north supporting a former pig farm that includes a collection of derelict buildings/barns with some hard standing and scattered vegetation/scrub occupying the areas between the buildings.
Existing urban edge	The site adjoins the urban edge and would be fairly well integrated because of surrounding topography and tree cover.
Trees and hedges	There are hedgrow trees worthy of protection.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open Countryside Northern part of the site allocated for housing in 2001 local plan within the development limit.
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The site comprises a small parcel of land with collection of derelict buildings/barns supporting a former pig farm. The remaining areas comprise hard standing with scattered vegetation/scrub occupying the areas between the buildings with some grassland cover around the boundaries. Swinney Beck defines the northeastern boundary of the site. The site contains a substantial oak tree.
Visual Sensitivity	Land gradually rises towards the western boundary. The site is visible from Foxholme Lane, Westholme Road and the Oaks. To the west there are agricultural fields and views towards the site are open from this direction. The site is fairly well contained by housing to the east and by landform and vegetation cover to the west.
Anticipated landscape effects	The derelict buildings detract from the character and appearance of the site. Large industrial buildings lie to the north/northwest, which are also a detractor at this rural edge of town.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Housing density to respect that of the neighbouring estate and layout to incorporate green infrastructure.
Likely level of landscape effects	Medium scale adverse effects providing that the dwelling densities remain low to allow for adequate landscape and structure planting within the development itself to mitigate the impacts of the rooflines.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	M8 and M10. The development of either of these sites alongside this site would considerably increase the affect on landscape character.

Conclusion

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

Rationale	Rating
Sensitivity Rating: Medium/low – key distinctive characteristics are resilient to change, typically a medium/low valued landscape where landscape condition may be fair with some existing reference to context to the type of development being proposed.	Light Green
Capacity Rating: High/medium – the area is able to accommodate the type and scale of development proposed with some minor detriment to landscape character and visual amenity that could be reduced with appropriate mitigation and enhancement.	Light Green

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

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

Summary conclusion	Medium/Low sensitivity to the loss of grass fields providing the setting to the urban edge in this location as there are fields of similar character adjacent. The landscape has the capacity to accept some change without detriment to character as there is an opportunity to improve the appearance of the urban edge.

Settlement: Masham

Site: M11 (Land at Westholme Road, Masham)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	North Pennnine Moors SAC/SPA about 5km to the W.
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	Marfield Fen approxmately 800m to the NE.
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural Englamd require consultation for residential development of 100 units or more.
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None close.
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows, veteran trees; Flowing water (Swinney Beck adjacent).
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None.
Sward	Species-poor semi improved pasture (1992 P1HS)
Trees and Hedges	Several mature boundary & field trees. Hedges along site boundaries except Foxholme Lane - mostly rather scrappy but better ones to the south-west and southern boundaries with many mature trees. There are two field trees.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Field oak near buildings has TPO, as do some of trees on eastern boundary with gardens; other mature trees in southern part of site may also benefit from protection.
Water/Wetland	Adjacent to Swinney Beck along Westholme Road.
Slope and Aspect	Land rises gently to the W.
Buildings and Structures	The northern part of the site is a former pig farm with a collection of derelict buildings/barns and hard standing with scattered vegetation/scrub occupying the areas between the buildings. Buidings include a concrete block and corrugated steel shed, and a wooden shed and a cobble and pan-tiled building in dilapidated condition. Yard close to the site entrance used for storage of materials.
Natural Area	NCA 22: Pennine Dales Fringe.
Environmental Opportunity	SEO4 Enhancing and connecting semi-natural habitats in river corridors to improve the wildlife movement corridors between lowland and upland. SEO3: Enhancing provision of new off-road linear and circular routes suitable for horses, cyclists and walkers, and increasing promotion of existing and new routes to further promote outdoor recreation in the area.
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 41 River Ure Corridor (Charlcot to Aldburgh Hall) • “Encourage the repair and management of existing hedgerows and hedgerow trees prioritising the areas contributing to the setting of Masham”. • “Promote appropriate woodland planting along the river corridor and planting of hedgerow trees”
Connectivity/Corridors	Swinney Beck and the hedgerows of the medium sized field boundaries form an important network which helps link the green infrastructure corridors of the rivers Burn and Ure to the west of Masham.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Opportunity to buffer Swinney Beck: There may be the opportunity to enhance the beck's floodplain with native woodland planting (e.g. alders) to enhance biodiversity and potentially help retain floodwaters upstream of Masham, as part of a SUDS scheme. The hedgerows should be reinforced and planted with new hedgerow trees. There may be the opportunity to create new footpaths/green links along the western countryside edge of Masham, linking proposed developments
Protected Species	Nesting birds likely to use buildings, hedges & trees; low bat roost potential of dilapidated pig sheds, may utilise mature trees on site, low possibility of water vole along Swinney Beck
BAP Priority Species	Potential for amphibians and reptiles among stored materials on site; kingfisher may use Swinney Beck
Invasive Species	None known. Himalayan balsam may occur along Swinney Beck.
Notes	was M30002.The site is in Entry Level Environmental Stewardship Sward should be surveyed in summer

Conclusion

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

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

Summary conclusion	The large oaks in and bounding the site should be retained and protected during the course of works. Boundary hedges should be retained and reinforced with hedgerow trees. The floodplain of Swinney Beck (FZ3) could be planted with water-tolerant native trees to enhance biodiversity and potentially help retain floodwaters upstream of Masham.

Settlement: Masham

Site: M11 (Land at Westholme Road, Masham)

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 partially within flood zones 2/3. We are aware of significant flooding events in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses including Swinney Beck & the River Ure. 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/ flood zones 2/3. As such, the Agency should be consulted regarding any proposals to develop this site.

Conclusion

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

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

Settlement: Masham

Site: M12 (Land at Fearby Road, Masham)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site located on the north side of Masham between Leyburn Road and Fearby Road north of Bellfield LCA41: River Ure Corridor
Landscape description	Area description: Masham is a historic market town situated on the west side of the Ure Valley on ground rising above the river corridor comprising a landscape of mixed arable and grass fields with predominantly hedgerow boundaries. Trees along the river corridor and field boundaries contribute to the setting of the town. Site Description: Arable fields with hedgerow boundaries. Stone wall to boundary with Leyburn Road.
Existing urban edge	Rural setting with parkland at Bellfield view and the allotments contributing to the urban edge.
Trees and hedges	Hedgerow boundaries with occasional trees. Possibility trees should be TPO'd
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open Countryside.
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume density 30+ per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	Loss of trees and hedgerows will change immediate setting and extend built form.
Visual Sensitivity	Views of the site on approaches from Fearby Road and Leyburn Road susceptible to introduction of new built form.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of agricultural field that contributes to the rural setting of the town and Bellfield
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Limited as development would extend into open countryside and extend the urban edge in this area considerably.
Likely level of landscape effects	Large scale adverse largely due to the extension of urban edge.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	M1 and M2 are located on the opposite side of Fearby Road and the cumulative effects on the approach to the town would be large scale if sites developed alongside each other.

Conclusion

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

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

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

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

Summary conclusion	Site is important to the character of the approach and the setting of Bellfield villa and the town. There is no capacity to extend development into open countryside in the location without causing significant harm to landscape character, setting and approaches to the town.

Settlement: Masham

Site: M12 (Land at Fearby Road, Masham)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Conservation and Design

Conservation and Design Site Assessment

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	None in immediate vicinity
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Bellfield House
Commentary on heritage assets.	The grand Victorian villa of Bellfield is a historic and architectural interest set in generous grounds, and it sits visually outside the edge of settlement. Historically it was well outside Masham town; development north of the villa would impact on its significance.
Topography and views	Land rises to the northeast. Views to south and southeast are limited by existing buildings.
Landscape context	Although opposite the twentieth century buildings belonging to the brewery to the south, these are low buildings.The site is seperated from other buildings by the generous grounds and trees within of Bellfield. The site is not therefore perceived as the edge of settlement, but outside the settlement.
Grain of surrounding development	There is no surrounding development. Nearby the site grain is mixed; houses southwest of the site on Fearby Road are detached, many are bungalows, and set in good sized gardens. Bellfield is set in generous grounds, part of which has been developed with a bunglaow close to Fearby Road, which detracts from views of the Victorian villa from its southeast.
Local building design	Building design in the context of the site is varied. Two storey housing on on Leyburn Road is mainly rendered with slate roofs, and housing on the road to Fearby is of a varied pallette and of diminutive scale . Bellfield, the victorian villa is of stone with welsh slate roofs. It is very generously proportioned and features bay windows and greater complexity of form than other housing.The brewery buildings are low in height and clad in profiled sheeting above artificial stone plinths.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The hedges around the site are low and well-trimmed. There are three large hedgerow trees to the roadside. The site is of two fields with a hedgerow between with hedgerow tree and in its vicinity is a small stone agricultural building, which was built around the turn of the twentieth century. Whilst of some historic interest, it is not of sufficient significance to be a non-designated heritage asset. The buildings of Bellfield are very close to the southern boundary of the site.

