

Built and Natural Environment Site Assessments Volume 8: Glasshouses – Huby



October 2016

Contents

1 Introduction	2
2 Policy Context	3
National Policy Context	3
Emerging Local Policy Context	5
3 Methodology	8
Landscape	8
Conservation and Design	13
Ecology	17
Land Drainage	20
4 Site Assessments	21
Glasshouses	23
Goldsborough	28
Great Ouseburn	47
Green Hammerton	57
Greenhow	107
Grewelthorpe	111
Hampsthwaite	120
Hopperton	148
Huby	161

1 Introduction

1 Introduction

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

- Glasshouses
- Goldsborough
- Great Ouseburn
- Green Hammerton
- Greenhow
- Grewelthorpe
- Hampsthwaite
- Hopperton
- Huby

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

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

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

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

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

2 Policy Context

National Policy Context

Introduction

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

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

Landscape

2.2 Paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is clear that the planning system should contribute to, and enhance, the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes. To help achieve this aim, paragraph 156 requires local plans to include strategic policies to deliver conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscape.

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

Conservation and Design

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

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

2 Policy Context

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

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

Ecology

- 2.7** Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 sets out a statutory obligation that, 'Every public body must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity.'
- 2.8** Section 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out national planning policies for conserving and enhancing the natural environment. Paragraph 109 of the NPPF identifies that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible, contributing to the Government's commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures. Paragraph 110 states that Local Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value, where consistent with other policies in the Framework.
- 2.9** Paragraph 118 of the NPPF sets out the principles by which local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity when determining planning applications, including:
- if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused;
 - proposed development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) likely to have an adverse effect on an SSSI should not normally be permitted.
 - development proposals where the primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be permitted;
 - opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments should be encouraged;
 - planning permission should be refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland and the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland, unless the need for, and benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh the loss.
- 2.10** In addition, paragraph 115 of the NPPF notes that the conservation of wildlife is an important consideration in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, such as the Nidderdale AONB.

Policy Context 2

Land Drainage

- 2.11** There is an increasing body of scientific evidence suggesting that the global climate is changing as a result of human activity. Across the globe the changing climate is likely to give rise to a variety of different impacts. For the UK the projections of future climate change suggest that more frequent, high intensity rainfall events and periods of long-duration rainfall, of the type responsible for the 2007 floods, could be expected.
- 2.12** In response to meeting the challenge of climate change and flooding, paragraph 100 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) identifies that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk, but where development is necessary, making it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere.
- 2.13** In terms of planning for future development needs, paragraph 100 identifies that Local Plans should be supported by Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and develop policies to manage flood risk from all sources, taking account of advice from the Environment Agency and other relevant flood risk management bodies, such as lead local flood authorities and internal drainage boards. It goes on to state that Local Plans should apply a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development to avoid where possible flood risk to people and property and manage any residual risk, taking account of the impacts of climate change, by:
- Applying the Sequential Test;
 - If necessary, applying the Exception Test;
 - Safeguarding land from development that is required for current and future flood management;
 - Using opportunities offered by new development to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding; and
 - Where climate change is expected to increase flood risk so that some existing development may not be sustainable in the long-term, seeking opportunities to facilitate the relocation of development, including housing, to more sustainable locations

Emerging Local Policy Context

Introduction

- 2.14** The development plan for Harrogate district comprises the saved policies of the Harrogate District Local Plan (2001; selective alteration 2004) and the Harrogate District Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD)(2009). The council is currently preparing a new Local Plan that will guide sustainable development across the district in the period up to 2035. The council's Local Development Scheme First Review (2016) identifies that the new Local Plan is time tabled for adoption in autumn 2018. Upon adoption this document will replace the saved policies of the Harrogate District Local Plan as well as the Harrogate District Core Strategy.
- 2.15** In summer 2015 the council consulted on Local Plan Issues and Options. The consultation sought views on what the plan should seek to achieve over the next 20 or so years, how new homes and jobs should be distributed across the district, what policies should be included in order to ensure that new development is sustainable and the scope of detailed development management policies.

2 Policy Context

- 2.16** Following further work the council consulted on the initial draft wording of detailed development management policies in November and December 2015. The key issues arising from these consultations can be found in the Harrogate District Local Plan: Issues and Options Consultation Statement (October, 2016).
- 2.17** In October 2016 the council published the Draft Local Plan for consultation. The draft plan sets out the emerging strategic policies alongside detailed draft development management policies as well as identifying draft allocations of land for future development.

Landscape

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

Conservation and Design

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

Ecology

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

Land Drainage

- 2.21** Draft policy CC1: Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage sets out the council's emerging approach to land drainage. The policy requires development proposals to ensure that there is no increase in the flow rate of surface water run off, and to achieve this, prioritises the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) to manage surface water discharge. SuDS that involve the use of soakaways should always be the first consideration, however, if ground conditions are not suitable for infiltration drainage techniques, the following order of preference should be used to develop an alternative method of surface water disposal:
- Watercourse
 - Surface water sewer
 - Combined water sewer
- 2.22** Soakaway drainage should not be used in the central area of Ripon where it has been identified as being at risk from gypsum dissolution. In addition, the policy seeks to resist the building over of culverts and the culverting or canalisation of water course, whilst encouraging the reopening of culverts and the modification of canalised water courses to achieve a more natural state. The policy also outlines support for safeguarding the use of land needed for flood risk management purposes. Draft policies CC2: Rivers; CC4: Sustainable Design and NE2: Water Quality also have some relevance to land drainage.

3 Methodology

3 Methodology

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

Landscape

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

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

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

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

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

Methodology 3

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

Table 3.1 Landscape: Screened Out Sites

- 3.5** For sites that were not screened out, the assessment of landscape sensitivity and capacity follows the approach outlined below. Information about the landscape baseline has been gathered using a combination of desk based study and field survey work.
- 3.6** **Landscape character, area and site description:** A key document is the Harrogate District Landscape Character Assessment (2004), which divides the district into a series of 106 broadly homogeneous landscape character areas. This is a comprehensive document, set within the context of the national assessment of landscape character by the (then) Countryside Commission and English Nature. The assessment is referred to where appropriate in the consideration of the likely harm ensuing from the development and where mitigation measures might be appropriate, or not. Site survey work has been carried out to verify the key characteristics of the area potentially affected and the contribution each site makes to landscape character. In addition the desk study identified the relevant landscape designations for each site. The base line information is recorded in the landscape sensitivity and capacity table and includes a description of the urban edge.
- 3.7** **Existing urban edge:** The determination of the nature of the urban edge. This is particularly the relationship between the urban edge and the surrounding countryside, whether it is unscreened or whether it is well integrated by tree and woodland cover for example. The assessment considers whether the new development could help restore or reconstruct the urban edge to enhance landscape character and local distinctiveness, or in some circumstances whether the new development would appear intrusive and encroach into open countryside.
- 3.8** **Trees and hedges:** Describes principal elements of site vegetation that may have a bearing on the physical capacity of the site to accommodate development.
- 3.9** **Landscape and Green Belt designations:** In this part of the assessment landscape related designations such as the Special Landscape Areas, Conservation Areas, Historic Parks and Gardens and AONB are noted for each site where they apply. The assessment takes into account where these designations may be compromised or affected, and this would count against development. In the case where the designation is likely to be compromised then landscape mitigation measures are identified, including 'off-site' measures such as planting or landscape restoration proposed on land outside the developer's control.
- 3.10** **Descriptions of proposals for the site:** At this stage, identification of whether the site is being considered for residential development, employment development or mixed (residential and employment) use.
- 3.11** **Physical sensitivity:** This identifies the landscape's susceptibility to change as a result of the proposed development, and the value placed on the landscape. Landscape sensitivity is a combination of both susceptibility and value, for example, higher value landscapes with high susceptibility to change as a result of the loss of key characteristics or the introduction of uncharacteristic features are assessed to have a higher sensitivity to change.

3 Methodology

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

Table 3.2 Criteria for Landscape Susceptibility

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

Methodology 3

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

Table 3.3 Criteria for Landscape Value

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

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

Table 3.4 Criteria of Visual Sensitivity

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

3 Methodology

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

- 3.14 Likely level of landscape effects:** This is a summary of the impacts and ranges from large through medium to small scale adverse effects.
- 3.15 Adjacent sites, cumulative impacts and benefits:** This part of the assessment identifies additional sites in close proximity that may be subject to inter-visibility with potential to impact on both cumulative landscape and visual effects.
- 3.16 Overall landscape sensitivity:** Sensitivity is determined by a combination of the value that is attached to a landscape and the susceptibility of the landscape to changes that would arise as a result of the proposed development. Sensitivity ratings are assessed as low, medium/low, medium, high/medium, or high.
- 3.17 Overall landscape capacity:** This relates to the degree to which a landscape can accept change without detriment to landscape character. The capacity of the landscape to accept change will depend upon the nature of the development and the opportunities available for mitigation. Those landscapes that have a higher capacity to accommodate new development of a certain type tend to be of lower sensitivity and have greater opportunities to mitigate any adverse effects. Capacity ratings are assessed as high, high/medium, medium, medium/low, or low.
- 3.18 Impacts on woodland and trees and potential mitigation:** The final section of the landscape assessment form concerns the likely effect that development could have on woodland and trees both existing and proposed. Assessment scoring is colour coded from dark green- identifying potential for significant woodland creation on site, to red- where development is likely to result in the loss of ancient woodland, veteran and/or protected trees.

Results

- 3.19** This approach to the assessment has been delivered so that some distinction can be made between areas, which have similar levels of anticipated effects. It is acknowledged that all potential sites, involving (by definition) a significant extension of the built form into what is presently countryside of one form or another, will lead to some degree of harm in landscape terms. That degree of harm will vary from site to site and will be capable of mitigation to a greater or lesser degree according to the site concerned, the eventual development proposals and the appropriateness of the mitigation to landscape character.
- 3.20** The main purpose and aim of this Landscape Capacity Assessment is to assist in guiding development to areas where the harm is at a relatively low level and where it can be mitigated most effectively.

Conservation and Design

- 3.21** It is acknowledged that any housing development will impact on the existing built environment and its countryside setting to varying degrees. The assessments carried out by Conservation and Design Officers primarily sought to determine whether development would be harmful to any heritage asset or setting of that asset, or whether development could be designed to protect and potentially enhance the quality of the environment.
- 3.22** The assessment of the potential sites was carried out in three stages:
1. A desk based study was used to determine whether development of the site directly affected a known heritage asset, potential heritage asset or would affect the setting of one or more heritage assets. Sites where it was identified that development would not directly or indirectly affect heritage assets were then screened out;
 2. For sites where development would directly or indirectly impact on heritage assets, a site visit was carried out to:
 - a. Study the context of the site to firstly determine whether non-designated historic buildings, structures or places have sufficient significance to be considered non-designated heritage assets, and then secondly to determine whether development would have a harmful or neutral impact on the significance of any heritage asset;
 - b. Assess any elements that contribute to local distinctiveness in order to determine if development could be designed in a manner to reinforce local distinctiveness;
 3. Finally, there was consideration of how development could be designed to protect, and potentially enhance, the quality of the area and the significance of any heritage asset.
- 3.23** The first stage of the assessment, the desk-top study, was carried out for all sites. This included ascertaining:
- Whether the site is within, or near to, a Conservation Area; whether there is a Listed Building on or near to the site.
 - Whether there are any Scheduled Ancient Monuments on, or near to, the site and whether the site is within the Nidderdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).
 - Whether development of the site would impact on a Scheduled Battlefield, Historic Park and Garden, or the World Heritage Site at Fountains Abbey and Studley Royal (although less likely).
- 3.24** If the site affected any of these heritage assets, further investigation was carried out to ascertain the nature of the asset from existing written, drawn or photographic evidence available to officers, for example the list or monument description, or the conservation area appraisal. The Heritage Environment Record (HER) is kept by North Yorkshire County Council, and the desk-top study carried out by Harrogate Conservation and Design Officers did not include interrogation of the HER, so non-designated archaeological assets, were not considered in the assessment. The desk-top study also included the study of historic maps to ascertain the era of development of buildings on or near the site.
- 3.25** Sites where development would not impact directly or indirectly on designated assets, or buildings that were constructed before 1910, were screened out. This date was chosen because, although some buildings erected after 1910 are of architectural and local historic interest, it is unlikely that they would have a high value of significance. In most instances,

3 Methodology

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

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

Methodology 3

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

Table 3.5 Conservation and Design: Screened Out Sites

3 Methodology

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

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

Results

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

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

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

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

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

Methodology 3

Ecology

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

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

Table 3.6 Ecology: Screened Out Sites

- 3.31** For sites not screened out, the assessment sought to identify potential impacts on particular ecological receptors, as set out below:
- 3.32** **International Sites:** Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) and Special Protection Areas (SPAs) form part of the European Natura 2000 network of sites that are considered to have international importance under the EU Habitats Directive and the EU Birds Directive. These directives are transposed into UK law through the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010. A Habitats Regulations Assessment may be required for any plan or project that may give rise to significant impacts on these sites.
- 3.33** **Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs):** These sites are designated by Natural England due to their national importance. Reference was also made to whether a site is identified as being within a SSSI risk zone. These are produced by Natural England to help understand whether a SSSI, SAC or SPA will be affected by proposals nearby.
- 3.34** **Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs):** Reference has been made to the list of SINCs contained in Appendix 3 of the Harrogate District Local Plan (2001), as well as additional sites that have been surveyed and ratified by the North Yorkshire SINC Panel and are relevant to the areas being assessed.
- 3.35** **Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) Priority Habitats:** Local BAP priority habitats are listed in the Harrogate District Biodiversity Action Plan (Harrogate Borough Council, 2012), and a list of UK priority habitats is available on the Department of the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) website.
- 3.36** **Phase 1 Habitat Survey Target Note Features:** Target Notes (TNs) give brief description of ecologically notable features. Particular reference was had to the Harrogate District Phase 1 Habitat Survey (P1HS) (1992), although Target Notes from other more up to date Phase 1 Habitat Surveys are referred to where appropriate.
- 3.37** The assessment also identified the following sites features that may indicate the potential presence of ecological receptors:
- 3.38** **Sward:** This has been noted by reference to the Harrogate District Phase 1 Habitat Survey (1992), and updated, where appropriate, through a site visit.

3 Methodology

- 3.39 Trees and Hedges:** The presence of trees and/or hedges was noted from site visits, aerial photographs or site photographs. Any trees that may merit additional protection through a Tree Protection Order (TPO) were also noted.
- 3.40 Water and/or wetland:** This was noted from Ordnance Survey (OS) maps, historical maps, aerial photographs and, where necessary, site visits
- 3.41 Buildings and structures:** This was noted from site visits, Ordnance Survey (OS) maps, historical maps, aerial photographs, site photographs and the assessments carried out by the council's Conservation and Design Officers.
- 3.42** As semi-natural habitats have become increasingly fragmented the importance of maintaining or restoring habitat connectivity is becoming better recognised. As a result, the context of the site in relation to habitat connectivity and/or corridors was also considered. This was primarily assessed from aerial photographs and Ordnance Survey (OS) maps with further data from site photographs and site visit. Maps and corridor descriptions from Natural England's work on regionally important Green Infrastructure (GI) corridors were also consulted.
- 3.43** Finally, the landscape character of the area that each site sits within, identified from the Harrogate District Landscape Character Assessment and Natural England's National Character Areas, was noted along with any relevant guidance relating to the particular character area, including extracts from the Environmental Opportunities section of the relevant National Character Area Profile.
- 3.44** In light of the information gathered for each site, opportunities for mitigation and for habitat creation through the development of Green Infrastructure (GI) and Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) were considered. The known presence or likelihood of protected species, BAP priority species or invasive alien species was recorded- in addition to the assessment above, this was also informed by existing knowledge of the known presence of these species and checked against an alert layer provided by the North and East Yorkshire Ecological Data Centre .

Results

- 3.45** An overall conclusion for each site, pulls together the research results to identify the likely impact of development on the site, highlighting the ecological constraints as well as mitigation that may be required alongside any potential enhancement opportunities afforded. This has then been used to score each site. The potential scores range from dark green (no adverse impact, potential for enhancement and net gains to biodiversity) through yellow, then orange, to red (a significant adverse effect on designated sites, the wider ecological network and/or priority species).
- 3.46** Almost all sites will have some level of ecological interest but it is comparatively rare that ecological sensitivity is such as to preclude development entirely. Relatively few sites have therefore been graded as 'red'. More often, biodiversity can be integrated into sites as part of good design and often there will be opportunities for positive enhancement, either on, and/or where appropriate, off-site through 'biodiversity offsetting'. For sites where this is comparatively straight-forward e.g. maintenance of boundary features around the site, the site is likely to have been graded as 'green'. Where mitigation should be possible but which may, for example, reduce the overall housing density of the site through retention of important features such as trees or a buffer zone along a stream, then it will have been graded as 'yellow'. Sites which are scored orange may have more substantial biodiversity interest, but this could generally be mitigated for with good design and appropriate safeguarding of

Methodology 3

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

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

3 Methodology

Land Drainage

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

Results

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

Site Assessments 4

4 Site Assessments

Glasshouses

Site Ref	Site Name	Site Area	Page
GL1	Land at Lupton Bank, Glasshouses	3.1987	23

Table 4.1 Glasshouses Site

Goldsborough

Site Ref	Site Name	Site Area	Page
GB1	Land at Goldsborough	3.2512	28
GB2	Land at Low Farm, Goldsborough	0.4408	Draft Allocation - housing 35
GB3	Land to the east of Station Road, Goldsborough	0.7567	42

Table 4.2 Goldsborough Sites

Great Ouseburn

Site Ref	Site Name	Site Area	Page
GO2	Land north of Branton Lane, Great Ouseburn	3.5664	47
GO3	Land at Branton Green, Great Ouseburn	0.6494	53

Table 4.3 Great Ouseburn Sites

Green Hammerton

Site Ref	Site Name	Site Area	Page
GH2	Land at New Lane, Green Hammerton	2.4704	Draft Allocation - housing 57
GH3	Land between Back Lane and Yule Lane, Green Hammerton	1.5959	61
GH4	Land to the east of Bernard Lane, Green Hammerton	0.8754	Draft Allocation - housing 65
GH6	Land north of York Road and south of New Lane, Green Hammerton	5.0482	74
GH7	Land off Back Lane and Yule Lane, Green Hammerton	1.513	78
GH8	Land south of York Road and east of Kirk Hammerton Lane, Green Hammerton	12.4696	82
GH9	Land west of B6265 and north of A59, Green Hammerton	2.4235	Draft Allocation - housing 86
GH10	Land adjacent to the B6265 at Green Hammerton	5.299	89
GH11	New/expanded settlement at Green Hammerton, Kirk Hammerton and Cattal, Option One	168.1139	Draft Option - new/expanded settlement 94
GH12	New settlement at Green Hammerton, Kirk Hammerton and Cattal, Option Two	224.1153	100

Table 4.4 Green Hammerton Sites

4 Site Assessments

Greenhow

Site Ref	Site Name	Site Area	Page
GR1	Land to the east of Duck Street Lane, Greenhow	1.8689	107

Table 4.5 Greenhow Sites

Grewelthorpe

Site Ref	Site Name	Site Area	Page
GW4	The old quarry field, Grewelthorpe	0.2706	111
GW5	Land adjacent to Newholme Farm, Grewelthorpe	3.1859	115

Table 4.6 Grewelthorpe Sites

Hampsthwaite

Site Ref	Site Name	Site Area	Page
HM2	Land at Cruet Farm, Hampsthwaite	0.315	120
HM4	Land south of Brookfield, Hampsthwaite	6.0218	125
HM5	Land to east of Rowden Lane, Hampsthwaite	3.6151	128
HM6	Land southeast of St Thomas a Beckett Walk, Hampsthwaite	2.2644	133
HM7	Land off Brookfield Garth, Hampsthwaite	1.3466	Draft Allocation - housing 138
HM8	Land at 43 Hollins Lane, Hampsthwaite	1.5182	142

Table 4.7 Hampsthwaite Sites

Hopperton

Site Ref	Site Name	Site Area	Page
HP5	Land off Hopperton Street 4, Hopperton	0.7843	148
HP6	Land off Grey Thorn Lane, Hopperton	12.0754	152
HP7	New/expanded settlement at Hopperton	94.055	157

Table 4.8 Hopperton Sites

Huby

Site Ref	Site Name	Site Area	Page
HB1	Land at Holly Hill Farm, Huby	33.7201	161
HB2	Land at Hunter's View, Huby	2.2031	168
HB3	Land at Merrybank Lane, Huby	1.2859	174
HB4	Land to the west of Harrogate Road, Huby	4.61	180
HB5	Land to the east of Harrogate Road, Huby	1.2085	187
HB6	Land at Strait Lane, Huby	8.0963	192

Table 4.9 Huby Sites

Settlement: Glasshouses**Site: GL1 (Land at Lupton Bank, Glasshouses)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Land at Lupton Bank Glasshouses LCA11: Nidderdale Valley (Pateley Bridge to Summerbridge).
Landscape description	Area description: Broad well wooded valley of the River Nidd. Built form generally concentrated in valley bottom and on lower slopes. Views filtered by woodland and trees in valley bottom which is overlooked from the higher slopes of the valley sides. Site description: Site comprises of three pastoral fields defined by dry stone walls situated between the B6165 at Lupton Bank and rear garden boundary of properties fronting onto Lipton Close. There is a recreation ground adjoining the site to the east and small woodland plantation along the sites western boundary along which is routed a PRow. The site slopes steeply down to the south from properties fronting the B6165 to the edge of settlement.
Existing urban edge	Site is in a rural location on the edge of settlement. between the viillage and the A6165.
Trees and hedges	Small group of trees within the site and several trees within the curtilage of Barnhill and occasional trees along the highway frontage.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Nidderdale AONB Open Countryside PRow along western edge of the site .
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The valley landscape is sensitive to development that would extend builtform up the valley side and require substantial changes in landform with the steepest sections of site at gradients of about 1:7. This would result in adverse impacts on the character of the river corridor that is one of the key characteristics of the AONB.
Visual Sensitivity	Prominent views of site seen from the B6165 to the east, views of the site from across the valley.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of three pastoral fields on the valley side that contributes to the key characteristics of the AONB.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Mitigation would require significant areas to be given over to green infrastructure particularly along the A6165 frontage which would also restrict key views across the valley
Likely level of landscape effects	Large scale adverse due to the sensitivity of the location and the uncharacteristic nature of the high density development proposed.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	None

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

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

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

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

Summary conclusion	Mitigation would require significant areas to be given over to green infrastructure particularly along the A6165 frontage which would also restrict key views across the valley. Large scale adverse due to the sensitivity of the location and the uncharacteristic nature of the high density development proposed.
---------------------------	--

Settlement: Glasshouses

Site: GL1 (Land at Lupton Bank, Glasshouses)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments

Type: Conservation and Design

Conservation and Design Site Assessment

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Glasshouses Conservation Area Kiln Hill Farmhouse and Blue Plain Cottages, both grade II listed buildings.
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Historic buildings on main street, Cliff View Terrace, Chapel Terrace and the Wesleyan Methodist Chapel. Also 2-4 Valley View. Stock Plain Cottage.
Commentary on heritage assets.	<p>Development of the site would affect the approach to the village, and due to topography would impact on views to the north, particularly from south of 2-4 Valley View and the green where the rising land can be seen above the bungalows of Lupton Close. Most of the historic buildings in Glasshouses list above are designated as being of interest and merit in the conservation area appraisal. Development would impact on the setting of 2-4 Valley View, Cliffe View Terrace and the Chapel in particular.</p> <p>The farmhouse is set behind other buildings, so development of the land is unlikely to impact on its setting. Blue Plain Cottages are separated from the site by the B6165 and a field, land levels result in the views from the cottages being little affected unless buildings are tall and set close to the main road.</p> <p>Stock Plain Cottage is adjacent to the site at the northwest corner. It is a nineteenth century house, which retains its original character despite some extensions and thus has some architectural interest. It is of modest significance, but contributes to the character of the AONB, its setting should be respected.</p>
Topography and views	<p>The site is on the valley side of the River Nidd, where land rises up to the north steeply. The site enjoys views across to the south and southwest. Views from the B6165 are across the site to the hillside beyond.</p> <p>The site is viewed from Lupton Close, the B6165 and the west, particularly from the footpath running alongside the boundary.</p>
Landscape context	The site is adjacent to the twentieth century estate north of the core of Glasshouses village.
Grain of surrounding development	<p>Within the village there are short terraces, rows, and occasional semi-detached and some detached homes. Many of the terraces are at the back of the footpath or behind very small front gardens. The detached houses tend to be set further away from the road, and many to the south are arranged to maximise the views and southern orientation. The main road through the village is not of standard width and there are points, and lengths, of narrowing. Lupton Close is wider, but due to lack of off-street parking, the road is reduced by parked cars. The majority of Lupton Close is comprised semi-detached bungalows set behind modest front gardens, to each end there are semi-detached houses, some set closer to the road. All are parallel to the road and so the grain is very different to the older part of the village.</p> <p>Outside the village, there are individual houses set close to the south of the main road, and farmsteads scattered across the hillside.</p>
Local building design	<p>The vernacular in the dale is robust and is characterised by two storey houses with stone walls having low window ratio, and stone slate roofs. The late nineteenth century terraces have taller rooms, their windows are in the main of vertical proportions and most roofs are of Welsh slate, some have dormers. At the bottom of the village the mill buildings are of three storeys in height.</p> <p>Stockplain Cottage reflects the vernacular, it is a three bay stone house with stone slate roof.</p> <p>The bungalows and houses of Lupton Close have horizontal proportions, they are of a light orange/buff coloured brick and have concrete pantiles of similar colour, but a little darker. They do not reflect local distinctiveness.</p>

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

The site is of four parts; there is residential property on the north boundary near the junction of Blazefield Bank. The dwelling seen from the road is a chalet style bungalow. Other buildings here appear to better respect local building style. Whilst they could be retained, there would not be objection to their demolition. The rest of the site is of three fields running north south. The boundaries between are drystone walls. Running down the west boundary is a footpath linking the B6165 to Valley View. To the east of the site is a play area. The boundary to the B6165 is a coursed stone wall. There is a well near the northeast corner and a spring near the centre of the site. West of the site is a small woodland, there are trees to the east of the chalet bungalow and a couple to its southwest. There is a tree near the northeast corner and some smaller trees and vegetation along the boundary with the play area. The amenity of residents of Lupton Close should not be detrimentally affected by development close to the south boundary of the site.

Conclusion

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

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

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

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

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

Summary conclusion

With the exception of the buildings at the junction with Glasshouses lane, which form a gateway to the village, the B6165 benefits from open-ness. Recently the field opposite to the north has been planted with saplings. Development along the road here and of such a large site would be contrary to local distinctiveness. Development would cause harm to the setting of the conservation area, only very modest development away from the west and the vista from the green would mitigate the harm.

Settlement: Glasshouses**Site: GL1 (Land at Lupton Bank, Glasshouses)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

SACs/SPAs	North Pennine Moors SAC/SPA 1500m to the south
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	Guiselcliffe Wood 900m to the south
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)	Stoney Bank Wood 600m to south
BAP Priority Habitats	None
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Improved Pasture (P1HS 1992)
Trees and Hedges	Some screen planting to Stone Croft with another small area of planting to the rear. Scattered saplings along the roadside. There is a conifer plantation on the other side of the western boundary
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	None
Water/Wetland	A spring is marked on the map in the middle field
Slope and Aspect	The land slopes down southwards towards the river
Buildings and Structures	The site includes some stone dwellings and buildings at Stable Croft
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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “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	B6265 forms northern boundary of the site; broadly follows the parallel with the River Nidd in the valley bottom
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	There may be an opportunity to provide some linear semi-natural habitat along the road corridor to buffer the verges.
Protected Species	None known
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	This scale of development is unlikely to impact adversely on the SAC/SPA (unless in combination with other developments). There may be the opportunity to provide some habitat enhancement in association with landscaping in the corridor between the River Nidd and the B6265.

Settlement: Glasshouses

Site: GL1 (Land at Lupton Bank, Glasshouses)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments

Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.

According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed site is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred.

We are however, aware of longstanding flooding incidents in the immediate area due to capacity issues in local sewers, watercourses and overland ground water flows. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide. We have received significantly increased levels of complaints over recent years from concerned residents affected by, and threatened by flooding from these sources.

