Minerals and Waste Joint Plan

Notes from Site Panel Assessment Sessions

to accompany the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan

October 2016

Minerals and Waste Joint Plan

Notes taken at Site Assessment Panel Sessions

To support Sustainability Appraisal work

Contents

Introduction

This document records the notes taken by assessors during the panel sessions that were held to support the Site Identification and Assessment process. These panel sessions were open to technical specialists representing a range of public bodies. Three panel sessions were held:

Panel session 1 (considering sites submitted in York and Selby district) which took place on Wednesday 28 January 2015 at the Guildhall in York.

Panel session 2 (considering sites submitted in Richmondshire, Hambleton, Ryedale and Scarborough districts) which took place on Wednesday 25 February 2015 at County Hall, Northallerton.

Panel session 3 (considering sites submitted in Harrogate and Craven districts) which took place on Wednesday 11 March 2015 at County Hall, Northallerton.

Panel members were asked to consider the initial draft sustainability appraisal for each site prior to attending the panel sessions. Sites were then considered in turn by the panel members at each panel session. Due to the large number of sites, discussions were, of necessity, time limited.

Notes were taken on standardised forms for each site. For some sites that were adjacent to each other and which in large part shared the same constraints and opportunities, notes were recorded on a single form.

These notes reflect the discussion that took place. Due to limitations on time discussions focussed on the most relevant issues, so often not all parts of the form were completed, particularly if earlier sustainability appraisal work had already identified issues satisfactorily, or the panel simply had nothing to say. For this reason some sections of forms are left blank.

Details of those present at each of the sessions are also shown on the forms.

The panel considered sites available for consideration on the dates when panel sessions were held. A number of adjustments to the area and function of sites continued to be made by submitters in the period following the panel sittings. These changes included the submission of additional sites as well as the withdrawal of some sites. These further adjustments are reflected in the sustainability assessments that accompany the Preferred Options consultation on the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan.

The findings of the panel session were used as one of the sources of information to inform the Sustainability Appraisal of sites presented at the Preferred Options consultation, alongside information from written and mapped sources.

In this report notes are organised in the groupings that each panel considered them.

Sites Considered at Panel Session 1: York and Selby District

MJP09: Barlby Road, Selby

Rail and road freight distribution facility including handling facility for aggregates.

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed MJP09 Barlby	**Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)**
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Landscape (SA11) – Mitigation of visual impact needs to be looked at as there is an absence of space for mitigation. The landscape context of the whole area needs to be looked at. In particular, there is the potential for this site to have a significant visual impact from the bypass as well as other locations, such as the Trans Pennine Trail to the south of the site boundary. However, the scope for enhancement is high. Flooding (SA16) Proximity to Ouse is a potential issue. The Environment Agency referred the authors to comments made in their response to Minerals and Waste Supplementary Site Allocations dated 12 March 2015. Traffic (SA03) – There may be potential scope to link this site out onto the A63 Selby Bypass. Health and wellbeing / community vitality (SA15 / SA13) – The Olympia Park development will be to the west of this site, so it will be important to consider potential matters arising from receptors getting closer to this site. There is some cross over between the responsibilities of the County and District councils in relation to this safeguarding site as although it is proposed to be safeguarded for the purpose of facilitating future minerals supply, any application would likely be determined by Selby District Council.
Is the Site likely to be	

deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	Mitigation to improve / enhance the Trans Pennine Trail in this area would be welcome.
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	Restoration in long term to be considered, but a restoration scheme cannot currently be put in place. There needs to be consideration of whether to and how to influence what could happen upon site closure, particularly as this site may fall outside the remit of the Minerals Planning Authority.
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; Ruth Benson, NYCC; David Cole, NYCC; Sally Parker, Environment Agency; Tom Ridley, Selby District Council; Ben Jackson, NYCC; Alison Cooke, City of York Council; Rob Smith, NYCC; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC.

MJP22: Hensall Quarry

Extraction of sand.

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed MJP22 Hensall	**Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)**
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Landscape (SA11) - General trend towards landscape degradation. This area is a bit different from the wider NCA description and very often the landscape character of this area is overlooked. Heritage (SA10) - Heritage impacts are slight in this area. This site would, however, require an archaeological assessment. Water / Flooding (SA02 / SA16) - In theory the site would be extracted above the water table. However, the area is subsiding due to mining subsidence so the level of the water table may be more difficult to predict. The site is in Source Protection Zone 3. This site is in Flood Zone 3 – so assessment would need to look at the way it (including its restoration) displaces water to other areas. The Environment Agency referred the authors to comments made in their response to Minerals and Waste Supplementary Site Allocations dated 12 March 2015. Access / Recreation (SA14) No particular access issues.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary,	Quarry traffic already heavy on local lanes.

synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	There is cumulative degradation of this 'sandy island' of landscape character in Selby and existing extraction site landforms in the area are poor.
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	Site could benefit from a wider landscape regeneration strategy (which could include consideration of landscape and biodiversity) – but difficult given scale of site. Better restoration would come through a more heathland type habitat (high walls of site make restoration to agriculture difficult). Sunken landform is not satisfactory (a shallow depression might be better than an abrupt depression). Agricultural restoration would be good, but other potential schemes would be more in tune with landscape character. An archaeological mitigation strategy is required. Mitigation to manage flood risk may be necessary.
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; Ruth Benson, NYCC; David Cole, NYCC; Sally Parker, Environment Agency; Tom Ridley, Selby District Council; Ben Jackson, NYCC; Alison Cooke, City of York Council; Rob Smith, NYCC; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC.

MJP23: Jackdaw Crag, Stutton

Extraction of Magnesian limestone

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **MJP23 Jackdaw Crag**	Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Landscape (SA11) – The southern extension of this site is subject to a planning permission but is getting near to the skyline / horizon which would make it visible from the A659 road. The visibility from the A64 should lead to a negative assessment, particularly as this may effect tourist impressions of Yorkshire. The area to the east of Crag Wood is a nice landscape and there are some concerns over the effect that a quarry would have on this landscape. The site is in the 'limestone ridge' local landscape designation (to confirm). The elevated position of this site may make it more visible, particularly from the A659. Lighting disturbance is also an issue (particularly from the A64). While the northern / western parts of the site are already compromised by the A64 (though would add to the impact on the A64 as a visual receptor), the southern part of the site is less disturbed, so there is potential for a more significant impact. Biodiversity (SA01) – Crag Wood has been quarried on three sides – so the eastern extension leaves it high and dry. From an ecological point of view the value of the site as an isolated unit is questionable. Access / Recreation (SA14) - In terms of access, a bridleway passes the site to the south (along Chantry Lane). There may be a potential noise issue in terms of this receptor, so screening may be required. There may be some potential to, in the future, make the track past Warren House Farm a bridleway (there is an existing claim for this).

	Heritage (SA10) - The registered battlefield (Battle of Towton) is just over 1 km away and a potentially significant receptor to impacts from this quarry. There is on-going consultation on this quarry with English Heritage in the context of a current planning application so English Heritage agreed to check on the significance of this issue. However it is anticipated that Warren House Farm is visible from the battlefield, the designated extent of which is being extended and lies to the south of Cock Beck. It is possible this site may have been the location of skirmishes etc. associated with this significant battle. English Heritage queried whether they had been consulted on the current application at the site. NYCC actioned this. Water / Flooding (SA02 / SA16) - Traditionally there has been some reservations about quarrying in this area due to potential contamination of groundwater (the site is in Source Protection Zone 1) which may affect the brewing industry, though the fact that quarrying is likely to be above the saturated zone mitigates this issue to a degree. The Environment Agency referred the authors to comments made in their response to Minerals and Waste Supplementary Site Allocations dated 12 March 2015. The SA recognised that there was some risk from fuel spills even above the saturated zone (given the protective layer above the aquifer would largely be removed), so this would require mitigation so that any pathways for migration of pollutants might be reduced.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary,	There may be cumulative effects on the landscape

synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	from this and other quarries in the vicinity.
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	Mitigation for this site should include a buffer between it and the A64. However, it is difficult to mitigate because of its location. In terms of restoration, options may be limited to low level agricultural restoration or nature conservation. As this is a deeper quarry the steep sides would continue to be a concern. However, there may be some potential to terrace the sides of the quarry to reduce their steepness. There may be some potential to create a 'bridge' across quarried areas to Crag Wood to leave it less isolated ecologically. Elsewhere, restoration to calcareous grassland with thin soils would be preferable to more difficult restoration to arable.
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; Ruth Benson, NYCC; David Cole, NYCC; Sally Parker, Environment Agency; Tom Ridley, Selby District Council; Ben Jackson, NYCC; Alison Cooke, City of York Council; Rob Smith, NYCC; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC.

MJP24: Darrington Quarry Processing Plant and Haul Road

Retention of plant site and haul road for processing of Magnesian limestone

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **MJP24 Darrington Processing Track and Haul Road and MJP27 Darrington Quarry (recycling)**	**Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)**
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Water (SA02) – There is a need to check if the Source Protection Zone co-incident with these sites is to protect the aquifer below. If so, the sites would need to demonstrate no increased risk to the aquifer. The Environment Agency referred the authors to comments made in their response to Minerals and Waste Supplementary Site Allocations dated 12 March 2015. MJP27 involves the addition of an inert recycling facility (as opposed to the continued use of plant under MJP24). This may present an increase risk to the aquifer so potential mitigation may be required. Recreation / leisure (SA14) - There is an adjoining footpath (Wakefield Footpath No, 29) which seems to coincide with a short length of Leys Lane (Wakefield's online map shows the footpath does not continue south towards Stubbs Lane & there is a gap on the lane between the south end of footpath no.29 & the east end of Wakefield Footpath no. 7.) No increase in traffic expected with MJP24, though there could be some increase from recycling traffic, though this would likely go southwards - so no impact on users of the right of way. Landscape (SA11) - This site is in a locally important landscape area. The landscape character has been already changed by the existing quarry. There was concern that MJP24 / MJP27 might delay restoration on these sites.

	Heritage (SA10) - The landscape in this area has changed dramatically. In terms of potential restoration, inspiration could be drawn from nearby parkland (Stapleton Park?). Ecology (SA01) – There is the possibility of a dust impact on priority woodland. There is an outstanding application for a wind farm on this site.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	Potential mitigation may be required in relation to the groundwater Source Protection Zone.
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	In terms of potential restoration, inspiration could be drawn from nearby parkland (Stapleton Park?).
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; Ruth Benson, NYCC; David Cole, NYCC; Sally Parker, Environment Agency; Tom Ridley, Selby District Council; Ben Jackson, NYCC; Alison Cooke, City of York Council;

	Rob Smith, NYCC; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC.

MJP28: Barnsdale Bar, Kirk Smeaton

Extraction of Magnesian limestone.

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed MJP28 Barnsdale Bar Extraction / MJP26 Barnsdale Bar Recycling	**Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)**
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Landscape (SA11) – The sites are within a locally important landscape area. Landscape in this area is in need of enhancement so extending impacts will not help, with concern being expressed as to the shape and size of these sites. The assessors need to get an idea of what is going on outside of the Plan area. There is a concern that MJP26 would help leave the area as an industrialised area. Visibility of the sites from Middlefield Lane would be reduced due to landform. There is also a potential increased risk of impact if the recycling operation prolongs the life of the site beyond that of the extraction period. Access (SA14) – For MJP26, Long Lane bisects the site. This is locally important for recreation. There is also a bridleway to the south of the sites. However, there is currently a break in the bridleway network along Long Lane (route exists at south & north ends but is not a designated route in the middle section). A possible future bridleway along Long Lane could be instated as part of site mitigation. Biodiversity (SA01) – Minor negative impacts for biodiversity, particularly as impacts on designated sites aren't an issue. There may, however, be an impact on local on-site habitats (e.g. woodland) There are opportunities to restore to quality habitat in this area. Heritage (SA10) – No likely impacts on designated sites were noted. However, there could be impacts upon local archaeological remains that are possibly

	on site as the ground is disturbed. There would, therefore, need to be a mitigation strategy put in place. Water / Flooding (SA02 / SA16) The Environment Agency referred the authors to comments made in their response to Minerals and Waste Supplementary Site Allocations dated 12 March 2015. Air (SA04) – There is potential for dust.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	There is a cumulative landscape impact with other limestone quarries in the locality. There was some concern that the perception of this part of Selby District from the A1 might be affected (the panel noted there was also a service station in the vicinity of the sites).
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	A possible future bridleway along Long Lane could be instated as part of site mitigation. There should be a presumption in favour of the restoration benefitting the local landscape. It certainly wouldn't be desirable to leave the area industrialised in perpetuity. There are opportunities to restore to quality habitat in this area. An archaeological mitigation strategy should be put in place.
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	

This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	The assessors need to understand the constraints affecting parts of the Barnsdale Bar complex that fall into neighbouring areas.
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; Ruth Benson, NYCC; David Cole, NYCC; Sally Parker, Environment Agency; Tom Ridley, Selby District Council; Ben Jackson, NYCC; Alison Cooke, City of York Council; Rob Smith, NYCC; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC.

MJP29: Went Edge Quarry, Kirk Smeaton

Extraction of Magnesian limestone

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed MJP29 Went Edge Extraction / WJP10 Went Edge Waste Facility	**Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)**
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Landscape (SA11) - This site is in an area of locally important landscape as defined by Selby Local Plan. It is also in the Green Belt. Landscape in this area is in need of enhancement so extending impact will not help. Need to get an idea of what is going on outside of the Plan area. There may be some screening lost if the existing industrial estate is moved or as a result of further quarrying. Recreation / Access (SA14) - In terms of access, there is unlikely to be much of an impact, though the quarry is close to a popular route through Brockadale SSSI. There are linkages to Brockadale, though not by public right of way. In summary, there are no showstoppers so the rights of way team would be unlikely to object. Though there is possibly a negative impact on the route across the field to the west. Biodiversity (SA01) – Minor negative impacts on biodiversity are predicted by the SA which seems broadly correct. It is, however, worth noting that the wildlife habitat network that Brockadale forms part of (a Living Landscape) extends in to Wakefield district. Yorkshire Wildlife Trust manage Brockadale. Heritage (SA10) - From a heritage perspective there are no likely impacts on the Wentbridge Conservation Area, and more broadly the SA should report minor / slight impacts rather than major impacts. As with other sites impacts should note some uncertainty until an archaeological assessment is carried out.

	Water (SA02) - The Environment Agency referred the authors to comments made in their response to Minerals and Waste Supplementary Site Allocations dated 12 March 2015. Air (SA04) – WJP10 in particular may present an air quality issue if the A1 is taken into account.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	There is a cumulative impact on landscape arising from the range of uses on site / ad hoc development taking place over a long period of time. A possible cumulative risk comes from quarrying and other uses nearby.
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	There are opportunities to restore to quality habitat in the longer term. Restoration of quarry bottom to calcareous grassland has been mooted in the past; however this might not be possible if the industrial estate is located here. An archaeological assessment would be required. While there is existing bunding and planting around the site, further vegetation / bunding may be required, but ultimately it is difficult mitigate the large hole left through quarrying. Integrating the restoration into the existing SSSI would be easier if the existing industrial estate were not relocated.
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	A possible future bridleway along Long Lane could be an opportunity.