Conclusion

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

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

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

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

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

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

Summary conclusion	Development northwest of the historic country residence, Bellfield, will impact on its historic significance. The site is too isolated from existing housing areas for development to reflect local distinctiveness.

Settlement: Masham

Site: M12 (Land at Fearby Road, Masham)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	North Pennines SPA/SAC approximately 500m to the W.
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	Marfield Fen about 500m to the NE
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England require consultation on residential development of 100 units or more
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	Marfield Gravel Pit about 700m to the N.
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows, Arable Farmland.
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Arable farmland.
Trees and Hedges	Hedges along field boundaries with some mature trees (including central field boundary)
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature trees along field boundaries likely to merit TPOs
Water/Wetland	None on site.
Slope and Aspect	Generally flat.
Buildings and Structures	Stone & slate roofed farm building to south centre of site. Stone wall along Leyburn Rd and lane to western boundary.
Natural Area	NCA 22: Pennine Dales Fringe.
Environmental Opportunity	SEO4 Enhancing and connecting semi-natural habitats in river corridors to improve the wildlife movement corridors between lowland and upland. SEO3: Enhancing provision of new off-road linear and circular routes suitable for horses, cyclists and walkers, and increasing promotion of existing and new routes to further promote outdoor recreation in the area.
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 41 River Ure Corridor (Charlcot to Aldburgh Hall) • “Encourage the repair and management of existing hedgerows and hedgerow trees prioritising the areas contributing to the setting of Masham”. • “Promote appropriate woodland planting along the river corridor and planting of hedgerow trees”
Connectivity/Corridors	The hedgerows of the surrounding medium sized fields form an important network which helps link the Green Infrastructure corridors of the rivers Burn and Ure to the west of Masham. The boundary trees contribute to the significant linear corridors of hedgerows and trees along Fearby and Leyburn Roads.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	There may be the opportunity to create a small SUDS wetland within the flood zone in the eastern corner of the site, to reinforce hedgerows and to create new footpaths/green links along the north western countryside edge of Masham
Protected Species	Nesting birds likley to use trees and hedgerows, bats may utilise mature trees.
BAP Priority Species	Priority birds of arable farmland may occur on site.
Invasive Species	None known.
Notes	

Conclusion

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

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

Summary conclusion	Boundary trees should be retained and protected. Planting of native hedgerows behind the boundary walls would enhance biodiversity. Cumulative impact on designated sites to north may need to be taken into consideration with other potential development sites but there may be some potential to create a Green Infrastructure corridor between the Ure and Swinney Beck to the north of Masham.

Settlement: Masham

Site: M12 (Land at Fearby Road, Masham)

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 mostly within flood zones 2/3. We are aware of significant flooding events in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses including Swinney Beck & the River Ure. 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. 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/ flood zones 2/3. As such, the Agency should be consulted regarding this site.

Conclusion

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

Rationale	Rating
Very adverse effects of additional surface water discharge on nearby watercourse where mitigation would be unlikely.	Red

Settlement: Masham

Site: M13 (Land at Thorpe Road (smaller site), Masham)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site located on the south side of Masham off Thorpe Road opposite I'Anson's mill. LCA41: River Ure Corridor
Landscape description	Area description: Masham is a historic market town situated on the west side of the Ure Valley on ground rising above the river corridor comprising a landscape of mixed arable and grass fields with predominantly hedgerow boundaries. Trees along the river corridor and field boundaries contribute to the setting of the town. Site Description: The site currently comprises an agricultural field and rough grass area to the north (adjacent residential development) with a track that is a PRoW crossing the site and links to Ripon Rowel walk.
Existing urban edge	20th century semi detached housing with fragmented hedgerow boundary for the urban boundary to the north. To the west is an industrial site (mill)
Trees and hedges	Field boundary hedgerows with trees. TPO'd trees on the track.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open countryside TPO
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	Loss of the majority of a field on approach to Masham. Field and associated trees and hedgerows soften appearance of the urban edge and I'Anson mill increasing sensitivity of the landscape to the loss of these features.
Visual Sensitivity	Views of Masham church would be affected. However, the mill is already a detractor and there may be an opportunity to improve appearance of urban edge providing built development of the site does not extend beyond the Mill and adequate green infrastructure is incorporated. Views from PRoW across the site would be affected.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of field and introduction of new built form. Assume existing boundary vegetation would be retained.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	There is the potential for additional mitigation in the form of tree planting and green infrastruture to soften the urban edge on the southern boundary. TPO trees to be retained and protected. Existing views of the church spire should be retained on the approach to the town (on foot or in a vehicle).
Likely level of landscape effects	Medium scale assuming adequate mitigation integrated with the scheme and reduced area for development.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	M5, M6, M7 the cumulative impact of developing any of these sites alongside M4 would the large.

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 is likely to result in the loss of ancient woodland, aged or veteran trees and/or trees protected by a TPO.	Red

Summary conclusion	There is medium capacity for the landscape to accept change with appropriate mitigation and with built form concentrated on the northern half of the site. Southern boundary should incorporate a substantial landscape buffer.

Settlement: Masham

Site: M13 (Land at Thorpe Road (smaller site), Masham)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Conservation and Design

Conservation and Design Site Assessment

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Masham Conservation Area, Church of St Mary, a grade II* listed building, and the Cross to the south of the church, which is a scheduled ancient monument.
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	None in the immediate vicinity.
Commentary on heritage assets.	The northern boundary of the site abuts the conservation area. Development of the south eastern part of the site would impact on the setting of St Mary's Church and the cross. Additionally, the conservation area appraisal notes that the hedge running southwards from the corner of the conservation area is an important hedgerow, and alongside this runs a strategic footpath from the conservation area. The footpath runs through the site M5, which if left as open land could cause the development of this land to have an adverse impact on the footpath. Development of the site will impact on the approach to the conservation area, consequently any development should be sensitively designed.
Topography and views	The land falls fairly gently towards the river, which is at its closest southwest of the site. Views are available from the site over the open fields, views to east are limited by I'ansons' buildings. Generally hedgerows and trees provide some screening of the southern part of the site from the road, although the smaller field south of Ibbetson Close is more open to view from Thorpe Road.
Landscape context	Although at the southern edge of the town, the site lies opposite I'Ansons, which is characterised by industrial type buildings, one of which is particularly tall and is a landmark on the approach to town. To the south and east are open fields. Hedgerows and trees are important to the character of the area because they screen views of the town from various approaches.
Grain of surrounding development	Grain is mixed: Immediately north of the site is Kings Head Farm and Gregory: south facing detached houses in large gardens. To the west of the northern area is Ibbetson Close: here modest semi-detached houses are in a cul-de-sac. Houses face the road behind small open gardens. There is little space between sides of buildings. Modest houses, and bungalows with accomodation in the roof to the west of Thorpe Road are set back from the road and are generously spaced. West of the main area of the site, the large buildings of I'Ansons are set behind a small open area and service courts.
Local building design	Kings Head Farm, although not early, reflects the vernacular having a simple form, dual pitched roof, low window to wall ratio,in stone with stone slated roof. Gregory: an interwar house (possible presbytery for catholic church) is in brick and has a hipped pantile roof. Ibbetson Close: features gabled reconstituted stone houses with reconstituted slate roofs; their basic form and massing reflects local distinctiveness, but not the architectural detail. Dwellings opposite the site on Thorpe Road are not locally distinctive. I'ansons has green coloured metal clad industrial buildings, some with profiled metal roofs, others in fibre cement.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The site marks the entrance to Masham, therefore any development would have to be sensitive to this and be of the highest quality. There are hedgerows to the field boundaries with hedgerow trees, and a number of trees just inside the site along the boundary with the main road. There is a footpath running through 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 but there are opportunities for mitigation and improvements.	Orange
Summary conclusion	Provided the pedestrian approach from the conservation area is through open space and area to its east left open, and density is low at the south and eastern parts of the site, and the development positively enhanced the approach to the settlement, the setting of the heritage assets could overall be conserved. There would be no detriment to local distinctiveness, provided density is low and buildings are not tall.