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 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). 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: Goldsborough**Site: GB1 (Land at Goldsborough)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site situated west of village off Station Road Goldsborough LCA67: Goldsborough and Ribston Park
Landscape description	Area description: The wider landscape comprises a moderate to large-scale area north of the River Nidd. The landform gently undulates as it rises gradually to the west. Land use is diverse with arable fields, woodland and parkland. Large cereal fields have hedgerow boundaries which are neglected and fragmented. Individual tree cover is sparse beyond the village edge and parkland Site description: The site comprises an irregular parcel of land between the cricket ground and the village edge. The land is divided by farm track to Cockstone Hill to the west with the field to the south used as a paddock and field to the north used for arable cropping. A PRoW is routed along the access track that heads in a north easterly direction towards the open countryside away from the village. The site is generally flat at an elevation of about 45m AOD. A low post and rail fence forms the boundary with cricket ground. A stone wall and trees defines the southern boundary. The site wraps around and continues beyond allotments at North End. There is a TPO'd avenue of trees partially within site along southern boundary.
Existing urban edge	The site, in the main, integrates well with the existing urban edge, development on the parcel of land to the north would however significantly encroach into open countryside.
Trees and hedges	Hedgerows and hedgerow trees define the site and field boundaries with the exception of the land to the north which is part of a large arable field
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open countryside HD3 – Adjoins Conservation Area R11 – Rights of Way TPO'd trees
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The loss of this group of fields adjacent to the urban edge and development of built form into the open countryside would affect the character of the Goldsborough and Ripon Park LCA and Goldsborough Conservation Area by removing a large arable component of the landscape and introducing an area of built form between the urban edge and the cricket ground
Visual Sensitivity	The site is contained by housing along two of its boundaries, and the cricket pitch with pavilion building and car park enclose the western edge. Large trees enclose the site to the south.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of agricultural land that provides an attractive rural setting to the village.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Retention of all hedgerows and hedgerow trees and reinstatement of field boundaries is critical. To strengthen the woodland setting of village, native woodland planting should be used to mitigate views of the village from the west.
Likely level of landscape effects	Medium to large-scale adverse landscape effects in this medium-scale landscape with a combination of attractive landscape features, such as hedgerows and woodland areas. Any new development would result in high adverse effects on the rural landscape character of the area without extensive and appropriate planting as landscape mitigation.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	GB3 to the east of Station Road

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

This is a large rectangular site that is important to the setting of Goldsborough Therefore changes to the key characteristics in this area would have some adverse impacts.
The landscape has limited capacity to accept the type of development proposed due to its scale and location

Settlement: Goldsborough**Site: GB1 (Land at Goldsborough)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Goldsborough Conservation Area. Village entrance gate piers (grade II listed).
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Victorian school building to south of gate piers, 4-5 traditional dwellings located to the east of the site.
Commentary on heritage assets.	The site is located outside but within the setting of the Goldsborough Conservation Area - it partially abuts its boundary on the north west corner. The site is located within the setting of the grade II listed gate piers located at the entrance to the west side of the village on west. This is a very significant structure in the conservation area (marked as a 'landmark' building in the conservation area appraisal document). The site is also within the setting of several non designated heritage assets - a Victorian school building to south of gate piers, on the south side of road and 4-5 traditional dwellings located to the east of the site, facing onto the west side of Station Road.
Topography and views	Views of site, looking east, in context with listed gate piers and heritage assets of Station Road beyond. Views of site in context with cricket ground and countryside beyond, to north / east. Land rises to the north of the track leading to Cockstone Farm. Land rises up towards the gate piers.
Landscape context	Rural village surrounded by countryside / fields with gentle hills.
Grain of surrounding development	Generally in village, linear development along two intersecting roads, plus some post war recent additions, sometimes in cul de sac layouts or as in Princess Mead, an additional road inserted running parallel with Station Road. Station Road – some dwellings set close to road and closely spaced, other newer dwelling set further back and in larger plots. Mostly detached but one or two rows (older properties).
Local building design	Older buildings on Station Road are very modestly scaled traditional cottages, brick or render and pantiles. Bungalows also present. Newer dwellings often in stone. Older buildings usually in brick. Former farmsteads present in village.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	Paddock area to south of farm track, crop field to north. Low post and rail fence to boundary with cricket ground. Stone wall and trees at south boundary (stone wall marked as important boundary in conservation area appraisal). Site wraps around and beyond allotments at north end. Land to south marked as important open area in conservation area appraisal. TPO avenue trees partially in site at south boundary.

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

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

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

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

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

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

Summary conclusion

Development would be harmful on the land to north of farm track due to the intrusion in to open countryside, exacerbated by high ground levels. High quality, very low density development on the land to the south of the track (as per former site RL102) could be acceptable if the scale of the dwellings is appropriate and in keeping with the traditional dwellings on Station Road. Also, if set well away from listed gate piers (consider a buffer zone at the south end of the site) and provision of appropriate landscaping to integrate the site into the countryside setting.

Settlement: Goldsborough**Site: GB1 (Land at Goldsborough)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

SACs/SPAs	None likely to be impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	None likely to be impacted
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likely to be impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerow
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Arable except central field of improved pasture
Trees and Hedges	There are a number of mature trees on the south eastern boundary (part of an avenue of limes protected by a TPO (01/1952 G5) and others in the SW bordering the tennis courts and domestic gardens. Hedgerow bordering site to the N along access track to Cockstone Farm and a newish hedge along the western boundary, north of the cricket pitch.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Significant trees benefit from TPO protection
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 67 Goldsborough and Ribston Park <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Strengthen existing woodland matrix to enhance character of the area and increase diversity of woodland age...” • “Native woodland planting can be used to integrate settlement with the wider landscape...” • “Hedgerow and tree management provide important elements to accentuate landform and increase diversity”
Connectivity/Corridors	To the east the site adjoins the back gardens of the village houses. To the west and north are mainly large scale arable fields (a large block to the immediate NW is in Countryside Stewardship), bound by the A59 and the river Nidd (Regionally important GI corridor) which separates the site from Knaresborough. To the south of the village is Goldsborough Park. The network of hedges is important in the context of this landscape and the avenue of trees to the south is a significant feature.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	All boundary trees and hedges should be retained and hedgerows should be reinforced with native tree planting. New boundary hedgerows should be created with field margins on the field-ward sides to compensate for loss of habitat for BAP bird species of arable farmland. There may be the opportunity to create a small SUDs wetland
Protected Species	Nesting birds likely to utilise hedgerows
BAP Priority Species	Potential for priority bird species of arable farmland
Invasive Species	None known
Notes	RL102 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	All boundary trees and hedges should be retained and hedgerows should be reinforced with native tree planting. New boundary hedgerows should be created with field margins on the field-ward sides to compensate for loss of habitat for BAP bird species of arable farmland. There may be the opportunity to create a small SUDs wetland.

Settlement: Goldsborough

Site: GB1 (Land at Goldsborough)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments

Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.

Whilst this site is situated just outside a drainage area administered by the Swale & Ure Internal Drainage Board, any surface water discharge could potentially flow directly or indirectly into the drainage board district. Consequently the drainage board should be consulted regarding any proposals to develop this site

According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed development is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred.

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

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

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

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

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

Conclusion

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

Rationale

Rating

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

Orange

Settlement: Goldsborough**Site: GB2 (Land at Low Farm, Goldsborough)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Low Farm east of village centre off Main Street Goldsborough LCA67: Goldsborough and Ribston Park
Landscape description	Area description: The wider landscape comprises a moderate to large-scale area north of the River Nidd. The landform gently undulates as it rises gradually to the west. Land use is diverse with arable fields, woodland and parkland. Large cereal fields have hedgerow boundaries which are often neglected and fragmented. Individual tree cover is sparse beyond the village edge and parkland Site description: The site comprises an irregular shaped area of land belonging formerly to Low Farm. The western part of the site is well vegetated with tree and scrub cover and is protected by a TPO. The remaining parts of the site are open with areas of hard standing of limited landscape value. The site gently rises from south east to north west with an average elevation of about 36m AOD
Existing urban edge	The site appears fairly well integrated at the village edge because of the abundance of tree, hedgerow cover and other built form.
Trees and hedges	Scattered trees along the roadside frontage and within western parts of the site which are the subject of a TPO.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open countryside HD3 – Within Conservation Area TPO'd trees
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The loss of this small area of rough pasture would not impact significantly on landscape character which is of high value but with medium susceptibility to change and therefore of medium physical sensitivity
Visual Sensitivity	The site lies near to the edge of the village, there are views from open countryside and the A59 to the north.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of rough area of grassland that provides an attractive rural setting to the village.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Retention of all existing trees and stone wall frontage. Native woodland planting should be used to mitigate views of the village from the north
Likely level of landscape effects	Medium to large-scale adverse landscape effects in this medium-scale landscape with a combination of attractive landscape features, such as hedgerows and woodland areas. Any new development would result in high adverse effects on the rural landscape character of the area without extensive planting as landscape mitigation.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	None

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

Rationale	Rating
Sensitivity Rating: Medium – key distinctive characteristics are susceptible to change, typically a medium valued landscape where; landscape condition may be fair with some existing reference or context to the type of development being proposed. Landscapes may have components that are not easily replicated/replaced and will have medium susceptibility to change.	Yellow
Capacity Rating: Medium/low – the area is not able to accommodate development of the scale and type proposed without detriment to landscape character and visual amenity and the opportunities for appropriate mitigation are limited.	Orange

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

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

Summary conclusion

This is a small irregular shaped site that is important to the setting of Goldsborough Therefore changes to the key characteristics in this area would have some adverse impacts.

The landscape has some capacity to accept the type of development proposed due to its small scale and location.

Settlement: Goldsborough**Site: GB2 (Land at Low Farm, Goldsborough)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Goldsborough Conservation Area. Low Farmhouse (grade II listed). St Mary's Church (grade II). Goldsborough Hall (II*) and associated buildings (grade II).
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Farm buildings associated with Low Farmhouse (see above) – unlikely to be able to be considered to be curtilage listed. The Beeches and a range of single storey outbuildings to the rear of The Beeches.
Commentary on heritage assets.	The character and appearance of the conservation area will be affected by development of the site, as will the setting of the listed Low Farmhouse (large house built of brick with pan tile roof and sash windows) - with associated farm buildings which are considered to have high significance as non-designated heritage assets because of their traditional form and importance of association with the listed farmhouse. Possible impact on the wider setting of the church and Goldsborough Hall as the site in on the edge of the settlement. The Beeches, to the west of the site, is a non-designated heritage asset of high significance, being a fine example of the local vernacular - a detached house built of brick with stone slate roof and sash windows. Set in a spacious site with attractive garden to the front. The range of single storey outbuildings is set well back from the road and provides some interest within the conservation area and setting of The Beeches.
Topography and views	Slight rise to north, rolling hills beyond to the north though views are not visible from the roadside due to the rise of the land. Edge of settlement position with only Low Farmhouse to the west.
Landscape context	There is a line of trees along the road frontage. Trees and hedgerows in the vicinity add to rural character. Three 'landmark' trees to north west boundary (as marked on the conservation area appraisal map).
Grain of surrounding development	Predominantly detached, two storey dwellings with some bungalows – to the north of the road, these have a road frontage (though The Beeches is set further back than others) and are located behind brick or stone boundary walls with coping stones. Generous spacing between dwellings. To the south of the road, two cul de sacs of modern buildings do not represent the historic grain of development, though are positioned in spacious plots.
Local building design	Predominantly detached dwellings that have a road frontage and are located behind brick or stone boundary walls.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	Stone boundary wall. Trees to rear and front boundaries. No buildings present – agricultural sheds associated with former farm use must have been demolished.

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 of the site should preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area, taking into account rural character and the setting of the surrounding heritage assets, particularly the adjacent, former farmstead associated with the grade II listed Low Farmhouse. Standard development form and density will not be acceptable - new buildings should be very low in number and be of high quality, locally distinctive design. Density should be such that rural character is maintained with generous spacing between dwellings. Development should comprise frontage properties, which are set back from the road. Trees and stone wall to front of site to be retained. The northern edge of any development would need to be softened by planting and good design and be designed so as to integrate into the adjoining countryside.

Settlement: Goldsborough**Site: GB2 (Land at Low Farm, Goldsborough)****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, woodland (adjacent)
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Ex-farm yard. Hard standing where 2 large agricultural sheds have been recently removed. Treed area with coarse grassland/tall ruderal to the west.
Trees and Hedges	Western part of the site is well vegetated with tree and scrub cover protected by TPO (01/1952 G11). There is an overgrown hedge behind the wall to the road frontage.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Trees on site are protected by a TPO
Water/Wetland	None
Slope and Aspect	35.00 AOD and falling gradually east towards Goldsborough Moor.
Buildings and Structures	Two elongated sheeted agricultural sheds orientated east to west have been recently removed. No buildings remaining. Stonewall and brick wall enclose the road frontage of 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 67 Goldsborough and Ribston Park <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Strengthen existing woodland matrix to enhance character of the area and increase diversity of woodland age...” • “Native woodland planting can be used to integrate settlement with the wider landscape...” • “Hedgerow and tree management provide important elements to accentuate landform and increase diversity”
Connectivity/Corridors	There is a line of trees along the road frontage. The trees and hedges connect those in the village with Goldsborough Park to the south and woodland at Goldsborough Moor to the east. In the wider landscape Ribstone Park is further south, and the River Nidd (Regionally important GI corridor) to the west and south.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Existing trees, shrubs and hedges should be retained. Opportunity to strengthen planting of native trees and shrubs to the west of the site
Protected Species	Nesting birds are likely to utilise the trees, scrub and hedgerow on site. Bats have been recorded at the adjacent site and may utilise the more mature trees to roost. There may be badgers in the vicinity
BAP Priority Species	Not known
Invasive Species	Not known
Notes	RL1046 (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 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	No objections to development on ecological grounds, providing existing trees, shrubs and hedges are be retained and planting is strengthened using native trees and shrubs to the west of the site.

Settlement: Goldsborough

Site: GB2 (Land at Low Farm, Goldsborough)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments

Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.

Whilst this site is situated just outside a drainage area administered by the Swale & Ure Internal Drainage Board, any surface water discharge could potentially 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.

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: Goldsborough**Site: GB3 (Land to the east of Station Road, Goldsborough)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site situated to the east of Station Road Goldsborough LCA67: Goldsborough and Ribston Park
Landscape description	Area description: The wider landscape comprises a moderate to large-scale area north of the River Nidd. The landform gently undulates as it rises gradually to the west. Land use is diverse with arable fields, woodland and parkland. Large cereal fields have hedgerow boundaries which are neglected and fragmented. Individual tree cover is sparse beyond the village edge and parkland Site description: The site comprises of a linear strip of land alongside the eastern boundary of Station Road between the the urban edge of Goldsborough extending north to the local cemetery. A hedgerow with hedgerow trees runs along the roadside boundary with an undefined field-side boundary. A PRow is routed diagonally through the site which is level at about 40m AOD
Existing urban edge	The site would extent built development along the highway into open countryside to the north.
Trees and hedges	Hedgerows and hedgerow trees define the site boundary along Station Road
Landscape and Green Belt designations	SG3 -Settlement Growth: Conservation of the Countryside including Green Belt R11 – Rights of Way TPO'd trees
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The loss of this strip of arable land significantly extending the urban edge of the settlement into the open countryside would affect the character of the Goldsborough and Ripon Park LCA by introducing a major component of built form into the landscape.
Visual Sensitivity	The site is highly visible within the open landscape to the north, east and west and from the PRow routed through the site
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of agricultural land that provides an attractive rural entrance/ setting to the village creating a sense of arrival.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Retention of frontage hedgerow and hedgerow trees and mitigation planting to filter views
Likely level of landscape effects	Medium to large scale adverse landscape affects in this medium-scale landscape with a combination of attractive landscape features, such as hedgerows and woodland areas. Any new development would result in high adverse effects on the rural landscape character of the area without extensive and appropriate planting as landscape mitigation.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	GB3 to the east of Station Road

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

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

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

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

Summary conclusion

This is a long linear site that is important to the setting of Goldsborough
Therefore changes to the key characteristics in this area would have
some adverse impacts.

The landscape has limited capacity to accept the type of development
proposed due to its scale, location and prominence in the landscape

Settlement: Goldsborough**Site: GB3 (Land to the east of Station Road, Goldsborough)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Goldsborough Conservation Area. Goldsborough Hall (grade II* St. Mary's Church (grade I).
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Traditional cottages on Station Road.
Commentary on heritage assets.	The site is located to the north of Goldsborough Conservation Area, therefore within its setting. Development on the site would also affect the wider setting of Goldsborough Hall and the church, due to the openness of the countryside surrounding the village in this location. The wider setting of historic buildings located on Station Road, which tend to be modestly scaled cottages, will be affected.
Topography and views	The conservation area appraisal sets out how there is an important view looking from Station Road, to the north of Princess Mead, to the south towards the centre of the village with Goldsborough Hall and the church in sight. It also states that the view is marred by this post war housing.
Landscape context	Open countryside, undulating hills, farmland with hedgerow and trees to boundaries.
Grain of surrounding development	Generally in village - linear development along two intersecting roads, plus some post war recent additions, sometimes in cul de sac layouts or in Princess Mead additional road inserted running parallel with Station Road. Station Road – some dwellings set close to road and closely spaced, other newer dwelling set further back and set in larger plots. Mostly detached but one or two rows (the older properties).
Local building design	Traditional buildings are in brick or render and pantiles. Bungalows also present. Newer dwellings often in stone. Older buildings usually in brick. Former farmsteads present.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The site is on the northern edge of the village, adjacent to the post war housing development of Princess Mead. The site is part of a field and therefore has no boundary to its eastern edge. Long and narrow, the site runs along Station Road, even narrower at its northern end where it meets a burial ground. Hedge, a few trees and verge to the road. Bungalows, allotments and a field are present on the other side of the road.

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

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

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

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

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

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

Summary conclusion

The site as proposed, is not appropriate for development, due to the way in which it encroaches into the open countryside, is extremely narrow at its northern end and would impede views of the village and heritage assets on approach to the village. An opportunity may be available to provide limited, low density development just to the north of Princess Mead as a means to soften this edge and better integrate the village with the rural context, but this should not extend much further north than the existing extent of development.

Settlement: Goldsborough**Site: GB3 (Land to the east of Station Road, Goldsborough)****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	Arable
Trees and Hedges	Row of trees alongside important hedgerow of locally scarce English Elm
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Roadside trees may merit TPO status
Water/Wetland	None
Slope and Aspect	Generally 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)	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
Connectivity/Corridors	Roadside hedgerows form an important element of connectivity through the surrounding large scale arable landscape
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Retention of the hedgerow may be difficult with the long thin site configuration proposed
Protected Species	Nesting birds, bats and terrestrial mammals may utilise trees and hedgerow
BAP Priority Species	Not known
Invasive Species	Not known
Notes	Surveyed by Lobo Ecology May 2015 15/03355/FULMAJ

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	It may prove difficult to safeguard the trees and hedgerow (including scarce English Elm) and associated protected species effectively into the future within such a narrow strip of land. It may more feasible to develop part of this field while conserving the biodiversity interest of the hedgerow within a less constrained narrow configuration of land.

Settlement: Goldsborough

Site: GB3 (Land to the east of Station Road, Goldsborough)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments

Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.

Whilst this site is situated just outside a drainage area administered by the Swale & Ure Internal Drainage Board, any surface water discharge could potentially 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.

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: Great Ouseburn**Site: GO2 (Land north of Branton Lane, Great Ouseburn)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site situated to the north of Branton Lane Great Ouseburn LCA92: Ouseburn Village and Vale Farmland
Landscape description	Area description: The wider landscape is low lying and flat and has a mixture of land management including patches of "wild Looking " wet pasture and woodland carr allowing only glimpses from the village into farmland beyond Site description: The site comprises of two fields one large (part) and one small, both in pastoral use situated to the west of Great Ouseburn. The site lies between Branton and Seggans Road, relatively flat at an elevation of 27mAOD and bordered by hedgerows. The hedgerow along Seggans Road is gappy and fenced in part by post and rail fencing. A staggered avenue of Lime trees runs either side of the footpath along Branton Road linking the hamlet of Branton Green with the village. The site adjoins the edge of Great Ouseburn CA from which has important views identified across the site.
Existing urban edge	There is housing development along the south and south east and eastern eastern boundary with remaining site edges mainly adjoining open countryside
Trees and hedges	Hedgerows predominantly form site and field boundaries. Avenue of Lime trees along Branton Lane
Landscape and Green Belt designations	SG3:Open countryside HD3: Adjoins Conservation Area TPO'd trees
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The site considered to be of high sensitivity with the site adjoining the village CA and likely impact on setting The value of the landscape is also high with historic TPO'd trees along the south west boundary of the site having local significance
Visual Sensitivity	The site is highly visible from the village CA and surrounding road network
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of an attractive pastoral setting to the village creating a rural sense of place on arrival when travelling from the west and north west
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	There is potential to plant woodland as mitigation at the northern end of the site but this would be out of character with the site's pastoral qualities and impact on setting
Likely level of landscape effects	Large scale adverse due to expansion of built development to the east and effect on CA
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	Adverse cumulative impacts could be encountered if site OC1 to the south west was also developed

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

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

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

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

Summary conclusion	Highly sensitive site due to proximity of CA, site's visual prominence and historic value of setting with regard to the avenue of Lime trees separating Branton Green from the village. Limited capacity for the landscape to accept development of this scale on this site
---------------------------	--

Settlement: Great Ouseburn**Site: GO2 (Land north of Branton Lane, Great Ouseburn)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Great Ouseburn Conservation Area and St Mary's Church, a grade II* listed building.
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Farmbuildings and houses near the site.
Commentary on heritage assets.	<p>The site is separated from the boundary of the conservation area by a grass verge on the area known as Green Hill. The conservation area appraisal shows the view across the site from this area as a key view. The appraisal also shows the farmbuildings southeast of the site and buildings on the corner of Carr Side Road as being of interest and merit. These and a number of houses, farmhouses and a few farmbuildings contribute to the character of the conservation area and are of interest in their own right, although not listed.</p> <p>The church is set on high land and views to it from the southeast and northeast of the village are important to sense of place. Development of buildings larger than traditional buildings would affect the setting of the church.</p> <p>The village remains strongly linked to its historical rural, pastoral surroundings.</p>
Topography and views	The site is relatively flat. Views out into the open countryside across the site provide links between the village and its surrounding landscape and agricultural heritage, adding to the rurality of its setting.
Landscape context	The site is opposite recent development west of Branton Lane, but visually separated from it by the avenue of lime trees. To the east side, the village hall and farmbuildings mark the end of the village. The site is at the edge of the village.
Grain of surrounding development	Most expansion has occurred at the north end of the village. The style, form and layout of this modern housing development does not reflect local tradition, rather it extends the village in an uncharacteristic way resulting in a discordant element in the village. Essentially Great Ouseburn is a linear village characterised by continuous frontages of the built form comprising informal groups of houses, terraces, cottages and former and existing agricultural buildings. Many properties have large rear gardens, driveways, passageways and spaces between buildings giving intriguing views into the countryside beyond the main street.
Local building design	Residential properties at the northern end of the village on the south side of Branton Lane and at the edge of the village along Carr Side Road are not characteristic of the locally distinctive properties that form the historic core. Traditionally buildings are of simple form. Most are of brick with pantiled roofs. Some buildings are rendered. They have low window to wall ratio. Detailing is unpretentious and consistent.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	A line of mature lime trees border the north side of Branton Lane, creating an attractive approach into the village. These trees are protected by an order. The site is known as Seggans Field contributes to an attractive ribbon of open countryside at the head of the village, which is important to the setting of the conservation area. The site is an open field beyond the confines of the village and beyond defined development limits.

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

The green open spaces and fields surrounding the conservation area make a special contribution to its rural qualities, aiding the transition from built form to open countryside. Seggans Field is integral to the character of the conservation area, development of the site would cause harm to this heritage asset. By causing harm to the settlement pattern of this rural village, development would impact detrimentally on local distinctiveness.

Settlement: Great Ouseburn**Site: GO2 (Land north of Branton Lane, Great Ouseburn)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

SACs/SPAs	None likely to be impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	Within about 400 meters of Upper Dunsforth Carrs Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) which is also a Yorkshire Wildlife Trust nature reserve
SSSI Risk Zone	NE require consultation on 'residential development of 100 units or more'. May be cumulative impact with other development sites in village
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	Ouse Gill Beck SINC is about 350m to south
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows, ponds, potential lowland meadow
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	FCPR November 2014
Sward	Species-poor semi-improved grassland plus some marshy grassland around ephemeral ponds
Trees and Hedges	Line of trees along Branton Lane; outgrown hedgerow along Seggans Lane; occasional hawthorns probably represent a remnant lost hedgerow
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Line of trees along Branton Lane benefits from TPO; boundary trees along Seggans Lane likely to merit TPO protection
Water/Wetland	A number of shallow temporary ponds occur on the site
Slope and Aspect	Generally flat in the south east falls towards Seggans Roads where it is gently undulating
Buildings and Structures	None on site
Natural Area	NCA 28 Vale of York
Environmental Opportunity	SE01 Managing, restoring and thickening hedgerows, as well as replacing and planting new hedgerow trees to create species-rich hedgerows... Restoring field ponds and other features such as ditches, dykes, small woodlands and shelterbelts, to ensure that they are being adequately managed for their contribution to the landscape and biodiversity. This will help to maximise their contribution to the permeability of the landscape and their role as stepping stones connecting larger areas of habitat.
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 92 Ouseburn Village and Vale Farmland <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •"Encourage maintenance of traditional field boundaries..." •"Wetland habitats are important to the area and their continued management is important to landscape character". • "The opportunity to create additional wetland habitats along the Ouseburn corridor would benefit wildlife links and contribute to the distinctive nature of the stream".
Connectivity/Corridors	The site forms a stepping stone of shallow and ephemeral wetland and marshy grassland between Upper Dunsforth Carrs SSSI with Ouse Gill Beck SINC, linked via a network of hedgerows
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Retain boundary trees and hedgerows and marshy grassland, possibly in association with Suds
Protected Species	Nesting birds and foraging bats are likely to utilise the boundary trees and hedgerows.
BAP Priority Species	Potential for priority species of ground-nesting birds. Amphibians likely to utilise the shallow pools on site
Invasive Species	Not known
Notes	14/01020/OUTMAJ Refused - 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 adverse effects on designated sites (Local Site, SSSI, LNR, the wider ecological network and/or priority habitats and species but appropriate siting/scale or substantial mitigation should enable development.	Orange
Summary conclusion	The site forms a stepping stone of shallow and ephemeral wetland and marshy grassland between Upper Dunsforth Carrs SSSI with Ouse Gill Beck SINC, linked via a network of hedgerows. This biodiversity value would require to be compensated for within green infrastructure provision of the site, possibly in association with Suds. This may impact on housing density achievable for this site,

Settlement: Great Ouseburn**Site: GO2 (Land north of Branton Lane, Great Ouseburn)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Land Drainage****Land Drainage Site Assessment****Land drainage: summary of issues.**

According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed site is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred.

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

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

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

Applicants would be expected to agree the outline drainage strategy with the LPA/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).

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: Great Ouseburn**Site: GO3 (Land at Branton Green, Great Ouseburn)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site situated at Branton Green Branton Lane Great Ouseburn LCA92: Ouseburn Village and Vale Farmland
Landscape description	Area description: The wider landscape is low lying and flat and has a mixture of land management including patches of "wild Looking " wet pasture and woodland carr allowing only glimpses from the village into farmland beyond Site description: The site comprises a small rectangular paddock surrounded by hedgerows and is relatively flat at an elevation of 27mAOD The hedgerow alongside the site's boundary with Branton Road is gappy in front of which is a grass verge and footpath with a staggered avenue of mature Lime trees running either side of the footpath.
Existing urban edge	Branton Close residential cul-de-sac lies to the west of the site with a single detached property set within a large garden to the east.
Trees and hedges	Hedgerow along all boundaries of the site.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	SG3:Open countryside TPO'd trees
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	This small site is considered to be of medium sensitivity adjoining a residential cul-de-sac to the west and single residential unit to east . TPO'd trees along the south west boundary of the site having local significance
Visual Sensitivity	The site is heavily filtered by surrounding vegetation and built form. Glimpse views would however be likely from Branton Lane with medium distance views possible from the important view identified in the Great Ouseburn CA.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of pastoral edge to Branton Green and coalescence of settlement with Great Ouseburn
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	There is potential to restrict development to frontage land and conserve viewline corridor through the site to the north from Great Ouseburn
Likely level of landscape effects	Medium scale adverse due to expansion of built development to the east of Branton Green
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	Adverse cumulative impacts could be encountered if site OC2 to the east was also developed

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

Rationale	Rating
Sensitivity Rating: 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	Medium sensitivity site due to its setting adjacent to a small hamlet in open countryside. Historic value of avenue of Lime trees and linkage with Great Ouseburn should also be taken into account. Limited capacity for the landscape to accept intensive development of this site. Some development along the site frontage with Branton Lane could be appropriate
---------------------------	---

Settlement: Great Ouseburn**Site: GO3 (Land at Branton Green, Great Ouseburn)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Great Ouseburn Conservation Area
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	None
Commentary on heritage assets.	Branton Green is at present a distinct settlement not far from Great Ouseburn. Development of the site would contribute to coalescence of the settlements thus impacting on the character and appearance of the conservation area. A key view of the conservation area is across Seggens Field in the direction of the rear of the site.
Topography and views	The site is relatively flat. Views out into the open countryside across the site provide links between the small settlement and its rural setting.
Landscape context	The site is between a close of houses and a single dwelling, which is at the edge of settlement.
Grain of surrounding development	The layout of the modern housing development next to the site does not reflect local grain, rather it extends the settlement in an uncharacteristic way resulting in a discordant element in this rural location. Otherwise, Branton Green is essentially a linear settlement characterised by a few groups of buildings and individual houses set along the lane. Many properties have large gardens, which together with gaps between buildings maintain the rural character.
Local building design	Traditionally buildings are of simple form. They are of brick with pantiled roofs. Some buildings are rendered. There is low window to wall ratio and detailing is unpretentious. Local to the site; the detached dwelling to one side is a relatively new house loosely based on the vernacular; houses in the close are simple in form, although constructed of brick, their large window to wall ratio is uncharacteristic of the area, and in front the extended rendered property forms an uncharacteristic landmark.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The trees at the front of the site should be preserved. The hedge to the field boundary is gappy and has been recently reduced in height. Any development should protect the amenity of existing residential properties adjacent to the site.