This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; Ruth Benson, NYCC; David Cole, NYCC; Sally Parker, Environment Agency; Tom Ridley, Selby District Council; Ben Jackson, NYCC; Alison Cooke, City of York Council; Rob Smith, NYCC; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC.

MJP31: Old London Road, Stutton

Extraction of Magnesian limestone and import of construction and excavation waste for use in creating restoration landform.

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed MJP31 Old London Road (extraction)	**Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)**
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Historic Environment (SA10) - Registered battlefield (Battle of Towton) is very close – English Heritage would consider this a showstopper due to proximity and the potential visibility of the site. Any proposed site here would need quite a bit of work doing to establish if the constraint could be overcome. The initial impression is that the site would have the potential to harm the significance of battlefield. To overcome this constraint there would need to be a satisfactory outcome to a robust assessment from the submitter of the contribution this site makes to the understanding, appreciation and enjoyment of the battlefield site. English Heritage could expand on the detail needed if required. It was also noted that London Road was a historic route. Hazlewood Castle (Grade 1) is probably sufficiently distant to exclude effects, but needs to be evaluated from the perspective of its views and setting (including the parkland estate). Landscape (SA11) - Landscape: this site is not far from the undesignated Grimston Park – so this would probably warrant an objection on landscape grounds. The site is in a tranquil area of landscape. It was also noted that there is a lack of screening existing around the site and also concern that it would involve extraction close to the Wingate Hill ridge, bringing it very close to the Jackdaw Crag operation & creating an unacceptable landform.

	Water (SA04) - In terms of water the site is in Source Protection Zone 2. The Environment Agency referred the authors to comments made in their response to Minerals and Waste Supplementary Site Allocations dated 12 March 2015. Recreation and Access (SA14) - For recreation, quarrying adjacent to bridleway isn't ideal, so this needs investigation. What would the submitters plan for access be? Would it involve travel on the nearby Old London Road which is also a bridleway (which would cause problems due to the interaction of HGVs and horses)?
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	Possible showstopper (battlefield).
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	A robust assessment of the contribution this site makes to the understanding, appreciation and enjoyment of the battlefield site would be required. The group discussed the mitigation for the group of sites around this area (i.e. MJP31, MJP58, WJP04, and MJP53) together to see if there were any synergies between mitigation. All sites in this group are very difficult to mitigate because of large voids. The group thought that there was no real tangible benefit of working with adjoining quarries over mitigation.

	In terms of landscape it is increasingly one of artificial landforms in an area of smooth / convex slopes. Here there is the potential to improve existing quarries, but the preference would be to avoid significantly more new quarries. In relation to leisure and access, mitigation would need to come in the form of alternative bridleways / access tracks and screening. But very little that could be done to fully mitigate / compensate the impact on public rights of way. HGVs should avoid sharing bridleway space with other users. For the historic environment there may not be any way of mitigating historic environment impacts in the more sensitive locations – disturbance would be for developers to address.
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; Ruth Benson, NYCC; David Cole, NYCC; Sally Parker, Environment Agency; Tom Ridley, Selby District Council; Ben Jackson, NYCC; Alison Cooke, City of York Council; Rob Smith, NYCC; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC.

MJP44: Land between Plasmor Block Making Plant, Great Heck and Pollington Airfield

Extraction of sand

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed MJP44 Land between Plasmor works (Great Heck) & Pollington airfield	**Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)**
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Access / Recreation (SA14) - The footpath that crosses the site and the M62 is no longer accessible (The Rights of Way representative offered to check if it still exists). There could be an opportunity for a diversion to make the access more usable (if PROW still exists). Heritage (SA10) – Impact is small to slight – not as significant as stated in assessment. This should be revised to neutral to minor negative. Landscape / soils (SA11/SA05): This is a Greenfield site (extension to existing site). Landscape – minor adverse. There is a minor adverse effect on soils due to the land currently being in arable use. The visual effects of this site could be mitigated however. Traffic (SA03) - There are sustainability benefits in terms of co-location, between extraction here and the adjacent Plasmor plant. However, there is a need to check where sand coming from currently & whether some would also be sold as building sand (checks made by NYCC confirm that submission refers to sale of building sand as well as use at the works). Ecology (SA01) – The site has a former SINC site adjacent, but this presents no major concerns. There may, however, be protected species on / adjacent to site. Water / Flooding (SA02/SA16) - The Environment Agency reported that this site is in Source Protection Zone 3 – The Environment Agency referred the

	authors to comments made in their response to Minerals and Waste Supplementary Site Allocations dated 12 March 2015.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	There is a need for some kind of green infrastructure to break up all these proposed works in this area.
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	A strategic plan for this area would be helpful in managing development and reducing impacts / creating benefits for ecology and landscape. Co-ordination would be needed with the East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; Ruth Benson, NYCC; David Cole, NYCC; Sally Parker, Environment Agency; Tom Ridley, Selby District Council; Ben Jackson, NYCC; Alison Cooke, City of York Council; Rob Smith, NYCC; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC.

MJP45: Land to North of Hemingbrough

Extraction of clay

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed MJP45: Land to North of Hemingbrough	**Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)**
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Landscape (SA11) – The scale of effects depends on the operations at any one time but is expected to include loss of trees and hedgerows and integration into the landscape. The process of restoration itself could also have a negative landscape impact. In particular, there is concern over area next to Hull Road. The site is also open to views from the railway in this area of quite pleasant countryside. Recreation / Access (SA14) - The site is close to the Trans Pennine Trail, and although this is not one of the more widely used parts it still needs to be screened. On bike people move more slowly than trains. Biodiversity (SA01) - Restoration to wetland in the long term would be positive. There is some concern over the presence of the adjacent Hagg Lane Green SINC. This is wet woodland that has protected species such as great crested newts. There is the potential for negative effects on the SINC if the site is dewatered. Restoration could potentially enhance the SINC and further clarification on restoration could ensure a positive benefit. Historic environment (SA10) - In terms of the historic environment a minor impact would be on the nearby conservation area – and this combined with Romano archaeology would raise the impact to major negative. There is therefore a need for an archaeological evaluation to establish potential. There is a need to avoid the most sensitive areas of the site, including parts of the site that affect the setting of the conservation area (particularly the eastern boundary).

	Water / Flooding (SA02 / SA16) - The Environment Agency referred the authors to comments made in their response to Minerals and Waste Supplementary Site Allocations dated 12 March 2015.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	Area between Cliffe and Hemingbrough becoming continually disturbed by development / more urbanised (landscape impact).This disturbance is likely to increase over time. In particular there may be a cumulative impact on the experience of railway users.
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	Screening and buffer alongside road and TPT and good design all around the site is needed (more hedgerow trees will be important – subject to investigation of archaeology). Restoration might lessen effects over time if phased. Restoration could enhance SINC? Educational aspects could also be explored. Buffer needed with SINC to protect from mineral site. Hagg Lane Conservation Group would need to be consulted. An archaeological evaluation would be needed and the rural gap between Hemingbrough and this land should be retained.
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information	

may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; Ruth Benson, NYCC; David Cole, NYCC; Sally Parker, Environment Agency; Tom Ridley, Selby District Council; Ben Jackson, NYCC; Alison Cooke, City of York Council; Rob Smith, NYCC; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC

MJP52: Field SE5356 9513 to North of Duttons Farm, Upper Poppleton

Extraction of clay

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed MJP52: Field to North of Duttons Farm	**Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)**
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Heritage (SA10) - Although there are no impacts on designated historic assets there is a need to evaluate the 6 characteristics / tests that relate to historic environment of the city of York (this applies to all York sites). There is also a need to consider the impact on the Green Belt. Water (SA16 / SA02) - The Environment Agency referred the authors to comments made in their response to Minerals and Waste Supplementary Site Allocations dated 12 March 2015. Air quality (SA4) – It will be important to check residential receptors and impacts on the York Air Quality Management Area. The main issues would be traffic and dust from this site – but the panel thought this may be quite low (5 to 10 lorries a day). Impacts may also depend on scale of operation. Noise, however, is likely to be at a low level. Biodiversity (SA1) - There may be potential for protected species such as great crested newt. Access (SA14) - There is no right of way along the track. The panel noted that this land is already disturbed land as the site was never restored originally.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its	Not applicable.

development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	Generally this site is relatively isolated (nearest sites are at Alne and Hemingborough).
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	Important to retain on-site soils (e.g. use as bund)
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	Are there any opportunities for better recreational access?
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	SFRA and lack of consideration of the aforementioned 6 factors important to the historic environment of York has limited this assessment. In addition, in this and other assessments it will be important to add uncertainties in SEA and add recommendations to address these uncertainties. E.g. does uncertainty at the site trigger the need for further research or precautionary mitigation? Does uncertainty require the developer to consider additional things as part of an application?
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; Ruth Benson, NYCC; David Cole, NYCC; Sally Parker, Environment Agency; Tom Ridley, Selby District Council; Ben Jackson, NYCC; Rebecca Harrison, City of York Council; Anthony Dean, City of York Council; Alison Cooke, City of York Council; Rob Smith, NYCC; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC

MJP53: Land to North of Old London Road Quarry, Stutton

Extraction of Magnesian limestone and import of construction and excavation waste for use in creating restoration landform

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **MJP53 - Land to north of Old London Road extraction**	**Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)**
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Heritage (SA10) – the size of this site and its slope towards the Registered Battlefield means that the relationship with the Battlefield site is likely to be a showstopper. There are also the potential for archaeological remains. Water / Flooding (SA02 / SA16) – The Environment Agency referred the authors to comments made in their response to Minerals and Waste Supplementary Site Allocations dated 12 March 2015. Landscape (SA11) - The site is visible from the south and east. There is concern that it would involve extraction close to the Wingate Hill ridge bringing it very close to the Jackdaw Crag operation & creating an unacceptable landform. There is only one field between this site and Jackdaw Crag Quarry, and its position on a slope makes the site highly visible. The site is in a locally important landscape area and a relatively tranquil and rural area. Farming on this site currently seems to be carried out with conservation objectives in mind, so such recent gains may, through this site, ultimately be lost. Access / Recreation (SA14) - In terms of recreation and access both adjacent bridleways would be impacted severely and may no longer be usable to horse riders. In particular, horses and HGVs would not compatible on the Old London Road. Ecology (SA01) – the loss of a hedge onsite would lead to minor negative impacts, but other than that

	there aren't any major concerns.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	The group discussed the mitigation for the group of sites around this area (i.e. MJP31, MJP58, WJP04, and MJP53) together to see if there were any synergies between mitigation. All sites in this group are very difficult to mitigate because of voids. The group thought that there was no real tangible benefit of working with adjoining quarries over mitigation. In terms of landscape it is increasingly one of artificial landforms in an area of smooth / convex slopes. Here there is the potential to improve existing quarries, but the preference would be to avoid significantly more new quarries. In relation to leisure and access, mitigation would need to come in the form of alternative bridleways / access tracks and screening. But very little that could be done to fully mitigate / compensate the impact on public rights of way. HGVs should avoid sharing bridleway space with other users. For the historic environment there may not be any way of mitigating impacts in the more sensitive locations – disturbance would be for developers to

	address.
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; Ruth Benson, NYCC; David Cole, NYCC; Sally Parker, Environment Agency; Tom Ridley, Selby District Council; Ben Jackson, NYCC; Alison Cooke, City of York Council; Rob Smith, NYCC; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC

MJP54: Mill Balk Quarry, Great Heck

Extraction of sand

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed MJP54 Mill Balk, Great Heck	**Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)**
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Water / Flooding (SA02 / SA16) – The site is in Source Protection Zone 1 so there is some concern at impact on water. The Environment Agency referred the authors to comments made in their response to Minerals and Waste Supplementary Site Allocations dated 12 March 2015. There is also an issue regarding the switch off of local pumps by the water company. Negotiations with the water company over water pumping are still on-going. Therefore a check should be made on the status of pumping. Landscape (SA11) – The site is well screened but a deepening of the quarry may remove existing vegetation. In terms of the landscape around the site, it lies in a sandy sub-area which is now a degraded landscape. Impacts will primarily come from vegetation removal: woodland is an asset to have in this landscape. Ecology (SA01) – There are concerns over the loss of natural regeneration that could potentially occur at this site. Regenerated heathland habitats and associated protected species may now be on site. It would be more desirable to change restoration to compensate for lost habitats (possible active or passive restoration). Recreation / access (SA14) – A question was asked as to whether the dismantled railway to the east of the site could be restored to a recreational route / walk?

Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	Phase 1 habitat survey of this site will be needed to inform mitigation.
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	The point was made: could restoration benefit the people that live in Great Heck in some way? There is also the possibility of off-site enhancement of a nearby dismantled railway to make it a walking / access route / link to Long Lane.
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; Ruth Benson, NYCC; David Cole, NYCC; Sally Parker, Environment Agency; Tom Ridley, Selby District Council; Ben Jackson NYCC; Alison Cooke, City of York Council; Rob Smith, NYCC; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC

MJP55: Land to North of Hemingbrough

Extraction of clay

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed MJP55 Escrick (extraction) (Site WJP06 (Escrick (landfill) also considered in this form)	**Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)**
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Access (SA14) - There was some concern that there could be major visual impact on users of the nearby Trans Pennine Trail (as this is the main link between Selby and York which is also used for commuters). The Trail is part of the National Cycle Network (route 65) so Sustrans would need to be consulted. It is difficult to determine the scale of any impact on the Trail without usage figures. Historic Environment (SA10) - This site also lies near to the Escrick Conservation Area. This is a more significant concern than the loss of archaeology. Therefore there would need to be an evaluation of any impact on the Conservation Area and parkland (Escrick Estate). In this sense the Sustainability Appraisal needs to be prefaced with uncertainty until this assessment is undertaken. In addition both sites at this location (MJP55 and WJP06) should have the same impact regarding the historic environment. Landscape / Soil (SA11 / SA05) - In terms of impacts upon landscape, mature trees at Mount Pond suggest the site may be significant in terms of its parkland setting. There is good quality (Best and Most Versatile) farmland on site, and it will be important to retain soils for later restoration. Long term impact depends on future land use. Biodiversity (SA01) - There are 2 SINC sites adjacent to the site. In terms of biodiversity it is important that restoration should replace what is already there. For instance, there is the possibility that great crested newts may be present on site and

	identified through further survey work. Surface water flooding at the site might transfer pollutants to receptors such as Heron Wood SINC. Air (SA04) – There may be air quality implications from the transit of clay between this site and the Great Heck block-making plant. Transport (SA03) - Selby are undertaking a highways study that could contribute information to these sites. Floods / Water / Climate Change Adaptation (SA16 / SA02 / SA07) - The Environment Agency referred the authors to comments made in their response to Minerals and Waste Supplementary Site Allocations dated 12 March 2015.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	The panel noted uncertain cumulative effects arising from traffic as a result of other mineral working / site allocations.
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	The overlapping nature of minerals extraction and landfill were noted with this site. There is the potential for on-going mitigation which could modify impacts and scale.
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	Wet restoration might have benefits for landscape – e.g. the site could be a country park linked to the Trans Pennine Trail. There may also be some potential to enhance biodiversity along the Trans Pennine Trail. There is an expectation that any restoration, because of the features already on site, would include

	biodiversity. Landfilling would commence approximately 2 years after extraction in MJP55 commenced, which would have a bearing on the timing of any restoration.
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	It would be useful to establish some information on usage rates along the relevant part of the Trans Pennine Trail. The Public Rights of Way representative will look into this further. There is a need to establish the landscape sensitivity of this area. Is the site too big for this landscape, or could it be phased? An evaluation of the impact on Escrick Conservation Area & the designed landscape of Escrick Park is required.
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; Ruth Benson, NYCC; David Cole, NYCC; Sally Parker, Environment Agency; Tom Ridley, Selby District Council; Ben Jackson, NYCC; Alison Cooke, City of York Council; Rob Smith, NYCC; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC

MJP58: Old London Road, Stutton

Extraction of Magnesian limestone, secondary aggregate recycling, storage of mineral fines and partial infilling with imported mineral fines material

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed MJP58 Old London Road (Recycling)	**Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)**
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Landscape (SA11) – The site currently has an artificial landform as it has never been fully restored, so it currently looks out of place. Broadly the impact on landscape would be major negative in the short term, so any long term impact would significantly have to outweigh this. Ecology (SA01) - In terms of ecology the site appears to have naturally regenerated of its own accord. However, any work on this site would require further information to understand the implications for the biodiversity that is now likely to be present. Heritage (SA10) - English Heritage noted that the presence of a Registered Battlefield in close proximity to this site could also generate a major impact. As with other sites in this area there needs to be evidence to demonstrate this site will not impact on setting of the Towton Battlefield. Although the temporary nature of the development is recognised, a strong case would need to be put forward that the Battlefield would not be affected. For instance, there is an open view top the south from the Battlefield. There is potential for restoration to a form that is more compatible with historic character. Water / flooding (SA02 / SA16) - The Environment Agency referred the authors to comments made in their response to Minerals and Waste Supplementary Site Allocations dated 12 March 2015. Recreation / Access (SA14) - In terms of recreation

	and access there was some concern that HGVs, if they share the same space as the adjacent bridleway to the east, might be incompatible with typical bridleway traffic, such as horses. Air (SA04) – Dust may be an issue.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	There may be cumulative impacts (across a range of sustainability themes) in association with the other developments submitted in this area.
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	There is potential for restoration to a form that is more compatible with historic character. The group discussed the mitigation for the group of sites around this area (i.e. MJP31, MJP58, WJP04, and MJP53) together to see if there were any synergies between mitigation. All sites in this group are very difficult to mitigate because of voids. The group thought that there was no real tangible benefit of working with adjoining quarries over mitigation. In terms of landscape it is increasingly one of artificial landforms in an area of smooth / convex slopes. Here there is the potential to improve existing quarries, but the preference would be to avoid significantly more new quarries. In relation to leisure and access, mitigation would

	need to come in the form of alternative bridleways / access tracks and screening. But very little that could be done to fully mitigate / compensate the impact on public rights of way. HGVs should avoid sharing bridleway space with other users. For the historic environment there may not be any way of mitigating impacts in the more sensitive locations – disturbance would be for developers to address.
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; Ruth Benson, NYCC; David Cole, NYCC; Sally Parker, Environment Agency; Tom Ridley, Selby District Council; Ben Jackson, NYCC; Alison Cooke, City of York Council; Rob Smith, NYCC; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC

WJP04: Old London Road Quarry, Stutton

Extraction of Magnesian limestone

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed WJP04 Old London Road (Landfill)	**Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)**
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Water / flooding (SA02 / SA16) – This site is in Source Protection Zone 2. The Environment Agency referred the authors to comments made in their response to Minerals and Waste Supplementary Site Allocations dated 12 March 2015. Landscape (SA11) - The site does have potential for restoration, however a lot of material would be required for this landfill so the quantity of trucks visiting the site could disrupt the character of the area. As with several other quarries in the vicinity there are currently straight sides to the existing quarry, though there is some natural regeneration and some screening. This means that the site may not be visible from the road. Ecology (SA01) – The site is adjacent to Cock Beck and therefore a potential pathway exists between the site and the Stutton Ings SSSI downstream, which could lead to potential negative effects. Some habitats have already regenerated on the site, meaning that there is the potential for disturbance to these habitats and the creatures that live there. Water vole is a possibility (e.g. in Cock Beck). There is a need to know the current value of the biodiversity on this site. The farmland adjacent to this site also has some conservation status. Recreation / access (SA14) – There is concern on the absence of an alternative route to the use of the

	Old London Road bridleway for transport access to this site, or the potential for mitigation. HGVs on the same route as a bridleway would cause problems due to the interaction of HGVs and horses). Heritage (SA10) – As with other sites in this area there needs to be evidence to demonstrate this site will not impact on setting of the Towton Battlefield. Air (SA04) – Dust may be an issue.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	There may be cumulative impacts (across a range of sustainability themes) in association with the other developments submitted in this area.
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	There is a need to know the current value of the biodiversity on this site through survey. (This may help determine restoration.) Risk assessment would be required for the landfill. The group discussed the mitigation for the group of sites around this area (i.e. MJP31, MJP58, WJP04, and MJP53) together to see if there were any synergies between mitigation. All sites in this group are very difficult to mitigate because of voids. The group thought that there was no real tangible benefit of working with adjoining quarries over mitigation. In terms of landscape the landscape is increasingly

	one of artificial landforms in an area of smooth / convex slopes. Here there is the potential to improve existing quarries, but the preference would be to avoid significantly more new quarries. In relation to leisure and access, mitigation would need to come in the form of alternative bridleways / access tracks and screening. But there is very little that could be done to fully mitigate / compensate the impact on public rights of way. HGVs should avoid sharing bridleway space with other users. For the historic environment there may not be any way of mitigating impacts in the more sensitive locations – disturbance would be for developers to address.
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; Ruth Benson, NYCC; David Cole, NYCC; Sally Parker, Environment Agency; Tom Ridley, Selby District Council; Ben Jackson, NYCC; Alison Cooke, City of York Council; Rob Smith, NYCC; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC

WJP05 Filed to North of Duttons Farm, Upper Poppleton

Landfill and recycling of waste from construction industry

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **WJP05 Field North of Duttons Farm**	**Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)**
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Water (SA2 / SA16) - Landfill is regulated by permitting. The Environment Agency referred the authors to comments made in their response to Minerals and Waste Supplementary Site Allocations dated 12 March 2015. If there is a change in the profile in the land level this may affect flood risk (need to be part of FRA). In addition, drainage engineers need to be consulted on SFRA. It would be useful to establish what happens to water on site – does it drain into a watercourse, particularly if not restored to a flat profile? Landscape (SA11) - In terms of landscape, key questions are would there be enough top soil on site to restore the site (particularly if the site was not restored before)? And will there be enough material for inert landfill to restore the site? (Would there be a problem with supply?) Access (SA14) - Although no PROW issues were observed it was recognised that the relevant officer from York was not present to confirm this. Environmental Health (SA15) - From an environmental health perspective key issues would be lighting, dust and noise. A question was also raised as to whether the site may be sterilised from future use.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	Will there be enough material for inert landfill to restore site? This needs to be considered.

If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	There is some potential for the site to be restored more positively (without the need for inert material) for instance through restoration to a wetland and the restoration of a pond. There is the potential for biodiversity restoration.
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	Low level biodiversity restoration might be an opportunity rather than landfill.
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	SFRA will need to inform assessment. In addition some form of assessment of whether top soil and inert landfill material are likely to be available will be needed as questions were raised as to whether material is available within the timescale allotted? (An assessment of availability of fill material is potentially a strategic need policy issue.)
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; Ruth Benson, NYCC; David Cole, NYCC; Sally Parker, Environment Agency; Tom Ridley, Selby District Council; Ben Jackson, NYCC; Rebecca Harrison, City of York Council; Anthony Dean, City of York Council; Alison Cooke, City of York Council; Rob Smith, NYCC; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC

WJP07 (now withdrawn) and WJP22: Land on former Pollington Airfield

WJP22 is for import of wood pellet production, modification to biomass plant permission (reduction to throughput and output), and additional infrastructure associated with wood processing.

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **WJP07 Pollington and WJP22 Land on former Pollington Airfield**	**Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)**
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Landscape (SA11): Concerns about noise were raised. There are already noisy developments in this area. The area is relatively open country. However, there is a concern about future traffic levels in Heck and at Pollington Lane. Generally the development in this area gives a poor impression of the area and the sites are visible from the M62 and the east. However, the additional impacts of both WJP07 and WJP22 should be slight to minor. Recreation / Access (SA14): There is a footpath through this site so this would need a diversion to be put in place. There was some discussion over the canal towpath and some uncertainty over effects here. It will be important to maintain access in some way as this is an important link. Discussions could be initiated with Sustrans over access issues in this area. Sustainable travel to work might be limited by HGVs. The Environment Agency referred the authors to comments made in their response to Minerals and Waste Supplementary Site Allocations dated 12 March 2015. Heritage (SA10) - Noted a disparity between the SA assessments, though the assessors pointed out that the WJP07 assessment looked at the effects of additional processing, while WJP22 investigated the effects of new buildings and a reduction in

	throughput. Heritage impacts are, under both assessments however, likely to be in the region of minor negative to neutral.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	Noise from these developments would combine with existing development to create a cumulative effect.
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	Green bunding is needed to prevent this development being seen from visual receptors. Sites need to be considered in a landscape framework covering a wider area including into the East Riding. Construction of the permitted bioenergy plant would provide some mitigation but would need to take into account potential impact of the building which may form part of the WJP22 development.
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	There is a need to understand how the proposed link to a new wharf on the Aire & Calder Navigation (Knottingley & Goole Canal) would affect aims for a potential leisure route along the side of the canal.
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; Ruth Benson, NYCC; David Cole, NYCC; Sally Parker, Environment Agency; Tom Ridley, Selby District Council; Ben Jackson, NYCC; Alison Cooke, City of York Council; Rob Smith NYCC; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC

WJP11: Harewood Whin, Rufforth

Retention of the following beyond 2017: landfill, open windrow composting, recycling (including treatment bulking and transfer) and liquid waste treatment, energy from waste (biomass and landfill gas utilization), kerbside recycling and waste transfer operation, and construction of new materials recycling facility and waste transfer station.

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **WJP11 – Harewood Whin**	**Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)**
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Heritage (SA10) - Check historic setting of York (i.e. through Heritage Impact Assessment / 6 historic character tests). Environmental Health / Air (SA15/SA4) - Odour could be a problem, and a recent fire at the site may affect the perception of local residents in relation to the site. The production of energy from waste could result in plume dispersion impacts (which could impact on air quality so development needs an Air Quality Impact Assessment as part of application to further understand impacts). Other issues include noise and dust. There was some uncertainty over the routes that traffic might take from this site. The assumption would be that traffic would turn left on to the ring road, though it may also be useful to consider if traffic might also travel through Rufforth and whether it would impact upon congestion. Landscape (SA11) - Some discussion was had over landscape impacts. In particular, mitigation is needed to offset infrastructure associated with use. The existing landfill is higher than the surrounding landscape so there was some concern that it may be difficult to restore the landscape character of the site. Woodland mostly screens the site. There is some screening on the eastern side in particular.

	The panel also asked if there are any issues in relation to greenbelt under new definitions. If allocated would the site then become a brownfield site (precedent set), thus ensuring it stays outside of the Green Belt and opening up the prospect of future development? City of York Council needs to define the inner edge of the Green Belt & consideration is being given to the relationship between this site and the Green Belt. <u>Water (SA2 / SA16)</u> - The Environment Agency referred the authors to comments made in their response to Minerals and Waste Supplementary Site Allocations dated 12 March 2015.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	There may be cumulative impacts on health and wellbeing, arising from noise, lighting etc., from this development combined with existing development / development at Rufforth Industrial Estate. There may be previous assessment work / monitoring available in the locality which may help with this.
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	Mitigation for landscape impacts / restoration needs to be integrated with local landscape character, particularly as surrounding land is flat. In addition, there is a need to ensure screening extends to bridleway.
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	Could there be a landscape and nature conservation strategy for this site? This would be good to understand the long term implications.
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment	Could we look at previous noise / odour / lighting impact assessments? There is a need for further Heritage Impact

and what further information may help refine the assessment?	Assessment work. Information on air quality impacts would be beneficial (though this may not be possible until form of development is known). Assessment of vehicle movement could also be carried out.
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; Ruth Benson, NYCC; David Cole, NYCC; Sally Parker, Environment Agency; Tom Ridley, Selby District Council; Ben Jackson, NYCC; Rebecca Harrison, City of York Council; Anthony Dean, City of York Council; Alison Cooke, City of York Council; Rob Smith, NYCC; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC

WJP16: Common Lane, Burn

Bulking and transfer of municipal and commercial waste.

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed WJP16 – Common Lane, Burn	**Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)**
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Landscape (SA11) – Ad hoc development has taken place on the old airfield over time, which is unsatisfactory. An overall strategy is needed for this area. Access / Recreation (SA14) – This is a small site so wouldn't have much of an impact on users of the nearby Trans Pennine Trail. The Canals and Rivers Trust will have details of access arrangements on the nearby canal towpath (as these are not necessarily public rights of way), though it appears as though this may be screened to some degree. Historic environment (SA10) – The site is considered too small to have a significant impact, so SA scoring in relation to the historic environment should be lowered (to either insignificant or minor significance) Ecology (SA01) - In terms of ecology there are no significant issues. Water / Flooding (SA02 / SA16) The Environment Agency referred the authors to comments made in their response to Minerals and Waste Supplementary Site Allocations dated 12 March 2015. Discharges of water may need to be in agreement with Internal Drainage Board (as drainage of land should be through planning route / but not focussed on the permitting area). On a wider level, the panel also noted that on sites such as this it should be assumed that regulatory controls (though not spatial issues) would be resolved by the regulatory system as a matter of course. So where such issues arise the score should be zero.

	Selby District Council would like to come back to the assessors in relation to this site.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	There might be a cumulative impact of this site with development already on the airfield, which might have landscape / visual effects on users of the Trans Pennine Trail.
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	An overall strategy is needed for this area.
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; Ruth Benson, NYCC; David Cole, NYCC; Sally Parker, Environment Agency; Tom Ridley, Selby District Council; Ben Jackson, NYCC; Alison Cooke, City of York Council; Rob Smith, NYCC; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC

WJP21: Brotherton Quarry, Burton Salmon

Import of inert waste for restoration purposes.