Settlement: Masham

Site: M13 (Land at Thorpe Road (smaller site), Masham)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	North Pennnines SPA/SAC about 5 km to the W.
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	Marfield Fen approximately 1 km to the N.
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England require consultation on residential units of 100 or more.
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	River Ure (Masham to Mickley) about 1km SSE.
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerow (including mature trees), Arable Farmland.
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None.
Sward	The NW part of the site which was white (species-poor) semi-improved grassland [1992 P1HS} is now dominated by coarse unmanaged grassland. The rest of the site comprises arable fields (part was once a cricket pitch and tennis courts).
Trees and Hedges	Boundary and intermal hedgerows are mostly mature and dense, containing a number of significant mature trees including oaks. There is also a group of trees around the dilapidated farm buildings. The hedge along Thorpe Road in the NW is very gappy.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Trees along the south eastern boundary of the site are likely to merit TPO protection.
Water/Wetland	None.
Slope and Aspect	Generally flat topography.
Buildings and Structures	Two buildings on site: dilapidated stone / corrugated sheet cow shed & dilapidated timber / corrugated sheet implement shed.
Natural Area	NCA 22: Pennine Dales Fringe
Environmental Opportunity	SEO3: Enhancing provision of new off-road linear and circular routes suitable for horses, cyclists and walkers, and increasing promotion of existing and new routes to further promote outdoor recreation in the area. SEO4 Enhancing and connecting semi-natural habitats in river corridors to improve the wildlife movement corridors between lowland and upland.
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 41 River Ure Corridor (Charlcot to Aldburgh Hall) • “Encourage the repair and management of existing hedgerows and hedgerow trees prioritising the areas contributing to the setting of Masham”. • “Promote appropriate woodland planting along the river corridor and planting of hedgerow trees”
Connectivity/Corridors	The hedgerows with mature oaks form an important network in a medium-scale arable field system, which form important green links for wildlife (and for people along footpaths between Masham, the Ure and the Burn
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Existing trees and hedgerows on site should be retained and breaks in the hedgerows should be planted up and reinforced with tree-planting. New native hedges with trees should be planted along any open boundaries.These hedgerows should have arable field margins on the fieldwards side to compensate for loss of arable habitat for BAP species of birds. There may be the possibility to create a new treed avenue approach into Masham along the footpath or the eastern site boundary.
Protected Species	Nesting birds likley to use boundary hedgerows and trees; bats may utilise mature trees.Barn Owl has been recorded roosting in the barns.
BAP Priority Species	This site is likely to support BAP priority species of birds of arable farmland.
Invasive Species	Himalayan balsam occurs on a small patch of waste ground near the Thorpe Road entrance.
Notes	

Conclusion

Will it deliver net gains to biodiversity and protect and enhance existing networks of priority habitats and species and provide for long term management of wildlife habitats? Will it offer opportunities to enhance Green Infrastructure?	
Rationale	Rating
Some potential adverse effects on designated sites (Local Site, SSSI, LNR, the wider ecological network and/or priority habitats and species but appropriate siting/scale or substantial mitigation should enable development.	Orange
Summary conclusion	The hedgerows with mature oaks form an important network in a medium-scale arable field system, which form important green links for wildlife (and for people) along footpaths between Masham, the Ure and the Burn.The main ecological constraint to development of the site is to ensure the retention of trees and hedgerows on site and their enhancement with significant new planting and enhancement of arable field margins aong the site boundaries. Habitat improvements e.g field hedges could be created alongside footpaths by the Ure nearby to off-set increased disturbance as a result of residential expansion.

Settlement: Masham

Site: M13 (Land at Thorpe Road (smaller site), Masham)

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 aware of significant flooding events in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses including Swinney Beck & the River Ure. 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 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: Pateley Bridge

Site: P1 (Land south of Ashfield Court (smaller site), Pateley Bridge)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	West of settement to rear of Ashfield Court Road. West of River Nidd at Pateley Bridge. LCA11: Nidderdale Valley (Pateley Bridge to Summerbridge)
Landscape description	Area description: Broad well wooded valley of the River Nidd. Built form generally in valley bottom and on lower slopes. View filtered by woodland and trees in valley bottom.
Existing urban edge	Post war housing with fenced boundaries to countryside adjacent to the site. School on village edge to the north. Urban edge not prominent due to landform.
Trees and hedges	Young woodland to the north end of the site adjacent to potential access. TPO'd woodland and trees to the boundaries.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Nidderdale AONB
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The field and associated trees and walls are part of the setting of Pateley on the west side of the river valley. Landscape highly susceptible to change as a result of loss of key characterisitics and addition of uncharacterisitc development in the highly valued AONB.
Visual Sensitivity	Views from the south limited by landform and woodland. Views from the across the valley to the north west are extensive and currently development not particualrly prominent on the valley side.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of field and potential impact on woodland and increase in uncharacteristic built form.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Sloping ground may limit the potential for mitigation on site. Existing woodland planting adjacent to the site does provide some screening and would be a backdrop to development.
Likely level of landscape effects	Loss of field and associated characterisistics in this visible location results in potentially large scale effect on landscape.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	P2 and P5 and P6 The development of any of these sites in conjuction with one another would significantly change the landscape further.

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 is likely to result in the loss of ancient woodland, aged or veteran trees and/or trees protected by a TPO.	Red

Summary conclusion	The landscape may be able to accommodated small scale development that avoids impacting on trees and woodland and concentrates new built form to the east boundary. On site mitigation would be needed in addition to the retention of neighbouring woodland.

Settlement: Pateley Bridge

Site: P1 (Land south of Ashfield Court (smaller site), Pateley Bridge)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Conservation and Design

Conservation and Design Site Assessment

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Grassfield Country House Hotel, a grade II listed building. Pateley Bridge Conservation Area
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Grassfield Court and Ashfield Villa.
Commentary on heritage assets.	Grassfield Court is quite concealed by trees and hedges, but appears to be a converted building formerly associated with the listed building, Until recently Grassfield Country House Hotel, was screened from the east by trees, which have been cut down. Formerly a country house, its setting contributes to its significance. The areas to its south and east are of particular value to its setting. The property to its southwest, Grassfield House, reduces the value of the hillside to its setting. Ashfield villa, south east of the site, is a generous victorian house of historic and architectural significance, but would be little impacted by development of this site. Pateley Bridge Conservation Area on the opposite side of the Nidd benefits from views across the valley, development further up from the valley floor will impact on the setting of the conservation area.
Topography and views	The Nidd valley sides are steep, thus there are spectacular views across to the town on the other side of the Nidd valley, although the housing on Ashfield Court Road and the trees behind Grassfield Hotel reduce the views from the site. There is however more intervisibility between the site and Grassfield House. There are views across the river from the front (eastern) area of the site near Low Wath Road, and views back to the hillside above. The site is clearly seen across the valley from parts of the town and beyond.
Landscape context	This site is in Bewerley Parish in the AONB. It is adjacent to a small housing estate built between the historic country houses of Grassfields Country House Hotel and Ashfield Villa. The area is outside the settlement of Bridge House Gate.
Grain of surrounding development	The grain of surrounding development does not reflect the character of either Pateley Bridge, nor the closer Bridgehouse Gate, which have areas of very tight grain and hence streets and spaces with a very enclosed character. Ashfield Court Road estate is typical of late twentieth century development having detached houses set very close together and set back from the road behind modest front gardens.
Local building design	The houses on Ashfield Court Road do not reflect the vernacular, and many are gable onto the road. They have concrete tiled roofs and quite wide windows and hence do not reflect the character of Nidderdale traditional buildings. The vernacular in the dale is robust and is characterised by two storey houses with stone walls having a low window ratio, and stone slate roofs. Pateley Bridge and Bridgehouse Gate have a number of three storey buildings. Windows are in the main of vertical proportions and most roofs are of Welsh slate.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	Access is from Low Wath Road through a small part of the site between the school and Grassfield Court. There is a small pond behind Grassfield Hotel, surrounded with trees. There is a woodland belt on the southwest boundary, hedges to the southeast and northwest boundary with hedgerow trees. The school is screened from the site by trees and hedge and there is similar vegetation at the front of the site. The site is above the valley floor and falls northeast towards the Nidd. Amenity of housing next to the site should be protected.