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

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

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

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

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

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

Summary conclusion	The development of the whole site would cause coalescence with the conservation area, and would extend an uncharacteristic development. The erection of a few houses well-spaced along the front could enhance the immediate area by screening inappropriate development whilst allowing views through to the open land beyond.
---------------------------	---

Settlement: Great Ouseburn**Site: GO3 (Land at Branton Green, Great Ouseburn)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

SACs/SPAs	None likely to be impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	Upper Dunsforth Carrs is about 260m to north east
SSSI Risk Zone	NE require consultation on 'residential development of 100 units or more'. May be cumulative impact with other development sites in village
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	Ouse Gill Beck is about 350m to south
BAP Priority Habitats	hedgerows
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	none (Wold Ecology Survey Feb. 2016)
Sward	species-poor semi-improved pasture (P1HS 1992) now appears overgrown and neglected - tall ruderal grassland
Trees and Hedges	Hedgerows with trees along northern and eastern and roadside boundaries.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	boundary trees may merit TPOs
Water/Wetland	pond 150m to west
Slope and Aspect	generally flat
Buildings and Structures	none
Natural Area	NCA 30 Southern Magnesian Grassland (borders Vale of York to NE)
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 92 Ouseburn Village and Vale Farmland <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •"Encourage maintenance of traditional field boundaries..." •"Wetland habitats are important to the area and their continued management is important to landscape character". • "The opportunity to create additional wetland habitats along the Ouseburn corridor would benefit wildlife links and contribute to the distinctive nature of the stream".
Connectivity/Corridors	Site may be a stepping stone linking SSSI to north with SINC to south
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Small site offers limited opportunities for enhancement
Protected Species	Tress and hedgerows likely to utilised by nesting birds and bats; some potential for amphibian terrestrial habitat
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 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	Small site with tall ruderal vegetaqtion which may act as a stepping stone between semi-natural habitats in the landscape; mitigation should include reinforcement of site boundary vegetation. Potential for presence of protected species. Full ecological survey required.
---------------------------	---

Settlement: Great Ouseburn**Site: GO3 (Land at Branton Green, Great Ouseburn)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Land Drainage****Land Drainage Site Assessment****Land drainage: summary of issues.**

According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed site is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred.

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

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

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

Applicants would be expected to agree the outline drainage strategy with the LPA/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.

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: Green Hammerton**Site: GH2 (Land at New Lane, Green Hammerton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site located on the north east side of the village between property on Meadow Vale and Yule Lane. LCA96: Green Hammerton Low lying farmland
Landscape description	Area description: large scale landscape of large arable fields that includes Green Hammerton on its western edge where smaller scale strip fields with hedgerow boundaries are important to the setting of the village. Site description: small field bound by hedges adjacent modern housing. Original field pattern lost.
Existing urban edge	Late 20th century development has impacted on the urban hedge resulting in a line of built development with mixed garden boundary treatments.
Trees and hedges	Hedgerow boundary to north east and south. Few hedgerow trees.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open countryside.
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ houses per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	Small field contributes to the setting of the village. However although valued the susceptibility of the landscape to change as a result of its loss is lower than for adjacent strip fields.
Visual Sensitivity	Not widely visible in the landscape but can be viewed from the conservation area and neighbouring property which are valued views with susceptibility to change.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of field will affect setting of the village. However similar fields adjacent and strip fields to the north of the site not affected.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Potential to improve the urban edge with appropriate boundary treatment and inclusion of large native trees to soften the urban edge in this rural location.
Likely level of landscape effects	Medium scale adverse
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	GH3 and GH7 adjacent to the north of the site. Cumulative effects large scale adverse effects if all sites developed.

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

Rationale	Rating
Sensitivity Rating: Medium – key distinctive characteristics are susceptible to change, typically a medium valued landscape where; landscape condition may be fair with some existing reference or context to the type of development being proposed. Landscapes may have components that are not easily replicated/replaced and will have medium susceptibility to change.	Yellow
Capacity Rating: 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 landscape has some capacity to accept the development of this field with appropriate mitigation.
---------------------------	--

Settlement: Green Hammerton**Site: GH2 (Land at New Lane, Green Hammerton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Green Hammerton Conservation Area.
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Various historic buildings located along Back Lane.
Commentary on heritage assets.	The site is located in the setting of the conservation area (on its east side) and there may be a possible impact on the wider setting of the various historic buildings located along Back Lane.
Topography and views	Significant views looking eastwards across site, with countryside visible in the distance when looking eastwards along Meadow Vale. Views looking north from New Lane. Views looking back, westwards, towards village with rural context distinct from hard edge formed by Meadow Vale. Land rises to east and north / undulating level.
Landscape context	Green Hammerton is situated on the boundary between rolling hills and the lower levels of Vale of York.
Grain of surrounding development	The field has an association with the adjoining narrow strip fields to the north and in turn (it all being part of an historic field pattern), this land has an association with Back Lane – this was historically used as an access to the rear of the properties facing onto The Green where their farm buildings were located. Such buildings have since been converted to dwellings and the lane is characterised by these brick buildings and other traditional buildings, mainly small cottages (mostly in brick, limited use of render). Many buildings face directly onto the road. The post war housing development of Meadow Vale has been inserted into the area located to the west of this site, accessed from Back Lane (development set around a green, two storey brick houses and bungalows). Historically, Green Hammerton is a village of linear form but 20th century development has occurred to the south of the village which is contrary to that grain.
Local building design	Traditionally dwellings are two-storey in local brick and have pantiled roofs.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	This site is a field located on the eastern edge of the village, to the east of Meadow Vale housing development (post / rail fence and hedge to boundary). It has an association with the strip fields immediately to its north. To the south, the boundary is formed by New Lane (hedge and verge), with more 20th century housing located to its south. Trees present on / near east boundary.

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

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

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

Rationale	Rating
Development is likely to 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	At standard housing densities, development would further harm the rural setting of the conservation area; however, it is possible that some, low density housing could help provide an improved edge to the village, with appropriate landscaping in order to aid integration with the countryside.
---------------------------	---

Settlement: Green Hammerton**Site: GH2 (Land at New Lane, Green Hammerton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

SACs/SPAs	None likely to be impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	None likely to be impacted
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likely to be impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Improved Pasture (P1HS 1992)
Trees and Hedges	Site bounded by hedgerows with occasional trees, especially along Yule Lane
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature Trees should be considered for TPOs
Water/Wetland	None
Slope and Aspect	Generally flat
Buildings and Structures	None
Natural Area	NCA 30 Southern Magnesian Limestone
Environmental Opportunity	SEO 2: Protect and manage existing semi-natural habitats, including grasslands, wetlands and woodlands; and increase the area of semi-natural habitats, restore and create new areas, and create networks and links between habitats, to make their ecology more resilient and to afford increased movement of species.
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 96 Green Hammerton Low-Lying Farmland "Encourage the maintenance, management and repair of hedgerows...and reintroduction of hedgerow trees" "Promote woodland management..." "Promote appropriate habitat creation..."
Connectivity/Corridors	The network of smaller 'strip' fields with hedges to the east of the village forms a valuable resource in the context of surrounding larger scale arable fields.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Nesting birds probably utilise the trees and hedges. Bats may use some of the mature boundary trees as a roost-sites.
Protected Species	Nesting birds probably utilise the trees and hedges. Bats may use some of the mature boundary trees as roosts. GCN pond 900m to east
BAP Priority Species	Not known - some potential for ground-nesting birds, brown hare
Invasive Species	Not known
Notes	RL3002 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	Boundary hedgerows and trees should be retained and reinforced with new native tree planting. Green infrastructure should be enhanced, especially to south and eastern boundaries. Some potential for protected species; ecological survey required.

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.

According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed development is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred.

We are however, aware of flooding incidents in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide.

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.

Whilst this proposed development is situated just outside drainage areas administered by the Swale & Ure Internal Drainage Board to the south east of the site, and the Marston Moor Internal Drainage Board to the east. Any surface water drainage strategy is likely to affect the watercourses within a board district. Consequently, the internal drainage boards should be consulted regarding any development proposals.

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

Conclusion

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

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

Settlement: Green Hammerton**Site: GH3 (Land between Back Lane and Yule Lane, Green Hammerton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	The site is located on the east side of Green Hammerton. LCA96: Green Hammerton Low Lying Farmland
Landscape description	Area description: large scale landscape of large arable fields that includes Green Hammerton on its western edge where smaller scale strip fields with hedgerow boundaries are important to the setting of the village. Site description: Small strip field with hedgerow boundaries.
Existing urban edge	Conservation area with back lane development comprising mix of farm buildings, barn conversions and infill development. Small post war housing estate to the south boundary.
Trees and hedges	Hedgerow boundaries with few trees.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open countryside. Conservation area to west boundary.
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	Strip fields are important to the setting of the village and their loss will impact upon the setting of the conservation area.
Visual Sensitivity	Not widely visible from the surrounding landscape but openness of the site is apparent from the conservation area and adjacent residential property.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of strip field to high density housing.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Limited as strip fields are rare and not replaceable.
Likely level of landscape effects	Large scale adverse due to uncharacteristic development and loss of historic field pattern.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	GH7 to the north and GH2 to the south development in combination with either of these sites would result in adverse cumulative effects.

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

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

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

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

Summary conclusion	High sensitivity due to the historic context of the field system, the setting of the conservation area and the fact that development would extend into the countryside. There is little scope to mitigate the loss of historic field pattern in this rural location.
---------------------------	--

Settlement: Green Hammerton**Site: GH3 (Land between Back Lane and Yule Lane, Green Hammerton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Green Hammerton Conservation Area .
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Traditional cottages / former farm buildings located along Back Lane
Commentary on heritage assets.	The site abuts the eastern boundary of the conservation area and therefore the setting of the conservation area may be affected. The site can be said to be within the setting of the non-designated heritage assets present on Back Lane.
Topography and views	Significant views looking eastwards across site, with countryside visible in the distance. Views along Back Lane, where hedgerow and lack of development distinguishes village development from the rural context. Land generally rises to the east
Landscape context	Green Hammerton is situated on the boundary between rolling hills and the lower levels of Vale of York.
Grain of surrounding development	Back Lane was historically used as an access to the rear of the properties facing onto The Green where their farm buildings were located. Such buildings have since been converted to dwellings and the lane is characterised by these brick buildings and other traditional buildings, mainly small cottages (mostly in brick, limited use of render). Many buildings face directly onto the road. To the east (where the proposal site/s are located), is farmland in the form of narrow strip fields. The post war housing development of Meadow Vale has been inserted into the southern-most of these fields, backing onto New Lane (development set around a green, two storey brick houses and bungalows). Historically, Green Hammerton is a village of linear form.
Local building design	Brick prevails in this area but with occasional render seen. Mix of houses, cottages and farm buildings (which are often converted).
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	This site is one of a network of historic, grassland strip fields that surround the village. Field is at higher level than road. Hedge and verge to roadside (noted as significant and historic in the conservation area appraisal). Hedgerow between fields to north and south, occasional tree in hedgerow (some marked as important in the appraisal). Conservation area appraisal marks Yule Lane (forming as part of the strategic pedestrian routes of the village).

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 field would be against the linear form of the conservation area / village. The fields form a very important part of the rural setting of the conservation area and development would harm this setting and also the setting of the heritage assets along Back Lane. This would be exacerbated by the rise of the land on the edge of the village. There would be a harmful impact on the hedgerows and the way in which they relate to the historic field pattern. Need to consider implications of proposals for neighbouring fields – GH1 / GH7 / GH3 / GH2, all located on this eastern edge of the conservation area and village.

Settlement: Green Hammerton**Site: GH3 (Land between Back Lane and Yule Lane, Green Hammerton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

SACs/SPAs	None likely to be impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	None likely to be impacted
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likely to be impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Improved Pasture (P1HS 1992)
Trees and Hedges	Site bounded by hedgerows with several mature trees, especially along Yule Lane
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature Trees should be considered for TPOs
Water/Wetland	None
Slope and Aspect	Generally flat
Buildings and Structures	None
Natural Area	NCA 30 Southern Magnesian Limestone
Environmental Opportunity	SEO 2: Protect and manage existing semi-natural habitats, including grasslands, wetlands and woodlands; and increase the area of semi-natural habitats, restore and create new areas, and create networks and links between habitats, to make their ecology more resilient and to afford increased movement of species.
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 96 Green Hammerton Low-Lying Farmland "Encourage the maintenance, management and repair of hedgerows...and reintroduction of hedgerow trees" "Promote woodland management..." "Promote appropriate habitat creation..."
Connectivity/Corridors	The network of smaller 'strip' fields with hedges to the east of the village forms a valuable resource in the context of surrounding larger scale arable fields.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Restoration of boundary hedgerows with trees
Protected Species	Nesting birds probably utilise the trees and hedges. Bats may use some of the mature boundary trees as a roost-sites.
BAP Priority Species	Not known - some potential for ground-nesting birds, brown hare. GCN pond 900m to east
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 hedgerows and trees should be protected, retained and reinforced with new native tree planting. Green infrastructure should be enhanced, especially along Yule Lane. Some potential for protected species; ecological survey required.

Settlement: Green Hammerton**Site: GH3 (Land between Back Lane and Yule Lane, Green Hammerton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Land Drainage****Land Drainage Site Assessment****Land drainage: summary of issues.**

According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed development is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred.

We are however, aware of flooding incidents in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide.

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.

Whilst this proposed development is situated just outside drainage areas administered by the Swale & Ure Internal Drainage Board to the south east of the site, and the Marston Moor Internal Drainage Board to the east. Any surface water drainage strategy is likely to affect the watercourses within a board district. Consequently, the internal drainage boards should be consulted regarding any development proposals.

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

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

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

Settlement: Green Hammerton**Site: GH4 (Land to the east of Bernard Lane, Green Hammerton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site located on the south side of the village east of Bernard Lane. LCA95: Intensive arable farmland next to boundary with LCA96.
Landscape description	Area description: The wider landscape is moderate to large scale where the settlements are well wooded and intimate, edged with small grassland fields managed for horses and grazing. In contrast the surrounding farmland is more open due to lack of woodland and the large scale arable field pattern. Site description: The site consists of a small triangular field, which is currently overgrown and contains no buildings. Existing hedgerows and hedgerow trees may be of potential ecological interest.
Existing urban edge	South side of Green Hammerton comprises a mix of 20th century housing. Conservation area borders north east corner of the site. The site is semi-rural in character and appearance and is fairly detached from the urban edge by the abundance of hedgerows.
Trees and hedges	Overgrown hedgerow on Bernard Lane and trees on east boundary TPO'd
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open countryside Two TPOs
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The embankment to the A59 lies to the south of the site and is planted with dense native trees and shrubs designed to reduce the impacts of the by-pass when it was constructed. A TPO covers a number of trees growing along part of the site's eastern boundary adjacent to 31,33 and 35 St Thomas Way.
Visual Sensitivity	This is a greenfield site that lies outside the existing development limit but the site is well contained and enclosed due to the high embankment of the A59 and surrounding hedgerows.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of a grassland field at the village edge. However, there are noise impacts from the A59 Bypass.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Bernard Lane bounds the site to the northwest and is rural in character with tall hedgerows to both sides. Beyond the lane there are open agricultural fields. All boundary planting and TPO trees should be retained to ensure the site remains concealed from all directions particularly from the northwest. Any development must respect the proximity to the Conservation Area.
Likely level of landscape effects	Small scale landscape effects due to the loss of a small field that is not typical of the area or the village setting in this location.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	H5 is located on the opposite side of Bernard Lane and there are potential cumulative effects if both developments go ahead. Ideally proposals should respect one another.

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 – 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 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 area has high capacity to accept development at this site without detriment to the surrounding landscape.
---------------------------	---

Settlement: Green Hammerton**Site: GH4 (Land to the east of Bernard Lane, Green Hammerton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Green Hammerton Conservation Area and St Thomas' Church, a grade II listed building.
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Green Hammerton School and historic houses at the corner of Bernard Lane.
Commentary on heritage assets.	The conservation area is against the northeastern part of the site, and at this point is important open space next to the school, which is a building of interest and merit. The church is a landmark, although not very tall, it is of particular architectural interest as designed by Sir Gilbert Scott. The rural character of the conservation area contributes to its significance. The site does not impact on key views, but none the less development will be seen from the conservation area and would impact on the character of the important open space. Development would have some impact on the setting of the church and school, the setting of both is somewhat compromised by the single storey buildings west of the older school building. Development would have little impact on the setting of the historic houses on the corner of Bernard Lane.
Topography and views	The village is relatively flat, but here land gently rises to the southwest. Views from the site are limited by trees and high hedges, but development would not be fully screened by the trees.
Landscape context	The site is at the edge of the village.
Grain of surrounding development	The village developed linearly along the roads and green, and most houses are detached, although short rows and a few terraces are seen in the village. Housing on Bernard Lane reflects that pattern, here detached houses are set behind enclosed front gardens. St Thomas's Way is a cul-de-sac, houses are set very close together behind small front gardens, most homes are detached.
Local building design	The majority of houses are two storey, dormers are not common. The older houses of the village have greater frontage width than depth, roofs are simple dual pitched roofs and most are covered in pantiles. There are a number of houses that are finished in slate and generally the pitches are a little lower. Although rare, stone slate can be seen. The houses are of brick, many are rendered. Window to wall ratios are low, and the majority of houses have vertical sliding sash windows. Outbuildings are single storey and have pantiled roofs, their walls are of brick and field cobble. Later houses do not all have the same general proportions as the older buildings, some introduce greater complexity of form and there is a greater palette of roofing materials, although on the whole they blend with the natural materials of the older roofs.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	There are protected trees on the northwestern boundary and to the boundary with the rear gardens of St Thomas' Way. The southern boundary is against a layby to the A59, which is screened by 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 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 the site would impact on the quality of the important open space next to the church and school, mitigation would include having space adjacent and low buildings in the area next to open space. The trees and the constraints of the Conservation Area would prevent development that would fully reflect local grain.

Settlement: Green Hammerton**Site: GH4 (Land to the east of Bernard Lane, Green Hammerton)****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, Woodland
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	TN 1 - mature oak on Bernard Lane (Brooks Ecology report 2015)
Sward	Tall ruderal and semi-improved neutral grassland in site interior
Trees and Hedges	Boundary woodland screen to south; treed hedgerows to western, northern and eastern boundaries; areas of scrub have developed inwards from the boundaries
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Any mature boundary trees not already covered may merit TPO protection
Water/Wetland	None on site
Slope and Aspect	Generally 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 95: Whixley Arable Farmland: “Tree planting around villages can help to define development limits...” • “This area has no designated sites for nature conservation. Encourage creation of wildlife corridors to improve diversity and enhance landscape pattern between settlements”.
Connectivity/Corridors	Roadside hedges and verges together with field hedges provide some linear connectivity through the landscape linking into the network of surrounding fields, village gardens and the verges of the A59 corridor
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Retain boundary hedgerows and mature trees; retain elements of scrub, grassland and wildflowers
Protected Species	Nesting birds likely to utilise trees and hedgerows and bats may use them for commuting/foraging
BAP Priority Species	Not known
Invasive Species	None known
Notes	Current application 15/04468/FULMAJ Erection of 18 dwellings - 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 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	Retain boundary hedgerows and mature trees, especially the mature oak along Bernard Lane; retain elements of scrub, grassland and wildflowers for wildlife including nesting birds and pollinators.
---------------------------	---

Settlement: Green Hammerton**Site: GH5 (Land to the north of Bernard Lane, Green Hammerton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site is located on the rural edge, southwest of the village centre and opposite the recreation ground. LCA95: Whixley Arable Farmland
Landscape description	Area description: The wider landscape is moderate to large scale where the settlements are well wooded and intimate, edged with small grassland fields managed for horses and grazing. In contrast the surrounding farmland is more open due to lack of woodland and the large scale arable field pattern. Site description: Fields with hedgerow boundaries along with two residential properties in the central part of the site.
Existing urban edge	The site is semi-rural in character and appearance and is fairly detached from the urban edge by the abundance of hedgerows. The fields to the west are intensively managed and some of the hedgerows are heavily trimmed giving a manicured appearance to the area.
Trees and hedges	Hedgerow to the north boundary is particularly important. Structure planting on the road verges to the south and west also make an important contribution.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open Countryside Adjoins Conservation Area Individual TPO at West Field in the middle of the site and several TPOs of boundary with gardens to the east. Adjoins existing recreation open space to the north.
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The fields contribute to the agricultural landscape at the rural edge. However the landscape is not particularly sensitive to their loss as they are separated from arable fields by roads, roadside planting and the recreation ground with associated village hall.
Visual Sensitivity	Relatively flat site. The site is well contained and enclosed due to the high embankment of the A59 and surrounding hedgerows. However, the western part of the site occupies an elevated position at the edge of the village with exposed views from the north, south and west. There are views as far as Whixley village
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of grassland fields at the village edge. There are noise impacts from the A59 by-pass. Development would result in the loss of agricultural lane.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Bernard Lane is on the east boundary of the site and is rural in character with tall hedgerows to both sides. All hedgerows and TPO trees should be retained. Any development must respect the proximity to the Conservation Area. The provision of large trees in and amongst the houses would also be essential in providing a rural setting to the village and breaking up the mass of any development.
Likely level of landscape effects	There would be large scale adverse effects, especially if the southern half of the site were densely developed. However with adequate woodland planting and trees in and amongst the housing the negative visual effects could be reduced to moderate.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	Development of this site in conjunction with H4 would not result in significant 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 – 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 landscape has some capacity to accept development on this site providing mitigation measures are integrated to ensure significant green infrastructure within the development.

Settlement: Green Hammerton**Site: GH5 (Land to the north of Bernard Lane, Green Hammerton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Green Hammerton Conservation Area, St Thomas's Church and High Farmhouse, which are grade II listed buildings.
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Green Hammerton School and important open space to its west. The field boundaries to the north and west are noted as boundaries important to the conservation area.
Commentary on heritage assets.	The conservation area is against the lower part of the site, and at this point is important open space next to the school, which is a building of interest and merit. The church is a landmark, although not very tall, it is of particular architectural interest as designed by Sir Gilbert Scott. The northernmost part of the site is close to the boundary of the conservation area on Harrogate Road. The rural character of the conservation area contributes to its significance. The site does not impact on key views, but none the less development will be seen from the conservation area and would impact on the character of the important open space. Development would impact on the setting of the church and school, and to a lesser extent High Farmhouse.
Topography and views	The site is relatively flat, beyond land rises northwest to Whitley Bank and southwest to Coney Garth Hill. Views out of the conservation area through the open space should be protected. Development should enhance views into the conservation area. Views out are limited by hedgerows.
Landscape context	The site is at the edge of the village.
Grain of surrounding development	The village developed linearly along the roads and green, and most houses are detached, although short rows and a few terraces are seen in the village. Housing on Bernard Lane reflects that pattern, here detached houses are set behind enclosed front gardens. St Thomas's Way is a cul-de-sac, houses are set very close together behind small front gardens and most homes are detached. Stoneleigh Court is of similar grain although houses are larger and slightly better spaced.
Local building design	The majority of houses are two storey, dormers are not common. The older houses of the village have greater frontage width than depth, roofs are simple dual pitched roofs and most are covered in pantiles. There are a number of houses that are finished in slate and generally the pitches are a little lower. Although rare, stone slate can be seen. The houses are of brick, many are rendered. Window to wall ratios are low, and the majority of houses have vertical sliding sash windows. Outbuildings are single storey and have pantiled roofs, their walls are of brick and field cobble. Later houses do not all have the same general proportions as the older buildings, some introduce greater complexity of form and there is a greater palette of roofing materials, although on the whole they blend with the natural materials of the older roofs.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	There are protected trees in the southern part of the site on the Bernard Lane boundary and to the boundary with the rear gardens of St Thomas' Way. The southern boundary is against a layby to the A59, which is screened by trees. There are a number of large trees along the boundary with Stoneleigh Court, and trees along the northern side of Bernard Lane. The two fields have hedgerow boundaries. At the entrance to the northern field is a bungalow and further back is a twentieth century house. Neither of the dwellings would be considered to be non-designated heritage assets. Whilst it would be sustainable to re-use them, there would be no objection to demolition. There are small trees along the drive to the house 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 of the site would impact on the quality of the important open space next to the church and school, mitigation would include having space adjacent and low buildings in the area next to open space. The trees and the constraints of the Conservation Area would prevent development that would fully reflect local grain on the southern field. Careful design of the northern field would mitigate the impact of further development to the edge of this village	

Settlement: Green Hammerton**Site: GH5 (Land to the north of Bernard Lane, Green Hammerton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Land Drainage****Land Drainage Site Assessment****Land drainage: summary of issues.**

According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed development is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred.

We are however, aware of flooding incidents in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide.

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.

Whilst this proposed development is situated just outside drainage areas administered by the Swale & Ure Internal Drainage Board to the south east of the site, and the Marston Moor Internal Drainage Board to the east. Any surface water drainage strategy is likely to affect the watercourses within a board district. Consequently, the internal drainage boards should be consulted regarding any development proposals.

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

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

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

Settlement: Green Hammerton**Site: GH6 (Land north of York Road and south of New Lane, Green Hammerton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site located on the east end of Green Hammerton on the north side of the A59. LCA96: Green Hammerton Low Lying Farmland
Landscape description	Area description: large scale landscape of large arable fields that includes Green Hammerton on its western edge where smaller scale strip fields with hedgerow boundaries are important to the setting of the village. Site description: Medium scale arable field with hedgerow boundary.
Existing urban edge	Modern housing on the eastern boundary of Green Hammerton is prominent on the skyline with occasional trees helping to break up the appearance of built form in this rural setting.
Trees and hedges	Hedgerow boundaries to the field. Trees at the junction into Green Hammerton.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open countryside
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	Agricultural field is characteristic of the area and the landscape has some susceptibility to its loss to built development.
Visual Sensitivity	The field rises gently to the west to the boundary with Green Hammerton and is prominent in views from the A59 and the west.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of agricultural field to uncharacteristic development in a highly visible location.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Potential for mitigation in the short and medium term is limited due to the highly visible nature of the site and the uncharacteristic nature of the development proposals.
Likely level of landscape effects	Large scale adverse due to the scale of the development in relation to the existing settlement and the highly visible nature of the site.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	GH2 located to the north west of the site and GH8 located to the south of the site. Cumulative effects would be adverse.

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	Limited capacity of the landscape to accept development on this site due to density of proposed development on rising land and the limited opportunity for mitigation.
---------------------------	--

Settlement: Green Hammerton**Site: GH6 (Land north of York Road and south of New Lane, Green Hammerton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Green Hammerton Conservation Area
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	None
Commentary on heritage assets.	The site is outside the conservation area, development would impact of views to the southeast from Back Lane and development would impact on the approach to this historic settlement
Topography and views	The site falls generally to the east. Views are available from the site to open countryside.
Landscape context	The site is at the edge of the settlement.
Grain of surrounding development	The village developed linearly along the roads and green, and most houses are detached, although short rows and a few terraces are seen in the core of the village. Local to the site most houses are semi-detached and to the northern end west of the site is a short cul-de-sac of semi-detached homes with the entrance pair set at an angle unlike other houses of the village, which are parallel to the roads. Off York Road to the west of the site are larger detached houses on a private drive.
Local building design	The majority of houses are two storey, dormers are not common. The older houses of the village have greater frontage width than depth, roofs are simple dual pitched roofs and most are covered in pantiles. There are a number of houses that are finished in slate and generally the pitches are a little lower. Although rare, stone slate can be seen. The houses are of brick, many are rendered. Window to wall ratios are low, and the majority of houses have vertical sliding sash windows. Outbuildings are single storey and have pantiled roofs, their walls are of brick and field cobble. Later houses do not all have the same general proportions as the older buildings, some introduce greater complexity of form and there is a greater palette of roofing materials, although on the whole they blend with the natural materials of the older roofs.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The field boundaries are hedges, there is a group of trees just outside the southwest corner of the site and a tree at the southeast corner.

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	If development were so modest in scale that it had minimal impact on the views from back lane, its impact on the setting of the conservation area would be mitigated. Development density would have to be very low at the east side, and modest generally to mitigate the impact of development on the edge of this rural village to ensure minimal harm to local distinctiveness.
---------------------------	--

Settlement: Green Hammerton**Site: GH6 (Land north of York Road and south of New Lane, Green Hammerton)****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	Large arable field (rape/wheat)
Trees and Hedges	Boundary hedges around site, occasional small trees
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Trees on junction of A59 with York Road may merit TPO protection
Water/Wetland	None
Slope and Aspect	Field centred on rounded gentle dome of Green Hill
Buildings and Structures	None
Natural Area	NCA 30 Southern Magnesian Limestone
Environmental Opportunity	SEO 2: Protect and manage existing semi-natural habitats, including grasslands, wetlands and woodlands; and increase the area of semi-natural habitats, restore and create new areas, and create networks and links between habitats, to make their ecology more resilient and to afford increased movement of species.
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 96 Green Hammerton Low-Lying Farmland "Encourage the maintenance, management and repair of hedgerows...and reintroduction of hedgerow trees" "Promote woodland management..." "Promote appropriate habitat creation..."
Connectivity/Corridors	Boundary hedgerows and verges provide some connectivity through the large-scale arable landscape
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Enhance boundary hedgerows with native shrub and tree planting, Arable strip should be established on far side of eastern boundary hedge. hance
Protected Species	Nesting birds likely to utilise boundary hedges; GCN occur at Helenfield within 500m to the NE of the site,
BAP Priority Species	Some potential for BAP priority species of birds of arable farmland and brown hare
Invasive Species	None known
Notes	part of GH 12

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 hedges should be retained and enhanced with new native tree and shrub planting. Provision of arable field margins could help compensate for any loss of priority arable species or habitat. Consideration should be given to the creation of a Suds wetland as part of green infrastructure provision.
---------------------------	---

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.

According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed development is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred.

We are however, aware of flooding incidents in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide.

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.

Whilst this proposed development is situated just outside drainage areas administered by the Swale & Ure Internal Drainage Board to the south east of the site, and the Marston Moor Internal Drainage Board to the east. Any surface water drainage strategy is likely to affect the watercourses within a board district. Consequently, the internal drainage boards should be consulted regarding any development proposals.