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed WJP21 Brotherton	**Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)**
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Heritage (SA10) - English Heritage noted Byram Hall and Poole listed building close to this site. However, the most significant effect is likely to come from existing uses at the site (quarrying) rather than this site proposal for import of inert waste. Therefore this further proposal is more likely to result in minor adverse effects. In particular, changes to this landscape are seen as unlikely to affect designated assets. Concern was expressed over possible sterilisation of the site as a source of building stone for York Minster. Landscape (SA11) – Byram Park is of historic landscape value and contains Capability Brown remnant features (Yorkshire Gardens Trust have an interest in this Park's connection with the tercentenary of Capability Brown). Existing quarry crosses the line of an avenue. So it would be good to restore some of these features. If there is an opportunity to rethink restoration this would be good. Any fill they can put into this quarry would be good to restore ground levels. Could restoration be considered across the whole site? Water (SA02) – The import of waste, if poorly managed, may have a groundwater impact. The Environment Agency referred the authors to comments made in their response to Minerals and Waste Supplementary Site Allocations dated 12 March 2015. These comments also refer to several other sites at panel sessions which were not attended by the Environment Agency (see below).
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors	

have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	It would be good to restore some of the historic landscape features that would have coincided with this site.
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	There is the potential to look at restoration solutions across the whole of the quarry area.
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; Ruth Benson, NYCC; David Cole, NYCC; Sally Parker, Environment Agency; Tom Ridley, Selby District Council; Ben Jackson, NYCC; Alison Cooke, City of York Council; Rob Smith, NYCC; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC

Sites Considered at Panel Session 2: Richmondshire, Hambleton, Ryedale and Scarborough Districts

MJP03: Scarborough Field, Adjacent to Forcett Quarry

Extraction of carboniferous limestone

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **MJP03 Scarborough Fields, Forcett**	Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Community (SA13) / Changing Population (SA17) - Area sits in North Richmondshire sub area of plan – housing growth low with no major housing developments proposed in the area. This area is sparsely populated Transport (SA03) - Access to the A66 is a concern (undulating single carriageway between junctions, high levels of accidents in the area). There is no direct route / access through to A1 or A66. (Major negative). Access to A1 would almost certainly be along the A66 once reached. Landscape (SA11) - There are no local landscape designations in new plan. However, former designated landscapes can be an indicator of quality of the landscape. Lots of plantations dotted around so this screens the site. Biodiversity (SA01) - Local SINCS have not been surveyed for 15 years. There is a nearby green infrastructure corridor. This is multifunctional – but remote. However, because this site is in a rural setting there is no obvious driver for strengthening the GI network here. Dust impacts on woodland probably are not particularly great as most woodland habitats are not particularly sensitive (though there are exceptions). There could be minor positive impacts on geo-diversity as there is a possibility that this site could

	create a future RIGS. There is a risk that without careful design there will be a detrimental impact on Hallmires plantation by it becoming isolated on a promontory. <u>Heritage (SA10)</u> There is a Scheduled Monument 300m to right: Stanwick Camp and Earthworks. Stanwick is a nationally important proto town – fortifications to the town spread out to here. Generally the wider area is rich in designated assets, with Forcett Hall Registered Park also nearby. <u>Recreation (SA14)</u> No PROWs affected
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	There would be a preference for low level grazing / less intensive farming, with pockets of species rich grassland. SINCs nearby could inform what would naturally regenerate onsite and survey of these would be useful to inform restoration. RIGS and biodiversity could work together. Could strengthen the network of ecological SINC sites by jointing together local habitats.
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	

This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; John King, Natural England; Julia Casterton, NYCC; Graham Megson, NYCC; John Hiles, Richmondshire Council Ruth Benson, NYCC; Sara Robin, Local Nature Partnership; Caroline Skelly, North York Moors NPA; Jill Thompson, Ryedale Council; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Clare Dance, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC

MJP06: Langwith Hall Farm, East of Well and MJP07: Oaklands near Well

MJP06 and MJP07 are both for extraction of sand and gravel

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **MJP06 Langwith and 07 Oaklands**	Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	**MJP06 Langwith** Heritage (SA10) - MJP06 – There is lots of potential historic interest in this area, so the potential for a massively important archaeological impact. The existing 'landform model' (as used for the Ladybridge Farm development) can be used as a methodology for predicting heritage impact. Biodiversity (SA01) - MJP06 - Land ownership issues may or may not cause problems in terms of achieving coherent restoration as long term management arrangements may be difficult to set up. There may be an impact on the aquatic ecology of Ings Goit as the current proposal is to divert this water course to a lake. There are also minor protected species issues on site. There is the potential for this site to attract bittern in the future as it is recorded locally. However, could the diversion of Ings Goit impact on bittern through loss of foraging habitat? There is the potential for *Crassula helmsii*[1] contamination which the quarry operators already have to address in the existing site. There is uncertainty over the achievement of compensatory habitat because of this. Landscape (SA11) - There was concern over the loss of legibility of the landscape. Through this and other sites quarrying is creating a completely new

[1] A species (Australian swamp stonecrop) restricted by Section 14 (2) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981, which restricts planting and causing to grow such plants in the wild.

	landscape in the place of the former landscape. The landscape would be further affected by the loss of the original route of the Ings Goit. Recreation (SA14) - No PROWS affected. **MJP07 Oaklands** Generally similar general issues were considered relevant to this site so panel members did not add further issues apart from in the area of landscape. Landscape (SA11) - Landscape issues include the proximity to Well village, some of which overlooks the site; also views from Long Lane. The landscape would be further disrupted by the loss of the original route of the Ings Goit & the loss of landscape context in the area. The site in effect removes another section of the valley, resulting in the loss of most of the original low lying valley. Recreation (SA14) - Adjacent footpath along western boundary. Consider suitable screening to mitigate impact.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	

What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; John King, Natural England; Julia Casterton, NYCC; John Hiles, Richmondshire Council; Ruth Benson, NYCC; Sara Robin, Local Nature Partnership; Caroline Skelly, North York Moors NPA; Jill Thompson, Ryedale Council; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Clare Dance, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC

MJP08: Settrington Quarry

Extraction of Jurassic Limestone

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **MJP08 Settrington Quarry.**	Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	SA seems to pick up on issues. Transport (SA03) - Traffic issues need to be considered in addition to the other issues already identified in the draft sustainability appraisal of the site. The LNP representative present reported no major issues with the assessment findings for this site. Natural England noted that it had no concerns additional to those outlined in the SA. Several panellists noted that there is an opportunity to secure something better in terms of biodiversity through this extension Historic Environment (SA10) - In terms of the historic environment it was noted that listed buildings nearby at Settrington Grange may be sensitive to this development. Landscape (SA11) - In terms of landscape this area is in an Area of High Landscape Value. The area is also part of the Yorkshire Wolds National Character Area, in which this site would represent an unnatural landform. Indeed, a question was asked 'is this landscape increasingly characterised by quarrying?' Recreation (SA14) - No PROWs affected though adjacent UUR may be required for access. Highways manage UURs, though as this may be predominantly used by walkers and bridleway traffic, some mitigation would be expected. Protection of these users from increased traffic.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	

If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	A suggestion was made that it may be worth having a buffer alongside Langton Lane to limit the visibility of this site.
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	The LNP representative noted that they would prefer a possible restoration to limestone grassland. Similarly, Natural England noted that they would also like to see restoration to grassland.
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; John King, Natural England; Julia Casterton, NYCC; John Hiles, Richmondshire Council; Ruth Benson, NYCC; Sara Robin, Local Nature Partnership; Caroline Skelly, North York Moors NPA; Jill Thompson, Ryedale Council; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Clare Dance, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC

MJP12: Whitewall Quarry, near Norton

Extraction of Jurassic Limestone

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **MJP12 Whitewall Quarry (extraction)**	Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Transport (SA03) - Transport implications – the site is very close to Malton / Norton and strain on the road network to the A64 is a key consideration. Economic Growth (SA12) - It should also be noted that the site is very close to thoroughbred stables / equestrian exercise routes / access to gallops etc. If affected by traffic for example there may be an economic impact. Indeed, the site is on an identified route for horses. Local stables and the British Horse Society could have information on possible route conflicts / other impacts on horses. There is a lot of land being put forward for possible housing allocations to the other side of Norton, though none this side of Whitewall stables. Biodiversity (SA01) Welham Verge SINC is adjacent to the entrance to this site – increased traffic might damage the verge through possible encroachment / salt spray / demands to widen the road etc. A point was raised about the proximity of this site to the River Derwent (1.4km from site). This should be considered as part of the Habitats Regulations Assessment process as an in-combination issue with other sites. Historic Environment (SA10) English Heritage confirmed that the draft SA has identified the relevant heritage issues. Landscape (SA11) The site is in an Area of High Landscape Value with potential for AONB designation (but not currently a

	nationally protected landscape) so there are landscape concerns. In particular a breach of the ridge is not acceptable. Recreation (SA14) - No PROWs affected.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	Opportunities for restoration include the creation of limestone grassland (this could be balanced with restoration to agriculture).
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; John King, Natural England; Julia Casterton, NYCC; John Hiles, Richmondshire Council; Ruth Benson, NYCC Sara Robin, Local Nature Partnership; Caroline Skelly, North York Moors NPA; Jill Thompson, Ryedale Council; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Clare Dance, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC

MJP13: Whitewall Quarry, near Norton

Enlarged area for recycling of inert waste

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **MJP13 Whitewall Quarry (recycling)**	Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Transport (SA03) - In combination effects around traffic and routing of vehicles important. If this activity takes place it could cause an intensification of traffic levels and potential impacts upon the nearby AQMA depending on the access route to site. Biodiversity (SA04) - In terms of biodiversity issues raised were largely the same as MJP12 with particular emphasis on traffic potentially affecting the Welham verge SINC. In addition there may be potential impacts on restoration as importation of & retention on site of non-lime based material may limit the potential biodiversity of the quarry site floor upon restoration, but this will have less of an impact on the quarry sides. There is a risk of a potential delay to restoration whilst activity occurs. Landscape (SA11) - There was some concern about the quarry, through this operation, becoming a brownfield site in perpetuity, meaning that future development in what is a rural area will be more acceptable in the future. Most directly this could be manifested in the potential extension of life of the site & its potential scale should the principle of a recycling facility become established & be sought to be retained. Recreation (SA14) - No PROWs affected.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National	

Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	There is a risk of cumulative effects with the adjacent site and such effects will need to be considered in and HRA due to the proximity of the River Derwent SAC.
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	Currently probably low level grazing. (See also above). Any restoration to species rich grassland would potentially involve a similar regime being put in place.
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; John King, Natural England; Julia Casterton, NYCC; John Hiles, Richmondshire Council; Ruth Benson, NYCC; Sara Robin, Local Nature Partnership; Caroline Skelly, North York Moors NPA; Jill Thompson, Ryedale Council; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Clare Dance, NYCC Colin Holm, NYCC

MJP17: Land to South of Catterick

Extraction of sand and gravel

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **MJP17 Land to south of Catterick**	Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Water (SA2) - There is a potential unknown impact on groundwater movement in this area as the height of the water table is not known. Recreation (SA14) - The bridleway observed in the assessment is a dead end bridleway. Bridleway should not be used for vehicular access without alternative accommodation for pedestrian and bridleway users through diversion. Historic Environment (SA10) - Historic issues include: listed buildings at Ghyll & Rudd Halls; Hornby Castle Park (registered park & garden) across road to west; Bainesse Scheduled Monument not far to north. There is lots of archaeological interest given A1. Biodiversity (SA01) – Ecologically, the fields are currently of relatively low interest, but the boundaries have potential for interest. Possible candidate for a mix of restoration if it is sustainable. However, concern was expressed at more lakes. There is currently newt fencing next to A1 suggesting that newts could also be a possibility at this site. Landscape (SA11) - The adjacent land is an historic park and garden. Transport (SA3) - This site is close to point where A1 upgrade goes offline. Any access northwards towards the central Catterick A1(M) junction raises issues with the state of the junction at Catterick Bridge.

	This is possibly the less sensitive site in this location.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	The site could be reasonably screened from the A1.
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	This site is a possible candidate for a mix of restoration if it is sustainable.
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; John King, Natural England; Julia Casterton, NYCC; John Hiles, Richmondshire Council; Ruth Benson, NYCC; Sara Robin, Local Nature Partnership; Caroline Skelly, North York Moors NPA; Jill Thompson, Ryedale Council; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Clare Dance, NYCC Colin Holm, NYCC

MJP21: Land at Killerby

Extraction of Sand and Gravel

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **MJP21: Killerby**	Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Landscape (SA11) - In terms of landscape, concerns were expressed about the impact on geomorphology of this part of the River Swale valley through loss of some of the landscape features, e.g. the proposed north-west lake cuts through ridge to the north-east of Killerby Hall. Killerby Hall & Oran House both have undesignated parkland & appear tranquil. Submission would bring extraction into a new area south of river (traditionally most has been north of the river). This is quite significant – long term adverse impact. This site wouldn't be terribly visible from A1. Some of this site once had a local landscape designation. There is some uncertainty over the reference to a former landscape designation in the assessment as the policy has been superseded. Biodiversity / Geo-diversity (SA01) - From a biodiversity perspective the River Swale SINC is affected by the proposed two river crossing points. Hedgerow loss may occur, although generally existing hedgerows are of low ecological value. A bat roost may be affected. However, there is a general lack of current information for this site and not all the land will be in the control of operator so there is some uncertainty as to whether ecological promises can be delivered (biodiversity restoration is limited to a lake with no surrounding land and MoD restrictions also limit the type of scheme that could be put in place). Does this site revert to the landowner at the end? There needs to be some level of control over management (e.g. through a Section 106 agreement). There was some concern that proposed lakes would be deep & reed fringed with a tight border between the 'ecological area' (i.e. the lake) & the farmland (bringing associated nutrient runoff to lakes).

	From a geo-diversity perspective the identification of sites of geomorphological interest is not far enough developed to seek designations yet. Water (SA2) - A question was raised as to whether there would be much capacity for flood storage as quarry will fill from groundwater rather than flood waters. In addition, the mineral is often in deep pockets of reserves – so the practicality of restoration comes up against an approach that is driven by where the mineral is. Heritage (SA10) - Heritage matters include high potential for archaeology on site, the Scheduled Monument sites include the WWII fighter pens & Castle Hills, the 2 halls/parkland (Killerby & Kiplin). There are lots of heritage assets in this area and potential for more we don't know about. Landscape (SA11) - The restoration scheme would result in the creation of a waterbody between Oran House and Killerby Hall which is considered would look out of place. Recreation (SA14) - Footpath 10.78/1 through the middle of proposed site. Suitable diversion would be required. A number of public footpaths around Hock House Farm (to the south) may be impacted. Suitable screening may be required. No PROWs should be used as vehicular access to the site.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	Is restoration deliverable without control over landowners?
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	There would be cumulative effects on biodiversity – i.e. lots of small impacts across the whole site. In total this may equate to the loss of an ecological network.
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this	

Site be mitigated?	
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; John King, Natural England; Julia Casterton, NYCC; John Hiles, Richmondshire Council; Ruth Benson, NYCC; Sara Robin, Local Nature Partnership; Caroline Skelly, North York Moors NPA; Jill Thompson, Ryedale Council; Graham Megson, NYCC; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Clare Dance, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC

MJP30: West Heslerton Quarry

Extraction of sand

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **MJP30 West Heslerton**	Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	The Ryedale representative suggested that they considered the assessment covers the relevant issues. Biodiversity / geo-diversity (SA01) - GM is co-ordinating the mapping of geo-diversity sites so agreed to send further comments through. In terms of biodiversity, no strategic issues were noted. However, it will still be important to compensate for loss of habitat (e.g. trees) due to quarrying. Historic Environment (SA10) - There is large archaeological potential at this site. However, the existing quarry already has a good mitigation strategy / method, so there is scope to roll the method of archaeological work already taking place. Landscape (SA11) - There would be a visual impact from the loss of trees at this site. The restoration scheme for the existing quarry is not considered to be adequate. Could the existing restoration scheme be updated through this site? Recreation (SA14) - No PROWs directly affected. However, this site may be visible from the Yorkshire Wolds Way National Trail which overlooks this site along Heslerton Brow. Should consider the visual impact of this and request suitable screening to mitigate any possible impact.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with	The panel considered that this site is too small for cumulative effects.

development of this Site? How significant are these?	
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; John King, Natural England; Julia Casterton, NYCC; John Hiles, Richmondshire Council; Ruth Benson, NYCC; Sara Robin, Local Nature Partnership; Caroline Skelly, North York Moors NPA; Jill Thompson, Ryedale Council; Graham Megson, NYCC; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Clare Dance, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC

MJP33: Home Farm, Kirkby Fleetham

Extraction of sand and gravel

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **MJP33 Home Farm**	Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Historic Environment (SA10) - The impact on high grade listed buildings is a possible issue to note as a conservation area and listed buildings may possibly be affected. Issues include location relative to Kiplin Hall, the Grade 2* Kirkby Hall & Church & the Kirkby Fleetham conservation area especially in terms of the settings of these features. Landscape (SA11) -The Kirkby Hall area is characterised by what appears to be a William Asleby designed landscape with woods with a lake which RB considered would be detrimentally affected. IS agreed to mention to English Heritage designation team to check assessment as to whether worthy of designation as a historic park or garden. As this site forms part of the setting of the house this is a landscape concern. In landscape terms this site has the benefit of some advance planting. It is on an interesting ridge with woodland running along it. There is concern over where processing plant may be in particular. With so many quarries / lakes in this area there are concerns over an artificial landscape emerging around river corridor. This was echoed by the Local Nature Partnership representative, who highlighted we may be losing the natural shape of the Swale. Biodiversity (SA01) - There is a collection of SINCS nearby. The site will significantly change the river corridor by creating potentially deep lakes of limited ecological potential (the MoD also has strong hold over the habitats that could be created here due to the issue of bird strike). Concerns were raised regarding impacts on movement of species along the river corridor. There is no detail on Park Plantation which would be lost as to whether it is of SINC quality. There may also be a potential detrimental impact on Fiddale Beck.