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	Design of the building at the site entrance should be carefully considered and trees should be retained so as not to present a very urban influence here. Trees around the site should be protected and the boundary with Ashfield Court Close reinforced. Protect amenity of existing houses. Buildings should not be tall and gardens close to the trees should be generous to ensure good amenity. Space should be provided to allow some trees within the development to prevent an unbroken sea of roofs. These constraints will reduce the density of dwellings on this site.

Settlement: Pateley Bridge

Site: P1 (Land south of Ashfield Court (smaller site), Pateley Bridge)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	North Pennines SPA & SAC witihin 1.2km to NE
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	East Nidderdale Moors within 1.2km to NE
SSSI Risk Zone	NE require consultation on "any residential developments with a total net gain in residential units"
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likely to be impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	Pond, Hedgerows (Woodland bounding site)
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Both fields species-poor semi-improved grassland [P1HS 1992, Brooks 2014].
Trees and Hedges	The large field to the SE is bound by a strip of woodland to the SW and hedges with trees to the SE and NW. The NE boundary with housing at Ashfield is mostly fenced. There is a small small pond behind Grassfield Hotel, set in a recently planted copse. OS Epoch 1 shows a number of field trees in this field in the 1890s. The small field to the NW is bounded on 3 sides by screen planting with tall and underplanted mixed deciduous and coniferous trees and shrubs in various proportions. There is a tall leylandii hedge along the track that forms the south boundary.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Boundary trees and woodland may benefit from the protection of a TPO
Water/Wetland	There is a small apparently newly created duck pond behind Grassfield Hotel, surrounded with trees. Other small garden ponds adjacent.There is a well shown on maps towards the north of the larger field.
Slope and Aspect	The site is just above the valley floor of the Nidd and falls northeast towards the Nidd.
Buildings and Structures	None
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 11 Nidderdale Valley “maintain individual tree cover for the longterm…”
Connectivity/Corridors	The site falls within the River Nidd regionally important strategic green infrastructure corridor which is relatively well-wooded compared to the valleys of the other major dales. The hedgerows of the field system of the NW side of the town connect into the network suburban of gardens and amenity planting with the parkland and woodland associated with Grassfield and Eagle Hall. This tree cover is valuable for wildlife and should be retained and reinforced.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Retain and reinforce the hedgerows (but replace the leylandii in the NW field with a hedge of native species). Increase the number of native trees along boundaries and within site.There may be the opportunity to enhance the duck pond with a small SUDS wetland.
Protected Species	Nesting birds are likely to use the boundary hedges and trees. Medium level bat foraging noted around site boundarie and may utilise some of the more mature boundary treess.Great Crested Newts not considered likely to occur 3 ponds in vicinity all have low HSI (Brooks June 2015)
BAP Priority Species	None known. The duck pond may support common toads
Invasive Species	Leylandii is invasive of light.
Notes	P3a 2010 (amber); Surveyed by Brooks for 14/05141/OUTMAJ (refused) Ecology consultation response 03.06.2015.

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 has been surveyed in assoiation with an earlier planning application. These ecological surveys have established that mitigation for protected species should be readily achievable. Mitigation should include retention of boundary hedges (except where non-native shrub species could be replaced by native species) and the retention of a pond on site, possibly in association with Suds, Intergrated bat and swift bricks should be included within the detailed proposals.

Settlement: Pateley Bridge

Site: P1 (Land south of Ashfield Court (smaller site), Pateley Bridge)

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

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: Pateley Bridge

Site: P2 (Land south of Ashfield Court, Pateley Bridge)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Conservation and Design

Conservation and Design Site Assessment

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Grassfield Country House Hotel, a grade II listed building. Pateley Bridge Conservation Area
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Eagle Hall, Shoulder of Mutton Farm and Ashfield Villa. The settlement of Bridgehouse Gate.
Commentary on heritage assets.	Until recently Grassfield Country House Hotel was screened from the east by trees, which have been cut down. Formerly a country house, its setting contributes to its significance. The areas to its south and east are of particular value to its setting. The property to its southwest, Grassfield House, reduces the value of the hillside to its setting. Ashfield villa, east of the site, is a generous victorian house is of historic and architectural significance, the setting of which would be impacted upon by development of this site. The site's southern boundary is immediately adjacent to Shoulder of Mutton Farm, a historic building, development here will impact on its rural setting. Eagle Hall, a historic country house, enjoys views across to the southeast, development of the southern area of the site would impact on its setting. Bridgehouse Gate is a compact settlement just above the valley floor, and which is visually seperated from Ashfield Court by mature trees. Development of this site would create a large uncharacteristic extension of this small settlement Pateley Bridge Conservation Area on the opposite side of the Nidd benefits from views across the valley, and development further up from the valley floor will impact on the setting of the conservation area.
Topography and views	The Nidd valley sides are steep, thus there are spectacular views across to the town on the other side of the Nidd valley. The site is clearly seen across the valley from parts of the town and beyond.
Landscape context	This site is in Bewerley Parish in the AONB. It is seperated from the small housing estate built between the historic country houses of Grassfields Country House Hotel and Ashfield Villa by a field (Site P1). The area is just outside the settlement of Bridge House Gate and is on rising land.
Grain of surrounding development	There is mixed grain around the site: Bridgehouse Gate has areas of very tight grain and hence streets and spaces with a very enclosed character. Ashfield Court Road estate is typical of late twentieth century development having detached houses set very close together and set back from the road behind modest front gardens. Other properties in the immediate area are detached and set in generous grounds.
Local building design	The houses on Ashfield Court Road do not reflect the vernacular, many are gable onto the road. They have concrete tiled roofs and quite wide windows and hence do not reflect the character of Nidderdale traditional buildings. The vernacular in the dale is robust and is characterised by two storey houses with stone walls having a low window ratio, and stone slate roofs. Pateley Bridge and Bridgehouse Gate have a number of three storey buildings. Windows are in the main of vertical proportions and most roofs are of Welsh slate.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	Access would be via Site P1 taken from Low Wath Road by a small site between the school and Grassfield Court. There is a woodland belt between the site and P1, which returns to the southwest and seperates this site (P2) into two distinct parts. The site is above the valley floor of the Nidd and falls northeast towards the Nidd. Amenity of housing next to the site should be protected.

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 of the southern part of the site would be detrimental to the setting of the farm, Eagle Hall, Ashfield Villa and Bridgehouse Gate, and additionally development rising up the hill would impact on views from and hence the setting of Pateley Bridge Conservation Area.

Settlement: Pateley Bridge

Site: P2 (Land south of Ashfield Court, Pateley Bridge)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	North Pennines SPA & SAC witihin 1.5 km to NE
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	East Nidderdale Moors within 1.5 km to NE
SSSI Risk Zone	NE require consultation on"any residential developments with a total net gain in residential units"
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likely to be impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerow, Woodland (plantation)
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	SI grassland 1992 P1HS, although fields to south and east appear less improved
Trees and Hedges	Plantation woodland along northern borders. Hedgerows contain many mature trees, espeecially towards the south-east boundary
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Many trees benefit from TPO protection but any mature trees not already covered would be likely to merit such protection
Water/Wetland	There is a spring mapped in the SE corner, ponds within around 100m to north and south of site.
Slope and Aspect	The site lies above the valley floor of the Nidd and falls northeastwards towards the Nidd.
Buildings and Structures	None on site
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 11 Nidderdale Valley • “Encourage diversification of management of improved grasslands to improve habitat diversity…” • “Maintain individual tree cover for the long term by promoting the planting of native field boundary trees…”
Connectivity/Corridors	The hedgerows of the field system to the NW side of the town connect the network of suburban gardens and amenity planting into parkland and woodland associated with Grassfield and Eagle Hall.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Existing trees and hedgerows should be retained and protected with additional planting of native trees along field boundaries and wildflower meadows.
Protected Species	Nesting birds are likely to use the hedges and trees and bats may utilise some of the more mature trees.
BAP Priority Species	Not known
Invasive Species	Not known
Notes	Most of this land was previously P3a(1) 2010 (amber) although the land now extends to the south & east.