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

Conclusion

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

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

Settlement: Green Hammerton**Site: GH7 (Land off Back Lane and Yule Lane, Green Hammerton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	The site is located on the east side of Green Hammerton. LCA96: Green Hammerton Low Lying Farmland
Landscape description	Area description: large scale landscape of large arable fields that includes Green Hammerton on its western edge where smaller scale strip fields with hedgerow boundaries are important to the setting of the village. Site description: Small strip field with hedgerow boundaries.
Existing urban edge	Conservation area with back lane development comprising mix of farm buildings, barn conversions and infill development. Small post war housing estate a field away (GH3) to the south.
Trees and hedges	Hedgerow boundaries with few trees.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open countryside. Conservation area to west boundary.
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	Strip fields are important to the setting of the village and their loss will impact upon the setting of the conservation area.
Visual Sensitivity	Not widely visible from the surrounding landscape but openness of the site is apparant from the conservation area and adjacent residential property.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of strip field to high density housing that would be slightly separate from existing development (unless developed alongside GH3)
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Limited as strip fields are rare and not replaceable.
Likely level of landscape effects	Large scale adverse due to uncharacteristic development and loss of historic field pattern.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	GH3 to the south developed in conjunction with this site would provide a link between new and existing built form but would result in further loss of historic field pattern.

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 the historic context of the field system, the setting of the conservation area and the fact that development would extend into the countryside. There is little scope to mitigate the loss of historic field pattern in this rural location.
---------------------------	---

Settlement: Green Hammerton**Site: GH7 (Land off Back Lane and Yule Lane, Green Hammerton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Green Hammerton Conservation Area .
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Traditional cottages / former farm buildings located along Back Lane.
Commentary on heritage assets.	The site abuts the eastern boundary of the conservation area and therefore the setting of the conservation area may be affected. The site can be said to be within the setting of the non-designated heritage assets present on Back Lane.
Topography and views	Significant views looking eastwards across site, with countryside visible in the distance. Views along Back Lane, where hedgerow and lack of development distinguishes village development from the rural context. Land generally rises to the east
Landscape context	Green Hammerton is situated on the boundary between rolling hills and the lower levels of Vale of York.
Grain of surrounding development	Back Lane was historically used as an access to the rear of the properties facing onto The Green where their farm buildings were located. Such buildings have since been converted to dwellings and the lane is characterised by these brick buildings and other traditional buildings, mainly small cottages (mostly in brick, limited use of render). Many buildings face directly onto the road. To the east (where the proposal site/s are located), is farmland in the form of narrow strip fields. The post war housing development of Meadow Vale has been inserted into the southern-most of these fields, backing onto New Lane (development set around a green, two storey brick houses and bungalows). Historically, Green Hammerton is a village of linear form.
Local building design	Brick prevails in this area but with occasional render seen. Mix of houses, cottages and farm buildings (which are often converted).
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	This site is one of a network of historic, grassland strip fields that surround the village. Field is at higher level than road. Hedge and verge to roadside (noted as significant and historic in the conservation area appraisal). Hedgerow between fields to north and south, occasional tree in hedgerow (some marked as important in the appraisal). Land generally rises to the east. Conservation area appraisal marks Yule Lane (forming as part of the strategic pedestrian routes of the village. The lane forms the boundary to the site on its north and east sides. A paddock / field is located to the north of Yule Lane (and then the farmstead of Hall Farm).

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 the field would be against the linear grain of the conservation area / village. The fields form a very important part of the rural setting of the conservation area and development would harm this setting and also the setting of the heritage assets along Back Lane. This would be exacerbated by the rise of the land on the edge of the village. There would be a harmful impact on the hedgerows and the way in which they relate to the historic field pattern. Need to consider implications of proposals for neighbouring fields – GH1 / GH7 / GH3 / GH2, all located on this eastern edge of the conservation area and village.
---------------------------	---

Settlement: Green Hammerton**Site: GH7 (Land off Back Lane and Yule Lane, Green Hammerton)****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	Arable
Trees and Hedges	Occasional mature boundary trees
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	The above mature trees may merit TPO protection
Water/Wetland	None
Slope and Aspect	Generally flat
Buildings and Structures	None
Natural Area	NCA 30 Southern Magnesian Limestone
Environmental Opportunity	SEO 2: Protect and manage existing semi-natural habitats, including grasslands, wetlands and woodlands; and increase the area of semi-natural habitats, restore and create new areas, and create networks and links between habitats, to make their ecology more resilient and to afford increased movement of species.
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 96 Green Hammerton Low-Lying Farmland "Encourage the maintenance, management and repair of hedgerows...and reintroduction of hedgerow trees" "Promote woodland management..." "Promote appropriate habitat creation..."
Connectivity/Corridors	The network of smaller 'strip' fields with hedges to the east of the village forms a valuable resource in the context of surrounding larger scale arable fields.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Restoration of boundary hedgerows with trees
Protected Species	Nesting birds probably utilise the trees and hedges. Bats may use some of the mature boundary trees as a roost-site.
BAP Priority Species	Some potential for BAP priority species of birds of arable farmland and brown hare
Invasive Species	Not known
Notes	

Conclusion

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

Rationale	Rating
No adverse impact, potential for enhancement and net gains to biodiversity.	Dark Green
Summary conclusion	Boundary hedgerows and trees should be retained and reinforced with new native tree planting. Green infrastructure should be enhanced, especially to north and eastern boundaries, Some potential for protected species; ecological survey required.

Settlement: Green Hammerton**Site: GH7 (Land off Back Lane and Yule Lane, Green Hammerton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Land Drainage****Land Drainage Site Assessment****Land drainage: summary of issues.**

According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed development is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred.

We are however, aware of flooding incidents in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide.

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.

Whilst this proposed development is situated just outside drainage areas administered by the Swale & Ure Internal Drainage Board to the south east of the site, and the Marston Moor Internal Drainage Board to the east. Any surface water drainage strategy is likely to affect the watercourses within a board district. Consequently, the internal drainage boards should be consulted regarding any development proposals.

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

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

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

Settlement: Green Hammerton**Site: GH8 (Land south of York Road and east of Kirk Hammerton Lane, Green Hammerton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site located at the east end of the village east of Kirk Hammerton Lane and south of the A59. LCA95: Whixley Arable Farmland
Landscape description	Area description: The wider landscape is moderate to large scale where the settlements are well wooded and intimate, edged with small grassland fields managed for horses and grazing. In contrast the surrounding farmland is more open due to lack of woodland and the large scale arable field pattern. Site description: Open arable field with hedgerow boundary to north and south. Land rises gradually from east to west.
Existing urban edge	A59 is the urban edge of Green Hammerton to the south except for 20th century development that extends south on Kirk Hammerton Lane and which is visible from the east.
Trees and hedges	Hedgerow boundary to north and south boundary .
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open countryside
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ houses per ha.)
Physical Sensitivity	The open arable landscape that provides the setting for local settlement and separate between settlement has some susceptibility to development of the type proposed.
Visual Sensitivity	The site is visible from the east and would increase the prominence of Green Hammerton in the rural countryside.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of agricultural field and extension of Green Hammerton south of the A59. Increased coalescence with Kirk Hammerton.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Possibility that additional mitigation could large proportion of the site could be green infrastructure to help integrate any development. Hedgerow boundaries should be strengthened.
Likely level of landscape effects	Large scale adverse effect due to visibility of the site. This may be reduced if only a small proportion of the site developed and significant green infrastructure incorporated to reflect valued setting of existing settlement.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	Development of GH6, KH6 and KH10 would all result in larger scale adverse cumulative landscape affects.

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

Summary conclusion	The landscape has little capacity to accept change without detriment to local landscape character. However reduced development area, substantial tree planting and green infrastructure would go some way to mitigating effects.
---------------------------	--

Settlement: Green Hammerton**Site: GH8 (Land south of York Road and east of Kirk Hammerton Lane, Green Hammerton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Green Hammerton Conservation Area
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	None
Commentary on heritage assets.	Development of site would impact on the approach to the conservation area, but not on views from it.
Topography and views	Site falls to east, site benefits from views to the open countryside.
Landscape context	Site is adjacent to ribbon development on Kirk Hammerton Lane, it is close to but not at the edge of Green Hammerton village.
Grain of surrounding development	The housing on Kirk Hammerton Lane is well spaced and set behind quite generous front gardens with the exception of a small close near the A59. Houses opposite the site are large detached and semi-detached.
Local building design	The majority of houses are two storey, dormers are not common. The older houses of the village have greater frontage width than depth, roofs are simple dual pitched roofs and most are covered in pantiles. There are a number of houses that are finished in slate and generally the pitches are a little lower. Rarely stone slate can be seen. The houses are of brick, many are rendered, window to wall ratios are low, and the majority have vertical sliding sash windows. Outbuildings are single storey and have pantiled roofs, their walls are of brick and field cobble. The houses on Kirk Hammerton Road do not reflect those at the core of the village, there is greater complexity of form and a wider palette of materials, particularly striking is the half-timbered effect featured on this road, which is highly visible from a distance.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The field boundaries are hedges and there are a number of hedgerow trees.

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

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

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

Rationale	Rating
Development is unlikely to affect any elements which contribute to the significance of a heritage asset.	Yellow

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

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

Summary conclusion

--

Settlement: Green Hammerton**Site: GH8 (Land south of York Road and east of Kirk Hammerton Lane, Green Hammerton)****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	Large arable field
Trees and Hedges	Hedgerows around field except to west; occasional hedgerow trees with a group of mixed tree screening the NW corner.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Screen belt above may merit TPO protection
Water/Wetland	None
Slope and Aspect	Rises gently towards the north
Buildings and Structures	none
Natural Area	NCA 30 Southern Magnesian Limestone bordering Vale of York
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 95: Whixley Arable Farmland: Tree planting around villages can help to define development limits..." • "This area has no designated sites for nature conservation. Encourage creation of wildlife corridors to improve diversity and enhance landscape pattern between settlements".
Connectivity/Corridors	Field boundaries and road verges provide only very limited connectivity through the landscape
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Potential to diversify the arable monoculture through native planting and habitat creation along the boundaries
Protected Species	Nesting birds likely to utilise trees and hedgerows
BAP Priority Species	Potential for priority species of arable farmland (e.g. ground-nesting birds, brown hare)
Invasive Species	some potential for priority BAP species of arable farmland
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 hedges should be retained opportunity for creation of green infrastructure planting along north, south and eastern boundaries. Offsite provision of arable field margins could compensate for any loss of priority habitat.

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.

According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed development is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred.

We are however, aware of flooding incidents in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide.

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.

Whilst this proposed development is situated just outside drainage areas administered by the Swale & Ure Internal Drainage Board to the south east of the site, and the Marston Moor Internal Drainage Board to the east. Any surface water drainage strategy is likely to affect the watercourses within a board district. Consequently, the internal drainage boards should be consulted regarding any development proposals.

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

Conclusion

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

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

Settlement: Green Hammerton**Site: GH9 (Land west of B6265 and north of A59, Green Hammerton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site located on the west side of the village north of the A59 and west of the B6265 to Boroughbridge. LCA95: Whixley Arable Farmland.
Landscape description	Area description: The wider landscape is moderate to large scale where the settlements are well wooded and intimate, edged with small grassland fields managed for horses and grazing. In contrast the surrounding farmland is more open due to lack of woodland and the large scale arable field pattern. Site description: Rectangular arable field with hedgerow boundaries typical of the area.
Existing urban edge	The site is currently detached from the urban edge.
Trees and hedges	Hedgerow boundaries. Strip of structure planting on boundary with the B6265,
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open countryside.
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	Field currently located in open countryside detached from existing settlement. Landscape therefore susceptible do development of the type proposed.
Visual Sensitivity	Views of the site from the wider countryside to the north in particular.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of agricultural field and creation of new small settlement in open countryside uncharacteristic of existing settlement pattern.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Limited opportunity for additional mitigation due to the location of the site detached from existing settlement.
Likely level of landscape effects	Large scale adverse due to the loss of open countryside in a field that appears detached from settlement.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	GH5 to the east links the site to Green Hammerton and its development may make this site a more viable option in landscape terms in the long run.

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	No capacity for development on this site without detrimental affect on landscape character and limited opportunity to mitigate.
---------------------------	---

Settlement: Green Hammerton**Site: GH9 (Land west of B6265 and north of A59, Green Hammerton)****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	Arable
Trees and Hedges	Hedgerows along all boundaries, tallest along B6265 with only very occasional trees
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	None
Water/Wetland	None
Slope and Aspect	Generally flat
Buildings and Structures	Telecoms mast near 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 95: Whixley Arable Farmland: . "Tree planting around villages can help to define development limits..." • "This area has no designated sites for nature conservation. Encourage creation of wildlife corridors to improve diversity and enhance landscape pattern between settlements".
Connectivity/Corridors	Roadside hedges and verges together with field hedges provide some linear connectivity through the landscape
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Strengthen boundary planting; offsite provision of arable field margins could compensate for any loss of priority habitat.
Protected Species	Nesting birds likely to utilise hedgerows and bats may use them for commuting/foraging
BAP Priority Species	Some potential for priority species of arable farmland (e.g. birds, brown hare)
Invasive Species	Not known
Notes	

Conclusion

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

Rationale	Rating
No adverse impact, potential for enhancement and net gains to biodiversity.	Dark Green
Summary conclusion	Boundary hedges should be retained and opportunities sought for creation of green infrastructure planting along boundaries.

Settlement: Green Hammerton**Site: GH9 (Land west of B6265 and north of A59, Green Hammerton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Land Drainage****Land Drainage Site Assessment****Land drainage: summary of issues.**

According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed development is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred.

We are however, aware of flooding incidents in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide.

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.

Whilst this proposed development is situated just outside drainage areas administered by the Swale & Ure Internal Drainage Board to the south east of the site, and the Marston Moor Internal Drainage Board to the east. Any surface water drainage strategy is likely to affect the watercourses within a board district. Consequently, the internal drainage boards should be consulted regarding any development proposals.

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

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

Rationale

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

Rating

Orange

Settlement: Green Hammerton**Site: GH10 (Land adjacent to the B6265 at Green Hammerton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site located north west of the village LCA95: Whixley Arable Farmland
Landscape description	Area description: The wider landscape is moderate to large scale where the settlements are well wooded and intimate, edged with small grassland fields managed for horses and grazing. In contrast the surrounding farmland is more open due to lack of woodland and the large scale arable field pattern. Site description: Agricultural field with hedgerow boundaries in open countryside detached from the village.
Existing urban edge	Site separated from exiting settlement by designed landscape and village fields except at the southern end where boundary is shared with one property on the edge of the village.
Trees and hedges	Hedgerow boundaries. To the east boundary is shared with designed landscape and includes mature trees.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open countryside
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	Landscape susceptible to loss of agricultural field to development that is in open countryside.
Visual Sensitivity	Site not widely visible except in local views. May affect views from the conservation area but development separated from the CA by designed landscape and fields which provide a buffer and maintain a link to open countryside.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of open countryside and associated fielture, extension of settlement that appears detached from existing.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	There is some potential for addition mitigation comprising green infrastructure could help integrate development with the countryside and link with the designed landscape at the northern end of the village. Views from the conservation area to open countryside must be considered.
Likely level of landscape effects	Medium to large scale adverse
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	GH12 is the area proposed for new settlelement and if GH12 a prefered option then development of GH10 would have adverse cumulative effects on the character of the eisting village through the loss of a buffer.

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

Summary conclusion	Landscape sensitive to large scale development that is slightly detached from the village edge and may impact on the designed landscape that provides the setting for the conservation area. There is limited capacity for the development of this site without substantial area being given over to green infrastructure.
---------------------------	---

Settlement: Green Hammerton**Site: GH10 (Land adjacent to the B6265 at Green Hammerton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Green Hammerton Conservation Area and Low Royd, a grade II listed building.
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	A number of houses on the green are designated as buildings of local interest and merit in the conservation area appraisal.
Commentary on heritage assets.	The area of Green Hammerton closest to the site is of very special character, there are a number of open fields that provide open aspects across to Whixley up the hill beyond. Low Royd is on the east side of the green as are a number of the non-designated heritage assets, and development of the proposed site will impact detrimentally on their rural setting.
Topography and views	The green falls very gently to the north, and land rises to the northwest to Whixley. Development of the site would fall within key views from the green.
Landscape context	The site, whilst being next to a house on Boroughbridge Road, would not be seen as an extension of the village because of the wide spacing of houses between the village and the last house.
Grain of surrounding development	The village developed linearly along the roads and green, and most houses are detached, although short rows and a few terraces are seen in the village. The area of the green and the extreme western edge of the village has very loose grain having large spaces between predominantly detached houses. On the green the houses on the west side are set against the edge of the green, whereas houses on the east of the green have modest enclosed front gardens and houses north of Boroughbridge Road have more generous front gardens.
Local building design	The majority of houses are two storey, dormers are not common. The older houses of the village have greater frontage width than depth, roofs are simple dual pitched roofs and most are covered in pantiles. There are a number of houses that are finished in slate and generally the pitches are a little lower. Although rare, stone slate can be seen in the village. The houses are of brick, many are rendered, window to wall ratios are low, and the majority have vertical sliding sash windows. Outbuildings are single storey and have pantiled roofs, their walls are of brick and field cobble. Later houses do not all have the same general proportions as the older buildings, some introduce greater complexity of form and there is a greater palette of roofing materials, although on the whole they blend with the natural materials of the older roofs. Two late twentieth century houses close to the site reflect the traditional houses of the village.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	Caskill Beck runs alongside the eastern boundary of the site. There are a number of trees alongside the beck, but they do not form a dense screen, particularly in winter. The northern boundary of the site follows an old field boundary, but has no hedge. Other boundaries are hedgerows. To the southwest corner is a tree at the boundary with the neighbouring house.

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 the site would fall within key views from the green, which would be detrimental to the rural character of the conservation area. The scale of the site would prevent the development from integrating with the settlement. Notwithstanding comments on the conservation area, only a very low density short ribbon of development along Boroughbridge Road would fit with settlement pattern.

Settlement: Green Hammerton**Site: GH10 (Land adjacent to the B6265 at Green Hammerton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

SACs/SPAs	None likely to be impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	None likely to be impacted
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likely to be impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerow, Flowing water (Caskill Beck), Arable Farmland
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Arable
Trees and Hedges	Mature trees dotted along becksides. Gappy hedge to roadside
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature trees along the beck likely to benefit from TPO protection
Water/Wetland	Caskill Beck forms eastern site boundary
Slope and Aspect	Generally flat
Buildings and Structures	None
Natural Area	NCA 30 Southern Magnesian Limestone
Environmental Opportunity	SEO 2: Protect and manage existing semi-natural habitats, including grasslands, wetlands and woodlands; and increase the area of semi-natural habitats, restore and create new areas, and create networks and links between habitats, to make their ecology more resilient and to afford increased movement of species.
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	mostly LCA 95: Whixley Arable Farmland: (LCA 96 in SE corner) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Tree planting around villages can help to define development limits...” • “This area has no designated sites for nature conservation. Encourage creation of wildlife corridors to improve diversity and enhance landscape pattern between settlements”.
Connectivity/Corridors	Caskill Beck links field boundaries and a number of small woods to north. B6265 has strong hedges and verges
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Caskill Beck should be buffered to form generous GI corridor to east. Opportunity for boundary planting of hedgerows and trees along roadside and northern boundary. Arable field margins could be created offsite to compensate for any loss of priority species.
Protected Species	Nesting birds and bats likely to utilise boundary hedgerows and trees
BAP Priority Species	Some potential for BAP priority species of birds of arable farmland and brown hare; possibility of riparian species associated with the beck.
Invasive Species	Himalayan balsam may occur along the beck
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	Caskill Beck should be buffered to form generous GI corridor to east possibly in association with Suds. Opportunity for boundary planting of hedgerows and trees along roadside and northern boundary.
---------------------------	--

Settlement: Green Hammerton

Site: GH10 (Land adjacent to the B6265 at Green Hammerton)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments

Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.

According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed development is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred.

We are however, aware of flooding incidents in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide.

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.

Whilst this proposed development is situated just outside drainage areas administered by the Swale & Ure Internal Drainage Board to the south east of the site, and the Marston Moor Internal Drainage Board to the east. Any surface water drainage strategy is likely to affect the watercourses within a board district. Consequently, the internal drainage boards should be consulted regarding any development proposals.

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

Conclusion

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

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

Settlement: Green Hammerton**Site: GH11 (New/expanded settlement at Green Hammerton, Kirk Hammerton and Cattal, Option One)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Large area south of Green Hammerton and the A59 between the main road and the railway line. LCA95: Whixley Arable Farmland and LCA 96: Green Hammerton low-lying Farmland
Landscape description	Area description: Medium to large scale open farmland interspersed with small villages with smaller scale fields providing their setting. To the south and west land form is gently undulating and to the east becomes flat. Site description: Agricultural fields between the A59 and the railway line south of Green Hammerton that separate existing settlements. Site is slightly detached from existing settlement by the A59 and the railway line.
Existing urban edge	Rural village of Green Hammerton is generally low density development with an urban edge softened by garden planting, small fields, a designed landscape and planting on the A59.
Trees and hedges	Fields have hedgerow boundaries. Structure planting on A59. Some trees along railway lane and in clumps. Non native hedges associated with Johnsons of Whixley site.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open Countryside.
Description of proposal for the site	New settlement with mixed use.
Physical Sensitivity	The scale of development proposed would have considerable effects on the open rural landscape.
Visual Sensitivity	There are areas within the site that are highly visible.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of open countryside and introduction of large scale built development that is uncharacteristic of the area.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	There is potential to create new landscape but not to mitigate the loss of open countryside.
Likely level of landscape effects	Very large scale adverse effect due to loss of open countryside and probable coalescence between existing settlements.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	The site includes GH8, KH6, KH10, CA1 and part of CA4 and is a smaller extent of GH12 which encompasses the village.

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	The valued rural landscape has very high sensitivity to the scale of development proposed. There is no landscape capacity for the change proposed without detriment to existing landscape character. Mitigation of loss of open countryside not possible but opportunity to create new landscape exists.
---------------------------	---

Settlement: Green Hammerton**Site: GH11 (New/expanded settlement at Green Hammerton, Kirk Hammerton and Cattal, Option One)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Kirk Hammerton and Green Hammerton Conservation Areas, Church of St John the Baptist, a grade I listed building. Providence House and Kirk Hammerton Signal Box, which are grade II listed buildings. The other station buildings are curtilage listed buildings.
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	The railway building on Parker Lane south of the tracks.
Commentary on heritage assets.	Both conservation areas are rural villages; being surrounded by open fields contributes to their characters even where the fields are screened by hedges or partially screened by trees, it is the absence of buildings that is important. This is also the case when considering the setting of the grade I listed church. Certain views are noted as key views in the conservation area appraisals. Development would impact on the view from Parker Lane northwards to the site. Development of the site would have less direct impact on Green Hammerton, it would however impact on its southern approach. Providence House is a three storey eighteenth century building, which enjoys a prominent position north of the A59, It is elevated above the road and despite the high hedgerow and some trees south of the A59, it will have views over part of the site. Development of the site in the vicinity would impact on the setting of this listed house. Kirk Hammerton Signal Box and the other station buildings at this station are of national significance. The other railway buildings are not of such high significance, but are an important part of railway heritage, easily identified by their architecture. Any development should respect these buildings.
Topography and views	The site is very large and consequently ground levels are complex. From the east the land rises up to Coney Garth Hill, but land also falls to the south in the area of Doodle Hills quite steeply. Views from the high areas will be extensive. Views to the site will be more open in parts than others, but the key view from the conservation area is from Parker Lane.
Landscape context	Although close to Green Hammerton and Kirk Hammerton, the site is not directly attached to either.
Grain of surrounding development	Due to the scale of the site, local grain is complex. The villages developed linearly along the roads and green, and most houses are detached, although short rows and a few terraces are seen in the villages. Some buildings are against the road/green, but more are behind small front gardens. The grain of the core of Kirk Hammerton is on the whole a little denser than that of the historic part of Green Hammerton. Post war housing is generally semi-detached. Later twentieth century development often takes the form of culs-de-sac, where mainly detached houses are set very close together behind small front gardens. On the edges of the village, development is mainly linear along the roads and density reduces at the outer edges. Outside villages are individual properties often close to the road and farmsteads, which have combinations of traditional buildings and larger twentieth century agricultural sheds.
Local building design	The majority of houses are two storey, dormers are not common. The older houses of the villages have greater frontage width than depth, roofs are simple dual pitched roofs and most are covered in pantiles. There are a number of houses that are finished in slate and generally the pitches are a little lower. The houses are of brick and many are rendered. Window to wall ratios are low, and the majority of houses have vertical sliding sash windows. Outbuildings are single storey and have pantiled roofs, their walls are of brick and field cobble. Later houses do not all have the same general proportions as the older buildings, some introduce greater complexity of form and there is a greater palette of roofing materials, although on the whole they blend with the natural materials of the older roofs.

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

Development of the highest parts of the site will have greater visual impact generally because buildings would be viewed against the skyline. Most fields and the lanes running through the site are bounded with hedgerows and in limited areas are characterised by hedgerow trees. Quite often there are single trees at field corners. There are trees around many of the curtilages of buildings, both residential, agricultural and employment. Also there are small groups or woodlands on the site. There is a feature on North Field that requires investigation, OS Epoch 2 shows a small structure there and the land in the vicinity appears left unploughed. There are a variety of buildings on the site including greenhouses and nursery sheds, agricultural buildings, railway buildings and the Victoria PH. The Victoria is a landmark, but not of architectural interest. Cattle station building 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

The site would cause coalescence of the two historic villages, and would impact detrimentally on views from Kirk Hammerton and the approaches of both, and also the setting of listed buildings. Development on this size of site could not reflect the distinctiveness of local rural villages.

Settlement: Green Hammerton**Site: GH11 (New/expanded settlement at Green Hammerton, Kirk Hammerton and Cattal, Option One)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

SACs/SPAs	None likely to be impacted (Kirk Deighton SAC around 8 km to SW)
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	Aubert Ings approx. 2km to south
SSSI Risk Zone	small proportion of site falls within zone where NE require consultations for over 100 residential units
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	Tockwith Ings approx 1 km to south
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows, Arable Farmland, potential veteran trees
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Mostly Arable, Johnstone's Horticultural, small areas of horse pasture
Trees and Hedges	some good hedgerows, mature trees
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Many trees may merit TPO e.g. oak on Gilsthwaite Lane
Water/Wetland	Kirk Hammerton Beck in SW corner, several small ponds, wet depression in field nr Rathmall Lane
Slope and Aspect	Relatively flat but the land generally falls west to east with gentle undulations to Coney Garth (46m)
Buildings and Structures	New Farm, dwellings along Gilsthwaite Lane; St Johns House (care Home) bridges over railway, beck
Natural Area	Southern Magnesian Limestone bordering Vale of York
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 95: Whixley Arable Farmland: "Tree planting around villages can help to define development limits..." • "This area has no designated sites for nature conservation. Encourage creation of wildlife corridors to improve diversity and enhance landscape pattern between settlements".
Connectivity/Corridors	Railway Corridor & A59
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Low lying areas provide opportunity to combine wetland habitat creation with Suds
Protected Species	GCN known from Whixley Hospital to west and Helenfield and Beggar Hall to east. Badger sett likely on railway embankment at Cattal. Bats may utilise mature trees, some of buildings, nesting birds likely to use trees & hedgerows, water vole may utilise beck
BAP Priority Species	BAP species of arable farmland (e.g. birds and brown hare) likely to be present
Invasive Species	Not known; Himalayan balsam likely to be present
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

Potential to support protected species e.g. bats and great crested newts. Site rating is largely a function of the scale of the site. Thorough ecological survey required, Retain important trees & hedgerows, Opportunities for habitat creation and enhancement, in association with provision of green infrastructure in particular Suds, would be required for any development. Aubert Ings SSSI, which is open access land, could be impacted by a large development settlement, unless substantial GI provided on site.

Settlement: Green Hammerton

Site: GH11 (New/expanded settlement at Green Hammerton, Kirk Hammerton and Cattal, Option One)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments

Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.

According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed development is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred.

We are however, aware of flooding incidents in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide.

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.

Whilst this proposed development is situated just outside drainage areas administered by the Swale & Ure Internal Drainage Board to the south east of the site, and the Marston Moor Internal Drainage Board to the east. Any surface water drainage strategy is likely to affect the watercourses within a board district. Consequently, the internal drainage boards should be consulted regarding any development proposals.

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

Conclusion

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

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

Settlement: Green Hammerton**Site: GH12 (New settlement at Green Hammerton, Kirk Hammerton and Cattal, Option Two)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	The site is a large area encompassing Green Hammerton to the west, the south and the south east. LCA95: Whixley Arable Farmland and LCA96: Green Hammerton low lying farmland.
Landscape description	Area description: Medium to large scale open farmland interspersed with small villages with smaller scale fields providing their setting. To the south and west land form is gently undulating and to the east becomes flat. Site description: Agricultural fields that separate the settlements of Green Hammerton, Kirk Hammerton, and Whixley in the open agricultural landscape. The site is gently undulating and on slightly higher ground to the west making this part of the site more visually prominent from the wider area.
Existing urban edge	The site wraps around Green Hammerton which comprises a mix of low density housing with gardens, fields, designed landscape and roadside structure planting softening the urban edge.
Trees and hedges	Hedgerow boundaries to fields, structure planting along roads (A59 in particular). Some trees along railway lane and in clumps. Non native hedges associated with Johnsons of Whixley site.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open countryside.
Description of proposal for the site	New settlement with mixed use
Physical Sensitivity	Landscape is sensitive to loss of openness due to large scale of development proposed.
Visual Sensitivity	There are parts of the site that are highly visible from the wider countryside.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of countryside and associated landscape characteristics (hedges, trees, field pattern) and introduction of uncharacteristic built form on a large scale.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	There is potential to create new landscape but not to mitigate the loss of open countryside.
Likely level of landscape effects	Very large scale adverse effect due to loss of open countryside and probable coalescence between existing settlements.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	The site includes GH4, GH5, GH6, GH8, GH9, KH6, KH10CA1 and part of CA4 and is a larger version of GH11.