	The site has water vole, bat and great crested newt potential which may be difficult to compensate for. Natural England highlighted concern on the impact of this site on the nearby SSSI (in combination with other sites). It was expressed that it is considered unlikely that site restoration will adequately replace habitats lost. YWT highlighted that part of the site lies in a Living Landscape area and that a wider restoration plan that joins up surrounding sites in a coherent ecological network would be supported. <u>Recreation (SA14)</u> Footpath 10.78/1 through the middle of proposed site. Suitable diversion would be required. A number of public footpaths around Hock House Farm (to the south) may be impacted. Suitable screening may be required. No PROWs should be used as vehicular access to the site.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	Site is in a green infrastructure corridor so would benefit from joined-up thinking in terms of the potential impact & the potential restoration opportunities. Land ownership may be a difficulty. MOD restrictions may also affect the type of restoration achievable at this site.

This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; John King, Natural England; Julia Casterton, NYCC; John Hiles, Richmondshire Council; Ruth Benson, NYCC; Sara Robin, Local Nature Partnership; Caroline Skelly, North York Moors NPA; Jill Thompson, Ryedale Council; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Clare Dance, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC

MJP43: Land to West of Scruton

Extraction of sand and gravel

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **MJP43 Land West of Scruton**	Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Historic Environment (SA10) - The historic issues include listed features at Leases Hall & a nearby unscheduled barrow Landscape (SA11) - There are concerns about the potential breach of the landscape ridge to the west of Low Street (near the A1) & the loss of the unnamed wood in north-west corner of part of the site near Stone Mole House. The western part of this site is up to the top of the moraine. There are substantial plantations adjacent – these might screen site. This site would contribute to a deterioration of landscape quality in this area. Double negative. Biodiversity (SA01) - Although the site could be considered of low ecological interest due to use of agriculture, Bedale Bypass planning application information suggests this landscape is of importance for farmland birds. Boundary features such as hedgerows on site could help habitat connectivity. Low street is a really strong bat foraging route and badgers may also be present. Wetland restoration not a priority here, more about field margins etc. Recreation (SA14) - Bridleways 10.4/3 and 10.125/1 are affected by the proposed site. These would need to be diverted and should not be used as vehicular access without suitable accommodation for pedestrian and bridleway users.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its	

development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; John King, Natural England; Julia Casterton, NYCC; John Hiles, Richmondshire Council; Ruth Benson, NYCC; Sara Robin, Local Nature Partnership; Caroline Skelly, North York Moors NPA; Jill Thompson, Ryedale Council; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Clare Dance, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC

MJP46: Kiplin Plant Processing Site, Kiplin

Retention of sand and gravel processing plant site

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **MJP46 Kiplin Plant**	Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Biodiversity (SA01) - This site lies within a living landscape – so this may represent an opportunity to restore the site in a way that is sympathetic to the Living Landscape. Heritage (SA10) - Not much impact on anything designated given that this is an existing facility. Transport (SA03) - Would this site draw in minerals to process from other areas? A check of the route(s) to the strategic road network & consideration of the traffic impact will be important. Landscape (SA11) - This site is in area of parkland. There is thus a need to make a good case to retain this site. This site may become more conspicuous in the landscape as other surrounding sites are restored. Recreation (SA14) - No PROW directly affected though this road does form part of Wainwrights Coast to Coast Path (one of the most popular long distance walks in the country). Impact may need to be mitigated – either screening or protection of walkers from traffic.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	

How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	More sensitive restoration could fit in with parkland.
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	Restoration could link with the Living Landscape in which the site lies, i.e. through this site there may be opportunities to pursue a non-agricultural restoration.
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; John King, Natural England; Julia Casterton, NYCC; John Hiles, Richmondshire Council; Ruth Benson, NYCC; Sara Robin, Local Nature Partnership; Caroline Skelly, North York Moors NPA; Jill Thompson, Ryedale Council; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Clare Dance, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC

MJP49: Metes Lane, Seamer

Extraction of sand and gravel

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **MJP49: Metes Lane**	Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Proposed alteration to SA objective. The group discussed the title of the SA objective which refers to sustainable economic growth (SA12). The group agreed that this could only be evaluated when considered against all the other SA objectives. Therefore it would be better to rename the objective so it refers to economic growth rather than sustainable economic growth then ask a question at the end of the assessment as to whether a site would lead to sustainable economic growth. Biodiversity (SA01) - There is a Yorkshire Wildlife Trust reserve / SINC Site adjacent called Burton Riggs – so it will be important to pursue restoration that is sympathetic to this nature reserve. Litter etc. can be an issue at wildlife site so it will be important to avoid this (e.g. if the land is landfilled as a means to achieve restoration). Could the restoration focus on wildlife as well as agriculture? How wet will this site be during extraction? Would it be suitable for agriculture? Natural England suggested that at least in principle they have no concerns. However, it will be important to re-instate priority habitat on site. Water (SA02) - SPZ is very sensitive as it protects the main water source for Scarborough. Transport (SA03) / Economy (SA03) - Concerns were raised about visual impact from road & rail & associated potential impact on tourism & economy. There is also a transport issue about accessing A64 especially at peak times. Historic Environment (SA10) - There are potential archaeology issues given location relative to Starr Carr. Starr Carr site is extremely important (most important Mesolithic site in the country). This site would need a robust archaeological assessment

	before allocation (with associated advance costs) as it might harbour archaeological remains pertinent to Starr Carr. This is true of all of the sites in the Vale of Pickering. Landscape (SA11) - There would be a visual impact from this site as it is difficult to screen (and screening would be out of character in this low lying area). It would be visible from slopes of Yorkshire Wolds from where it draws the eye (as happens with the landfill site). Recreation (SA14) - Bridleway 30.20/8 runs through the centre of the site. Diversion would be required if any impact to prow anticipated. Quarry traffic should not use bridleway for vehicular access.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	There may be significant advance costs associated with retrieving the archaeology from this site? The setting of the Scheduled Monument is also a significant factor, which may also increase the costs of mitigation.
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	There is an issue of cumulative effects arising from losses to archaeology in combination with Scarborough District Council allocations. English Heritage stressed that there is a need for a wider archaeological strategy in this area to address cumulative impacts. Cumulative effects with adjacent site may also occur. In terms of landscape, the Plan needs to be aware of the wider minerals sites in this area – a strategy may be needed.
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust might make more suggestions for mitigation, given the proximity of their nature reserve – but mitigation can't justify development. It will be important to re-instate any priority habitat on site.
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	The site offers potential long-term restoration opportunities that should be sympathetic to the nearby wildlife interest.

This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; John King, Natural England; Julia Casterton, NYCC; John Hiles, Richmondshire Council; Ruth Benson, NYCC; Sara Robin, Local Nature Partnership; Caroline Skelly, North York Moors NPA; Jill Thompson, Ryedale Council; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Clare Dance, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC; David Hand, Scarborough District Council

MJP50: Sands Wood, Land to East of Sandy Lane, Wintringham

Extraction of sand

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **MJP50 Sands Wood, Wintringham**	Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Historic Environment (SA10) - Query about draft SA table listing the impact as 0 in long-term; the permanent loss of archaeological remains should be represented by a double negative score in the long term also. The long term impact on listed buildings in the vicinity & on the setting of Scampston Park should also be considered. There is a need to record that these are permanent effects. There is high archaeological potential in this area. There is a grade 1 listed building nearby (Church of Saint Peter in Wintringham 1.4km south). Landscape (SA11) - The site is in an Area of High Landscape (Yorkshire Wolds). It would be a permanent change to the landform and would also affect the setting of Scampston Park (existing land use affects the setting – so future use would also affect it). Areas of the site are currently in HLS (the two SINC parcels), so environmental gains through this might be lost. It is approaching the Capability Brown Tercentenary – so this raises the significance of Scampston Park. Sands wood plantation could be removed without major detrimental impacts. SA01: Biodiversity (SA01) - Natural England to further investigate possible impacts upon Wintringham Marsh SSSI. In particular, concerns were raised about the lack of information in relation to the depth of extraction as it could impact on the hydrological situation in the area including upon various local SINC sites and the SSSI. On site SINC is a rare arable weed community.

	The site is currently under a management scheme to protect the SINC within the site. This SINC is characterised by thin soils which in order to maintain their ecological potential requires disturbance but that is proving difficult to achieve. There is potential (but risky) to recreate that rare habitat but it would be difficult, so concerned about the impact. The LNP representative also pointed out that the North-east Wolds Scarp is an identified 'living landscape' so this needs to be taken into account in terms of the proposed restoration types & the scope to connect to that landscape. SA should be double negative for biodiversity. <u>Soil / land (SA05)</u> - A question mark was raised over the Best and Most Versatile Land status recorded for this site as locally soil is seen as poor. <u>Transport (SA03</u>) - It was queried whether access would be along the A64? <u>Water (SA02)</u> - The Ryedale Council representative queried the potential impact on water supply & would check what details the District Council had on that issue. Private boreholes are possibly on site. <u>Tourism and Recreation (SA13 and SA14</u>) - This is a tourist area so this needs to be taken into account. It was suggested that the SA score be revised to double negative for objective 13 due to impacts upon nearby visitor attractions and for objective 14 (recreation) due to proximity to the Yorkshire Wolds Way and Centenary Way. (Consider impact of increased noise and activity upon adjacent bridleway 25.81/15to the east of the site. Also consider any visual or noise impact upon the Yorkshire Wolds Way National Trail 500 metres south of the proposed site.)

Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	Will there be enough restoration material to restore this site as stated?
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	There is potential (but risky) to recreate the rare arable weed habitat on site, but it would be difficult, so concerned about the impact.
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	The North-east Wolds Scarp is an identified 'living landscape' so this needs to be taken into account in terms of the proposed restoration types.
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; John King, Natural England; Julia Casterton, NYCC; John Hiles, Richmondshire Council; Ruth Benson, NYCC; Sara Robin, Local Nature Partnership; Caroline Skelly, North York Moors NPA; Jill Thompson, Ryedale Council; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Clare Dance, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC

MJP59: Spikers Quarry, East Ayton

Extraction of Jurassic Limestone

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **MJP59**	Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Biodiversity (SA01) - There are potentially significant ecological issues with this site given its location relative to existing designated sites (such as the Raincliffe and Forge Valley Woods SSSI / NNR adjacent). It will be important to screen for appropriate assessment as this site may or may not affect Natura 2000 sites in the vicinity. Natural England will ultimately need to formulate their advice on this, but as part of the consideration of impacts (in both HRA and SEA) assessors must look at alternatives, including does the site need to be so large? Otter / other protected species are likely to be present. As Raincliffe and Forge Valley Woods is a National Nature Reserve it is also important to consider effects on recreation. Historic Environment (SA10) - The site is a potential source of building limestone (clarification should be sought as to whether the site would be used as a source of building stone or for aggregate) for local vernacular buildings. However, it is important to know what the stone was originally used for (e.g. Ayton Castle?) and if alternative sources are available. There may be a need to speak to BGS regarding their database of stone that can be used at historic sites. Is there a face that could be opened up for a small supply? The SA should also consider the setting of the nearby scheduled monument and conservation area. Landscape (SA11) - There is limited scope to screen the site. No buffer is proposed between the site & the Forge valley so it is likely to produce an unacceptable landform. Visual impact is generally local, but the site is in National Park. A steep ridge to the site would not be desirable in this location. This site may have an impact on tranquillity.

	SA14: Recreation In NYMNP. Adjacent public footpath that would require some consideration for shielding and other mitigation. Should not be directly affected.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	Smaller site may not be viable as an operation. Options for extending existing quarry may be better alternative.
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	Possibly. Need NPPF clarification on this – the National Park is investigating this.
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	There is scope to create limestone grassland through restoration.
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; John King, Natural England; Julia Casterton, NYCC; John Hiles, Richmondshire Council; Ruth Benson, NYCC; Sara Robin, Local Nature Partnership; Caroline Skelly, North York Moors NPA; Jill Thompson, Ryedale Council; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Clare Dance, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC; David Hand, Scarborough District Council

MJP60: Land to the West of Kirkby Fleetham

Extraction of sand and gravel from a new extraction site

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **MJP60 West of Kirkby Fleetham**	Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Biodiversity (SA01) - Positive or negative effects may occur at this site depending on the restoration pursued. One query related to whether it would be feasible to be restored to agriculture without material being imported. If material was to be imported then there may be scope for the recreation of the shallow marshy mire character which may have been in this area. Landscape (SA11) - This site is on the doorstep of several settlements and will result in the loss of hedgerows from the landscape. Possible historic field pattern? Recreation (SA14) - Footpath 10.84/2 runs through the proposed site. This would require a suitable diversion. PROWs should not be used for vehicular access.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	There is a cumulative impact issue in relation to biodiversity with the other sites proposed in the area.
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	Restoration – agriculture may not be viable if this site extracts below the water table.