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	Existing trees should be retained and protected, especially mature deciduous trees scatted through the site, especaily towards the southern boundaries. Hedgerows should be retained and reinforced with native planting of shrubs and wildflowers

Settlement: Pateley Bridge

Site: P2 (Land south of Ashfield Court, Pateley Bridge)

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

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: Pateley Bridge

Site: P4 (Land off Church Lane, Pateley Bridge)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site located on north east boundary of Pateley Bridge outside the development limit off Old Church Lane LCA11: Nidderdale Valley (Pateley Bridge to Summerbridge)
Landscape description	Area description: Broad well wooded valley of the River Nidd. Built form generally in valley bottom and on lower slopes. Views filtered by woodland and trees in valley bottom. Site description: grazed fields on sloping ground above Pateley. Drystone wall boundaries.
Existing urban edge	Modern housing development with harsh domestic curtilage edge comprisinng various boundary treatments. Although not particularly well integrated urban edge is not prominent either.
Trees and hedges	Mature trees to boundaries. TPO'd trees on site.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Nidderdale AONB Pateley Bridge Conservation area (small part at south end of site)
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The site comprises an irregular shaped grassland field with undulating landform. There are dry stone wall boundaries and the area provides the immediate setting of the town and conservation area.
Visual Sensitivity	The site occupies a complexly undulating track of land in an elevated position above Old Church Lane. High visual sensitivity.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of field and potential loss of mature trees and changes to landform on the valley side.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Limited due to landform. The existing property towards the southwest corner of the site contributes to the historic character of the area. Site development would extend urban edge into countryside.
Likely level of landscape effects	Change in character of sloping field on village edge would add to the detrimental effects of existing modern housing. Large scale effect in sensitive landscape.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	None

Conclusion

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

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

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

Rationale	Rating
Development is likely to result in the loss of ancient woodland, aged or veteran trees and/or trees protected by a TPO.	Red

Summary conclusion	Highly valued landscape of the AONB is sensitive to development that would affect the setting and character of the town and its conservaiton area. The area has no landscape capacity to accept change that would result from the development of this field without significant harm to landscape character.

Settlement: Pateley Bridge

Site: P4 (Land off Church Lane, Pateley Bridge)	
Natural and Built Heritage Assessments	**Type: Conservation and Design**
Conservation and Design Site Assessment	
Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Pateley Bridge Conservation Area
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Bedlam Barn and Church Lane Cottage. Springfield Barn
Commentary on heritage assets.	Springfield Barn, east of the site, is a nineteenth century building that has been extended and converted, and consequently is not of high significance, none the less its setting would be impacted by development over the whole site. Bedlam Barn and Churchlane Cottage, immediately adjacent the site, reflect the vernacular (except the infill between cottage and outbuilding next to the road) and contribute to the significance of the conservation area. Their setting would be impacted by development over the whole site. The southwestern part of the site is in the conservation area, consequently development will affect the conservation area. Any access for a large housing scheme would rely on the tree and retaining wall being removed, which would impact detrimentally on the character of Old Church Lane.
Topography and views	The land falls steeply towards the River Nidd and offers spectacular views across the town below to the hills on the other side of the Nidd valley.
Landscape context	The site, in the AONB, is adjacent to the settlement, on rising land well above the valley floor.
Grain of surrounding development	There are three areas of different grain local to the site; the traditional housing located very close to and against the highway (the barns being related to the farmhouses or fields they serve); the mid twentieth century (former) council estate south of Old Church Lane, which comprises semi-detached houses set close to each other behind modest front gardens generally parallel to the contours, and; the later twentieth century development northeast of the site set around a more complex arrangements of culs-de-sac; the houses nearest the site are detached.
Local building design	Buildings on Old Church Lane generally reflect the vernacular; two storey stone with stone slate or Welsh slate roofs, some detached and some in short rows. Generally larger wall to window ratio and vertical emphasis to windows. The former council houses do not reflect the vernacular, being faced in pebbledash with grey tiled roofs.The materials of the later houses are better, they are in stone (and some appear artstone) with concrete tiled roofs, but they feature projecting gables and highly visible garages, which do not reflect local building styles.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	A tree group near the north of the site and three individual trees on the site are protected by orders. There are issues on the site and the stone wall near 2 Springfield Way features a grilled opening at the point noted “sink” on plan. The topography is a major constraint.The part of the field next to Old Church Lane is significantly higher than the lane. The remainder of the field generally falls southwest, but the land near the issues and the line between Springfield and Bedlam barns falls steeply down to those features. The land at the northwest of the site falls particularly steeply. The west and north boundaries are drystone walls, as is the retaining wall to the lane. The south-east boundary adjacent to the access to Springfield barn is a post and wire fence. The only direct access from the lane is right next to the cottage and the tree. Any access for a large housing scheme would rely on the tree and retaining wall being removed, which would impact detrimentally on the character of Old Church Lane, which is a steep narrow winding lane. There are properties around the site, which would be affected by development of the site, these are: Bedlam Barn and Church Lane Cottage, Springfield Barn, which has windows overlooking the site, and; 2,8 and 12 Springfield Way.
Conclusion	

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

Will it conserve those elements which contribute towards the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets?	
Rationale	Rating
Development is likely to result in harm to elements which contribute to the significance of a heritage asset and the harm is not capable of mitigation.	Red
Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?	
Rationale	Rating
The nature of the site means that built development will have a negative impact on local distinctiveness but there are opportunities for mitigation and improvements.	Orange
Summary conclusion	Any access for a large housing scheme would rely on the tree and retaining wall being removed, which would impact detrimentally on the character of Old Church Lane and thus would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Development that prevents the barn retaining a visual link with open land would be detrimental to its setting. It might be possible to build a short row of cottages set parallel and above the lane and served by the existing access, or share a private drive with the neighbouring Springfield Barn.

Settlement: Pateley Bridge

Site: P4 (Land off Church Lane, Pateley Bridge)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	Within 1250 meters of North Pennine Moors SPA and SAC. Potential impact of recreational disturbance on SPA/SAC may need appropriate assessment
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	Within 1250 meters of East Nidderdale Moors SSSI.
SSSI Risk Zone	Consult NE on “Any residential developments with a total net gain in residential units"
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likely to be impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	None on site (but check out pond) combination of rank grassland, seepages and trees has some local ecological value
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	White (species-poor) semi-improved pasture [P1HS 1992]. More recently has developed rank grassland.
Trees and Hedges	There are significant groups of trees near the northern, western and south-eastern boundaries.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Some trees near the northern and western boundaries are protected by TPO. Other mature trees on site are likely to merit TPO protection
Water/Wetland	Two small watercourses runs through the site. One originating in the centre of the eastern boundary sinks in the middle. There is a pond on mapped site near the north-east boundary.
Slope and Aspect	An irregular shaped grassland field with undulating landform whcih generally falls towards the south west
Buildings and Structures	There are a couple of outbuildings on site associated with Bedlam Barn near the SE corner. Dry stone wall field boundaries.
Natural Area	Yorkshire Dales NCA 21:
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 11 Nidderdale Valley • “Encourage diversification of management of improved grasslands to improve habitat diversity…” • “Maintain individual tree cover for the long term by promoting the planting of native field boundary trees…”
Connectivity/Corridors	The tree-line extends from the site NE towards the wooded disused quarry. The water courses appear to have been culverted between the settlement of Pateley and the River Nidd.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	De-culverting of the watercourses would represent an enhancement and further tree-planting to enhance their qualities as wildlife corridors would be beneficial.
Protected Species	Nesting birds and bats may utilise the trees and buildings for nesting or roosting. Common species of reptiles may utilise the drystone walls
BAP Priority Species	Common species of reptiles may utilise the drystone walls and rough grassland
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	Intensive development across the whole site would be detrimental to biodiversity of this relatively well treed group of small fields with streams.Drystone walls and watercourses should be retained and buffered. All trees should be retained and protected. Further tree planting along the water-courses and along the site boundaries could provide enhancement

Settlement: Pateley Bridge

Site: P4 (Land off Church Lane, Pateley Bridge)

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, watercourses & overland flow from the adjacent fields. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide. We have received significantly increased levels of complaints over recent years from concerned residents affected by, and threatened by flooding from these watercourses. Due to the number of major development proposals in the general area planning to discharge surface water to the same watercourses, it is essential that surface water discharge is kept to an absolute minimum. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) should always be any developer's first consideration and giving preference to soakaways. In my view, infiltration drainage is unlikely to be fully successful at this location due to ground conditions in the surrounding area being predominantly heavy clay soils & the sloping nature of the site. However, any potential developer would be expected to submit a detailed feasibility study showing the use of SuDS including soakaways permeable cellular pavements, grassed swales, infiltration trenches, wetlands, ponds and green roofs that assist in dealing with surface water at source, has been fully explored. Any proposed discharge of surface water from the development site should be restricted to Greenfield rates (1.4 l/s/ha for all storm scenarios). The overall strategy should show that there is sufficient on site attenuation to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without increasing the restricted flows to the watercourse. Applicants would be expected to agree the outline drainage strategy with the LPA in principle before any planning consent is granted. The outline drainage information should include an assessment of flood risk to the site & surrounding area, topographical survey, feasibility of infiltration drainage, on site storage, rates of discharge, outfall location & condition survey results of existing watercourses/culverts (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: Pateley Bridge