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	Landscape has very high susceptibility due to the scale of loss. There is no landscape capacity for the change proposed without detriment to existing landscape character. Mitigation of loss of open countryside not possible but opportunity to create new landscape exists.
---------------------------	--

Settlement: Green Hammerton

Site: GH12 (New settlement at Green Hammerton, Kirk Hammerton and Cattal, Option Two)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments

Type: Conservation and Design

Conservation and Design Site Assessment

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.

Kirk Hammerton, Green Hammerton and Whixley Conservation Areas, Church of St John the Baptist, which is a grade I listed building in Kirk Hammerton.
Church of St Thomas, Low Royd and High Farmhouse, Kirk Hammerton Signal Box and Providence House on the A59 are all grade II listed buildings.

Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.

In Green Hammerton a number of houses on the Green and the school are designated as of local interest and merit in the conservation area appraisal. A number of field boundaries next to the village have boundaries shown as important in the appraisal.
Cattal station buildings and the railway building on Parker Lane south of the tracks are of historic, communal and some architectural interest.

Commentary on heritage assets.

Both conservation areas are rural villages, and being surrounded by open fields contributes to their characters even where the fields are screened by hedges or partially screened by trees, it is the absence of buildings that is important. This is also the case when considering the setting of the grade I listed church. Certain views are noted as key views in the conservation area appraisal; in Kirk Hammerton development would impact on the view from Parker Lane northwards to the site.
In Green Hammerton, the site is against important open space next to the school, which is a building of interest and merit. The Church of St Thomas is a landmark, although not very tall, it is of particular architectural interest as designed by Sir Gilbert Scott. Even where the site does not impact on key views, development will be seen from York Road in the conservation area and would impact on the character of the important open space.
The area of Green Hammerton closest to the north of the site is of very special character, there are a number of open fields that provide open aspects across to Whixley up the hill beyond. Low Royd is on the east side of the green, as are a number of the non-designated heritage assets, and development of the proposed site will impact on their rural setting. Development would impact on the setting of the church and school, and to a lesser extent High Farmhouse.
Providence House is a three storey eighteenth century building, which enjoys a prominent position north of the A59, it is elevated above the road and despite the high hedgerow and some trees south of the A59, it will have views over part of the site. Development of the site in its vicinity will impact detrimentally on its setting.
Kirk Hammerton signal box is listed and the other station buildings are curtilage listed. The other railway buildings are not of such high significance, but are an important part of railway heritage, easily identified by their architecture. Any development should respect these historic buildings.

Topography and views

The site is very large and consequently ground levels are complex. From the east the land rises up to Coney Garth Hill, but land also falls to the south in the area of Doodle Hills quite steeply. Land rises northwest to Whixley Bank. Views from the high areas will be extensive. Views to the site will be more open in parts than others. All views from the conservation areas should be protected or enhanced, the key views are from Parker Lane, Kirk Hammerton, the Green and through the open space next to the school and church, Green Hammerton. Any development of the northern part of the site would fall within key views from the Green and impact on a key view from Whixley Conservation Area.

Landscape context

The site wraps around the west and southern sides of Green Hammerton and is separated from Kirk Hammerton by the railway track. The site lies southeast of Whixley, the northernmost part being only two small fields from Whixley.

Grain of surrounding development	<p>Due to the scale of the site, local grain is complex. The villages developed linearly along the roads and green, and most houses are detached, although short rows and a few terraces are seen. Some buildings are against the road/green, but more are behind small front gardens.</p> <p>In Green Hammerton, housing on Bernard Lane reflects that pattern, here detached houses are set behind enclosed front gardens. St Thomas's Way is a cul-de-sac, houses are set very close together behind small front gardens, most homes are detached. Stoneleigh Court is of similar grain although houses are larger and slightly better spaced.</p> <p>The grain in the core of Kirk Hammerton is on the whole a little denser than that of the historic part of Green Hammerton. Post war housing in Kirk Hammerton is generally semi-detached. Later twentieth century development often takes the form of culs-de-sac, where mainly detached houses are set very close together behind small front gardens. On the edges of the village development is mainly linear along the roads and density reduces at the outer edges.</p> <p>Outside villages are individual properties often close to the road and farmsteads, which have combinations of traditional buildings and larger twentieth century agricultural sheds.</p>
Local building design	<p>The majority of houses are two storey, dormers are not common. The older detached houses of the villages have greater frontage width than depth, roofs are simple dual pitched roofs and most are covered in pantiles. There are a number of houses that are finished in slate and generally the pitches are a little lower. The houses are of brick or render. Window to wall ratios are low, and the majority of houses have vertical sliding sash windows. Outbuildings are single storey and have pantiled roofs, their walls are of brick and field cobble.</p> <p>Later houses do not all have the same general proportions as the older buildings, some introduce greater complexity of form and there is a greater palette of roofing materials, although on the whole they blend with the natural materials of the older roofs.</p>
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	<p>Development of the highest parts of the site will have greater visual impact generally because buildings would be viewed against the skyline. Most fields and the lanes running through the site are bounded with hedgerows, and in limited areas are characterised by hedgerow trees. Quite often there are single trees at field corners. There are trees around many of the curtilages of buildings, both residential, agricultural and employment. Also there are small groups or woodlands on the southern part of the site.</p> <p>There is a feature on North Field that requires investigation, OS Epoch 2 shows a small structure there and the land in the vicinity appears left unploughed.</p> <p>There are a variety of buildings on the site including dwellings, greenhouses and nursery sheds, agricultural buildings, railway buildings and the Victoria PH. The Victoria is a landmark, but not of architectural interest. Cattle station building should be retained.</p>

Conclusion

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

Will it conserve those elements which contribute towards the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets?	
Rationale	Rating
Development is likely to result in harm to elements which contribute to the significance of a heritage asset and the harm is not capable of mitigation.	Red
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 site would cause coalescence of the two historic villages, and would impact detrimentally on the setting, views from and the approaches of both conservation areas, and also the setting of listed buildings.

Development on this size of site could not reflect local rural villages. The development would cause coalescence of the two Hammerton settlements. The northern part of the site would from certain aspects cause visual coalescence with Whixley.

Settlement: Green Hammerton**Site: GH12 (New settlement at Green Hammerton, Kirk Hammerton and Cattal, Option Two)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

SACs/SPAs	None likely to be impacted (Kirk Deighton SAC around 8 km to SW)
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	Aubert Ings approx. 2km to south
SSSI Risk Zone	small proportion of site falls within zone where NE require consultations for over 100 residential units
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	Tockwith Ings approx 1 km to south
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows, Arable Farmland, potential veteran trees
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Mostly Arable, Johnstone's Horticultural, small areas of horse pasture
Trees and Hedges	some good hedgerows, mature trees
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Many trees may merit TPO e.g. oak on Gilsthwaite Lane, around New Farm
Water/Wetland	Kirk Hammerton Beck in SW corner, several small ponds, wet depression in field nr Rathmall Lane
Slope and Aspect	land generally falls west to east with gentle undulations to Coney Garth (46m)
Buildings and Structures	New Farm, dwellings along Gilsthwaite Lane; St Johns House (care Home, bridges over railway, beck
Natural Area	NCA 30 Southern Magnesian Limestone bordering Vale of York
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)	mostly LCA 95: Whixley Arable Farmland: (LCA 96 in NE corner) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Tree planting around villages can help to define development limits..." • "This area has no designated sites for nature conservation. Encourage creation of wildlife corridors to improve diversity and enhance landscape pattern between settlements".
Connectivity/Corridors	Railway Corridor & A59
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Low lying areas provide opportunity to combine wetland habitat creation with Suds
Protected Species	GCN known from Whixley Hospital to west and Helenfield (within 250m) and Beggar Hall to east. Badger sett likely on railway embankment at Cattal. Bats may utilise mature trees, some of buildings, nesting birds likely to use trees & hedgerows, water vole may utilise beck
BAP Priority Species	BAP species of arable farmland (e.g. birds and brown hare) likely to be present
Invasive Species	Not known; Himalayan balsam likely to be present
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

Little additional sensitivity in comparison with GH11. Potential to support protected species e.g. bats and great crested newts. Thorough ecological survey required, Retain important trees & hedgerows, Opportunities for significant habitat creation and enhancement, in association with provision of green infrastructure in particular Suds, would be required for any development. Aubert Ings SSSI, which is open access land, could be impacted by a large development settlement, unless substantial GI provided on site.

Settlement: Green Hammerton

Site: GH12 (New settlement at Green Hammerton, Kirk Hammerton and Cattal, Option Two)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments

Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.

According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed development is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred.

We are however, aware of flooding incidents in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide.

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.

Drainage strategies for Brownfield or mixed sites should provide characteristics, which are similar to Greenfield behaviour. Therefore surface water from currently developed areas should be reduced by a minimum 30% of existing peak flows, plus an allowance of 30% to account for climate change. The drainage strategy for areas of the site that are not currently developed or positively drained should be designed using Greenfield calculations (1.4l/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 site without risk to people or property and without increasing the restricted flow rates to the watercourse.

A full survey of the drainage systems from currently developed areas should be undertaken to establish condition and outfall location.

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.

Whilst this proposed development is situated just outside drainage areas administered by the Swale & Ure Internal Drainage Board to the south east of the site, and the Marston Moor Internal Drainage Board to the east. Any surface water drainage strategy is likely to affect the watercourses within a board district. Consequently, the internal drainage boards should be consulted regarding any development proposals.

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

Conclusion

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

Rationale

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

Rating

Orange

Settlement: Greenhow**Site: GR1 (Land to the east of Duck Street Lane, Greenhow)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	South of Greenhow. B6265 to the north boundary. Greenhow Quarry located to the east of the site. LCA5: Bewerley Moor Grassland and Historic industrial area.
Landscape description	Area description: Diverse landscape with historic associations. Evidence of past mining and quarrying. Site Description: Grass field with stone wall boundaries.
Existing urban edge	None of significance. Scattered settlement at Greenhow.
Trees and hedges	None of note.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Nidderdale AONB
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	Open landscape of Nidderdale AONB is highly valued and susceptible to addition of built form in open countryside.
Visual Sensitivity	The site is located in an exposed landscape in the Nidderdale AONB although it is in a dip and therefore not widely visible.
Anticipated landscape effects	Proposals would be a significant extension to Greenhow and would be out of scale with existing settlement giving the impression of a 'new' settlement in open countryside.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Limited due to the exposed nature of the landscape.
Likely level of landscape effects	Large scale effects on Greenhow in sensitive AONB.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	None

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

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

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

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

Summary conclusion	The site is located in the open landscape of Nidderdale AONB, an area that is susceptible to change as a result of increase. There is no capacity for new built development as it would cause harm to the existing rural character of the area.
---------------------------	--

Settlement: Greenhow**Site: GR1 (Land to the east of Duck Street Lane, Greenhow)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	"Greenhow Hillside" on Duck Street Lane is a grade II listed building.
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	The house at corner of roads next to site (formerly the post office), the church, vicarage, former sunday school, Kiplings Cottage, former Miners Arms, historic buildings of Lane Farm and to its north and south, and the barn on Duck Street Lane.
Commentary on heritage assets.	Hillside is an eighteenth century house, which is gable onto the road and enjoys a southerly aspect typical of relatively isolated historic rural buildings. Dense development of the whole site would change the character of its setting. The other historic buildings contribute positively to this small settlement in the AONB. The local distinctiveness portrayed by these historic buildings should be reflected in any new development. Although altered in part since early twentieth century by infill development, Greenhow retains its historic rural character.
Topography and views	The site is on Green How Hill, a very exposed area. Green How Hill rises to the west and Duck Street Lane rises more gently to the south. The site is lower than the road. To the west the hillside limits views and to the north the buildings and a few trees limit views. Views to the east and south are a little less limited. The site is highly visible from both roads.
Landscape context	The site in the AONB is at the crossroad opposite one of the sporadic areas of development of Greenhow.
Grain of surrounding development	Generally buildings are arranged linearly along the road, but northeast of the site buildings served by a narrow lane face southeast, as does Kiplings Cottage north of the site. Later housing has infilled between historic buildings to create the small areas of more dense development along the road. Overall, the grain is characterised by sporadic lengths of linear development with some isolated dwellings along the roads, and a few small farmsteads set back.
Local building design	The houses and historic buildings are of stone, occasionally rendered, with stone and slate roofs. Window to wall ratio is small and the buildings are robust in nature. The vicarage is more vertically proportioned and has some decorative features compared to the more practical aesthetic of the vernacular. Opposite the site is a bungalow, which does not reflect local distinctiveness. A large farmbuilding of Lane Farm is clad in timber boarding, typical of recent agricultural development of the area.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The site is of three fields. The fields are bounded by dry stone walls. There is a tree near the boundary at the bend in Duck Street Lane. The site is lower than the roads.

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 whole site would change the character of its setting, which would be detrimental to the individual historic assets and the pattern of settlement.
---------------------------	--

Settlement: Greenhow**Site: GR1 (Land to the east of Duck Street Lane, Greenhow)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

SACs/SPAs	North Pennine Moors c.750m NW and c. 1km south; Appropriate Assessment may be required
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	Within c. 100m of Greenhow Quarry (geological) and 200m of Greenhow Pasture SSSIs (botanical - grassland sward)
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)	Within 50m of Duck Street SINC
BAP Priority Habitats	None although sward requires full assessment
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	TN12 just to south
Sward	Semi-improved (species-poor) grassland - P1HS 1992 Closely sheep grazed, except southern corner (refuse tip)
Trees and Hedges	A small number of small trees and shrubs along the Duck Street verge
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	None
Water/Wetland	None on site; small ponds to the south and west within 200m
Slope and Aspect	High elevation (400m) but gently undulating
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 5 Bewerely Moor Grasslands and Industrial Heritage Area
Connectivity/Corridors	Maintain and enhance diversity of grassland to provide moorland fringe habitats appropriate to character in association with the Harrogate District Biodiversity Action Plan
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Potential opportunity to create Suds ponds to add to locally important network
Protected Species	Potential for ground-nesting birds; great crested newt may breed in nearby ponds
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
Significant adverse effects on designated sites (Local Site, SSSI, LNR), the wider ecological network and/or priority habitats and species.	Red
Summary conclusion	Large scale development so close to important designated wildlife sites is likely to be detrimental to them. Small scale development in parts of the site close to the village may be acceptable in return for habitat enhancement and buffering following full ecological assessment.

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.

According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed site is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred.

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

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

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

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

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

Conclusion

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

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

Settlement: Grewelthorpe**Site: GW4 (The old quarry field, Grewelthorpe)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site located on the west side of the village of Grewelthorpe to the north outside the development limit. LCA35: Kirkby Malzeard and Grewelthorpe
Landscape description	Area description: Small scale landscape with undulating landform gradually falling north towards the River Ure. Site Description: Sloping grass field at the north east end of the village. NOTE Japanese Knotweed present on road verge adjacent to the boundary.
Existing urban edge	Rural linear village with strip field and piecemeal enclosure providing the setting.
Trees and hedges	Mature trees to site boundary
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Nidderdale AONB
Description of proposal for the site	Residential
Physical Sensitivity	High value landscape susceptible to change as a result of the type of development proposed in open countryside.
Visual Sensitivity	Views of the site are limited due to landform and tree cover.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of grass field and introduction of new building that does not relate to existing settlement pattern.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Limited due to the size and location of the site.
Likely level of landscape effects	Medium scale in a very sensitive location.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	None.

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

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

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

Rationale	Rating
Development 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 high sensitivity to change as a result of development in open countryside. There is no landscape capacity for development without significant harm to landscape character.
---------------------------	---

Settlement: Grewelthorpe**Site: GW4 (The old quarry field, Grewelthorpe)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	None
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Buildings of Cliffe Farm, Rockwell, Cliffe House and the Reddings
Commentary on heritage assets.	Cliffe Farm is concealed from view by the other houses and the trees to its north, so is unlikely to be affected by development. Rockwell and Cliffe House are nineteenth century, their northern elevation is unattractive, but the presence of the historic building so close to the lane contributes to its character. Similarly the Reddings gable is against the lane. These houses reflect rural tradition because they face a southerly direction rather than fronting onto the lane.
Topography and views	Views out are quite constrained by trees and to the south, the quarry face (or cliff). The site is open to view from the lanes.
Landscape context	The site in the AONB is outside the village. Although near the small enclave of historic buildings, it is visually separated from them.
Grain of surrounding development	Local to the site, the buildings of Cliff Farm are closely grouped to form a court. The other historic houses are set close to the lane, but not fronting it as they are orientated to the south. North of the site is Low Moor, which is set parallel, but well back from the lane. To its east is a large building against a historic field boundary and set considerably back from the lane.
Local building design	Houses and taller barns are two storey, a number of farm and outbuildings are single storey in height. The vast majority of buildings in Grewelthorpe are of local stone, and a few are rendered, but not brightly painted. Roofs are a mixture of stone and Welsh slates and pantiles, with occasional concrete slates on new buildings or replacement roofs. The ratio of window to wall is low and the majority of the fenestration has a vertical emphasis. Low Moor is a bungalow and does not reflect local distinctiveness.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The lanes are narrow, and constrained by buildings and in parts banking. The site is bounded by drystone walls. There is a drain in the northwest of the site. There are mature trees on site. Just outside the site against the boundary of Hutts Lane is a small stone outbuilding that contributes to the rural character, but against it is a larger profiled clad building that is detrimental to the scene.

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	Very modest development could be sited here without detriment to the heritage assets and local distinctiveness.
---------------------------	---

Settlement: Grewelthorpe**Site: GW4 (The old quarry field, Grewelthorpe)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

SACs/SPAs	None likley to be impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	None likley to be impacted
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England require consultation for residential development of 100 units or more
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likley to be impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerow
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Improved pasture
Trees and Hedges	Tree and shrub belt along northern boundary, several young-mature trees along roadside boundaries, significant field tree in the west.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature trees are likely to merit TPO protection
Water/Wetland	A small stream crosses the site in the north-western corner
Slope and Aspect	Slopes down from the south
Buildings and Structures	None other than stone wall boundaries
Natural Area	NCA 24 Pennine Dales Fringe
Environmental Opportunity	SE04: Supporting and encouraging the creation of grass/woodland buffer strips, in-field grass strips, sediment traps, ponds and wetland habitats to slow run-off and intercept sediments and pollutants from farmland
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 35 Kirkby Malzeard and Grewelthorpe <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Encourage the maintenance and repair of existing hedgerows...” • “Hedgerow trees are important to diversity... Promote the planting and replacement of native hedgerow trees”.
Connectivity/Corridors	The network of small pasture fields and hedgerows contributes to a biodiverse countryside in the eastern dales fringe of the Nidderdale AONB.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Existing trees, hedgerows and the stream should be protected, retained and enhanced with additional native planting, including new hedgerows
Protected Species	Birds are likley to nest and bats to forage among the boundary trees and hedgerows
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 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, hedgerows and the stream should be protected, retained and enhanced with additional native planting, including new hedgerows, which would restrict the extent of potential development.

Settlement: Grewelthorpe**Site: GW4 (The old quarry field, Grewelthorpe)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Land Drainage****Land Drainage Site Assessment****Land drainage: summary of issues.**

According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed site is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred.

We are however, aware of flooding incidents in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide.

Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) should always be any developer's first consideration and giving preference to soakaways.

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: Grewelthorpe**Site: GW5 (Land adjacent to Newholme Farm, Grewelthorpe)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site located in a field at south end of Grewelthorpe. LCA43: Vale Fring Farmland Kirby Malzeard to Azerley (on boundary with LCA34: Kirky Malzeard to Grewelthorpe).
Landscape description	Area description: The wider landscape is a small to medium scale rolling landscape with scattered settlement and a mix of early enclosure fields. Site description: Medium sized grass field at the south end of the village.
Existing urban edge	Site is in open countryside separated from the linear village of Grewelthorpe at its southern end by strip field.
Trees and hedges	Hedgrows boundaries with few trees in hedgerow.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Nidderdale AONB Public Right of Way Open countryside.
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The rural landscape is highly valued and susceptible to change as a result of the introduction of new uncharacteristic development. Susceptibility increases with the scale of development proposed and where proposals do not respect existing settlement pattern.
Visual Sensitivity	Views of the site from the south will become more extensive with the introduction of buildings.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of field in open countryside to uncharacteristic development.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	It would not be possible to successfully mitigate the effects of introducing a new development in this location that is separate from the existing village.
Likely level of landscape effects	Large scale adverse due to the size of the development in open countryside that would not respect existing settlement pattern.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	None.

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

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

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

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

Summary conclusion	The landscape character of the Nidderdale AONB has very low capacity to accept new development particularly in open countryside and that does not respect local settlement pattern.
---------------------------	---

Settlement: Grewelthorpe**Site: GW5 (Land adjacent to Newholme Farm, Grewelthorpe)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	None
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Highfield House, and the historic settlement.
Commentary on heritage assets.	Highfield House is a Victorian house set well away from the street and faces south. It is a building of good quality, designed to be at the edge of the village to take advantage of the views. Development of the eastern part of the site would impact on these views. Within the village a number of historic buildings, including listed buildings contribute to its character. The village has architectural and historic significance, such that it could be considered a conservation area. The road rises from the east up to the village and of particular note the narrowing of the road near Highfield provides a gateway into the village. Development of the whole site with houses would affect the setting of the historic village.
Topography and views	The land falls in an easterley direction. The site is barely visible from the road due to the fact the road is lower at the north end and there is a high hedge. The site enjoys views in all directions, particularly from the higher northern part.
Landscape context	The site in the AONB is just outside the village.
Grain of surrounding development	Generally, linear development of buildings are eaves onto the street, and the distance back from the street varies providing considerable interest. The area in front of Maryfield Farmhouse and northwards forms such a large verge that it appears a green, some houses have modest enclosed front gardens, whilst further up a row is right against the highway. Behind the frontage, farmsteads and tofts have been developed and these developments generally take the form of yards. Further north is a twentieth century close of detached homes, which is not locally distinctive. Local to the site, detached homes are set back from the road, Highfield is set well away and faces south. To the southeast of the site is Newholme Farm, close to the site a dwelling is set away from the farm buildings, which form a group.
Local building design	Houses and taller barns are two storey, a number of farm and outbuildings are single storey in height. The vast majority of buildings are of local stone, and a few are rendered, but not brightly painted. Roofs are a mixture of stone and Welsh slates and pantiles, with occasional concrete slates on new buildings or replacement roofs. The ratio of window to wall is low and the majority of the fenestration has a vertical emphasis. North of the site is a hipped roofed house that is rendered and has wide windows. North of this are bungalows. The dwelling at Newholme Farm is a bungalow. None of these reflects local distinctiveness. Highfield House is Victorian, it has canted bays linked with a porch roof, but otherwise generally reflects the vernacular.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The north of the site is higher than the road, and here there are steps from the road to a footpath that runs across the site. The boundaries are hedges and there are a few hedgerow trees on the north, west and south sides.

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

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

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

Rationale	Rating
Development is unlikely to affect any elements which contribute to the significance of a heritage asset.	Yellow

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

Rationale	Rating
The nature of the site means that built development will have a negative impact on local distinctiveness.	Red
Summary conclusion	Development of the whole of the site would not reflect local settlement pattern and would be outside the "gateway" to the village. Development of this site would be contrary to local distinctiveness.

Settlement: Grewelthorpe**Site: GW5 (Land adjacent to Newholme Farm, Grewelthorpe)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

SACs/SPAs	None likley to be impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	Hackfall SSSI is c.1km to north
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England require consultation for residential development of 100 units or more
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likley to be impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Improved pasture. The road verge may be species-rich.
Trees and Hedges	Boundary hedges (except to south east) Several mature boundary trees
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature boundary trees may merit TPO protection
Water/Wetland	None on site. Village pond 200m to north; Crimble Dale ponds 400m to west
Slope and Aspect	Generally flat
Buildings and Structures	None
Natural Area	NCA 24 Pennine Dales Fringe
Environmental Opportunity	SE04: Supporting and encouraging the creation of grass/woodland buffer strips, in-field grass strips, sediment traps, ponds and wetland habitats to slow run-off and intercept sediments and pollutants from farmland
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 35 Kirkby Malzeard and Grewelthorpe <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Encourage the maintenance and repair of existing hedgerows...” • “Hedgerow trees are important to diversity... Promote the planting and replacement of native hedgerow trees”.
Connectivity/Corridors	The network of small pasture fields and hedgerows contributes to a biodiverse countryside in the eastern dales fringe of the Nidderdale AONB.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Existing boundary trees and hedgerows should be protected, retained and enhanced with additional native planting and wildflower planting along the boundaries to complement the the road verges.
Protected Species	Birds are likley to nest and bats to forage among the boundary trees and hedgerows, great crested newt may breed in surrounding ponds.
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 network of small pasture fields and hedgerows contributes to a biodiverse countryside in the eastern dales fringe of the Nidderdale AONB. Were the site to be developed, existing boundary trees and hedgerows should be protected, retained and enhanced with additional native planting and wildflower planting along the boundaries to complement the the road verges.
---------------------------	---

Settlement: Grewelthorpe

Site: GW5 (Land adjacent to Newholme Farm, Grewelthorpe)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments

Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.

According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed site is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred.

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

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

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

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

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

Conclusion

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

Rationale

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

Rating

Orange

Settlement: Hampsthwaite**Site: HM2 (Land at Cruet Farm, Hampsthwaite)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site located on the south side of Hampsthwaite. LCA24: Lower Nidderdale Valley Northwest of Harrogate.
Landscape description	Area description: The wider landscape comprises the broad valley of the Nidd with a flat valley floor that has a landscape pattern that is diverse with areas of random field pattern typical of early enclosure. There are several villages and scattered farmsteads along the valley and this area is well served by a network of minor roads. Site description: Small irregular parcel of land adjacent small new brick housing development that appears out of place. The site includes two existing buildings which appear to be in the process of renovation.
Existing urban edge	The site is detached from the main settlement of Hampsthwaite but does relate to settlement on the opposite side of Hollins Lane.
Trees and hedges	There does not appear to be any significant vegetation on site.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open countryside.
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The landscape of the Nidd Valley is influenced by the appearance of settlement within the landscape and this site is seen on the approach to the village
Visual Sensitivity	Site is seen on the approach to Hampsthwaite but is seen in context with various existing built form.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of mature vegetation and openness on the edge of the village. Addition of high density built form in a rural location.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Built form density would need to be lowered to respect neighbouring development and the rural location beyond the village edge.
Likely level of landscape effects	Medium scale adverse due to this small site being located beyond the village edge.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	None 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: 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 the type of development proposed but the approach to the village would be altered further.
---------------------------	--

Settlement: Hampsthwaite**Site: HM2 (Land at Cruet Farm, Hampsthwaite)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	None
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	House south of site, Cruet Farm Barn and house.
Commentary on heritage assets.	<p>The house adjacent to the site faces south; it is typical of the vernacular in its basic simple dual pitched form and materials, however it features more generous overhangs to the roof and on the south front canted bays going through two storeys and topped with hipped roofs. This house is of historic and architectural importance.</p> <p>On the site, the nineteenth century barn has considerable visual impact because its gable sits against the highway at this corner in the road. It is not in an ideal condition, but none the less should be retained because of its contribution to the rural character of the area. The farmhouse has recently been restored, it faces east and has an asymmetrical roof caused by a full length lean-to on the west side. Whilst from the road it is not of high architectural quality, other than its stone slate roof, it is of historic value.</p>
Topography and views	The land gently falls to the north. There are views out from the rear of the site. The front of the site is highly visible from Hollins Lane.
Landscape context	Until recently Cruet Farm stood alone on the east side of the lane, however recently a small housing development has been constructed adjacent to the site.
Grain of surrounding development	Typical of the rural area, Hampsthwaite was developed linearly along the principal routes. Near the site, the area between Hollins Lane and High Street is a large estate of detached homes set quite close side by side behind modest front gardens. Along Hollins Lane houses and bungalows are set further back from the road and distances between the sides of dwellings are varied, so the grain is less dense. The new development next to the site is set around a cul-de-sac; its short rows and mainly semi-detached houses are set close to the new road, and the first house is gable onto Hollins Lane.
Local building design	<p>Building design is varied in the context of the site. The house adjacent the site and farmhouse reflect the vernacular; they are of simple two storey form, constructed in stone and have welsh slate and stone slate roofs. They have a low window to wall ratio, and so are robust in character, and have ridge end stacks. Typically windows are vertical sliding sashes, but elsewhere in the village older houses have yorkshire sliding sashes. The twentieth century housing near the site is a variety of bungalows, many with rooms in the roof, and two storey houses. Materials vary, most dwellings are brick or render and have tiled roofs.</p> <p>The new two storey housing is generally of simple form eaves onto the road, although a couple of units are gable on, so these buildings do not reflect traditional short terraces. The houses are of brick or render and have concrete tiled roofs. They are not locally distinctive and do not respect the historic buildings of Cruet Farm.</p>
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The farmhouse and barn ought to be retained. North of the house is a brick single storey building that has been rendered and altered since erection. It is not of any significance and could be demolished. Any development of the site should ensure that the amenity of residents around the site is not unreasonably reduced.

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 southern part of the site should be kept free of development and the two historic buildings worthy of retention should be conserved.