	The patch of woodland known as ‘The Bog’ could provide inspiration – look at low lying habitats, relax some drainage ditches, create shallow wetlands / lowland fen habitats.
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; John King, Natural England; Julia Casterton, NYCC; John Hiles, Richmondshire Council; Ruth Benson, NYCC; Sara Robin, Local Nature Partnership; Caroline Skelly, North York Moors NPA; Jill Thompson, Ryedale Council; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Clare Dance, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC

MJP61: Land to South of Alne Brickworks, Forest Lane, Alne

Extraction of clay

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **MJP61**	Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	This site was not discussed in any detail due to time constraints. Any comments were added when notes on meeting circulated. Biodiversity (SA01) - Great Crested Newt an issue at site. This Alne site is more about opportunities in this fairly low quality ecological landscape. Recreation (SA14) - Footpath 10.6/2 runs along the northern boundary of this proposed site. This right of way should not be used as access for the site. Suitable screening should be incorporated into the scheme. A claimed public right of way runs along the eastern boundary of the site. This requires the same protection as a recorded PROW.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment	

and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; John King, Natural England; Julia Casterton, NYCC; John Hiles, Richmondshire Council; Ruth Benson, NYCC; Sara Robin, Local Nature Partnership; Caroline Skelly, North York Moors NPA; Jill Thompson, Ryedale Council; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Clare Dance, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC

MJP62: Land at Toft Hill, near Kiplin

Extraction of sand and gravel

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **MJP62 Toft Hill**	Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Biodiversity (SA01) - This site is ½ km from Swale Lakes SSSI so there may be potential hydrological impacts. There were no particular issues noted from an LNP perspective. Landscape (SA11) - This site would be very visible from the B6271 road & the track to the east & south of the site; there is also a potential impact on café at Ellerton. If this is a wet scheme topography could result in long bank margins given the shape of the site, so it could be hard to design an appropriate landform for restoration. Transport (SA03) - Access on to Sled Lane is tight & there may be a potential conflict between this access and people accessing properties & the leisure facilities in Ellerton. Historic Environment (SA10) - The area has high archaeological potential. Castle Hills Scheduled Monument is not far away. Will there be an impact on Castle Hill? Recreation (SA14) - No PROWs affected though adjacent UUR may be required for access. Highways manage UURs, though as this may be predominantly used by walkers and bridleway traffic, some mitigation would be expected. Protection of these users from increased traffic may be needed.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to	

trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	There may be cumulative biodiversity effects from this site taken together with other proposals in this area.
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	Restoration opportunities may be limited at this site.
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; John King, Natural England; Julia Casterton, NYCC; John Hiles, Richmondshire Council; Ruth Benson, NYCC; Sara Robin, Local Nature Partnership; Caroline Skelly, North York Moors NPA; Jill Thompson, Ryedale Council; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Clare Dance, NYCC Colin Holm, NYCC

WJP01: Hillcrest, Harmby

Waste Transfer Station

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **WJP01 Hillcrest, Harmby**	Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Landscape (SA11) - Lower Wensleydale sub area – employment opportunity would be counter balanced with landscape impact. Even if this is a small site it is large in a Richmondshire context. Queried what is proposed in terms of buildings given proximity to A684 & the Wensleydale railway. Transport (SA03) - What would be the extent of waste that would be imported rather than generated locally? Panel considered the proposed import tonnage is large for it to be from only locally generated sources. Biodiversity (SA01) - There are TPOs locally. This is a small site with not many restoration opportunities – but things like integrating habitats into buildings, standoff from trees could be pursued. Recreation (SA14) - Should not impact on prows.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	There is no high growth area proposed in either Harmby or Spennithorne villages, so cumulative impacts, at least in this respect, might be low.
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	This is a small site with not many restoration opportunities – but things like integrating habitats into buildings, creating hibernacula, standoff from

	trees etc. could be pursued. This site is in quite a rural setting – maybe it should go back to countryside.
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; John King, Natural England; Julia Casterton, NYCC; John Hiles, Richmondshire Council; Ruth Benson, NYCC; Sara Robin, Local Nature Partnership; Caroline Skelly, North York Moors NPA; Jill Thompson, Ryedale Council; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Clare Dance, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC

WJP09: Whitewall Quarry Materials Recycling Facility, near Norton

Materials Recycling Facility

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **WJP09 Whitewall Quarry (MRF)**	Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	The panel expressed some uncertainty as to what processes would be going on inside the on-site building? Need further clarification. Transport (SA03) - Trip generation – This site would create a new facility in the existing quarry to the east of the proposed outdoor recycling facility at MJP13. Taken together these two facilities would increase generated trips. Malton and Norton may be sources of waste. Landscape (SA11) What kind of building are they putting up? Is it a high building? (There may be some concern over a high building). Visually any building needs to be a recessive colour. SA01: Biodiversity /Geo-diversity The same issues that apply to other Whitewall sites apply to this one. However, in-combination / cumulative issues are crucial and more information is needed to complete SA. Issues with traffic may create a potential impact on Welham verge SINC. There will need to be a HRA due to the River Derwent SAC. In terms of geo-diversity no issues are yet identified. Recreation (SA14) - No PROWS affected
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major	

development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; John King, Natural England; Julia Casterton, NYCC; John Hiles, Richmondshire Council; Ruth Benson, NYCC; Sara Robin, Local Nature Partnership; Caroline Skelly, North York Moors NPA; Jill Thompson, Ryedale Council; Graham Megson, NYCC; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Clare Dance, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC

WJP15: Seamer Carr, Eastfield, Scarborough

Extraction of Sand and Gravel

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **WJP15 Seamer Carr**	Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Biodiversity (SA01) - Is the compost being used for restoration? Will grassland be used for grazing? Is it grassland and woodland with nature conservation objectives (e.g. to support reserve)? Such restoration could potentially have positive or negative effects on the local wildlife network, depending on how it is pursued. Natural England would like clarification of boundary and restoration details. Heritage (SA10) - It will be important to consider the setting of Starr Carr (in relation to the new part of this site). To do this assessors need to consider / be clear about what is new development proposed and what is proposed to merely continue at the site. Landscape (SA11) - This is an existing site – Concerns were raised that because of the sensitive nature of the landscape in the local area there was unlikely to be a more suitable site which means any relocation would be some distance away resulting in increased journey times. There are concerns about the visual impact in short & mid-term. Any proposed screening would be out of character with the area. There are many long distance views, so site would detract from the area and any screening would only draw attention to the site (as happens with the landfill site). Will the site continue on as a brownfield site once development has gone (i.e. precedent set that increases the likelihood of future development)? Transport (SA03) / Material Assets (SA08) - Is there scope to refine site area, i.e. remove the areas of the landfill if restored? If not allocated then assessors / planners would need to be aware that there would either need to be an alternative (new) site, or longer journeys for taking the material which currently arrives at the site.

	Recreation (SA14) - Bridleway to Sweetbeck Pig Farm may be affected. Should not be used as access to the site unless bridleway diverted. Adjacent footpath on eastern edge of proposed development may require additional screening but should not be directly affected by the development. .
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	It would be good if the site could be restored to link with the local ecological network. Public access could be considered – but it would be worth considering the long term costs of this and whether or not it would be a significant management issue. There is not a particular green space deficit in Scarborough. But the scale of the site is an issue if restoration is not finished.
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; John King, Natural England; Julia Casterton, NYCC; John Hiles, Richmondshire Council; Ruth Benson, NYCC; Sara Robin, Local Nature Partnership; Caroline Skelly, North York Moors NPA; Jill Thompson, Ryedale Council; David Hand, Scarborough Borough Council Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Clare Dance, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC

WJP18: Tancred, near Scorton

Retention of landfill, recycling (including treatment, bulking and transfer), open windrow composting

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **WJP18 Tancred**	Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Transport (SA03) / Air Quality (SA02) - A1 improvements will impact on air quality (so need to take care in how use AQMA data). The A1 improvements will mean there are no Catterick north & south A1 junctions & only the central Catterick junction, & there is currently no proposal for a roundabout at Catterick Bridge) so there may be potential difficulties with access to Strategic Road Network. Community Vitality (SA13) - There would be concerns should the EFW element remain as part of the proposal as this could change the nature of the area which is in between two communities (Scorton & Brompton on Swale). There is a potential housing extension to the north-west of the WJP18 site (to east/north of the existing housing on Gatherley Road). Richmondshire Council noted that pre-application enquiry has been received regarding a large factory unit at the site. Although a level of development is expected at Brompton-on-Swale and Scorton, employment opportunities may be preferable to be focused in Catterick Garrison. Landscape (SA11) - Industrial development would be out of place with wider restorations. So, restoration needs to be considered in the context of what is going on around it. Meanwhile, Scorton Quarry is to the east – and there are more lakes in the area. However, we need to think of this site as lying within an area that has a separate landform that is higher than the surrounding land. Don't necessarily directly reproduce more of the features of other quarry restorations surrounding the site as this is a different landform. Biodiversity (SA01) - A question was raised as to whether this site needs to return to just agriculture. Farmland birds are important in this area and hedgerows are locally good.

	There are also concerns about the juxtaposition of the landfill with the lake being formed in Scorton quarry to the east. Water (SA16) - Questions have been raised about the integrity of drainage systems from Scorton Lakes across this site to the River Swale. Recreation (SA14) - Though this does not directly impact upon any PROWs, it is adjacent to Wainwrights Coast to Coast Path (bridleway 20.58/1 and bridleway 20.58/11. This is one of the most popular long distance walks in the country and should be protected from adverse impact. Users are required to cross the B6271at the south eastern extent of the site. Potential increased traffic could pose a safety concern for Coast to Coast users and normal bridleway users. Appropriate mitigation would need to be provided.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	Could buffers be introduced to the margins of the site e.g. near the pond at the north end of the landfill area? There are also concerns about the juxtaposition of the landfill with the lake being formed in Scorton quarry to the east and whether there was scope to use hedgerows to enhance the site & its relationship with the Scorton site.
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	A question was raised as to whether this site needs to return to just agriculture. Could more wildlife friendly farming be pursued? Farmland birds are important in this area and hedgerows are locally good. Restore with hedgerows etc. for farmland birds.

This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; John King, Natural England; Julia Casterton, NYCC; John Hiles, Richmondshire Council; Ruth Benson, NYCC; Sara Robin, Local Nature Partnership; Caroline Skelly, North York Moors NPA; Jill Thompson, Ryedale Council; Rachel Pillar, NYCC;; Clare Dance, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC;

WJP19: Fairfield Road, Whitby

Recycling and transfer of municipal and commercial waste

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **WJP19 Fairfield Road Whitby**	Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Landscape (SA11) - The National Park would not be too concerned about this site, though advise caution over views of Whitby Abbey. It's in a business park – so this would be an appropriate use. The Area Action Plan requires buildings be designed well and mitigated. There is a design brief for this. NYCC's Principal Landscape Architect felt the impact may be more significant however. In particular concerns were raised about the current impact of the site in the context of the setting in the National Park and visual intrusion. This is because the plan needs to take account of the landform & the lack of scope for screening the site. This site conflicts in a small way (cumulatively) with purposes of the National Park. There is, however, an opportunity to make something better of the existing site. Biodiversity (SA01) - As with landscape there may be opportunities to improve the current situation at the site for biodiversity through the allocation of this site. Natural England suggested that the SA needs to assess alternatives in relation to this site. Recreation (SA14) - No PROWS affected.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative	At least 20% of site should be screening.

effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ian Smith, English Heritage; John King, Natural England Julia Casterton, NYCC; John Hiles, Richmondshire Council; Ruth Benson, NYCC; Sara Robin, Local Nature Partnership; David Hand, Scarborough Borough Council; Caroline Skelly, North York Moors NPA; Jill Thompson, Ryedale Council; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Clare Dance, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC

Sites Considered at Panel Session 3: Harrogate and Craven Districts

MJP04: Aram Grange, Asenby

Extraction of sand and gravel

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **MJP04 Aram Grange, Asenby (Minerals)**	Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Recreation (SA14) - Lots of PROW impacts need to be addressed in terms of potential diversions & scale of operation. Would it be phased such that it would be temporary closures, or would diversions be required for the whole lifespan of the development? Landscape (SA11) - The site is extensive and goes off in all directions. It is not contained, so concerns arise because of size. However, there could be restoration opportunities. An issue is the loss of geomorphology of the area (i.e. the hummocks). Biodiversity (SA01) -There are lots of remnant wetlands that we don't know much about in this area. These are possibly of local interest. There is also lots of opportunity. Restoration, however, depends on the levels at which minerals are extracted. However, the panel recommended avoiding a 'vast lake'. The scale of this site may mean it presents an important restoration opportunity. Local issues include the unknown potential impact on Leckby Carr.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with	

development of this Site? How significant are these?	
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	A desirable outcome might be a ‘biodiverse farmed landscape’ of shallow wetlands / fens etc.
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ruth Benson, NYCC; Wendy Wright, Harrogate Borough Council; Merlin Ash, Natural England; Julia Casterton, NYCC; Ben Jackson, NYCC; Dr Tim Thom, Local Nature Partnership; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC;

MJP05: Lawrence House Farm, Scotton

Extraction of sand and gravel

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **MJP05 Lawrence House Farm, Scotton (minerals)**	Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Recreation (SA14) - This site could have an impact on the adjacent footpath. It would need shielding as mitigation. Location of the site in vicinity of a bridleway is not ideal as horses & quarrying operations do not mix. Biodiversity (SA01) - The site is close to Farnham Mires SSSI and there are obvious surface water links to site. There is thus a possible impact on habitat at SSSI and water quality. Dust may also have an impact. Hay-a-Park SSSI is far enough away to not be an issue. The potential impact on SSSI ground & surface waters is of an unknown scale. Dovecote Carr may also be affected, but the value of its interest is unknown, e.g. potential for newts. Restoration issues will be affected by the limit of extraction, depth of extraction & the landform proposed including the features of any water bodies (depth, shape, size, etc.). In terms of onsite issues, the site is relatively ecologically poor; but there is a wetland area that needs its biodiversity assessing. The Yorkshire Wildlife Trust Staveley Nature Reserve is not that far away to north-east, so this area is a priority and in the past the Wildlife Trust have looked into the possibility of purchasing land adjacent to the Reserve. Potential beneficial restoration would occur if designed for shallow water/mire areas, provided that does not negatively impact the SSSI. From a Yorkshire Wildlife Trust perspective this area is a priority. The Wildlife Trust is looking to purchase land adjacent. At the River Tutt a restoration scheme is being planned to reintroduce meanders etc. The panel would be interested in shallow restoration that would not impact on SSSI.