Site: P5 (Grassfield Court, Pateley Bridge)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site located off Low Wath road at the north west end of Pateley Bridge adjacent to Grassfield House Country Hotel. LCA11: Nidderdale Valley (Pateley Bridge to Summerbridge)
Landscape description	Area description: Broad well wooded valley of the River Nidd. Built form generally in valley bottom and on lower slopes. Views filtered by woodland and trees in valley bottom. Site description: Residential property and associated garden on the edge of Pateley Bridge.
Existing urban edge	Site detached from existing urban edge.
Trees and hedges	Mature garden planting. TPO adjacent to southeast boundary.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Nidderdale AONB
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha) Existing property to remain.
Physical Sensitivity	Residential property with garden for development. Garden contains mature vegetation that helps integrate site and town with surroundings.
Visual Sensitivity	Reasonably well contained visually at present due to boundary vegetation and location on lower valley side. There are views of the site from across the valley.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of mature garden vegetation and introduction of built form.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Limited due to the size of the site and the density of properties proposed.
Likely level of landscape effects	Loss of large garden characteristic of larger properties on the edge of Pateley Bridge would imapct upon the setting of the town.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	P1, P2, P6, P10 are all in the vacinity and the development of any of these sites in combination would result in cumulative effects.

Conclusion

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

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

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

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

Summary conclusion	The landscape is sensitive to the loss of mature vegetation on the edge of settlement that contributes to the setting of the town and its integration with the wider landscape. As a result capacity to accept residential development without detriment is limited. Lower density of built form and retaining mature vegetation in large gardens would help to mitigate.

Settlement: Pateley Bridge

Site: P5 (Grassfield Court, Pateley Bridge)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Conservation and Design

Conservation and Design Site Assessment

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Grassfield Country House Hotel, a grade II listed building. Pateley Bridge Conservation Area
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Grassfield Court.
Commentary on heritage assets.	Grassfield Court is quite concealed by trees and hedges (site not entered) and appears to be a converted building formerly associated with the listed building, consequently has significance. Until recently Grassfield Country House Hotel, was screened from the east by trees, which have been cut down. Formerly a country house, its setting contributes to its significance. Pateley Bridge Conservation Area on the opposite side of the Nidd benefits from views across the valley, but the screening of this site would reduce impact of development on the conservation area.
Topography and views	The Nidd valley sides are steep, thus there are spectacular views across to the town on the other side of the Nidd valley, although the trees behind Grassfield Hotel and the planting to the front of the site reduce the views from the site. Land rises at the west.
Landscape context	This site is in Bewerley Parish in the AONB. It is visually seperated from a small housing estate that was built between the historic country houses of Grassfields Country House Hotel and Ashfield Villa. The area is outside the settlement of Bridge House Gate, but is in close proximity of the high school.
Grain of surrounding development	The grain of surrounding development does not reflect the character of either Pateley Bridge, nor the closer Bridgehouse Gate, which have areas of very tight grain and hence streets and spaces with a very enclosed character. Ashfield Court Road estate is typical of late twentieth century development and has detached houses set very close together and set back from the road behind modest front gardens. Grassfields Hotel and Court are detached buildings set in very generous plots.
Local building design	The houses on Ashfield Court Road do not reflect the vernacular, many are gable onto the road. They have concrete tiled roofs and quite wide windows and hence do not reflect the character of Nidderdale traditional houses. The vernacular in the dale is robust and is characterised by two storey houses with stone walls having a low window ratio, and stone slate roofs. Pateley Bridge and Bridgehouse Gate have a number of three storey buildings. Windows are in the main of vertical proportions and most roofs are of Welsh slate.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The existing building should be retained and its setting protected. There are protected trees to the south of the building and along the northern boundary of the site. To the southwest of the site is a treed area.

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
Site re-development provides an opportunity for high quality design.	Dark Green
Summary conclusion	The site would have limited capacity because of the existing building and trees.

Settlement: Pateley Bridge

Site: P5 (Grassfield Court, Pateley Bridge)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	North Pennines SPA & SAC witihin 1.2km to NE
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	East Nidderdale Moors within 1.2km to NE
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)	None likely to be impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	'Gardens and urban wildspace'
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Amenity grassland
Trees and Hedges	Large numbers of ornamental shrubs and trees
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature trees on site may merit TPO protection
Water/Wetland	Duck pond 20m to south; River Nidd 250m to north east
Slope and Aspect	Generally flat
Buildings and Structures	Modern brick and stone slate roofed building on site.
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 11 Nidderdale Valley • “Encourage diversification of management of improved grasslands to improve habitat diversity…” • “Maintain individual tree cover for the long term by promoting the planting of native field boundary trees…”
Connectivity/Corridors	The hedgerows of the field system of the NW side of the town connect into the network suburban of gardens and amenity planting with the parkland and woodland associated with Grassfield and Eagle Hall.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	This tree cover is valuable for wildlife and much should be retained and reinforced. Swift and bat bricks should be incorporated into new buildings.
Protected Species	Nesting birds and foraging bats are likely to utilise trees and shrubs. Duck pond low habitat suitability for great crested newts (Brooks, 2015 for14/05141/OUTMAJ)
BAP Priority Species	Some potential for amphibians (e.g. toads, smooth newts) associated with nearby duck pond
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 garden is likley to be rich in common wildlife species given the extent of tree and shrub cover, much of which should be retained. Some potential for the presence of protected species; ecological survey required.

Settlement: Pateley Bridge

Site: P5 (Grassfield Court, Pateley Bridge)

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 including Ashfield Road/Low Wath Road due to capacity issues in local sewers, watercourses & overland flow from the adjacent fields. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide. We have received significantly increased levels of complaints over recent years from concerned residents affected by, and threatened by flooding from these watercourses. Due to the number of major development proposals in the general area planning to discharge surface water to the same watercourses, it is essential that surface water discharge is kept to an absolute minimum. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) should always be any developer's first consideration and giving preference to soakaways. In my view, infiltration drainage is unlikely to be fully successful at this location due to ground conditions in the surrounding area being predominantly heavy clay soils & the sloping nature of the site. However, any potential developer would be expected to submit a detailed feasibility study showing the use of SuDS has been fully explored. Garden developments are now classed as Greenfield land. Consequently any proposed discharge of surface water from the development site should be restricted to Greenfield rates (1.4 l/s/ha for all storm scenarios). The overall strategy should show that there is sufficient on site attenuation to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without increasing the restricted flows to the watercourse. Applicants would be expected to agree the outline drainage strategy with the LPA in principle before any planning consent is granted.

Conclusion

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

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

Settlement: Pateley Bridge

Site: P6 (Land opposite Nidderdale High School, Pateley Bridge)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site located on north west side of Pateley Bridge in field opposite Nidderdale High School LCA11: Nidderdale Valley (Pateley Bridge to Summerbridge)
Landscape description	Area description: Broad well wooded valley of the River Nidd. Built form generally in valley bottom and on lower slopes. Views filtered by woodland and trees in valley bottom. Site description: Part of a larger grass field in the valley bottom.
Existing urban edge	Caravan park to the south partly screened by landform and planting. Site detached from the urban edge in open countryside.
Trees and hedges	One oak tree on boundary with Low Wath Road
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Nidderdale AONB
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	Grass field largely above flood plain in the valley bottom. Open site with few trees. Important to approach to Pateley Bridge. The landscape is susceptible to the loss of fields in open countryside to built development.
Visual Sensitivity	Viewed across extensive parts of the valley side and valley bottom by residents and visitors. High visual sensitivity as a result.
Anticipated landscape effects	Introduction of new built form that is detached from the town and highly visible would not be characteristic.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Limited due to land form and openess of the site. It would be difficult to integrate new builtform with existing landscape as a result without allowing large areas for extensive native planting to soften the appearance of development and significantly lowering proposed built form density.
Likely level of landscape effects	Large scale adverse due to the size of the site in an open location that is highly visible.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	P1, P2 and P5 - cumulative effects of devleopment would be increase with the development of these sites alongside P6.

Conclusion

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

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

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

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

Summary conclusion	There is no capacity for the addition of built form in this location without detriment to existing landscape character and affecting the character of the town in the Nidderdale Valley.