Settlement: Hampsthwaite**Site: HM2 (Land at Cruet Farm, Hampsthwaite)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

SACs/SPAs	None likely to be impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	None likely to be impacted
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likely to be impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	None
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Elements of tall ruderal
Trees and Hedges	Only a few feral shrubs and seedlings
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	None
Water/Wetland	A drain flow east from the site
Slope and Aspect	Generally flat
Buildings and Structures	Disused cottage and farm buildings
Natural Area	NCA 22: Pennines Dales Fringe
Environmental Opportunity	SEO4 Enhancing and connecting semi-natural habitats in river corridors to improve the wildlife movement corridors between lowland and upland. SE04: Supporting and encouraging the creation of grass/woodland buffer strips, in-field grass strips, sediment traps, ponds and wetland habitats to slow run-off and intercept sediments and pollutants from farmland
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 24 Lower Nidderdale Valley north west of Harrogate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Preserve traditional field boundaries and encourage the restoration and management of hedgerows and walls” • “Hedgerow and Parkland Trees require management and a programme of replacement”. • “Explore opportunities to diversify grassland in the area..”
Connectivity/Corridors	The site connects into remnants of a historic network of small fields which was once exceptionally rich in mature trees. High density of veterans survives in the fields to the north.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Hedgerow planting with native trees to complement the surviving local historic legacy
Protected Species	Nesting birds and potentially bats will utilise boundary and ornamental trees on site.
BAP Priority Species	Not known
Invasive Species	None known
Notes	

Conclusion

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

Rationale	Rating
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	Derelict buildings likely to require to be surveyed for bats and breeding bird. Water quality of the ditch on the eastern boundary should be safeguarded. Opportunities should be sought to incorporate biodiversity enhancement into the redevelopment
---------------------------	---

Settlement: Hampsthwaite

Site: HM2 (Land at Cruet Farm, Hampsthwaite)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments

Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.

According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed development is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred.

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

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

It is likely that a proportion of the existing buildings and barns etc. are not positively drained to either a watercourse or public sewer, consequently, A full survey of the drainage systems from currently developed areas should be undertaken to establish condition and outfall location.

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

Conclusion

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

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

Settlement: Hampsthwaite**Site: HM4 (Land south of Brookfield, Hampsthwaite)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site located south of the village centre. LCA24: Lower Nidderdale Valley north west of Harrogate
Landscape description	Area description: The wider landscape comprises the large-scale broad valley of the river Nidd. The valley floor is flat with an intimate field pattern typical of early enclosure. Woodland and tree cover in the area is particularly good, especially along the valley floor. Site description: Grass fields with overgrown mixed hedgerow boundaries containing some trees. The land slopes upwards to the south away from the village.
Existing urban edge	The site is detached from the urban edge except for a small section of the northern boundary which extends to the back of housing on Brookfield. However, adjacent site HM1 is currently being developed and will result in a change to the urban edge in relation to this site.
Trees and hedges	Hedgerow field boundaries with mature trees. (Few TPOs on north boundary - there are other trees on site possibly worthy of TPO)
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open Countryside Public Right of way through the northern part of the site. TPO.
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The rural landscape has very high sensitivity to the loss of fields in open countryside.
Visual Sensitivity	The site is screened from Rowden Lane due to the overgrown hedge on the lane. There are extensive views of the site from the wider landscape, particularly across the valley.
Anticipated landscape effects	The development of this site would result in an uncharacteristic extension of considerable size in relation to the existing settlement.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Effective mitigation would not be possible and adjacent sites offer greater opportunities for mitigation.
Likely level of landscape effects	Large scale adverse effects due to scale of development in open countryside detached from the urban edge.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	HM1 is being developed for housing and will provide a link between the site and the urban edge. The development of HM7 would also link the site to the urban edge. However, despite the greater opportunities for mitigation the scale of development involved would result in large scale adverse effects.

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

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

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

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

Summary conclusion	The landscape does not have the capacity to accept the scale of development proposed which would extend the village particularly when viewed from across the valley.
---------------------------	--

Settlement: Hampsthwaite**Site: HM4 (Land south of Brookfield, Hampsthwaite)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments** **Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

SACs/SPAs	None likley to be impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	None likley to be impacted
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likley to be impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Improved pasture (P1HS 1992)
Trees and Hedges	Boundary hedges with some significant mature trees. One mature field tree
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature trees should be considered for TPOs
Water/Wetland	Drain runs northwards between the two fields
Slope and Aspect	Land falls northwards towards the Nidd Valley
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. SE04: Supporting and encouraging the creation of grass/woodland buffer strips, in-field grass strips, sediment traps, ponds and wetland habitats to slow run-off and intercept sediments and pollutants from farmland
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 24 Lower Nidderdale Valley north west of Harrogate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Preserve traditional field boundaries and encourage the restoration and management of hedgerows and walls” • “Hedgerow and Parkland Trees require management and a programme of replacement”. • “Explore opportunities to diversify grassland in the area...”
Connectivity/Corridors	Hedgerows, trees and drain form a network
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Enhancement of hedgerows with native tree-planting and buffering of drain, possible to create a small Suds wetland
Protected Species	Bats and nesting birds may utilise mature trees and hedgerows
BAP Priority Species	Not known
Invasive Species	Not known
Notes	was RL 37a 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 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	Hedgerows and mature trees should be protected and retained and granted sufficient space within the development for their long-term survival. Opportunities for new tree and hedge planting and buffering of field drain to create a small Suds wetland
---------------------------	---

Settlement: Hampsthwaite**Site: HM4 (Land south of Brookfield, Hampsthwaite)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Land Drainage****Land Drainage Site Assessment****Land drainage: summary of issues.**

According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed site is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Settlement: Hampsthwaite**Site: HM5 (Land to east of Rowden Lane, Hampsthwaite)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site located southwest of settlement off Rowden Lane LCA24: Lower Nidderdale Valley North West of Harrogate
Landscape description	Area description: The wider landscape comprises the large-scale broad valley of the river Nidd. The valley floor is flat with a field pattern typical of early enclosure. Woodland and tree cover in the area is particularly good, especially along the valley floor. Site description: The site comprises a small parcel of land occupying a grass field used for sheep grazing right at the village edge. The field rises sharply to the northeast and culminates with a small rock outcrop from where there are attractive views over the surrounding countryside.
Existing urban edge	The site is surrounded by open countryside along three boundaries and projects beyond the urban edge of the village.
Trees and hedges	Hedgerow field boundaries with some mature trees.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open countryside Public Right of Way on north boundary. TPO on north boundary.
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The landform of the site is susceptible to change and the loss of vegetation and the introduction of built form in this location would be incongruous.
Visual Sensitivity	The site is visible from Rowden Lane to the south at mid distance, but at close range the land rises sharply along the road boundary and the field is concealed behind the hedgerow.
Anticipated landscape effects	Development would be visible in the wider landscape because of the site's exposed position at the village edge. Access to Rowden Lane would be difficult, constrained by level differences between the site and the road.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Limited potential for mitigation since the site lies at a highly exposed location at the edge of the village where tree and hedgerow cover is limited.
Likely level of landscape effects	Large scale adverse due to the location of the site on the valley side above Hampsthwaite and the impact on the setting and context of the village.
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	The area's ability to accept change is limited, especially in village edge locations, which are particularly susceptible to change.
---------------------------	---

Settlement: Hampsthwaite**Site: HM5 (Land to east of Rowden Lane, Hampsthwaite)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Hampsthwaite Conservation Area
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	None
Commentary on heritage assets.	The site is separated from the conservation area by a small enclave of housing on Rowden Lane. Development of the site would affect the approach to the conservation area.
Topography and views	Rowden Lane falls quite steeply down to the High Street to the north. The rocky outcrop on the site affords significant views over the village and wider valley. The site is much higher than the lane at the northern end and consequently development here will have a greater visual impact on the approach to the conservation area, and housing would be seen from the north if located near the outcrop.
Landscape context	The site is to the south of existing housing and a site, which has consent for housing. To the south and east are agricultural fields.
Grain of surrounding development	Typical of the rural area, Hampsthwaite was developed linearly along the principal routes. Near the site, the area between Hollins Lane and High Street is a large estate of detached homes set quite close side by side behind modest front gardens. There are low density detached suburban houses to north, arranged in fan formation around shared drive. They are set well back from lane and not oriented to face the lane.
Local building design	Older buildings of the conservation area reflect the vernacular, they are of simple two storey form, constructed in stone and have Welsh slate and stone slate roofs. They have a low window to wall ratio, and so are robust in character, and have ridge end stacks. Typically windows are vertical sliding sashes, but some older houses have Yorkshire sliding sashes. Off Rowden Lane: are four detached mid-twentieth century dwellings with gabled forms. There is a mix of two storey houses and dormer bungalows. The bungalows being nearest the site, where the land is higher. This housing is a mix of brick and render, with pantile roofs. They and the housing of Brookfield are not locally distinctive.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The site levels are such that vehicular access would have to be near the south, which is away from the conservation area. From Rowden Lane steps provide pedestrian access to a footpath that runs across the northern part of the site. There is a hedge to the lane and dry stone wall to the boundary on the north. There are a couple of large trees on the northern boundary. The site's main feature is the rocky outcrop marked on OS maps as Knox Hill. This has very steeply sloping sides and an exposed, rocky brow (possibly quarried at a small scale at some point).

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

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

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

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

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

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

Summary conclusion

As development north of the outcrop would be harmful to the setting of the village, and development close to the west would harm the approach to the village, any development on the site would be isolated from the existing settlement and thus would not reflect local settlement pattern.

Settlement: Hampsthwaite**Site: HM5 (Land to east of Rowden Lane, Hampsthwaite)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

SACs/SPAs	None likley to be impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	None likley to be impacted
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likley to be impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	Target Note SE25NE 05 Knox Hill. Small area of semi-improved neutral grassland with gritstone boulders with bluebell and lesser spearwort.
Sward	Improved grassland [P1HS 1992] (but see TN above). Relatively unmanaged verge to Rowden Lane
Trees and Hedges	Good hedges to all field boundaries with some mature trees - especially along southern and south-easterly boundaries. A few small trees near the rock outcrop at Knox Hill.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature boundary tree likley to merit TPO protection
Water/Wetland	None on site
Slope and Aspect	The land is undulating but generally falls towards Hampsthwaite to the north west
Buildings and Structures	None on site
Natural Area	NCA 22: Pennines Dales Fringe
Environmental Opportunity	SEO4 Enhancing and connecting semi-natural habitats in river corridors to improve the wildlife movement corridors between lowland and upland. SE04: Supporting and encouraging the creation of grass/woodland buffer strips, in-field grass strips, sediment traps, ponds and wetland habitats to slow run-off and intercept sediments and pollutants from farmland
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 24 Lower Nidderdale Valley north west of Harrogate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Preserve traditional field boundaries and encourage the restoration and management of hedgerows and walls” • “Hedgerow and Parkland Trees require management and a programme of replacement”. • “Explore opportunities to diversify grassland in the area...”
Connectivity/Corridors	The roadside verges and hedges link into the valley of Cockhill beck (just over Rowden Lane from the site) which forms a lightly wooded corridor from Graystone Plain through the village and joins the river Nidd north of the village.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Enhancement of hedgerows with native tree-planting and enhancement of seminatural grassland around the rock outcrop at Knox Hill
Protected Species	Bird and bats likely to utilise boundary hedgerows and trees; some potential for ground-nesting birds
BAP Priority Species	Not known
Invasive Species	None known
Notes	RL4005 2010 (amber)

Conclusion

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

Rationale	Rating
Some potential adverse effects on designated sites (Local Site, SSSI, LNR, the wider ecological network and/or priority habitats and species but appropriate siting/scale or substantial mitigation should enable development.	Orange
Summary conclusion	The outcrop at Knox Hill should be excluded from any development and buffered utilising a wildflower meadow. Trees and hedgerows should be protected, retained and enhanced with native tree-planting

Settlement: Hampsthwaite**Site: HM5 (Land to east of Rowden Lane, Hampsthwaite)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Land Drainage****Land Drainage Site Assessment****Land drainage: summary of issues.**

According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed site is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Settlement: Hampsthwaite**Site: HM6 (Land southeast of St Thomas a Beckett Walk, Hampsthwaite)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site is located on the north side of the village adjacent to development at the former abattoir site. LCA24: Lower Nidderdale Valley North West of Harrogate
Landscape description	Area description: The wider landscape comprises the large-scale broad valley of the river Nidd. The valley floor is flat with an field pattern typical of early enclosure. Woodland and tree cover in the area is particularly good, especially along the valley floor. Site description: Low lying flat arable field north of Cockhill beck.
Existing urban edge	To the west boundary is the cricket ground and to the north is new development. South of Cockhill beck there is housing. Although rural in character the site sits well within the context of the village and the wider landscape.
Trees and hedges	Mature trees on the boundary with Cockhill beck to the south.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open countryside. Public Right of Way across the site and along side Cockhill Beck.
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The landscape has sensitivity to development on the village edge particularly where development protrudes into open countryside.
Visual Sensitivity	The site will be widely seen but is viewed in context with new development to the north that has integrated with the village to the south.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of open field on the village edge.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Built form density should reflect that of adjacent development and green infrastructure should seek to enhance the beck corridor.
Likely level of landscape effects	Medium scale adverse due to the loss of open field on the village edge. However development in this area need not be out of character.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	HM3 to the south would extend new built form on the village edge and increase impact on the landscape resource.

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	There is some capacity for the landscape to accept residential development on this site assuming landscape mitigation is intrinsic to the design and built form density is appropriate.
---------------------------	---

Settlement: Hampsthwaite**Site: HM6 (Land southeast of St Thomas a Beckett Walk, Hampsthwaite)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Hampsthwaite Conservation Area
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Buildings on the east side of Church Lane
Commentary on heritage assets.	The site is separated from the conservation area by the cricket field. There is a key view marked on the conservation area appraisal, which looks towards the northern part of the site. There are a number of buildings on the east side of Church Lane that are of interest and merit such that they contribute to the significance of the conservation area. One is the two storey former outbuilding to Swallow Cottage, which together with the land around it was noted as requiring enhancement. The building has been recently restored. Notwithstanding some recent fencing and timber garden building, glimpsed views show the open-ness of the land beyond, which contribute to the rural character of the village. Development of the site would affect the setting of the conservation area.
Topography and views	The site is in low lying land near the river. Glimpsed views are available from the conservation area. The path, marked in the appraisal as a strategic path, passes to the south of the site, and consequently has views across the site. Views from the site to the north and east are over farmland.
Landscape context	The site is separated from the core of the village by the cricket field and is adjacent to existing residential areas to the north and south.
Grain of surrounding development	Typical of the rural area, Hampsthwaite was developed linearly along the principal routes. South of the site, Hollins Close is an estate of bungalows; one cul-de-sac has semi-detached homes, the other nearest the site features detached homes set quite close side by side behind small front gardens. Along Hollins Lane houses and bungalows are set further back from the road and distances between the sides of dwellings are varied. North of the site is a bungalow and to its northeast is the recent development of the former abattoir. Here large detached houses with quite steeply pitched roofs are set in modest gardens.
Local building design	Building design is varied in the context of the site. The historic houses and outbuildings of the conservation area reflect the vernacular; houses are mainly of simple two storey form, constructed in stone and have welsh slate and stone slate roofs. They have a low window to wall ratio, and so are robust in character, and have ridge end stacks. Typically windows are vertical sliding sashes, but some older houses have Yorkshire sliding sashes. The housing north of the site is of materials that reflect the traditional materials, however their higher roof pitches and location on a raised area of land, results in them not fully reflecting local distinctiveness. The bungalows south of the site are in a variety of materials, which together with their low height, forms and larger window to wall ratio cause them to be contrary to local distinctiveness.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The north and west parts of the site are in the flood zone, similarly the south of the site alongside Cockhill Beck is in its flood zone. Any development of the northern part of the site would have to protect the amenity of the dwellings 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 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 in theory low density development could be restricted to the southeast part of the site to minimise impact on views from the conservation area, development here would impact detrimentally on settlement pattern, compounded by the fact buildings would have to be raised above potential flood levels and so would be prominent in this location.

Settlement: Hampsthwaite**Site: HM6 (Land southeast of St Thomas a Beckett Walk, Hampsthwaite)****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	Flowing water (Cockhill Beck), Arable Farmland
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	see Smeeden Forman survey associated with 15/01993/OUT
Sward	Arable
Trees and Hedges	Patchy hedge and tree lined beck to south
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Riparian trees may merit TPO protection
Water/Wetland	Cockhill beck on southern boundary; much of the site is within the floodzone
Slope and Aspect	Generally flat
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. SE04: Supporting and encouraging the creation of grass/woodland buffer strips, in-field grass strips, sediment traps, ponds and wetland habitats to slow run-off and intercept sediments and pollutants...
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 24 Lower Nidderdale Valley north west of Harrogate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Preserve traditional field boundaries and encourage the restoration and management of hedgerows and walls” • “Hedgerow and Parkland Trees require management and a programme of replacement”. • “Explore opportunities to diversify grassland in the area...”
Connectivity/Corridors	Cockhill beck links Hampsthwaite with the River Nidd
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Opportunity for multi-functional habitat enhancement of the corridor of the beck
Protected Species	Trees and shrubs may support breeding birds and foraging bats, Beck may support riparian species such as otter and kingfisher
BAP Priority Species	Some potential for priority bird species of arable farmland and brown harew
Invasive Species	Himalayan balsam may occur along Cockhill Beck
Notes	RL1106 2010 15/01993/OUT refused

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	Generous buffering may offer the potential for ecological enhancement of corridor of Cockhill Beck, which may also help to relieve flooding to some extent. See DC comments for 15/01993/OUT (refused)
---------------------------	--

Settlement: Hampsthwaite**Site: HM6 (Land southeast of St Thomas a Beckett Walk, Hampsthwaite)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Land Drainage****Land Drainage Site Assessment****Land drainage: summary of issues.**

According to the Environment Agency flood maps, a large proportion of this proposed site is located within flood zone 2/3.

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.

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 a potentially high water table. 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: Hampsthwaite**Site: HM7 (Land off Brookfield Garth, Hampsthwaite)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site located southeast of village, off Brookfield Garth LCA24: Lower Nidderdale Valley north west of Harrogate
Landscape description	Area description: The wider landscape comprises the large-scale broad valley of the river Nidd. The valley floor is flat with a field pattern typical of early enclosure. Woodland and tree cover in the area is particularly good, especially along the valley floor. Site description: The site comprises a narrow elongated rough field at the village edge. The field is poorly managed with areas of rank weed growth and regenerating scrub. There are some young ash trees along the north boundary that would be worthy of retention.
Existing urban edge	The site is closely related to the urban edge since it is contained by housing to the north and east. Urban edge comprises late 20th century housing on Brookfield.
Trees and hedges	Overgrown hedgerow boundaries
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open Countryside Public Right of Way crosses the site.
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwelling per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The landscape has sensitivity to changes in the urban edge and the loss of characteristic fields at the urban edge.
Visual Sensitivity	The site occupies a site on the lower valley side and is mostly viewed in context with the built up area of the village. A public footpath passes along the south boundary with direct views over the site.
Anticipated landscape effects	There would be loss of an open field at the village edge in an area that is popular to locals for dog walking and informal recreation.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	The field itself is not of high landscape quality however retention of hedgerows and native trees is critical to preserve the rural character of the area.
Likely level of landscape effects	Medium to small scale adverse effects, with careful design and appropriate landscape mitigation, harmful effects could be minimised.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	HM1 - site currently under construction to the west links with this site.

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	There is some landscape capacity for the development of this site assuming appropriate mitigation and the opportunity to improve the appearance of the urban edge is taken.
---------------------------	---

Settlement: Hampsthwaite**Site: HM7 (Land off Brookfield Garth, Hampsthwaite)****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, (possible veteran Trees).
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Improved grassland [1992 P1HS]. Now neglected, tussocky grassland with abundant thistle and docks. Some knapweed.
Trees and Hedges	Remnant hedgerow exists along northern boundary with Brookfield Garth with scattered mature trees (including oak and ash) - probably remnants of trees shown along field boundary in 1st ed. OS.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature trees along the boundaries may benefit from TPO protection
Water/Wetland	A small stream runs northwards along the western boundary of the field before being culverted as it enters the garden of a house on Brookfield Garth. There is a drain along NE boundary with Brookfield Garth. Natural drainage linking to Cockhill Beck has been culverted under Brookfield estate.
Slope and Aspect	Generally flat
Buildings and Structures	None
Natural Area	NCA 22: Pennines Dales Fringe
Environmental Opportunity	SEO4 Enhancing and connecting semi-natural habitats in river corridors to improve the wildlife movement corridors between lowland and upland. SE04: Supporting and encouraging the creation of grass/woodland buffer strips, in-field grass strips, sediment traps, ponds and wetland habitats to slow run-off and intercept sediments and pollutants from farmland
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 24 Lower Nidderdale Valley north west of Harrogate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Preserve traditional field boundaries and encourage the restoration and management of hedgerows and walls". • "Hedgerow and Parkland Trees require management and a programme of replacement". • "Explore opportunities to diversify grassland in the area..."
Connectivity/Corridors	The connectivity of hedgerows and drains in the area has been disrupted by the development of the Brookfield Estate. Measures on or off site that would help to restore or compensate for further loss should be sought.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Hedgerow and trees along northern boundary should be conserved and enhanced, Similar hedgerows could be created either side of the public footpath, which would reflect historic character of the area. The part of the field south of the footpath could be managed as semi-natural grassland open space. SUDs enhancement opportunities may have to be sought offsite. Hampsthwaite lies adjacent to the Regionally Important Strategic Green Infrastructure Corridor identified along the River Nidd. Opportunities to enhance GI within corridor this should be prioritised.
Protected Species	nesting birds are likely to be associated with the hedgerows and trees near the boundary and bats may utilise the mature trees.
BAP Priority Species	None known
Invasive Species	None known
Notes	was RL2061 2010 (amber)

Conclusion

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

Rationale	Rating
Some potential adverse effects on designated sites (Local Site, SSSI, LNR, the wider ecological network and/or priority habitats and species but appropriate siting/scale or substantial mitigation should enable development.	Orange
Summary conclusion	The site is becoming naturalised following agricultural disuse. Trees and hedgerows should be retained and protected, and opportunities sought for significant new native planting. Opportunity for creation of Suds wetland should be explored. Ecological survey required.

Settlement: Hampsthwaite

Site: HM7 (Land off Brookfield Garth, Hampsthwaite)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments

Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.

According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed site is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred.

We are however, aware of flooding incidents in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses including Brookfield. 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: Hampsthwaite**Site: HM8 (Land at 43 Hollins Lane, Hampsthwaite)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Site located on the east side of the village, off Hollins Lane LCA24: Lower Nidderdale Valley north west of Harrogate
Landscape description	Area description: The wider landscape comprises the large-scale broad valley of the river Nidd. The valley floor is flat with a field pattern typical of early enclosure. Woodland and tree cover in the area is particularly good, especially along the valley floor. Site description: The site comprises two medium sized fields containing numerous mature oaks and good hedgerows. The oak trees are highly distinctive and contribute to the exceptionally attractive setting at this edge of the village.
Existing urban edge	The site is separated from the urban edge by Hollins Lane and supports numerous landscape features that contribute to its attractive character. The area is unspoilt and development would result in loss of rural character and a significant encroachment into open countryside.
Trees and hedges	Hedgerow boundaries and mature trees worthy of TPO.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open countryside Public Right of Way along north boundary.
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The landscape character of the Nidd valley and the setting of Hampsthwaite is susceptible to the loss of mature trees and fields with a character distinctive of the area.
Visual Sensitivity	The site occupies the lower valley side and is visually contained by topography and surrounding tree cover. There are limited views from higher ground to the south and views are mainly screened by intervening tree cover.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of hedgerows and the effects on the mature oak trees would result in a significant impact. Access would also be difficult from the highway without damage to existing hedgerows.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	There is limited potential for mitigation since development would result in the loss of landscape features that would be difficult to replace.
Likely level of landscape effects	Large scale adverse affects on landscape pattern and rural setting of the village.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	HM3 to the north.

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	The area is an excellent example of a surviving landscape of high quality and great importance comprising distinctive mature oak trees, an historic field system and field pasture. These landscape features should be restored and managed for future protection. There is no capacity to accept the change proposed without significant detriment.
---------------------------	--

Settlement: Hampsthwaite**Site: HM8 (Land at 43 Hollins Lane, Hampsthwaite)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Hampsthwaite Conservation Area
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Fairleigh House
Commentary on heritage assets.	<p>The edge of the conservation area lies to the west of the site, views east encompass Fairleigh House and its access, hence any development of the north part of the site will affect the setting of the conservation area. Dense high buildings on the site would impact on the approach to the conservation area.</p> <p>Fairleigh House is of historic and architectural interest. Its main front faces south onto its private garden, which is screened from Hollins Lane by a boundary wall. The outbuilding east of the house is of historic interest, it has been altered so its architectural merit is not high, but none the less is of some significance.</p>
Topography and views	Land gently falls to the north to Cockhill Beck. There are views out to the north, east and southeast over open countryside.
Landscape context	Fairleigh House was an isolated house, fields to three sides retain this rural character. It is separated from residential development by Hollins Lane.
Grain of surrounding development	<p>Typical of the rural area, Hampsthwaite was developed linearly along the principal routes.</p> <p>West of the site, Dale Close reflects suburbia, with a mixture of semi-detached and detached houses and bungalows set behind small front gardens and closely spaced. Detached bungalows facing Hollins Lane have longer front gardens.</p> <p>South of the site a new development of semi-detached houses and short rows are set close to the road.</p> <p>Fairleigh House is gable onto Hollins Lane, facing south, which is typical orientation for rural houses isolated from the core of settlements.</p>
Local building design	<p>Building Design is mixed in the context of the site. Fairleigh House and outbuilding reflect the vernacular, where houses are of simple two storey form, constructed in stone and have welsh or stone slate roofs. They have a low window to wall ratio, and so are robust in character, and have ridge end stacks. Typically windows are vertical sliding sashes, but elsewhere in the village older houses have yorkshire sashes. The outbuilding is of generous height and features a loft access door of the north side.</p> <p>Bungalows west and northwest of the site have concrete tiled roofs, many have dormers, walling materials vary, brick render and some random stone walling. Windows are wide. They do not contribute to local character, however their diminutive height offers some mitigation of the harm to the historic environment.</p> <p>New houses south of the site are in brick and render, they are not locally distinctive.</p>
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	Fairleigh House, outbuilding and the garden should be conserved. The trees alongside Hollins Lane, south of the garden and along the outgrown hedges east of the site should be protected where possible.

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	Fairleigh House and outbuilding should be retained, development at the east of the site should be low density.

Settlement: Hampsthwaite**Site: HM8 (Land at 43 Hollins Lane, Hampsthwaite)****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
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likely to be impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows, Parkland and Veteran Trees.
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Improved Pasture (1992). Species Poor Semi-Improved Pasture 2010.
Trees and Hedges	At least 15 veteran oaks appear to survive, apparently the remnants of 3 field boundaries from a historic strip field system of old fields. An exceptionally important, increasingly rare and irreplaceable biodiversity resource. Good field boundary hedgerows with some remnants of internal hedgerows surviving.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Veteran Oaks should be a priority to be protected with TPOs.
Water/Wetland	A spring is shown in the SW corner and remnants of drainage ditches survive in southern half of the site.
Slope and Aspect	relatively flat
Buildings and Structures	Farleigh House is a traditional stone built property with an associated barn in the north west corner of the site
Natural Area	NCA 22 Pennine Dales Fringe
Environmental Opportunity	Conserving and managing historic parklands, including: appropriate management of ancient and veteran trees; retention of deadwood fauna and flora; establishment of new generations of trees appropriate for each parkland's historic character; and provision of access and opportunities for engagement where appropriate.
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 24 Lower Nidderdale Valley north west of Harrogate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Preserve traditional field boundaries and encourage the restoration and management of hedgerows and walls" • "Hedgerow and Parkland Trees require management and a programme of replacement". • "Explore opportunities to diversify grassland in the area..."
Connectivity/Corridors	Hedgerows interconnect with adjacent fields, and other veteran trees to comprise significant local resource.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Hedgerows could be restored along the original field boundaries on site and also the surrounding area. Regeneration of replacement planting (or seeding) of local origin generation should be secured as a priority. Specialist advice should be sought on conservation of veteran trees.
Protected Species	hedgerows are likely to be utilised by nesting birds, which may also utilise the veteran trees, which may also provide roost sites for bats. Bats and nesting birds may also utilise the substantial buildings in the NW corner of the site. The site lies within c. 500m of GCN pond at Hollin Hall.
BAP Priority Species	None known but may be significant invertebrates and fungi associated with so many veteran trees
Invasive Species	None known
Notes	RL37c 2010 (red) was larger site, extending to 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
Significant adverse effects on designated sites (Local Site, SSSI, LNR), the wider ecological network and/or priority habitats and species.	Red
Summary conclusion	The presence of so many very significant mature and veteran trees, is a major constraint, as they must be given a very large amount of free space to protect their root zones and canopies once necessary risk assessments undertaken.

Settlement: Hampsthwaite

Site: HM8 (Land at 43 Hollins Lane, Hampsthwaite)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments

Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.

According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed site is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred.