	Landscape (SA11) - Area has been quite well quarried in the past – this site extends this well quarried and thus disturbed area with a degrading impact on landscape character. The area is vulnerable to urban intrusions (which would include quarrying activities). There has been a historic loss of field boundaries in the area, which extraction would further continue (but how much would depend on restoration). The wider area is quite open, as is site itself – so minor to major impacts might be expected. Some degradation is visible in the wider landscape. There is not much woodland in this area, but villages are important to character. So a key objective is to avoid development between the settlements (as this might impact on their setting). There are a number of footpaths at close to medium distance from the site. This area is more sensitive to change as it is already degraded. There are a number of heritage features which may be receptors to this quarry, including the Quaker burial ground & Scotton Old Hall. The loss of tranquillity in particular would impact on the burial ground. Heritage (SA10) - There is a Quaker burial ground to south as well as a number of other heritage features of concern – the SA needs to mention potential loss of tranquillity to that burial ground.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this	Restoration issues will be affected by the limit of extraction, depth of extraction & the landform proposed including the features of any water bodies

Site be mitigated?	(depth, shape, size, etc.). Potential beneficial restoration would occur if designed for shallow water/mire areas, provided that does not negatively impact the SSSI.
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ruth Benson, NYCC; Wendy Wright, Harrogate Borough Council; Merlin Ash, Natural England; Julia Casterton, NYCC; Ben Jackson, NYCC; Dr Tim Thom, Local Nature Partnership; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC

MJP10: Potgate Quarry, North Stainley

Extraction of Magnesian limestone

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **MJP10 Potgate, North Stainley (minerals)**	Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Biodiversity (SA01) - For this site there are similar issues in relation to restoration as MJP39. Restoration has to be addressed in the context of other restorations – and the final biodiversity value of the site needs to be an improvement the original biodiversity situation. This site doesn't fit with the local Living Landscape, but restoration to calcareous grassland would be of interest if feasible and if it would be managed. The site is arable now – so existing interest may not be that great. It will be important to minimise impacts on existing species however. Great crested newts are on site in ponds and lagoons. There is a veteran oak on site. Five Ponds Wood SINC could be compromised in its functional connectivity by being on high cliffs – could the wood retain ecological connectivity – and would hydrology be affected? It is important to note that the creation of one set of opportunities (e.g. calcareous grassland) does not off-set the impact on other features (e.g. the woodland SINC). Recreation (SA14) - There is a bridleway on the edge of this site – horses and quarrying don't mix, so this needs screening. There is an application in for a diversion here (the PROW Representative agreed to check the status of this). Any restoration at the site could build on the presence of Lightwater Valley nearby, attracting tourists / visitors to walks etc. However, a caravan site to south didn't happen as inspector recognised sensitivity of this area. However, it has now been proposed in a more contained area of the Lightwater Valley site.

	Landscape (SA11) - Mature trees on edge of quarry should be retained – creating a buffer for the bridleway may open up an opportunity to extend this line of trees. The setting of the AONB is a concern, due to this site being on a ridge (this opens up views from Vale of Mowbray also) and the impact on Ripon Parks SSSI is also of concern. The site would be considerably more visible than existing quarries, though may not be as harmful to landscape as the other West Tanfield site. The site would isolate Five Ponds Wood on a bluff, which is not considered acceptable in landscape terms. The area is characterised as estate influenced countryside & extraction would cause loss of historic landscape character. Given the site may affect the setting of listed buildings such as Friar's Hurst it would require a thorough LVIA. The impact of Lightwater Valley has affected the baseline already. The landscape is quite enclosed so this may lessen impacts on the local landscape to a degree. Fences / hoardings could have effects on landscape character during construction. You'd see soil stripping etc. from A6108. Transport (SA03) -There will be impacts on local roads from traffic.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	

What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	Any restoration at the site could build on the presence of Lightwater Valley nearby, attracting tourists / visitors to walks etc. This site doesn't fit with the local Living Landscape, but restoration to calcareous grassland would be of interest if feasible and if it could be managed.
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ruth Benson, NYCC; Wendy Wright, Harrogate Borough Council; Merlin Ash, Natural England; Julia Casterton, NYCC; Ben Jackson, NYCC; Dr Tim Thom, Local Nature Partnership; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC

MJP11: Gebdykes Quarry, near Masham

Extraction of Magnesian limestone

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **MJP11 Gebdykes Quarry, near Masham (minerals)**	Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Biodiversity (SA01) - A few possible ancient trees were noted on site. However, with this site long term benefits are important to consider. Nature After Minerals may be a good guide. The site is a relatively small quarry. One problem may arise if quarry operators extract right to the boundary, which may leave less habitat for cliff nesting birds. Also, calcareous grassland needs an appropriate gravelly substrate and grazing / management to get established but its viability would depend on whether wet or dry quarrying had been pursued. Restoration may be limited in scope. Biodiversity offsetting may be appropriate. NYCC's Principal Ecologist emphasised that it would be important to avoid a nutrient rich soil. Limestone scrub might also be a good habitat to aim for. The area is quite intensively farmed and thus not a priority for large scale restoration. Natural England broadly agreed on restoration – and emphasised the need to avoid a big lake. It may be possible to take a strategic look at sites and ask 'are restorations delivering ecosystem services?' There is lots of potential at river sites for ecosystem services, but not necessarily at this site. Such a study has been carried out by Natural England in the North East of England. There is uncertainty over impacts on Marfield Fen SSSI as there are concerns about hydrology, so this may need further consideration. This potential issue will depends a lot on depth. To help, one could look at borehole monitoring of the existing application. Dust from trucks may also be an issue. There aren't absolute thresholds for impacts as dust dispersion is different for roads and the quarry. However, there is no indication in the monitoring of SSSI that dust is having an impact.

	Landscape (SA11) - Strips of woodland might be desirable – probably on the top of the quarry. However, a square hole with cliffs would not be desirable. Restoration profile needs to give scope for softening the edges, e.g. through formation of benches & screes, etc. The area is relatively tranquil. The quarry would generally give rise to local-scale effects, but there is limited screening from the road & at Five Lane Ends junction (visibility may be increased by 5 roads coming together). There is also a landform issue as cannot develop a comprehensive scheme for the whole area including the existing quarry (as the landform would be divided by the retention of the road between Five Lane Ends & Gebdykes Farm). There may be 'in combination' impacts with other quarries – so the AONB should be consulted. There may be cumulative impacts with the quarry to the south. When effects are combined Lime Kiln Lane may be visually impacted. There may also be a loss of field pattern and hedgerows. There could also be impacts on the setting of Gebdykes Farm (early 19th Century development / an undesignated heritage asset), particularly if any buildings are proposed. Proximity to wood to east is an issue, although that wood does provide screening. There may be visual effects on a right of way to the west. Visual impact to west & south, woods screen from east. Effects are generally irreversible / permanent. Recreation (SA14) - The road to the south may be used by walkers – so they would need to be accommodated. Green Lane, which is assumed to be an unclassified road, may also be used by walkers. Public Rights of Way are not directly affected. Harrogate's green infrastructure strategy should be considered.

Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	Could a buffer be left around this quarry and could corners be rounded off to make landscape effects more acceptable?
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	Biodiversity offsetting could be considered instead of direct restoration? This may help focus on one target for biodiversity rather than small bits of restoration. There is a possible link with 'in combination effects' in terms of offsetting, so restoration could be focussed from an in combination perspective. As site may cover several landholdings could benefits be rolled out to whole landholdings? Restoration to calcareous grassland / scrub would depend on whether wet or dry quarrying had been pursued.
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ruth Benson, NYCC; Wendy Wright, Harrogate Borough Council; Merlin Ash, Natural England; Julia Casterton, NYCC; Ben Jackson, NYCC; Dr Tim Thom, Local Nature Partnership; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC

MJP14: Ripon Quarry, North Stainley

Extraction of sand and gravel

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **MJ14 Ripon Quarry, North Stainley – Pennycroft and Thorneyfields**	Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Biodiversity / Geo-diversity (SA01) - Concern over impact on SSSI and existing high quality woodlands. Restoration needs to be linked to SSSI in north. While the site is currently arable land, could the habitats on the SSSI be extended to the site? Natural England raised concerns over the proximity of the southern part of the site to the SSSI, with hydrology / effects on aquifer a concern. Great crested newt and otters are on site along with breeding birds. Northern part also has great crested newt features. In terms of restoration there is potential to make into a fair quality habitat that could buffer SSSI. Restoration to a big lake may not be desirable. The SA should consider the Natural England Response from 3 Feb 2012 when making the assessment. In addition, the High Batts data needs to be used as a baseline to guide the understanding of what the effects would be & what mitigation might be required e.g. from working wet & working in cells & possible use of a pump to maintain the hydrology. High Batts Nature Reserve Trust would need to be consulted – no mention of this in SA. Clarify wording in SA – the Wildlife Trust are working with SOME members of minerals industry, not all in their Living Landscapes project. In relation to the north extension – the meander has similar habitats to High Batts SSSI. Here the mineral may not be as deep. Southern area – they are undertaking some further work in relation to High Batts. In the planning application they are still very much working out what impacts might be. A pipeline crosses the site – this may encourage the creation of 2 deep lakes. Biodiversity wouldn't benefit

	from deep lakes. This site is also more sensitive than the previous extension. Wetlands between the sites are starting to deliver biodiversity benefits – so restoration should match up with this. Areas of the Batts have dried out when pumping has occurred in the area. Geo-diversity – these sites may have long term implications in terms of preventing restoration of the geomorphology of the river. The potential for the river to move in its flood plain should not be constrained by the creation of landforms which prevent that movement, e.g. proposals for lakes or bund. It was noted that the current application for this area *NY/2011/00429/ENV* includes more land than the site area included in this part of MJP14. <u>Recreation (SA14)</u> - Although there is little in terms of access at the northern site, the southern site is close to Ripon Rowell. There would be an impact on Ripon Rowell as the access for extraction would be likely to be on or alongside part of the Rowell route so there would need to be some provision made to avoid impact on the Rowell route. The possibility of HGVs meeting horses on the bridleway would be an impact that needs mitigating if this were to occur, so it would be useful to check the planning application to make sure traffic is properly separated. <u>Landscape (SA11)</u> - The southern site has a relationship with Norton Conyers designed landscape which is nationally significant. Will offsite mitigation / landscaping be in conflict or will it complement this? Amenity impacts may also occur. The site is relatively close to Thornborough Henges, but is quite well screened. It would be desirable to allow the water to meander (a big lake would prevent the meander). Historic meanders are visible. The Harrogate Council representative iterated that

	numerous designations are within potential range of this development (e.g. Norton Conyers Park and Garden, numerous listed buildings within that area and the Norton Conyers 'South Lawn'). In past a mushroom distribution facility has been dismissed as the area was seen to be a sensitive landscape. While there could be direct impacts on vistas from the Ripon Rowell and on the river corridor setting there may also be cumulative effects from 'a possible future quarried landscape' / from other sites.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	There may be cumulative effects from 'a possible future quarried landscape' / from other sites.
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ruth Benson, NYCC; Wendy Wright, Harrogate Borough Council; Merlin Ash, Natural England; Julia Casterton, NYCC; Ben Jackson, NYCC; Dr Tim Thom, Local Nature Partnership; Rachel Pillar, NYCC; Colin Holm, NYCC;

MJP15: Blubberhouses Quarry, west of Harrogate

Extraction of silica sand

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **MJP15 Blubberhouses Quarry (minerals) Harrogate**	Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	The group discussed how best to assess this 'mothballed' site and it was agreed that that the baseline should be taken as the conditions on the ground now. Biodiversity (SA01) - An application is currently in for the extension of the site. Impacts on Natura 2000 features are being investigated through a Habitats Regulations Assessment. There are issues in relation to peat and how this is re-used. The restoration was proposed in the1980s. This needs to be more up to date and linked to monitoring. Loss of land and traffic disturbance to breeding birds are key issues, as are issues of monitoring and long term management and the moving of a road (construction) & impact on traffic in the road's new position relative to the SPA. The mothballed site, as it stands, provides some diversity from the wider habitats (e.g. wetland areas) – so this area is different from wider SAC. The question 'could restoration be informed by this?' was raised. However, this is not a situation where replacing one habitat with another is acceptable. There are BAP habitats on site – how would these be affected? There is also wider biodiversity in this area, including bats and great crested newts. The LNP representative highlighted the loss of blanket bog. Blanket bog should not be replaced by alternative habitats. Because no-one is certain of the depth of peat a better understanding of this needs to inform restoration. Long term storage of peat is an issue as it rapidly degrades. This may affect the restoration viability. Peat needs further surveying. It is irreplaceable. The A59 diversion potential adds to the issues

	associated with the site. Transport (SA03) - This is a remote location & so traffic impact (given the tendency of the A59 to landslips) is a concern. Landscape (SA11) - As the site is in an AONB there is loss of a valued landscape. This site is in open moorland – so it is visible on the skyline. Tourism to Coldstones cut may be affected. Impacts from transport will also affect character. The proximity to Bolton Estate in the context of inheritance tax was raised. The National Park could also be impacted. Possible impacts from shifting A59 could combine with this site in the future as improvements to east-west connectivity have previously been mooted. Check with Highways whether this remains on the agenda. What are the benefits which could be achieved for landscape (including on the National Park)? Recreation (SA15) - A footpath would need to be diverted and access land may be cut off. There was some uncertainty as to the degree that access rights can be extinguished by the consent. This site is considered to have a major negative impact on access and recreation, so mitigation needed.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	

What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ruth Benson, North Yorkshire County Council Wendy Wright, Harrogate Borough Council Merlin Ash, Natural England Julia Casterton, North Yorkshire County Council Ben Jackson, North Yorkshire County Council Dr Tim Thom, Local Nature Partnership Rachel Pillar, North Yorkshire County Council Colin Holm, North Yorkshire County Council

MJP32: Barsneb Wood, Markington

Extraction of sandstone

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **MJP32 Barsneb Wood, Markington (minerals)**	Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Biodiversity (SA01) - The southern part of site is in a 'PAWS' (Plantation on Ancient Woodland Site). The northern part of site is agricultural. There may be hydrological impacts on the nearby Cayton Marsh SINC site to the south east. There may also be an impact on the PAWS in relation to accessing the site and taking materials out. There is some evidence of wind destruction of trees already near the site. Extraction from the agricultural area is preferable to extraction from the ancient woodland area (though a buffer would still be needed), which would represent loss of irreplaceable habitat. Dust deposition may also impact on PAWS ground flora depending on scale of quarry. A suggestion was made that the site outside of the PAWS could be considered an 'alternative' site for the purposes of Strategic Environmental Assessment, which requires consideration of alternatives. The void likely to be formed would create issues including the steepness of the sides upon restoration. Natural England said they had no designated site concerns, though did have concerns about the impact on the ancient woodland. There is no major beneficial biodiversity benefit from restoring the northern quarry. Landscape (SA11) - The site is in a small scale landscape with small field patterns & woodland along the Cayton Beck. This landscape is potentially highly sensitive to change. Working areas will be tight, which may be difficult for extraction. Strategic rights of way / roads nearby afford high levels of sensitivity. Given the height of land there is a potential impact on the setting of Ripley Park & Garden, although the

	visibility is potentially contained in terms of long-distance views. In terms of visibility – impacts may be contained by woods. In terms of tranquillity, this is a very tranquil area with a lack of light pollution & disturbance– so disturbance may be significant. Potential skyline impacts may occur. In addition possible skyline effects need to be checked. One possible landscape benefit might arise if this site provides local stone for vernacular buildings. <u>Heritage (SA10)</u> - On site buildings (if any) might impact on the setting of Cayton Hall. There is a possible heritage objection from Harrogate if any site buildings impact on the High Cayton Scheduled Monument. <u>Recreation (SA14)</u> -The Nidderdale Way may be screened from this site, so a large impact is not expected. The distance to the Nidderdale Way also means that any impact on it is likely to be limited. However, use of the bridleway by HGVs could be a key impact if lorries and horses must share access rights. An alternative access route may be needed.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	An alternative access route may be needed if access is via the bridleway. A buffer would be needed between the edge of the northern site and the ancient woodland.