Settlement: Pateley Bridge

Site: P6 (Land opposite Nidderdale High School, Pateley Bridge)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Conservation and Design

Conservation and Design Site Assessment

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Grassfield Country House Hotel, a grade II listed building, and Pateley Bridge Conservation Area
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Grassfield Court.
Commentary on heritage assets.	Grassfield Court is quite concealed by trees and hedges, but appears to be a converted building formerly associated with the listed building, Until recently Grassfield Country House Hotel was screened from the east by trees, which have been cut down. Formerly a country house, its setting contributes to its significance. The areas to its south and east are of particular value to its setting. Pateley Bridge Conservation Area on the opposite side of the Nidd benefits from views across the valley, so development of the site will impact on the setting of the conservation area.
Topography and views	The Nidd valley sides are steep, thus there are spectacular views across to the town on the other side of the Nidd valley. There are views across the river from the site, and views back to the hillside. The site is clearly seen from the valley road. There is intervisibility between the site and Grassfield Country House Hotel.
Landscape context	This site is in Bewerley Parish in the AONB. It is open land opposite the historic country house of Grassfields Country House Hotel and the high school. To its south is a caravan park. The area is outside the settlement of Bridge House Gate and contributes to the quality of this area of the valley floor.
Grain of surrounding development	The grain of surrounding development does not reflect the character of either Pateley Bridge, nor the closer Bridgehouse Gate, which have areas of very tight grain and hence streets and spaces with a very enclosed character. Ashfield Court Road estate is typical of late twentieth century development and has detached houses set very close together and set back from the road behind modest front gardens. Ashfield Villa, Grassfields Hotel and Court are substantial buildings set in generous grounds.
Local building design	The houses on Ashfield Court Road do not reflect the vernacular, many are gable onto the road. They have concrete tiled roofs and quite wide windows and hence do not reflect the character of Nidderdale traditional houses. The vernacular in the dale is robust and is characterised by two storey houses with stone walls having a low window ratio, and stone slate roofs. Pateley Bridge and Bridgehouse Gate have a number of three storey buildings. Windows are in the main of vertical proportions and most roofs are of Welsh slate.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The eastern edge of the site is in the flood plain. The exposed situation of the site in the AONB and in the setting of the listed country house hotel means that it is very sensitive to development.

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	Small scale development of the site could be designed to reflect local distinctiveness and preserve the setting of the listed building. However harm to the setting of Grassfield Country House Hotel, the conservation area and local distinctiveness caused by medium or greater density development could not be successfully mitigated.

Settlement: Pateley Bridge

Site: P6 (Land opposite Nidderdale High School, Pateley Bridge)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	North Pennines SPA & SAC witihin 1 km to NE
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	East Nidderdale Moors within 1 km to NE
SSSI Risk Zone	NE require consultation on "any residential developments with a total net gain in residential units"
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likely to be impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerow
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Species-poor (white) semi-improved grassland [P1HS 1992].
Trees and Hedges	There is a small section of well trimmed hedge at the SE corner and a large roadside oak with few other trees in the vicinity, except for row of alders along the Nidd. , otherwise field boundaries are drystone wall.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Significant roadside oak would be likely to benefit from TPO protection
Water/Wetland	Springline towards the east of the site
Slope and Aspect	Undulating landform which falls towards the river in the east
Buildings and Structures	None but a 'spoil heap' is marked on the map around the eastern boundary – so some of the undulations of the landform may not be entirely natural.
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 11 Nidderdale Valley • "Encourage diversification of management of improved grasslands to improve habitat diversity…" • "Maintain individual tree cover for the long term by promoting the planting of native field boundary trees…"
Connectivity/Corridors	The site abuts the suburban/amenity fringe of Pateley to the south and the west but the dry stone wall field boundaries have little natural lilnkage to the planting associated with the townscape. The site falls within the River Nidd regionally important strategic green infrastructure corridor. Further encroachment towards the river corridor would require careful consideration and should only be permitted in exchange for enhancement of the quality of the adjacent corridor.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Onsite planting of native trees. There may be an opportunity for Suds wetland at the foot of the slope, in association with the spring-line. There may also be an opportunity for enhancement of the nearby riverside.
Protected Species	Not known. There may be the possibility of ground-nesting birds.
BAP Priority Species	Not known
Invasive Species	None known
Notes	P5a 2010 (green). Surveyed by Smeeden Foreman for 16/00031/OUTMAJ. see DC comments

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	Ecological surveys for current planning application indicate that impacts on bats, breeding birds and the River Nidd Corridor are capable of being mitigated for. In addition to onsite planting of native trees, there may be an opportunity for Suds wetland at the foot of the slope, in association with the spring-line. There may also be an opportunity for enhancement of the nearby riverside.

Settlement: Pateley Bridge

Site: P6 (Land opposite Nidderdale High School, Pateley Bridge)

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

Conclusion

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

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

Settlement: Pateley Bridge

Site: P7 (Former Highways Depot, Pateley Bridge)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Landscape

Landscape Site Assessments

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Located on north side of the town in valley bottom east of the River Nidd LCA11: Nidderdale Valley (Pateley bridge to Summerbridge)
Landscape description	Area description: Broad well wooded valley of the River Nidd. Built form/settlement generally in valley bottom and on lower slopes. Views filtered by woodland and trees in valley bottom. Site description: Former Highways depot comprising disused buildings and boundary vegetation.
Existing urban edge	Site located within the development limit of Pateley Bridge. To the north is the Scout Hut. Tree cover along this urban edge is good.
Trees and hedges	To the periphery of the site are trees and hedges but nothing substantial on site.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Nidderdale AONB
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	Landscape not particularly sensitive to loss of building. Sensitive if inappropriate built form to replace existing.
Visual Sensitivity	The site is well contained in the valley bottom by existing built form and trees.
Anticipated landscape effects	Change to residential development from Highways depot.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Opportunities for mitigation through layout and design. Enhancement through change to more characterisitic buildings.
Likely level of landscape effects	Small scale effects due to location of site and its current use.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	No sites adjacent.

Conclusion

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

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

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

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

Summary conclusion	The site is visble from upper slopes of the valley but views partly interupted by intervening vegetation and the site is viewed in context with existing development. There is capacity for the landscape to accept the redevelopment of this site to residential use.

Settlement: Pateley Bridge

Site: P7 (Former Highways Depot, Pateley Bridge)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Conservation and Design

Conservation and Design Site Assessment

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Pateley Bridge Conservation Area
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Historic Terraces, which back onto the access street, and historic station buildings northeast of the site.
Commentary on heritage assets.	The extreme west edge of the site and Millfield Street are in the conservation area. Sensitively designed development, which respects the character of the conservation area should not impact detrimentally on the setting of the heritage assets.
Topography and views	Land rises to northeast, although the site is quite flat. Trees beside the river limit views across the valley.
Landscape context	The site is at the edge of the settlement in the AONB; only the scout hut to its north lies between the site and the Milennium Green Park and open countryside beyond. The river and riverside trees lies to the west of the site.
Grain of surrounding development	The approach to the site is between rows of terraces, which front directly onto the pavement. Kings Close has an amorphous layout of bungalows, which does not reflect the grain of the conservation area.
Local building design	In the context of the site, there is a variety of building types; the coal yard sheds, small workers terraced housing, bungalows, almshouse style public housing at Netherdale and The Sidings. All housing is in stone with slate (or similar) roofs. The terraced housing reflects local distinctiveness.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The site is bounded to the west by a popular riverside walk. Buildings on the site are utilitarian; some may have a limited employment use, although all are unattractive. The coal yard, with similar buildings, is to the northeast. The site is fairly level and bounded by a post and mesh fence. The Scout Hall is just north of the site. There are no features on the site worthy of retention.

Conclusion

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

Rationale	Rating
Development of the site within the Conservation Area will improve a poor quality site and contribute to local distinctiveness.	Dark Green

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

Rationale	Rating
Development is likely to enhance or better reveal elements which contribute to the significance of a designated heritage asset.	Dark Green

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

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

Summary conclusion	Development must be sensitive to its location, so the north and west parts of the site should not be densely developed to the outer edges.