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

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

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

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

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

Conclusion

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

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

Settlement: Hopperton**Site: HP5 (Land off Hopperton Street 4, Hopperton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Land off Hopperton Street Hopperton LCA68: Hunsingore and Hopperton Farmland
Landscape description	Area description: A moderate large-scale landscape consisting of large fields and several woodland blocks creating a partially enclosed feel. A pleasant and attractive area but the presence of the A1(M) and its constant traffic noise is a major detractor. Site description: The site is part of an 'L' shaped large arable field extending out into a flat open landscape to the east and north. Buildings associated with Grange Farm are located at the site's southern boundary consisting of a group of large scale buildings. A grassed verge and hedgerow runs along the roadside forming the site's western boundary with a brick and cobble wall, further to the south, forming the road boundary to the farm buildings. There is no site boundary to the east and south and no discernible edge to the north
Existing urban edge	The site is remote from any nearby settlement with the nearest property to the site 0.6km to the north fronting Hopperton Street.
Trees and hedges	Hedgerow along the roadside with absence of hedgerow trees
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open Countryside
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The site is considered to be of medium value as it is a landscape in good condition with components generally well maintained. The site is also considered to have a medium susceptibility to change due to its openness and lack of filtering vegetation and intervening topography resulting in a predicted medium sensitivity with regard to landscape character.
Visual Sensitivity	The site is highly visible from Hopperton Street with few other sensitive nearby receptors
Anticipated landscape effects	Development would result in a significant encroachment into open countryside with loss of part of an arable field adjacent to the highway
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Screen planting mitigation could be introduced to a limited effect
Likely level of landscape effects	There would be large adverse effects if the site was developed.
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	HP4 to the north on the west side of Hopperton Street

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: 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 large arable and wooded landscape would be affected by built form development in an open area devoid of any existing screening measures. The landscape has limited capacity to accept development on this site.
---------------------------	---

Settlement: Hopperton**Site: HP5 (Land off Hopperton Street 4, Hopperton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	None
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Hopperton Grange / Grange Farm. Other traditional buildings located to the north along Hopperton Street, plus one or two to the south west.
Commentary on heritage assets.	The site is located within the setting of the buildings of Hopperton Grange (Grange Farm) - farmhouse, rendered with hipped, stone slate roof and sash windows, plus range of historic, brick farm buildings to its north. Other, traditional cottages / dwellings located further to the north of the site, plus one or two to the south west.
Topography and views	Site is open and seen in context with surrounding countryside and buildings. Rise of lane to the east restricts wider views looking east but trees are visible in distance.
Landscape context	Gently undulating countryside of farmland with hedge and trees to boundaries.
Grain of surrounding development	Hopperton is a linear settlement with very low density, approx. 20 dwellings positioned in loose groupings, with fields separating the groups.
Local building design	Modest dwellings or converted farm building of brick and cobble.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The site is part of a field. The buildings of Grange Farm are located to its south. Verge and hedge to road which forms the west boundary (brick and cobble wall further to the south forming the road boundary to the farm buildings). No boundary to the east and south and also little 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.	Red

Summary conclusion	Development, at expected housing density and across the whole site would be harmful to the setting of the heritage assets present (particularly Grange Farm) and be contrary to the established, rural grain. Appropriate development may be a very low number of locally distinctive dwellings located at the north end of the site, facing the road, to a plot size / form that reflects others in the vicinity (therefore maintaining the linear and very low density grain present here i.e. no backland development). Harm to the setting of Grange Farm could be reduced by limiting development at the south end of the site and maintaining a rural character to all aspects of the development.
---------------------------	--

Settlement: Hopperton**Site: HP5 (Land off Hopperton Street 4, Hopperton)****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 most non- residential development in relation to SSSIs.
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	None likely to be impacted.
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows; Arable Farmland with field margins.
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None.
Sward	Arable (with 6m wide field margins).
Trees and Hedges	Low but good quality roadside and northern boundary hedgerows.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	None.
Water/Wetland	Ponds close by to NE and SW; Hew Beck to east.
Slope and Aspect	Slightly rising to the east.
Buildings and Structures	None on site, agricultural barns immediately to south.
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 68 Hunsingore and Hopperton Farmland "Woodland Planting which,,links with woodland and trees in the neighbouring countryside...links with hedgerows and new hedgerow planting may also help to link the [A1M] corridor with its landscape setting"
Connectivity/Corridors	Roadside and northern boundary hedgerows.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Strengthen existing hedgerows. New native tree and hedgerow planting.
Protected Species	Nesting birds likely to utilise boundary hedges and possibly arable field margins; birds and bats may use adjacent barns.
BAP Priority Species	Priority birds species of arable farmland and brown hare may be present.
Invasive Species	None known.
Notes	Likely to be in 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 effects on designated sites (SINC, SSSI, LNR), the wider ecological network and/or priority habitats and species but relatively easy to mitigate for.	Yellow
Summary conclusion	Existing hedgerows should be retained and strengthened and new native trees and hedgerows planted. Priority species of arable farmland may be present.

Settlement: Hopperton

Site: HP5 (Land off Hopperton Street 4, Hopperton)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments

Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.

According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed site is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred.

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

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

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

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

Conclusion

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

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

Settlement: Hopperton**Site: HP6 (Land off Grey Thorn Lane, Hopperton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Land off Grey Thorn Lane Hopperton LCA68: Hunsingore and Hopperton Farmland
Landscape description	
Existing urban edge	The site is remote from existing urban areas with the small hamlet of Hopperton to the north east
Trees and hedges	Hedgerows define the western boundary of site and both sides of Grey Thorn Lane. There are also hedgerow trees along the lane and along the northern part of the site bordering the A168. Poulter's Plantation, an isolated area of woodland, adjoins the south east boundary of the site
Landscape and Green Belt designations	Open Countryside
Description of proposal for the site	Employment site
Physical Sensitivity	The site is considered to be of medium value as it is a landscape in good condition with components generally well maintained. In terms of susceptibility the site is considered to have a medium susceptibility to change due to the proximity of the A1(M) and the line of the railway to the north of the site which would result in a medium sensitivity with regard to landscape character.
Visual Sensitivity	The site is highly visible the A168 with glimpsed views from the A1(M) corridor
Anticipated landscape effects	Development would result in a significant encroachment into open countryside with loss of arable land.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Woodland screening mitigation could mitigate some visual affects but not effects on landscape character
Likely level of landscape effects	There would be large adverse effects
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	Development of this site in conjunction with FX1 to the west of the A1(M) would have significant adverse impacts on the locality

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: 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 is considered to have a medium susceptibility to change due to the proximity of the A1(M) and the line of the railway to the north of the site which would result in a medium sensitivity. Development would result in a major encroachment into open countryside with loss of arable land.
---------------------------	--

Settlement: Hopperton**Site: HP6 (Land off Grey Thorn Lane, Hopperton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Allerton Park registered park and garden (grade II).
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	A dwelling that is the former gate house to the railway line. Other assets are present in the nearby countryside, for example, New Inn Farm and Forest Farm. Several traditional dwellings also located in Hopperton.
Commentary on heritage assets.	<p>The site is located within the rural landscape that surrounds Allerton Park registered park and garden (grade II); however, it is considered unlikely, due to topography and distance, that there will be a direct impact on the setting of the park (or otherwise, mitigation could limit impact through appropriate density of development / building heights and form / introduction of landscape screening).</p> <p>The site is located within the setting of the adjacent dwelling that is the former gate house to the railway line – this is located close to the north east corner of the site (the building is built of brick with stone quoins, overhanging eaves, decorative barge boards and has a modern extension). The site is located in the wider setting of the other heritage assets present in the nearby countryside, for example, New Inn Farm and Forest Farm (however, impact on setting will be reduced due to the presence of the A1M). Several traditional dwellings are also located in Hopperton. As for Allerton Park, mitigation could limit impact through appropriate density of development / building heights and form / introduction of landscape screening).</p>
Topography and views	The presence of the A1M is a major factor in how the site is seen in the wider landscape. Levels are relatively flat with gentle undulations.
Landscape context	Gently undulating countryside of farmland with hedge and trees to boundaries.
Grain of surrounding development	No development apart from dispersed farmsteads and the former gatehouse. Linear, very low density settlement of Hopperton located to the north east of the site.
Local building design	Modest dwellings or converted farm building of brick and cobble.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The site comprises fields through which runs a track called Grey Thorn Lane (no through road, trees along road). The railway line forms the north boundary. The A168 forms the west boundary (hedge and verge to road, shrubby trees to northern part). Small copse adjacent to south east corner of the site.

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

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

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

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

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

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

Summary conclusion

Whilst the addition of buildings which are, or reflect the scale and form of agricultural buildings (in combination with appropriate landscaping to integrate the development into the countryside and where buildings are not provided across the whole site and are of appropriate scale / height) could be implemented in a way that would be appropriate to the rural location and setting of heritage assets, the provision of buildings of a scale and density more akin to an urban commercial / industrial park would be harmful to local character, grain and also the setting of heritage assets. The increased impact of increased traffic and potential need for new road accesses would also likely result in a negative impact on the rural character of the area (over and above the existing negative impact from the A1M).

Settlement: Hopperton**Site: HP6 (Land off Grey Thorn Lane, Hopperton)****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 most non- 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	Arable.
Trees and Hedges	Mature Trees along Grey Thorn Lane; trees in hedgerow to the north along A168 of it. Poulter's Plantation lies adjacent to SE. Gappy hedgerow along Grey Thorn Lane.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Trees along Grey Thorn Lane likely merit TPOs.
Water/Wetland	None.
Slope and Aspect	Generally flat.
Buildings and Structures	None .
Natural Area	NCA 30 Southern Magnesian Limestone.
Environmental Opportunity	SEO 2: Protect and manage existing semi-natural habitats, including grasslands, wetlands and woodlands; and increase the area of semi-natural habitats, restore and create new areas, and create networks and links between habitats, to make their ecology more resilient and to afford increased movement of species.
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 68 Hunsingore and Hopperton Farmland "Woodland Planting which,,links the A1M corridor,,, with woodland and trees in the neighbouring countryside...links with hedgerows and new hedgerow planting may also help to link the corridor with its landscape setting"
Connectivity/Corridors	Railway and A168 corridors and Grey Thorn Lane.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Retain and enhance trees and hedgerows; opportunity to create Suds wetland.
Protected Species	Mature trees and hedgerows likely to support bats and nesting birds.
BAP Priority Species	Potential to support priority bird species of arable farmland.
Invasive Species	Not known.
Notes	

Conclusion

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

Rationale	Rating
Some potential 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 and hedges are the main features of ecological interest which should be enhanced and buffered from development. Fields and boundary features may support priority bird species of arable farmland.

Settlement: Hopperton**Site: HP6 (Land off Grey Thorn Lane, Hopperton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Land Drainage****Land Drainage Site Assessment****Land drainage: summary of issues.**

According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed site is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Settlement: Hopperton**Site: HP7 (New/expanded settlement at Hopperton)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	Allerton Park registered park and garden (grade II), Allerton Castle (grade II) and also including associated and separately listed structures, for example, the walled garden (grade II).
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	New Inn Farm. Former Allerton Station building. Former gate house to the railway line. Several traditional dwellings also located in Hopperton. Holly Cottage.
Commentary on heritage assets.	The site is located adjacent to Allerton Park registered park and garden, the A59 separating the two on the south edge of the park. The site is located within the rural landscape that surrounds the park and Allerton Castle and therefore is located within their setting. Some listed elements have a closer relationship with the site, such as the walled garden which is located to the south of the park. A dwelling that is the former gate house to the railway line (the building is built of brick with stone quoins, overhanging eaves, decorative barge boards and has a modern extension), is located within the site on its south edge - the building itself therefore maybe affected by development and / or its setting. The former Allerton Station building and also New Inn Farm are located outside the site on the west side, but impact on setting is reduced due to the location of the buildings on the other side of the A1M to the site, which provides some visual separation. Several traditional dwellings also located in Hopperton, the site adjoining Hopperton on its western edge. For example, Hopperton Grange (also known as Grange Farm), a farmhouse, rendered with hipped, stone slate roof and sash windows, plus range of historic, brick farm buildings to its north. Holly Cottage is located outside the site, on its north eastern edge, on the north side of the A59 – a one and half storey, lodge type dwelling with rendered walls, stone slate roof, substantial stone chimneys and decorative barge boards – the site is located within its setting.
Topography and views	The raised height of the A1M and A59 provide wide ranging visibility across parts of the site, but with the presence of the woodland blocks providing a break to these views in some locations. Views also from the A168 looking east towards Hopperton, with its buildings visible on a slight rise in the land (and views also looking from Hopperton, to the west, through gaps between buildings, these gaps being very spacious).
Landscape context	Gently undulating countryside of farmland with hedge and trees to boundaries. Large fields and woodland blocks. The A1M runs through the land in this location.
Grain of surrounding development	Hopperton is a linear settlement with very low density, approx. 20 dwellings positioned in loose groupings, with fields separating the groups. Otherwise, isolated farmsteads are present in the landscape, along with other isolated buildings such as those associated with the railway.
Local building design	Modest dwellings or converted farm building of brick and cobble within Hopperton. Elsewhere, vernacular farmsteads and country dwellings of varied form.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The site comprises a series of fields and areas of woodland, located to the south of the A59 and east of the A1M (but with the A168 forming the west boundary to the site) and adjoining the settlement of Hopperton on its western edge. The railway line forms part of the site's southern boundary. Hedgerows and trees form field boundaries.

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, at standard housing density and across the full extent of the site would be harmful to the character and grain of the settlement of Hopperton, being wholly contrary to its very low density, linear form. Anything other than limited infill in a linear form along Hopperton Street would be harmful to its character. Harm would also be caused to the landscape setting of Allerton Park and some of the associated heritage assets within it where housing at standard density and form would be out of character with this rural setting. Harm could be reduced, in respect of Allerton Park, by provision of development only to the south of Low Plantation, which would help provide a visual break between the two. Within a smaller site such as this (which would represent a significant reduction in the size of the proposed site), harm could be reduced by any scheme of development providing relief across the site to break up extensive dense built form with landscaping, green linkages, varied building heights and densities. Design to be high quality and locally distinctive. Due regard should be given to any indivisibility with Allerton Park Estate and mitigation of harm to the significance and setting of the same. However, the cumulative impact of development of this site in conjunction with FX1, FX3 and HP6 should be duly considered.

Settlement: Hopperton**Site: HP7 (New/expanded settlement at Hopperton)****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 most non- residential development in relation to SSSIs.
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	Allerton Park Lakes north of A59 - not likely to be impacted provided that sufficient green infrastructure is provided on this site.
BAP Priority Habitats	Woodland (some identified as priority deciduous woodland on MAGIC website), Hedgerows, Arable Farmland.
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None (SE45 NW TN9 just north of A59).
Sward	Arable.
Trees and Hedges	Plantation woodland (Gelshome, Middle and low plantations) includes broadleaved compartments; Strong hedgerows along the transport routes and some good internal hedgerows, some with mature trees.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Woodland and mature trees on site likely to benefit from TPO protection.
Water/Wetland	There is a drain runs E-W along the footpath to south of the the site; small drains within the woodland. Pond 250m to SE of site.
Slope and Aspect	The land gently undulates generally falling towards the east.
Buildings and Structures	None on site (other than railway).
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 68 Hunsingore and Hopperton Farmland "Woodland Planting which,,links the A1M corridor,,, with woodland and trees in the neighbouring countryside...links with hedgerows and new hedgerow planting may also help to link the corridor with its landscape setting"
Connectivity/Corridors	Footpath through site follows field boundaries and ditch. A168 follows old A1, A59 railway linear corridors along site boundaries.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Retain woodlands and hedgerows; enhance these features and connectivity, Opportunity for substantial Suds wetland.
Protected Species	Woodland likley to support bats, badgers and nesting birds. eDNA evidence of Great crested newt in pond (recorded to north of A59).
BAP Priority Species	Arable farmland may support priority bird species of arable farmland and brown hare.
Invasive Species	Himalayan balsam likely to be present.
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	Retain woodlands and hedgerows; enhance with native planting and buffer and enhance connectivity along transport corridors. Potential for significant Suds wetland in association with this site. Full ecological survey required, especially of woodland
---------------------------	---

Settlement: Hopperton

Site: HP7 (New/expanded settlement at Hopperton)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments

Type: Land Drainage

Land Drainage Site Assessment

Land drainage: summary of issues.

According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed development is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred.

We are however, aware of flooding incidents in the general area due to capacity issues in local sewers and watercourses. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to reduce flood risk where possible using NPPF as a guide.

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 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.

This site is situated partially 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.

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

Conclusion

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

Rationale

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

Rating

Orange

Settlement: Huby**Site: HB1 (Land at Holly Hill Farm, Huby)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Land at Holly Hill Farm Huby LCA61: South West Harrogate Upland Fringe Undulating Farmland
Landscape description	Area description: The wider landscape is a large scale area which slopes down south towards the River Wharfe Valley. The landform rolls and undulates with open views across a patchwork of random, medium sized fields. The land is managed predominantly for livestock with occasional arable fields scattered between. Site Description: This large site comprises of of approximately 14No fields both in arable and pastrolal use together with a number of woodland blocks the largest of which lies to the west of Holly Hill Farm. Fields are bounded by hedgerows and hedgerow trees with a long shelterbelt woodland block along part of the site's southwestern boundary. The site falls from west to east from 140m down to 75m AOD. Two PRoWs are routed across the site.
Existing urban edge	The site is part contained by housing along its lower limits, bordered by Almscliffe Drive, Crag Lane and Holly Park.
Trees and hedges	Mixed deciduous and coniferous woodland block and screen belt margins along Crag Lane and part of the western boundary of the site, Hedgerows and hedgerow trees defining field boundaries
Landscape and Green Belt designations	The site is situated within Green Belt R11 Rights of Way
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The landscape is considered of high value set within a wooded and mainly pastoral setting and has a relatively high level of tranquility. Susceptibility to change is also considered to be high with few detracting features in the landscape.
Visual Sensitivity	The site is open and visible particularly from Merrybank Lane and Crag Lane to the north and from Almscliff Crag. Long distance views are also likely from across the wharfe Valley to the south. Near distance views from Crag Lane to the south are largely screened by intervening vegetation and built form
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of arable and pastoral fields and extension of settlement edge into open countryside within a south east facing valley side.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	There would be some limited potential to mitigate effects of development though retention of hedgerows and woodland blocks and significantly limiting development to lower parts of the site adjacent to the settlement edge. Further screen planting and green infrastructure measures alongside retained footpath links would also be of benefit
Likely level of landscape effects	Large scale adverse effects which could not be effectively mitigated due to the scale and impact of the development
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	Cumulative effects could be encountered if HB3 to the south was also developed but this adjacent relatively small scale site is of minor consequence in comparison to the proposal site

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

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

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

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

Summary conclusion

The landscape is considered of high value set within a wooded and mainly pastoral setting and has a relatively high level of tranquility. Susceptibility to change is also considered to be high with few detracting features in the landscape.

There would be some limited potential to mitigate effects of development though retention of hedgerows and woodland blocks and limiting development to lower parts of the site adjacent to the settlement edge. Further screen planting and green infrastructure measures alongside retained footpath links would also be of benefit.

Settlement: Huby**Site: HB1 (Land at Holly Hill Farm, Huby)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	None.
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Holly Park. Holly Hill. Crag Farm.
Commentary on heritage assets.	Adjacent dwellings on Holly Park are late 19th century / early 20th century buildings, rendered, pan tiles, decorative terracotta, gables. Other heritage assets may be present - Holly Hill (not seen), which is within a site is visible on OS maps, indicating a farm or former farm - 'Hollin Hill Barn' marked on mid/late 19th century map. Also, on this map, Crag Farm and Cliff House are present - located outside of the site, to the north west. The site is located in the setting of these buildings.
Topography and views	Significant changes in ground level, land rises from Crag Lane to the north west. Views from Crag Lane of attractive fields with variation in levels and trees.
Landscape context	Hilly countryside of largely pasture fields.
Grain of surrounding development	Huby - Village spread over large area of land, characterised by large areas of open green fields with variations in ground levels, stone walls to field boundaries and numerous trees. Village roads in large, triangular form with traditional form of development along those roads being linear - little backland development except where 20th century closes / cul de sacs added. Historically linear development along Strait Lane, with the usual 20th century cul de sacs added later. Here, low stone walls to road, plus hedges / mostly two storey / due to topography, sense of close relationship between buildings / land rises up the lane from W to E / some farm buildings / some large, traditional dwellings set back in large gardens but otherwise buildings set close to road. Crag Lane - where meets Strait Lane, further historic dwellings / buildings plus along road but also group of 20th century dwellings on north side of lane in two cul de sacs. To the north end of the lane, numerous large, detached dwellings, some of earlier 20th century date displaying arts and crafts style, along road to the south side. Little development to the north side. Exception is the close of Holly Park, early 20th century at the north end of Crag Lane. A658 - dwellings located to east side of the road which are mainly brick dwellings of mid or late 20th century date. Further 20th century development to the east of the A658, including Kingsway (mid/late 20th century close).
Local building design	Varied, but stone is the predominant material. Strait Lane - two storey stone dwellings plus two and half storey stone terraces. Slate roofs. Timbered effect on some. Crag Lane - To the north end, numerous large, detached dwellings, some of earlier 20th century date displaying arts and crafts style in stone, some stone slate roofs. South west end of lane - stone but also brick but several earlier 20th century, one and half storey villa style dwellings, mainly rendered and pan tile roofs. Also, early 20th century semis in brick and slate.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	Land comprises fields with hedged boundaries within. Tree belt to south boundary and other wooded areas in site. Trees to boundary with road at west side. Rear of properties of Holly Park form partial boundary to the north east.

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

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

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

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

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

Rationale	Rating
The nature of the site means that built development will have a negative impact on local distinctiveness.	Red
Summary conclusion	Development at standard density and form would be completely against existing grain and at the scale proposed, would have a harmful impact on character of the area / setting of the heritage assets that make up the village. However, harm upon setting of individual heritage assets could be reduced by consideration of buffer zones / reduction in density in the vicinity. Otherwise, there may be limited opportunities for providing pockets of development in context with existing buildings (e.g. potential redevelopment of Holly Hill / additional few dwellings adjacent to Merry Bank Cottages) but this would not achieve the expectations of housing provision on a site of this size.

Settlement: Huby**Site: HB1 (Land at Holly Hill Farm, Huby)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

SACs/SPAs	None likely to impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	Great Almscliffe Crag geological SSSI is 200m to the north
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	Gravelly Hill SINC 600m to SW.
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Improved pasture (P1HS, 1992)
Trees and Hedges	Plantation surrounds Holly Hill; small blocks of deciduous woodland, hedgerows bound most fields
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature trees and woodlands are likely to merit TPO protection
Water/Wetland	A drain crosses the site from east to west and another from NE to SW
Slope and Aspect	The land undulates across the site but generally rises from Crag Lane to the north west towards Almscliffe Crag
Buildings and Structures	Holly Hill
Natural Area	NCA 22: Pennines Dales Fringe
Environmental Opportunity	SEO4 Enhancing and connecting semi-natural habitats in river corridors to improve the wildlife movement corridors between lowland and upland. SE04: Supporting and encouraging the creation of grass/woodland buffer strips, in-field grass strips, sediment traps, ponds and wetland habitats to slow run-off and intercept sediments and pollutants... SEO 1: "Protect and connect native broadleaved woodland, parkland and veteran trees to maximise their value for wildlife, flood risk alleviation, water quality, climate regulation, recreation, sense of place and sense of history".
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 61 South West Harrogate Upland Fringe Undulating Farmland Promote woodland planting along valleys and close to existing buildings to enhance wildlife corridors... Maintain and replant hedgerows so that they are high and bushy especially along the roadsides. Promote varied management regimes to diversify field appearance and improve biodiversity
Connectivity/Corridors	Trees and hedgerows along the boundaries of the medium-sized fields link the village with the Wharfe Valley and with the upland fringe
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Retain, enhance and buffer boundary hedgerows and woodland and water courses with semi-natural habitats
Protected Species	Nesting birds and foraging bats are likely to utilise the boundary hedgerows and woodland
BAP Priority Species	Possibility of priority species of ground-nesting birds and brown hare
Invasive Species	Not known
Notes	

Conclusion

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

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

Summary conclusion

Development on this scale, so close to the SSSI would have an adverse impact on Great Armscliffe Crag. Trees and hedgerows along the boundaries of the medium-sized fields link the village with the Wharfe Valley and with the upland fringe.

Settlement: Huby**Site: HB1 (Land at Holly Hill Farm, Huby)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Land Drainage****Land Drainage Site Assessment****Land drainage: summary of issues.**

According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed site is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Settlement: Huby**Site: HB2 (Land at Hunter's View, Huby)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Land at Hunter's View Huby LCA62: Wharfe Valley Side Farmland
Landscape description	Area Description: This is a broad and hummocky valley side of the Wharfedale Valley. Land use is simple and harmonious with medium-sized grassland fields bound by hedges and fences in places for horse and livestock control. The area is important to Harrogate as it separates the town from the conurbation of Leeds. Site Description: The site is broadly rectilinear in shape and in pastoral use to the north west of the A658 alongside which is a low stone wall and area of mature trees. Stock fencing, hedgerows and hedgerow trees define remaining site boundaries with Running Beck, a small watercourse, flowing east forming the site's southern boundary. There is a small agricultural building with access and gravel parking area at the south eastern edge of the site. Site landform is generally flat along the southern margins before rising more steeply to the north from about 67m to 82mAOD. A PRow is routed along the eastern edge of the site linking the A658 with Strait Lane
Existing urban edge	The site's eastern boundary adjoins residential properties fronting onto the A658 together with properties accessed off The Pines residential cul-de-sac
Trees and hedges	Hedgerows and hedgerow trees define some of the field boundary with a number of trees along the road frontage and within the north west and south east corner of the site.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	The site is situated within Green Belt R11: Rights of Way
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The landscape is considered of high value set within a treed and pastoral setting on a distinctive rising landform. Susceptibility to change is also considered to be high with any development adversely impacting on openness and setting of the village
Visual Sensitivity	The site is open and visible particularly from the PRow crossing the site and from the A658 travelling north east
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of a pastoral field and intrusion of built form along a prominent elevated edge of the village into open countryside
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Potential to adequately mitigate adverse effects of development through retention of hedgerows and trees within the site and along boundaries together with additional screen planting measures are limited
Likely level of landscape effects	Large scale adverse effects
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	Cumulative effects could be encountered if HB6 adjoining the site to the north and west was also developed

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

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

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

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

Summary conclusion

The landscape is considered of high value set within a treed and pastoral setting on a distinctive rising landform. Susceptibility to change is also considered to be high with any development adversely impacting on openness and setting of the village.

Potential to adequately mitigate adverse effects of development through retention of hedgerows and trees within the site and along boundaries together with additional screen planting measures are limited

Settlement: Huby**Site: HB2 (Land at Hunter's View, Huby)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	None.
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Various traditional dwellings / buildings along the south side of Strait Lane.
Commentary on heritage assets.	There are a variety of buildings located along Strait Lane but some have significance due to being of a late 19th or early 20th century date, or earlier, and displaying quality of form.
Topography and views	Land rises from road up to Strait Lane - views up to some of the dwellings there. Views from Strait Lane to site are partial glimpses between buildings.
Landscape context	Hilly countryside of largely pasture fields. Green Belt.
Grain of surrounding development	Huby - Village spread over large area of land, characterised by large areas of open green fields with variations in ground levels, stone walls to field boundaries and numerous trees. Village roads in large, triangular form with traditional form of development along those roads being linear - little backland development except where 20th century closes / cul de sacs added. Historically linear development along Strait Lane, with the usual 20th century cul de sacs added later. Here, low stone walls to road, plus hedges / mostly two storey / due to topography, sense of close relationship between buildings / land rises up the lane from W to E / some farm buildings / some large, traditional dwellings set back in large gardens but otherwise buildings set close to road. Crag Lane - where meets Strait Lane, further historic dwellings / buildings plus along road but also group of 20th century dwellings on north side of lane in two cul de sacs. To the north end of the lane, numerous large, detached dwellings, some of earlier 20th century date displaying arts and crafts style, along road to the south side. Little development to the north side. Exception is the close of Holly Park, early 20th century at the north end of Crag Lane. A658 - dwellings located to east side of the road which are mainly brick dwellings of mid or late 20th century date. Further 20th century development to the east of the A658, including Kingsway (mid/late 20th century close).
Local building design	Varied, but stone is the predominant material. Strait Lane - two storey stone dwellings plus two and half storey stone terraces. Slate roofs. Timbered effect on some. Crag Lane - To the north end, numerous large, detached dwellings, some of earlier 20th century date displaying arts and crafts style in stone, some stone slate roofs. South west end of lane - stone but also brick but several earlier 20th century, one and half storey villa style dwellings, mainly rendered and pan tile roofs. Also, early 20th century semis in brick and slate.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	Field. Low stone wall to road. Trees on boundary and within site. At east corner, a small metal clad, agricultural type building with enclosure around. Adjacent to a pair of semi detached properties - rendered, timber detailing and pan tiles.

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	Standard development would harm the character of the settlement by further erosion of historic grain in the vicinity of Strait Lane. Site is on rising land so would be prominent of approach to settlement. However, site is in close context with housing located between Strait Lane and the A658 and provision of some additional housing as a small extension to existing could be acceptable - density should be much reduced at the west end of the site and ideally avoided altogether.