What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ruth Benson, North Yorkshire County Council Wendy Wright, Harrogate Borough Council Merlin Ash, Natural England Julia Casterton, North Yorkshire County Council Ben Jackson, North Yorkshire County Council Dr Tim Thom, Local Nature Partnership Rachel Pillar, North Yorkshire County Council Colin Holm, North Yorkshire County Council

MJP35: Ruddings Farm, Walshford

Extraction of sand and gravel

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **MJP35 Ruddings Farm, Walshford (minerals)**	Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Biodiversity (SA01) - There is hydrological uncertainty in terms of the potential impact on Kirk Deighton & in terms of access (newts crossing road). The Aubert Ings SSSI wetland is downstream and may also be vulnerable to water quality / quantity impacts. It may provide suggestions as to the scope for restoration opportunities & the associated issues, but that depends on the depth of extraction, etc.) The site is relatively inaccessible, but it is a big site, which may equate to a big opportunity for wildlife. Recreation (SA14) - There are no particular public right of way issues. Landscape (SA11) - Concerns include the impact on Ribston Hall Registered Park & Garden (visible from rights of way) but it is recognised that the A1(M) has already impacted on the area. The river corridor needs a buffer. The Harrogate representative suggested that an objection might arise due to the impact on the setting of the 'undesignated' Ruddings Farm & the Ribston Lodge listed building at Walshford. It will be important to avoid adverse impacts on perceptions of road travellers. The site is visible from roads including the A1(M) & the over-bridges over the A1(M). Extraction would lead to a loss of features in the east of site. The land is BMV but there is scope for restoration opportunities. Impacts would fall in the medium term.

Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ruth Benson, North Yorkshire County Council Wendy Wright, Harrogate Borough Council Merlin Ash, Natural England Julia Casterton, North Yorkshire County Council Ben Jackson, North Yorkshire County Council Dr Tim Thom, Local Nature Partnership Rachel Pillar, North Yorkshire County Council Colin Holm, North Yorkshire County Council

MJP37: Moor Lane Farm, Great Ouseburn

Extraction of sand and gravel

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **MJP37 Moor Lane Farm, Great Ouseburn (minerals) - Harrogate**	Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Biodiversity (SA01) - There may be hydrological impacts on Upper Dunsforth Carrs SSSI and surface water links are possible. This is a big site. Much depends on how deep they will go. There are local SINCS in the area. In particular, Ousedale Beck may be linked hydrologically. To west of site are ancient woodlands – (e.g. Lylands Wood). This would need a buffer. If extraction were to include the woodland called 'The Dale' that would result in a loss of ancient woodland. There are also local issues with loss of boundary features. Landscape (SA11) - This is a relatively tranquil area with an established small / medium field pattern & woodland so its loss would have a moderate harm to landscape character. There would be impacts on the bridleway & other rights of way. There are potential cumulative impacts with Allerton Waste Recovery Park (AWRP) development and the other quarry at Ox Close Lane. To the south west the landscape is estate influenced. The site is also within a landscape enhancement area for Allerton Park. It is Grade 2 agricultural land. Concerns were expressed regarding the landform & the scope for restoration. Recreation (SA15) - Bridleways & footpath diversion issues & also an issue with the proposed use of the Moor Lane bridleway as the site access. This is likely to be a big impact.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major	

development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	There are potential cumulative landscape impacts with Allerton Waste Recovery Park (AWRP) development and the other quarry at Ox Close Lane.
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ruth Benson, North Yorkshire County Council Wendy Wright, Harrogate Borough Council Merlin Ash, Natural England Julia Casterton, North Yorkshire County Council Ben Jackson, North Yorkshire County Council Dr Tim Thom, Local Nature Partnership Rachel Pillar, North Yorkshire County Council Colin Holm, North Yorkshire County Council

MJP39: Quarry House, West Tanfield

Extraction of sand and gravel

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **MJP39 Quarry House, West Tanfield (minerals) – Harrogate**	Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Biodiversity (SA01) - Biodiversity needs to be examined in context of a strategic overview of the area. There are restoration opportunities if it becomes a wetland as this could be a 'stepping stone' to Nosterfield Local Nature Reserve, but it needs to be shallow water to be beneficial. A hydrological study is required in order to assess potential impact on flood water movement & whether development would impact on the river. It could also consider the effects of flooding on biodiversity There is a risk from invasive species, especially Himalayan balsam & *Crassula helmsii,* which are both an existing on-going management issue in the area, so a potential long-term management issue here as well. As the site is relatively small it is considered to be on the low side of viability in terms of restoration management, but there is potential for wetland, wet grassland or wet woodland. MOD safeguarding may be an issue – but with correct evidence assessors could look at whether or not this is a real issue. Evidence isn't strong that there would be an impact on planes. Species present may not be relevant. The site is upstream of Ripon Parks SSSI which is a concern. Water discharges may be an issue. In relation to Nosterfield LNR there is a possible hydrological impact but this is unlikely to be a showstopper. There is an opportunity through this site to support wetland birds. Recreation (SA14) / Economy (SA12) - In terms of rights of way, there is the potential to divert the route that crosses the site, but the impact on the Ripon Rowell may be more difficult to mitigate. It may not be possible to divert this route. Could there be a buffer between quarrying and the route? There may a severance and an economic impact on

	Slenningford Mill caravan site, as the Rowell route provides an access route to West Tanfield (pub, shop, etc.). There is potential for an impact on the amenity of users of the cricket pitch as well. <u>Historic Environment (SA10) / Landscape (SA11) -</u> There would be impacts on listed buildings and views from public rights of way. The Quarry Hill caravan site is nearby, so there is recreational use in the area. The Quarry Hill caravan site has permission to expand which heightens the consideration of the impact on local public rights of way further. The area has an open character as one descends from the former river cliff and so tree planting would be required. Harrogate Council may well object to the site due to the impact on landscape. Slenningford Park (undesignated designed landscape) is nearby. Working the site would give limited or no benefits in landscape terms. The perception is that West Tanfield has had limited disturbance, whereas to the north-east there is more apparent disturbance and this would introduce that to the area south of the river. The existing landscape has a lot of existing interest – so benefits of keeping it intact may outweigh the benefits of having this site here. The site encroaches into a relatively attractive and rare area that has not been disturbed: something of 'an oasis of tranquillity'. Short and medium term effects are of most concern.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	
How can the main likely	

negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	In terms of biodiversity any potential restoration would need to be exceptional for the site to move forward to allocation. It would need to be restored to shallow water or dry land as it would not be right to promote as being of biodiversity benefit if proposed as a wet restoration with deep water as there would be no biodiversity value from such a restoration.
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ruth Benson, North Yorkshire County Council Wendy Wright, Harrogate Borough Council Merlin Ash, Natural England Julia Casterton, North Yorkshire County Council Ben Jackson, North Yorkshire County Council Dr Tim Thom, Local Nature Partnership Rachel Pillar, North Yorkshire County Council Colin Holm, North Yorkshire County Council

MJP41: Scalibar Farm, Knaresborough

Extraction of sand and gravel

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **MJP41 Scalibar Farm, near Knaresborough (minerals) – Harrogate**	Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Biodiversity (SA01) - Water Framework Directive funding could have a bearing in this area. If shallow working then it may have restoration potential with opportunities for wetland creation, or for woodland or scrubby grassland if it is a dry site. There are SINC woodlands in area, so scope for opportunities in restoration to add to that woodland. The potential impact on wood next to Scalibar Farm (ancient woodland) is unknown, but care would be required in locating the site access as the panel would not wish an impact to occur if the road needed widening to accommodate the access. A658 goes through Birkham Woods SSSI – so there may be impacts from HGVs. This would depend if there were changes to the road layout. No particular existing priorities in this area for biodiversity, but there are potential new opportunities. Natural England highlighted that there were possible dust impacts to Birkham Woods SSSI. There are no major hydrological concerns however, although the potential downstream impact is unknown. Landscape (SA11) - The site is open to views from the B-road. The existing pylons would constrain extraction & restoration. Restoration may also be constrained by road. Incremental urbanisation is taking place to the south of Knaresborough – this site could add to the disturbed character generated by that urbanisation resulting in permanent change. The site would be very visible to footpaths across the valley. Site straddles two landscape character areas (Nidd floodplain & the North Wetherby rolling landscape). There is a need to maintain distinctiveness of the 2 character areas.

	The site would be alien in its context – so it could be difficult to get a satisfactory scheme. Woodland along the river corridor might be desirable restoration to give setting to watercourse. There is potential to add woodland to screen site from views from the east Recreation (SA14) - There is no predicted impact on access – but there may be an opportunity to get some access along river through restoration as this is a good sized bit of land, so a longer term benefit could result.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	There may be an opportunity to get some access along river through restoration. Woodland along the river corridor might be desirable restoration to give setting to watercourse. There is potential to add woodland to screen road from views from the east. If shallow working then this site may have restoration potential with opportunities for wetland creation, or for woodland or scrubby grassland if it is a dry site.
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has	

this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ruth Benson, North Yorkshire County Council Wendy Wright, Harrogate Borough Council Merlin Ash, Natural England Julia Casterton, North Yorkshire County Council Ben Jackson, North Yorkshire County Council Dr Tim Thom, Local Nature Partnership Rachel Pillar, North Yorkshire County Council Colin Holm, North Yorkshire County Council

MJP51: Great Givendale, Ripon

Extraction of sand and gravel

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **MJ51 Great Givendale, near Ripon (minerals) – Harrogate**	Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Biodiversity (SA01) / Water (SA02) - Site is on the opposite side of the River Ure from a reed bed which is being managed for biodiversity. The impacts depend on the way the site would be worked, its depth & how it would be restored. Ideally it should be reed bed, or if not suitable for that, a wet woodland area. Estate may want it to go back to high quality agriculture. Natural England confirmed that in terms of the Quarry Moor & Bishop Wood SSSIs there are no issues. Depending on design the site may have potential as a wetland bird habitat, but extraction at the site may create disturbance to wetland birds in the area. The site may have potential for natural flood alleviation Recreation (SA14) - In terms of rights of way there are no major concerns. There will be some minor impact but to a lesser extent than stated in SA. There may be a permissive path along river and plans to create a circular walk in this area (to check). Any restoration to biodiversity may be quite isolated in terms of access. Recreational opportunities may come through the Yorkshire Wildlife Trust reserve on other side of river. However, the permissive path connections to a bridge over the river may be lost through this site. Long term benefits could come through linking to Harrogate GI SPD Historic Environment (SA10) - There could be some historic environment concerns such as impacts on the Ripon Ure and Ouse Navigation. The impact on this should be considered in assessment. .

	Landscape (SA11) - There are geomorphology issues / issues around loss of farmland with this site. This is quite a tranquil area – linked via short walkable road to Ripon (so there may be opportunities for future access). Ripon has an open space deficit.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	Ideally this site should be restored to reed bed, or if not suitable for that, a wet woodland area. Recreational opportunities may come through linking the site with the Yorkshire Wildlife Trust reserve on other side of the river.
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ruth Benson, North Yorkshire County Council Wendy Wright, Harrogate Borough Council Merlin Ash, Natural England Julia Casterton, North Yorkshire County Council Ben Jackson, North Yorkshire County Council Dr Tim Thom, Local Nature Partnership Rachel Pillar, North Yorkshire County Council Colin Holm, North Yorkshire County Council

WJP08: Allerton Park, near Knaresborough

Retention of landfill and associated landfill gas utilisation plant and use of site for growth of energy/biomass crops beyond 2018. Proposed composting, transfer station and material recycling facility, recycling (including of minerals for secondary aggregates).

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **WJP08 Allerton Park, near Knaresborough (waste) – Harrogate**	Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Recreation (SA14) - Potential issue with bridleway as submission area includes the track to Walls Close properties which is a bridleway. Can this be accommodated or diverted? Biodiversity (SA01) - Natural England suggested that there was generally some bat interest in the area, and Upper Dunsforth Carrs SSSI lies to the north east, but there are no specific concerns. There may be some restoration opportunities. Landscape (SA11) - Impacts on Allerton Park Registered Parkland are possible as this site takes a notch out of parkland. Could this be restored / recreated on restoration? Heritage (SA10) - There may be impacts to the setting of registered parkland and impacts on Grade II* Temple of Victory and the Grade I listed castle.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this	

Site be mitigated?	
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ruth Benson, North Yorkshire County Council Wendy Wright, Harrogate Borough Council Merlin Ash, Natural England Julia Casterton, North Yorkshire County Council Ben Jackson, North Yorkshire County Council Rachel Pillar, North Yorkshire County Council Colin Holm, North Yorkshire County Council

WJP13: Halton East, near Skipton

Retention of waste transfer station with higher vehicle numbers and hours of operation

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **WJP13 Halton East, Skipton (waste) – Craven**	Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	Landscape (SA11) - Site is well screened. Increased traffic from the site could affect rural character – and do people use the routes for recreation? In terms of setting, adverse effects may come from the visibility of tops of the roofs. The site is in a sensitive area as viewed from National Park. The roof of the building on site is also visible from two conservation areas Eastby & Embsay, as is the adjacent coating plant. A concern was also expressed as to whether there is a long term restoration strategy for the quarry as a whole. If so this site could delay restoration. Generally this sort of site is not in keeping with landscape around. This area is relatively undisturbed, but this site is an anomaly. Biodiversity (SA01) / Air (SA04) - Possible effect on air quality from increase in traffic associated with the site – effects would depend on routes taken.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative	

effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	
This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ruth Benson, North Yorkshire County Council Wendy Wright, Harrogate Borough Council Merlin Ash, Natural England Julia Casterton, North Yorkshire County Council Ben Jackson, North Yorkshire County Council Dr Tim Thom, Local Nature Partnership Rachel Pillar, North Yorkshire County Council Colin Holm, North Yorkshire County Council

WJP17: Skibeden, near Skipton

Retention of Household Waste Recycling Centre for waste transfer of household and some commercial waste.

Form for Recording Panel Comments

Site / Area to be Assessed **WJP17 Skibeden, near Skipton (waste) – Craven**	Panel comments (include examples or key evidence where applicable)
Review of initial SA findings: Please list any findings you disagree with, recording the objective number and the points you disagree with.	No access issues were noted. Biodiversity (SA01) - Traffic might create an air quality issue Landscape (SA11) - Landscape impact is limited due to location. This site has less of a landscape character impact overall, as it is closer to road (which means the character is more disturbed), but due to its location (with hill to north) there is no impact on National Park. However, there is a need to maintain the mitigation derived from the existing planting.
Is the Site likely to be deliverable? What factors have led you to your conclusion?	
If the site is in a National Park or AONB would its development be likely to trigger the major development test?	
Are there secondary, synergistic or cumulative effects associated with development of this Site? How significant are these?	
How can the main likely negative effects associated with development of this Site be mitigated?	There is a need to maintain the mitigation derived from the existing planting.
What are the main likely opportunities arising from development of this Site?	

This assessment has been made on the information available to the panel. Has this limited your assessment and what further information may help refine the assessment?	
Please list the panel members present when making this assessment	Ruth Benson, North Yorkshire County Council Wendy Wright, Harrogate Borough Council Merlin Ash, Natural England Julia Casterton, North Yorkshire County Council Ben Jackson, North Yorkshire County Council Dr Tim Thom, Local Nature Partnership Rachel Pillar, North Yorkshire County Council Colin Holm, North Yorkshire County Council

Contact us

Minerals and Waste Joint Plan Team Planning Services, North Yorkshire County Council, County Hall, Northallerton, North Yorkshire, DL7 8AH

Tel: **01609 780780** Email: **mwjointplan@northyorks.gov.uk**