Settlement: Pateley Bridge

Site: P7 (Former Highways Depot, Pateley Bridge)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	North Pennines SPA & SAC witihin around 1 km to NE
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	East Nidderdale Moors within around 1 km to NE
SSSI Risk Zone	NE require consultation on "any residential developments with a total net gain in residential units"
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likely to be impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	River (Nidd adjacent)
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	Urabn - not applicable
Sward	Not applicable
Trees and Hedges	There a few trees e.g. Ash and Hawthorn trees on site, close to the boundaries, which should be retained. There is a row of conifers bounding the adjacent property 'Fairview'. There are trees along the embankment and adjacent to the river including Alder, Ash and Hawthorn.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Trees on site may merit TPO protection
Water/Wetland	River Nidd adjacent beyond flood defence embankments.
Slope and Aspect	Generally flat
Buildings and Structures	Buildings on the site are modern and insubstantial operational buildings
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 11 Nidderdale Valley • “Encourage diversification of management of improved grasslands to improve habitat diversity…” • “Maintain individual tree cover for the long term by promoting the planting of native field boundary trees…”
Connectivity/Corridors	River Nidd is a regionally important strategic green infrastructure corridor. The site is bounded to the north by the Pateley Bridge Millennium Green, a small natural park, which links in to the river and the countryside beyond. Apart from this and the river itself, with its row of bankside trees (mostly Alder) there is relatively little semi-natural habitat around the town. Most open space is amenity grassland and upstream agricultural land is mostly intensively managed improved or species-poor semi-improved grassland.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	This site should be redeveloped in the context of the River Nidd GI corridor and the adjacent millennium green park. Consideration should be given to redevelopment in association with the adjoining P6 site. Consideration should be given to setting back of the floodbanks and the recreation of a more natural floodplain for the Nidd, which may assist with flood alleviation downstream in the town. Even if realignment is not possible, it may be practicable to enhance the floodplain. The small adjacent Millennium Green ‘natural park’ to the north shows the type of approach that is possible.
Protected Species	Nesting birds are likely to use the boundary trees and shrubs. Buildings on site may support nesting birds but are unlikely to be substantial enough to support bat roosts. Otter occurs in the Nidd. Kingfisher and water vole may occur along the Nidd.
BAP Priority Species	BAP fish species e.g. Brown Trout occur in the Nidd.
Invasive Species	Not known but Himalayan balsam is likely to occur along the Nidd.
Notes	P2 2010 (green)

Conclusion

Will it deliver net gains to biodiversity and protect and enhance existing networks of priority habitats and species and provide for long term management of wildlife habitats? Will it offer opportunities to enhance Green Infrastructure?	
Rationale	Rating
No adverse impact, potential for enhancement and net gains to biodiversity.	Dark Green
Summary conclusion	No objections to redevelopment of this site on ecological grounds. The river and its flood plain should be protected from any impacts of development and opportunities should be sought to restore aspects of the semi-natural character of the flood-plain. Enhancement onsite and offsite should be undertaken to create a more naturalistic riverside approach to the town, in keeping with the Millennium Green just upstream. Boundary trees and hedgerows should be retained and protected.

Settlement: Pateley Bridge

Site: P7 (Former Highways Depot, Pateley Bridge)

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 surrounded by flood zones 2/3. However, the Agency has introduced flood defences adjacent to the site and the River Nidd over recent years We are however, aware of flooding incidents in the immediate area including Millfield Street due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide. We have received significantly increased levels of complaints over recent years from concerned residents affected by, and threatened by flooding from these watercourses. Due to the number of major development proposals in the general area planning to discharge surface water to the same watercourses, it is essential that surface water discharge is kept to an absolute minimum. I would suggest that suitable property flood mitigation measures need to be incorporated assuming this proposed development gains approval i.e. raised floor levels, high level electric circuits, appropriate air bricks etc. It is likely that a proportion of the existing buildings and garages etc. are not positively drained to either a watercourse or public sewer, consequently, A full survey of the drainage systems should be undertaken to establish condition and outfall location. 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. 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, 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). The Environment Agency is responsible for administering matters attaining to Main River. As such, if the surface water strategy includes discharge to the River Nidd (directly or indirectly) the Agency should be consulted.

Conclusion

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

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

Settlement: Pateley Bridge

Site: P10 (Grassfield House, Pateley Bridge)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Conservation and Design

Conservation and Design Site Assessment

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Grassfield Country House Hotel, a grade II listed building.
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Grassfield Court
Commentary on heritage assets.	Until recently Grassfield Country House Hotel was screened from the east by trees, which have been cut down. Formerly a country house, its setting contributes to its significance. The areas to its south and east are of particular value to its setting. Grassfield Court is quite concealed by trees and hedges, but appears to be a converted building formerly associated with the listed building, Grassfield House, reduces the value of the hillside to the setting of the heritage assets setting. However redevelopment of the site could cause further harm to the setting of the listed and other historic building.
Topography and views	The Nidd valley sides are steep, thus in many locations there are spectacular views across to the town on the other side of the Nidd valley. The historic buildings and surrounding trees restrict views from Grassfield House,
Landscape context	This site is in Bewerley Parish in the AONB. It is adjacent to a small housing estate built between the historic country houses of Grassfields Country House Hotel and Ashfield Villa. The area is outside the settlement of Bridge House Gate.
Grain of surrounding development	The grain of surrounding development does not reflect the character of either Pateley Bridge, nor the closer Bridgehouse Gate, which have areas of very tight grain and hence streets and spaces with a very enclosed character. Ashfield Court Road estate is typical of late twentieth century development having detached houses set very close together and set back from the road behind modest front gardens. Grassfield Court, Grassfield Country House Hotel and Ashfield Villa are all large detached buildings set in generous gardens.
Local building design	The houses on Ashfield Court Road do not reflect the vernacular, many are gable onto the road. They have concrete tiled roofs and quite wide windows and hence do not reflect the character of Nidderdale traditional houses. The vernacular in the dale is robust and is characterised by two storey houses with stone walls having a low window ratio, and stone slate roofs. Pateley Bridge and Bridgehouse Gate have a number of three storey buildings. Windows are in the main of vertical proportions and most roofs are of Welsh slate.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The northern part of the site is well-treed and there are protected trees to the west of Grassfield Country House Hotel and to the north and west 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 but there are opportunities for mitigation and improvements.	Orange

Summary conclusion	Any more built form than existing would cause further harm to the setting of the listed building. This site is not appropriate for dense development.

Settlement: Pateley Bridge

Site: P10 (Grassfield House, Pateley Bridge)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments — Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	North Pennines SPA & SAC witihin 1.2km to NE
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	East Nidderdale Moors within 1.2km to NE
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)	None impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Amenity lawns
Trees and Hedges	Many ornamental hedges and trees. TPOed trees in northern part of site.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Siginificant trees have TPOs
Water/Wetland	small garden ponds on site; duck pond adjacent to west.
Slope and Aspect	generally fla, slopes gently to east
Buildings and Structures	Modern dwelling
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 11 Nidderdale Valley “maintain individual tree cover for the longterm…”
Connectivity/Corridors	The hedgerows of the field system of the NW side of the town connect into parkland and woodland associated with Grassfield and Eagle Hall on the one hand and the surrounding suburban network of garden and amenity planting on the other. All of this tree cover is valuable for wildlife and should be retained and reinforced. The site falls within the River Nidd regionally important strategic green infrastructure corridor
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Retain mature trees
Protected Species	Nesting birds likely in trees and hedgerows. Some potential for bats. Garden ponds and duck pond low habitat suitability for great crested newts (Brooks, 2015 for 14/05141/OUTMAJ)
BAP Priority Species	Not known
Invasive Species	None known
Notes	

Conclusion

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

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

Summary conclusion	Garden likley to be rich in common wildlife species. Mature trees should be retained. Some potential for protected species;ecological survey required.

Settlement: Pateley Bridge

Site: P10 (Grassfield House, Pateley Bridge)

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 including Ashfield Road/Low Wath Road due to capacity issues in local sewers, watercourses & overland flow from the adjacent fields. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide. We have received significantly increased levels of complaints over recent years from concerned residents affected by, and threatened by flooding from these watercourses. Due to the number of major development proposals in the general area planning to discharge surface water to the same watercourses, it is essential that surface water discharge is kept to an absolute minimum. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) should always be any developer's first consideration and giving preference to soakaways. In my view, infiltration drainage is unlikely to be fully successful at this location due to ground conditions in the surrounding area being predominantly heavy clay soils & the sloping nature of the site. However, any potential developer would be expected to submit a detailed feasibility study showing the use of SuDS has been fully explored. Garden developments are now classed as Greenfield development. Consequently any proposed discharge of surface water from the development site should be restricted to Greenfield rates (1.4 l/s/ha for all storm scenarios). The overall strategy should show that there is sufficient on site attenuation to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without increasing the restricted flows to the watercourse. Applicants would be expected to agree the outline drainage strategy with the LPA in principle before any planning consent is granted.

Conclusion

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

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