Settlement: Huby

Site: HB2 (Land at Hunter's View, Huby)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments

Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	None likely to impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	None likely to impacted
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	Gravelly Hill Marsh 750m to west
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Improved pasture
Trees and Hedges	Trees line the beck and north & western boundaries, The western and northern and roadside boundaries are also well-treed. There are hedgerows along the northern and eastern boundaries. There are some clumps of field trees, some mature.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature on-site and boundary trees likely to merit TPO protection.
Water/Wetland	Running Beck forms southern boundary
Slope and Aspect	The land rises to the north away from Harrogate Road
Buildings and Structures	There is a metal shed and half a semi-detached house in the eastern corner of the site
Natural Area	NCA 22: Pennines Dales Fringe
Environmental Opportunity	LCA62 Wharfe Valley Side Farmland Promote native woodland planting ...in particular stream corridors and small valleys...to enhance the corridors. Native woodland and tree planting around existing farmsteads and large scale buildings Protect and manage Ancient Semi-Natural woodland.
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 62 Wharfe valley side farmland
Connectivity/Corridors	Trees and hedgerows and the beck along the boundaries of the medium-sized fields link the village with the Wharfe Valley and with the upland fringe to the north
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Retain, enhance and buffer boundary hedgerows and woodland and water courses with semi-natural habitats
Protected Species	Nesting birds and foraging bats are likely to utilise the boundary hedgerows and woodland and possibly the semi-detached house.
BAP Priority Species	Not known
Invasive Species	Not known
Notes	

Conclusion

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

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

Summary conclusion	Trees and hedgerows and the beck along the boundaries of the medium-sized fields link the village with the Wharfe Valley and with the upland fringe to the north. Should the site be developed, it would be necessary to retain, enhance and buffer boundary hedgerows, woodland and water courses with semi-natural habitats
---------------------------	---

Settlement: Huby**Site: HB2 (Land at Hunter's View, Huby)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Land Drainage****Land Drainage Site Assessment****Land drainage: summary of issues.**

According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed site is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Settlement: Huby**Site: HB3 (Land at Merrybank Lane, Huby)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Land at Merrybank Lane Huby LCA61: South West Harrogate Upland Fringe Undulating Farmland
Landscape description	Area description: The wider landscape is a large scale area which slopes down south towards the River Wharfe Valley. The landform rolls and undulates with open views across a patchwork of random, medium sized fields. The land is managed predominantly for livestock with occasional arable fields scattered between. Site Description: The site consists of a narrow rectangular area of pasture bounded by a hedgerow on three sides with the fourth edge bordered by shelterbelt woodland. The site is flat with an elevation of about 117m AOD
Existing urban edge	The site adjoins the rear of properties fronting onto Crag View and Almscliffe Drive with further properties along Merrybank Lane and directly across the road from the site.
Trees and hedges	The site is bordered by hedgerows and shelterbelt woodland to the northeast
Landscape and Green Belt designations	The site is situated within Green Belt
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The landscape is considered of high value set within a wooded and mainly pastoral setting and has a relatively high level of tranquility. Susceptibility to change is considered to be medium as this narrow site abuts residential development similar to and in context with the type of development being proposed.
Visual Sensitivity	The site is visible from Merrybank Lane with potentially long distance views from the south.
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of single pastoral field and narrow extension of settlement edge into open countryside within a flat plateau area.
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	There would be some potential to mitigate effects of development through retention of hedgerows and additional screen planting
Likely level of landscape effects	Medium scale adverse effects which could be mitigated due to the small scale of the development and existing screening
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	Significant cumulative effects could be encountered if HB1 to the north was also developed

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

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

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

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

Summary conclusion

The landscape is considered of high value set within a wooded and mainly pastoral setting and has a relatively high level of tranquility. Susceptibility to change is however considered to be medium as this narrow site abuts residential development similar to and in context with the type of development being proposed.

There would be some potential to mitigate effects of development through retention of hedgerows and additional screen planting

Settlement: Huby**Site: HB3 (Land at Merrybank Lane, Huby)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	None.
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Almscliff House.
Commentary on heritage assets.	The site is located within the setting of Almscliff House, to the west of the site, separated by field - a two and a half storey house, stone, hipped roof with slates, sash windows.
Topography and views	Views into site from road, trees form enclosure to rear, view up road with site in context. Land at high point in this area (with land dropping down to south generally).
Landscape context	Hilly countryside of largely pasture fields. Green Belt.
Grain of surrounding development	Huby - Village spread over large area of land, characterised by large areas of open green fields with variations in ground levels, stone walls to field boundaries and numerous trees. Village roads in large, triangular form with traditional form of development along those roads being linear - little backland development except where 20th century closes / cul de sacs added. Historically linear development along Strait Lane, with the usual 20th century cul de sacs added later. Here, low stone walls to road, plus hedges / mostly two storey / due to topography, sense of close relationship between buildings / land rises up the lane from W to E / some farm buildings / some large, traditional dwellings set back in large gardens but otherwise buildings set close to road. Crag Lane - where meets Strait Lane, further historic dwellings / buildings plus along road but also group of 20th century dwellings on north side of lane in two cul de sacs. To the north end of the lane, numerous large, detached dwellings, some of earlier 20th century date displaying arts and crafts style, along road to the south side. Little development to the north side. Exception is the close of Holly Park, early 20th century at the north end of Crag Lane. A658 - dwellings located to east side of the road which are mainly brick dwellings of mid or late 20th century date. Further 20th century development to the east of the A658, including Kingsway (mid/late 20th century close).
Local building design	Varied, but stone is the predominant material. Strait Lane - two storey stone dwellings plus two and half storey stone terraces. Slate roofs. Timbered effect on some. Crag Lane - To the north end, numerous large, detached dwellings, some of earlier 20th century date displaying arts and crafts style in stone, some stone slate roofs. South west end of lane - stone but also brick but several earlier 20th century, one and half storey villa style dwellings, mainly rendered and pan tile roofs. Also, early 20th century semis in brick and slate.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The site is a field / paddock. verge and hedge to road. hedge and trees to boundaries.

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

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

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

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

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

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

Summary conclusion

Development of the site would further erode the character of the historic grain by further extending the area of housing to its east which comprises Crag View and Almcliffe Drive. This would be seen in the context of rural Almscliff House but harm could be reduced by reducing the extent of development on the site, perhaps limited infill at front of site forming linear development along the road.

Settlement: Huby**Site: HB3 (Land at Merrybank Lane, Huby)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

SACs/SPAs	None likely to impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	Great Armscliffe Crag geological SSSI 850m to north - not 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)	Gravelly Hill SINC 500m to SW. Not likely to be impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows, arable farmland
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Arable
Trees and Hedges	Hedges with occassional trees bound three sides; wooded boundary to north
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature boundary trees and shrubs are likely to merit TPO protection
Water/Wetland	None
Slope and Aspect	The land slopes down from the north west
Buildings and Structures	None
Natural Area	NCA 22: Pennines Dales Fringe
Environmental Opportunity	SEO4 Enhancing and connecting semi-natural habitats in river corridors to improve the wildlife movement corridors between lowland and upland. SE04: Supporting and encouraging the creation of grass/woodland buffer strips, in-field grass strips, sediment traps, ponds and wetland habitats to slow run-off and intercept sediments and pollutants... SEO 1: "Protect and connect native broadleaved woodland, parkland and veteran trees to maximise their value for wildlife, flood risk alleviation, water quality, climate regulation, recreation, sense of place and sense of history".
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA 61 South West Harrogate Upland Fringe Undulating Farmland Promote woodland planting along valleys and close to existing buildings to enhance wildlife corridors... Maintain and replant hedgerows so that they are high and bushy especially along the roadsides. Promote varied management regimes to diversify field appearance and improve biodiversity
Connectivity/Corridors	Trees and hedgerows along the boundaries of the medium-sized fields link the village with the Wharfe Valley and with the upland fringe
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Retain, enhance and buffer boundary hedgerows and woodland with semi-natural habitats
Protected Species	Nesting birds and foraging bats are likely to utilise the boundary hedgerows and woodland
BAP Priority Species	Possibility of priority species of ground-nesting birds and brown hare
Invasive Species	Not known
Notes	

Conclusion

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

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

Summary conclusion

Trees and hedgerows along the boundaries of the medium-sized fields link the village with the Wharfe Valley and with the upland fringe. Retain, enhance and buffer boundary hedgerows and woodland with semi-natural habitats.

Settlement: Huby**Site: HB3 (Land at Merrybank Lane, Huby)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Land Drainage****Land Drainage Site Assessment****Land drainage: summary of issues.**

According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed site is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Settlement: Huby**Site: HB4 (Land to the west of Harrogate Road, Huby)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Land to the west of Harrogate Road Huby LCA62: Wharfe Valley Side Farmland
Landscape description	Area Description: This is a broad and hummocky valley side of the Wharfedale Valley. Land use is simple and harmonious with medium-sized grassland fields bound by hedges and fences in places for horse and livestock control. The area is important to Harrogate as it separates the town from the conurbation of Leeds. Site Description: The site is an irregular shaped parcel of pastoral land between the western edge of the A658 Harrogate Road and the rear of properties fronting onto Crag Lane. A low drystone wall forms the site boundary along Harrogate Road. There are a number of former hedgerow trees retained within the site. A hedgerow bisects the site with a hedgerows along the western site boundary and to the rear of properties to the north together with a hedgerow and hedgerow trees along Crag Lane. Landform gently rises to the north from the edge of Harrogate Road. There is also a small beck which crosses the site culverted under the road
Existing urban edge	The site's north western boundary adjoins residential properties fronting onto Crag Lane together with a hall and gate house property to the west. Almscliffe Village Hall and a detached residential property are situated fronting the eastern edge of Harrogate Road
Trees and hedges	Hedgerows and hedgerow trees define some site and field boundaries with a number of former hedgerow trees scattered within the site
Landscape and Green Belt designations	The site is situated within Green Belt
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The landscape is considered of medium value adjacent to a busy highway with limited tranquility. Susceptibility to change is however considered to be high with any development adversely impacting on openness and setting of the village
Visual Sensitivity	The site is open and visible particularly from the A658
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of pastoral fields and intrusion of built form at the northern edge of the village
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Potential to adequately mitigate adverse effects of development through retention of hedgerows and trees within the site and along boundaries together with additional screen planting measures are limited
Likely level of landscape effects	Large scale adverse effects
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	Cumulative effects could be encountered if HB5 to the west was also developed

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

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

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

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

Summary conclusion

The landscape is considered of medium value adjacent to a busy highway with limited tranquility. Susceptibility to change is however considered to be high with any development adversely impacting on openness and setting of the village.

Potential to adequately mitigate adverse effects of development through retention of hedgerows and trees within the site and along boundaries together with additional screen planting measures are limited

Settlement: Huby**Site: HB4 (Land to the west of Harrogate Road, Huby)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	None.
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Crag Lane. Lodge.
Commentary on heritage assets.	A few early 20th century dwellings are located on Crag Lane (typically stone and tending to be in arts and crafts style). There are also early 20th century dwellings located at Holly Park (rendered, pan tiles, hips and gables, decorative terracotta). A small lodge building is adjacent to the south end of the site, associated with 'Langland.' The site is located within the setting or wider setting of these buildings.
Topography and views	Significant view when entering and exiting village along main road with visibility across the site. Land rises from road up to Crag Lane. Glimpse views towards site from between dwellings on Crag Lane.
Landscape context	Hilly countryside of largely pasture fields. Green Belt.
Grain of surrounding development	Huby - Village spread over large area of land, characterised by large areas of open green fields with variations in ground levels, stone walls to field boundaries and numerous trees. Village roads in large, triangular form with traditional form of development along those roads being linear - little backland development except where 20th century closes / cul de sacs added. Historically linear development along Strait Lane, with the usual 20th century cul de sacs added later. Here, low stone walls to road, plus hedges / mostly two storey / due to topography, sense of close relationship between buildings / land rises up the lane from W to E / some farm buildings / some large, traditional dwellings set back in large gardens but otherwise buildings set close to road. Crag Lane - where meets Strait Lane, further historic dwellings / buildings plus along road but also group of 20th century dwellings on north side of lane in two cul de sacs. To the north end of the lane, numerous large, detached dwellings, some of earlier 20th century date displaying arts and crafts style, along road to the south side. Little development to the north side. Exception is the close of Holly Park, early 20th century at the north end of Crag Lane. A658 - dwellings located to east side of the road which are mainly brick dwellings of mid or late 20th century date. Further 20th century development to the east of the A658, including Kingsway (mid/late 20th century close).
Local building design	Varied, but stone is the predominant material. Strait Lane - two storey stone dwellings plus two and half storey stone terraces. Slate roofs. Timbered effect on some. Crag Lane - To the north end, numerous large, detached dwellings, some of earlier 20th century date displaying arts and crafts style in stone, some stone slate roofs. South west end of lane - stone but also brick but several earlier 20th century, one and half storey villa style dwellings, mainly rendered and pan tile roofs. Also, early 20th century semis in brick and slate.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The site is a field with low stone wall to road, trees within and along boundaries.

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

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

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

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

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

Rationale	Rating
The nature of the site means that built development will have a negative impact on local distinctiveness.	Red
Summary conclusion	Development would be completely against existing grain and have a harmful impact on character of the settlement, particularly where the openness of this land contributes to the local distinctiveness of Huby. Impact on the setting of the heritage assets affected could be reduced but only if development was very low density and appropriate design of development provided for with respect to their context.

Settlement: Huby**Site: HB4 (Land to the west of Harrogate Road, Huby)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

SACs/SPAs	None likely to impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	None likely to 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 impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Improved and semi-improved (species-poor) grassland
Trees and Hedges	Outgrown hedge forms a tree-line in the NW corner. Remaining northern boundary formed of garden hedges. Southern boundary hedge contained some mature trees, becoming gappy.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature boundary trees are likely to benefit from TPO protection
Water/Wetland	A drain crosses the site from west to east towards the north of the site
Slope and Aspect	The land falls to the east
Buildings and Structures	A stone wall forms the eastern boundary
Natural Area	NCA 22: Pennines Dales Fringe
Environmental Opportunity	SEO4 Enhancing and connecting semi-natural habitats in river corridors to improve the wildlife movement corridors between lowland and upland. SE04: Supporting and encouraging the creation of grass/woodland buffer strips, in-field grass strips, sediment traps, ponds and wetland habitats to slow run-off and intercept sediments and pollutants... SEO 1: "Protect and connect native broadleaved woodland, parkland and veteran trees to maximise their value for wildlife, flood risk alleviation, water quality, climate regulation, recreation, sense of place and sense of history".
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA62 Wharfe Valley Side Farmland Promote native woodland planting ...in particular stream corridors and small valleys...to enhance the corridors. Native woodland and tree planting around existing farmsteads and large scale buildings Protect and manage Ancient Semi-Natural woodland.
Connectivity/Corridors	Trees and hedgerows along the boundaries of the medium-sized fields link the village with the Wharfe Valley and with the upland fringe to the north
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Retain, enhance and buffer boundary hedgerows and woodland and water courses with semi-natural habitats
Protected Species	Nesting birds and foraging bats are likely to utilise the boundary hedgerows and woodland
BAP Priority Species	Possibility of priority species of ground-nesting birds and brown hare
Invasive Species	Not known
Notes	

Conclusion

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

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

Summary conclusion

Trees and hedgerows along the boundaries of the medium-sized fields link the village with the Wharfe Valley and with the upland fringe to the north. Retain, enhance and buffer boundary hedgerows and woodland and water courses with semi-natural habitats

Settlement: Huby**Site: HB4 (Land to the west of Harrogate Road, Huby)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Land Drainage****Land Drainage Site Assessment****Land drainage: summary of issues.**

According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed site is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Settlement: Huby**Site: HB5 (Land to the east of Harrogate Road, Huby)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Land to the east of Harrogate Road Huby LCA62: Wharfe Valley Side Farmland
Landscape description	Area Description: This is a broad and hummocky valley side of the Wharfedale Valley. Land use is simple and harmonious with medium-sized grassland fields bound by hedges and fences in places for horse and livestock control. The area is important to Harrogate as it separates the town from the conurbation of Leeds. Site Description: The site consists of two narrow pastoral fields situated between the eastern edge of Harrogate Road and the Leeds to Harrogate railway line. A low drystone wall separates the site from the highway. A small beck and hedgerow separates the two fields crossing the site from west to east and culverted both under Harrogate Road and the railway line. There is an avenue of cherry trees along the road frontage. The embankment of the railway line is heavily treed. The site is flat and sits at a lower elevation than the adjacent highway.
Existing urban edge	The site's southern boundary adjoins residential property fronting onto the Harrogate Road and next to it, Almscliffe Village Hall
Trees and hedges	A hedgerow separates the two field areas and forms the site's northern boundary. An avenue of cherry trees runs along the edge of the highway
Landscape and Green Belt designations	The site is situated within Green Belt
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The landscape is considered of medium value adjacent to a busy highway with limited tranquility. Susceptibility to change is however considered to be high with any development adversely impacting on openness and setting of the village
Visual Sensitivity	The site is open and visible particularly from the A658
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of pastoral fields and intrusion of built form at the northern edge of the village
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Potential to adequately mitigate adverse effects of development through retention of hedgerows and trees within the site and along boundaries together with additional screen planting measures are limited
Likely level of landscape effects	Large scale adverse effects
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	Cumulative effects could be encountered if HB5 to the west was also developed

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

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

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

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

Summary conclusion	The landscape is considered of medium value adjacent to a busy highway with limited tranquility. Susceptibility to change is however considered to be high with any development adversely impacting on openness and setting of the village. Potential to adequately mitigate adverse effects of development through retention of hedgerows and trees within the site and along boundaries together with additional screen planting measures are limited
---------------------------	--

Settlement: Huby**Site: HB5 (Land to the east of Harrogate Road, Huby)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	None.
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Dwellings on Crag Lane and Holly Park. Langland.
Commentary on heritage assets.	A few early 20th century dwellings are located on Crag Lane (typically stone and tending to be in arts and crafts style). There are also early 20th century dwellings located at Holly Park (rendered, pan tiles, hips and gables, decorative terracotta). A small lodge building is adjacent to the south end of the site, associated with 'Langland.' The site is located within the setting or wider setting of these buildings.
Topography and views	Level ground adjacent to railway. Land forms part of open views on approach / existing village.
Landscape context	Hilly countryside of largely pasture fields. Green Belt.
Grain of surrounding development	Huby - Village spread over large area of land, characterised by large areas of open green fields with variations in ground levels, stone walls to field boundaries and numerous trees. Village roads in large, triangular form with traditional form of development along those roads being linear - little backland development except where 20th century closes / cul de sacs added. Historically linear development along Strait Lane, with the usual 20th century cul de sacs added later. Here, low stone walls to road, plus hedges / mostly two storey / due to topography, sense of close relationship between buildings / land rises up the lane from W to E / some farm buildings / some large, traditional dwellings set back in large gardens but otherwise buildings set close to road. Crag Lane - where meets Strait Lane, further historic dwellings / buildings plus along road but also group of 20th century dwellings on north side of lane in two cul de sacs. To the north end of the lane, numerous large, detached dwellings, some of earlier 20th century date displaying arts and crafts style, along road to the south side. Little development to the north side. Exception is the close of Holly Park, early 20th century at the north end of Crag Lane. A658 - dwellings located to east side of the road which are mainly brick dwellings of mid or late 20th century date. Further 20th century development to the east of the A658, including Kingsway (mid/late 20th century close).
Local building design	Varied, but stone is the predominant material. Strait Lane - two storey stone dwellings plus two and half storey stone terraces. Slate roofs. Timbered effect on some. Crag Lane - To the north end, numerous large, detached dwellings, some of earlier 20th century date displaying arts and crafts style in stone, some stone slate roofs. South west end of lane - stone but also brick but several earlier 20th century, one and half storey villa style dwellings, mainly rendered and pan tile roofs. Also, early 20th century semis in brick and slate.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The site is a field / paddock. Treed embankment forms boundary on the east. Low stone wall to road, plus verge. Fence and small trees to the north. Beck / stream runs across the site.

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

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

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

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

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

Rationale	Rating
The nature of the site means that built development will have a negative impact on local distinctiveness.	Red
Summary conclusion	Development here would be harmful to local distinctiveness due to the openness of the land in combination with that to the other side of the main road (and less so, the awkward location adjacent to the railway embankment). Development of the land would harm the wider setting of the settlement and the nearby heritage assets but provision of very low density housing would help to reduce harm (on heritage assets).

Settlement: Huby**Site: HB5 (Land to the east of Harrogate Road, Huby)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Ecology****Ecology Site Assessment**

SACs/SPAs	None likely to impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	None likely to 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 impacted
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Species-poor semi-improved pasture P1HS
Trees and Hedges	There are hedgerows with trees along the railway corridor and isolated trees along the boundary of the southern field with the A658 and the boundary of the northern field with Woodgate Lane and the boundary separating the two fields.
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Mature on-site and boundary trees likely to merit TPO protection.
Water/Wetland	A drain separates the 2 fields
Slope and Aspect	Generally flat
Buildings and Structures	None on site, except low walls to road boundaries. Bridge over railway just offsite
Natural Area	NCA 22: Pennines Dales Fringe
Environmental Opportunity	SEO4 Enhancing and connecting semi-natural habitats in river corridors to improve the wildlife movement corridors between lowland and upland. SE04: Supporting and encouraging the creation of grass/woodland buffer strips, in-field grass strips, sediment traps, ponds and wetland habitats to slow run-off and intercept sediments and pollutants...
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA62 Wharfe Valley Side Farmland Promote native woodland planting ...in particular stream corridors and small valleys...to enhance the corridors. Native woodland and tree planting around existing farmsteads and large scale buildings Protect and manage Ancient Semi-Natural woodland.
Connectivity/Corridors	Trees and hedgerows and the beck along the boundaries of the medium-sized fields link the village with the Wharfe Valley and with the upland fringe to the north. The railway and the A658 provide linear corridors.
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Trees and hedgerows and watercourses should be retained, enhanced and buffered with semi-natural habitats.
Protected Species	Nesting birds and foraging bats are likely to utilise the boundary hedgerows and trees and possibly the railway bridge
BAP Priority Species	Not known
Invasive Species	Not known
Notes	

Conclusion

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

Rationale	Rating
Some potential effects on designated sites (SINC, SSSI, LNR), the wider ecological network and/or priority habitats and species but relatively easy to mitigate for.	Yellow
Summary conclusion	Trees and hedgerows and the drain link the village with the Wharfe Valley and with the upland fringe to the north. The railway and the A658 provide linear corridors. Trees and hedgerows and watercourses should be retained, enhanced and buffered with semi-natural habitats.

Settlement: Huby**Site: HB5 (Land to the east of Harrogate Road, Huby)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Land Drainage****Land Drainage Site Assessment****Land drainage: summary of issues.**

According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed site is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Settlement: Huby**Site: HB6 (Land at Strait Lane, Huby)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Landscape****Landscape Site Assessments**

Location/HBC Landscape Character Area	Land at Strait Lane Huby LCA62: Wharfe Valley Side Farmland
Landscape description	Area Description: This is a broad and hummocky valley side of the Wharfedale Valley. Land use is simple and harmonious with medium-sized grassland fields bound by hedges and fences in places for horse and livestock control. The area is important to Harrogate as it separates the town from the conurbation of Leeds. Site Description: The site consists of several pastoral fields of which two comprise of small paddocks adjacent to Strait Lane. Hedgerows and hedgerow trees define field boundaries with a tall hedgerow along Strait Lane forming a prominent edge to the site. Running Beck watercourse runs along the the site's southern boundary with the site gently rising from south to north from 79m to 103m AOD. A PRoW is routed along the eastern edge of the site linking the A658 with Strait Lane
Existing urban edge	The site's eastern boundary adjoins residential properties fronting onto Grosvenor Gardens cul-de-sac and several properties fronting onto Strait Lane.
Trees and hedges	Hedgerows and hedgerow trees define field boundaries.
Landscape and Green Belt designations	The site is situated within Green Belt R11: Rights of Way
Description of proposal for the site	Residential (assume 30+ dwellings per ha)
Physical Sensitivity	The landscape is considered of high value set within a treed and pastoral setting on a distinctive rising landform. Susceptibility to change is considered to be high with any development adversely impacting on openness and setting of the village
Visual Sensitivity	The site is open and visible particularly from the PRoW crossing the site and from the A658 travelling north east
Anticipated landscape effects	Loss of pastoral fields and intrusion of built form along a prominent elevated edge of the village into open countryside
Potential for mitigation and opportunities for enhancement	Potential to adequately mitigate adverse effects of development though retention of hedgerows and trees within the site and along boundaries together with additional screen planting measures are limited
Likely level of landscape effects	Large scale adverse effects
Adjacent sites/cumulative impacts/benefits	Cumulative effects could be encountered if HB2 adjoining the site to the south east was also developed

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

Rationale	Rating
Sensitivity Rating: High – key distinctive characteristics are very vulnerable to change; typically a high valued landscape where landscape conditions is very good and where detracting features or major infrastructure is not present or where present has limited influence on the landscape resulting in a higher susceptibility to change.	Red
Capacity Rating: 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	The landscape is considered of high value set within a treed and pastoral setting on a distinctive rising landform. Susceptibility to change is also considered to be high with any development adversely impacting on openness and setting of the village Potential to adequately mitigate adverse effects of development though retention of hedgerows and trees within the site and along boundaries together with additional screen planting measures are limited
---------------------------	--

Settlement: Huby**Site: HB6 (Land at Strait Lane, Huby)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Conservation and Design****Conservation and Design Site Assessment**

Heritage designations potentially affected by development of the site.	None.
Known non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development of the site.	Various traditional dwellings / buildings along the south side of Strait Lane.
Commentary on heritage assets.	There are a variety of buildings located along Strait Lane but some have significance due to being of a late 19th or early 20th century date, or earlier, and displaying quality of form.
Topography and views	Land rises from the road up to Strait Lane - views up to some of the dwellings there. Views from Strait Lane to site are partial glimpses between buildings.
Landscape context	Hilly countryside of largely pasture fields. Green Belt.
Grain of surrounding development	Huby - Village spread over large area of land, characterised by large areas of open green fields with variations in ground levels, stone walls to field boundaries and numerous trees. Village roads in large, triangular form with traditional form of development along those roads being linear - little backland development except where 20th century closes / cul de sacs added. Historically linear development along Strait Lane, with the usual 20th century cul de sacs added later. Here, low stone walls to road, plus hedges / mostly two storey / due to topography, sense of close relationship between buildings / land rises up the lane from W to E / some farm buildings / some large, traditional dwellings set back in large gardens but otherwise buildings set close to road. Crag Lane - where meets Strait Lane, further historic dwellings / buildings plus along road but also group of 20th century dwellings on north side of lane in two cul de sacs. To the north end of the lane, numerous large, detached dwellings, some of earlier 20th century date displaying arts and crafts style, along road to the south side. Little development to the north side. Exception is the close of Holly Park, early 20th century at the north end of Crag Lane. A658 - dwellings located to east side of the road which are mainly brick dwellings of mid or late 20th century date. Further 20th century development to the east of the A658, including Kingsway (mid/late 20th century)
Local building design	Varied, but stone is the predominant material. Strait Lane - two storey stone dwellings plus two and half storey stone terraces. Slate roofs. Timbered effect on some. Crag Lane - To the north end, numerous large, detached dwellings, some of earlier 20th century date displaying arts and crafts style in stone, some stone slate roofs. South west end of lane - stone but also brick but several earlier 20th century, one and half storey villa style dwellings, mainly rendered and pan tile roofs. Also, early 20th century semis in brick and slate.
Features on site, and land use or features off site having immediate impact.	The site comprises historic field pattern with hedges / trees to boundaries.

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

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

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

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

Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?

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

Summary conclusion

Development would be completely against existing grain and have a harmful impact on character of the area / setting of the heritage assets that make up the village but harm to the setting of the heritage assets could be reduced by provision of appropriate density / form and scale of buildings and landscaping. Impact on local distinctiveness could only be reduced by reducing the size of the site significantly (reducing the site to one which provides low density development at the northern end of the site, along Strait Lane). Development would need to be designed in such a way as to retain existing trees and respect field boundaries.

Settlement: Huby

Site: HB6 (Land at Strait Lane, Huby)

Natural and Built Heritage Assessments

Type: Ecology

Ecology Site Assessment

SACs/SPAs	None likely to impacted
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	None likely to impacted
SSSI Risk Zone	Natural England do not require consultation on residential development in relation to SSSIs
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	Gravelly Hill Marsh to 650m west
BAP Priority Habitats	Hedgerows
Phase 1 Survey Target Notes	None
Sward	Improved pasture
Trees and Hedges	Semi-improved grassland with patch of marshy grassland (P1HS1992) possibly since part-improved
Presence of Trees that Merit TPO	Trees line the beck and internal field boundaries within the site. There are hedgerows along most internal and external site boundaries. There are some clumps of field trees, some mature.
Water/Wetland	Running Beck forms southern boundary
Slope and Aspect	The land rises to the north away from Harrogate Road
Buildings and Structures	None on site
Natural Area	NCA 22: Pennines Dales Fringe
Environmental Opportunity	SEO4 Enhancing and connecting semi-natural habitats in river corridors to improve the wildlife movement corridors between lowland and upland. SE04: Supporting and encouraging the creation of grass/woodland buffer strips, in-field grass strips, sediment traps, ponds and wetland habitats to slow run-off and intercept sediments and pollutants...
LCA and Relevant Guidance (for biodiversity)	LCA62 Wharfe Valley Side Farmland Promote native woodland planting ...in particular stream corridors and small valleys...to enhance the corridors. Native woodland and tree planting around existing farmsteads and large scale buildings Protect and manage Ancient Semi-Natural woodland.
Connectivity/Corridors	Trees and hedgerows and the beck along the boundaries of the small fields link the village with the Wharfe Valley and with the upland fringe to the north
GI/SUDS Opportunities (for biodiversity)	Retain, enhance and buffer boundary hedgerows and woodland and water courses with semi-natural habitats
Protected Species	Nesting birds and foraging bats are likely to utilise the boundary hedgerows and woodland
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
Significant adverse effects on designated sites (Local Site, SSSI, LNR), the wider ecological network and/or priority habitats and species.	Red

Summary conclusion	Trees and hedgerows and the beck along the boundaries of the medium-sized fields link the village with the Wharfe Valley and with the upland fringe to the north. It would be very difficult to retain, enhance and buffer the boundary hedgerows and woodland and water courses with semi-natural habitats with extensive development of the site. The impact of development on small-scale narrow fields with treed hedgerows would be detrimental to the rich habitat network to the SW of the village
---------------------------	---

Settlement: Huby**Site: HB6 (Land at Strait Lane, Huby)****Natural and Built Heritage Assessments****Type: Land Drainage****Land Drainage Site Assessment****Land drainage: summary of issues.**

According to the Environment Agency flood maps, the proposed site is located within flood zone 1. We hold no recorded information of any flooding events on the site; nevertheless, this does not mean that flooding has never occurred.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

