

**Appendix S5: Assessment of Sites in Richmondshire District
Joint Minerals and Waste Plan**

Preferred Options Consultation

Sustainability Appraisal Update Report

Volume 2: Assessment of Sites

Contents

| Reference | Site Name | Preferred or Discounted | Type of site | Page |
|-----------|---|-------------------------|--|------|
| MJP03 | Scarborough Field, adjacent to Forcett Quarry | Preferred | Extraction of Carboniferous limestone | 1 |
| MJP62 | Land at Toft Hill, near Kiplin | Discounted | Extraction of sand and gravel | 16 |
| MJP46 | Kiplin plant processing site, Kiplin | Discounted | Retention of sand and gravel processing plant site | 29 |
| WJP01 | Hillcrest, Harmby | Preferred | Waste Transfer Station (including recycling) | 41 |
| WJP18 | Tancred, near Scorton | Preferred | Landfill, recycling (including treatment, bulking and transfer), open windrow composting | 52 |

MJP03 – Scarborough Field, adjacent to Forcett Quarry

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Site Name | MJP03 (Scarborough Field, adjacent to Forcett Quarry, East Layton) |
| Current Use | Agriculture |
| Nature of Planning Proposal | Extraction of limestone |
| Size | 13.3 ha |
| Proposed life of site | 10- 20 years |
| Notes | Possible restoration noted as agriculture. Site is proposed extension to existing (but currently mothballed) quarry |

SA FINDINGS SUMMARISE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS ONLY. A WIDER RANGE OF CONSTRAINTS AND OPPORTUNITIES WERE INITIALLY ANALYSED AND DISTILLED DOWN TO ONLY THOSE WITH THE POTENTIAL TO BE SIGNIFICANT (SEE ALSO SITE ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY SUMMARY REPORT FOR A FULL LIST OF CONSTRAINTS AND OPPORTUNITIES).

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| 1. To protect and enhance biodiversity and geo-diversity and improve habitat connectivity | <p>Proximity of international / national and local designations and key features Natura 2000: 8.5 km to the south lies North Pennine Dales and Meadows Special Area of Conservation (SAC); Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI): 8.1km from Gingerfields SSSI, 7.72km from Brignall Banks SSSI; Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC): 2 SINC's border the site at 0m (Forcett Quarry North (potential) / Forcett Quarry (existing)). A third SINC lies 0.4 km away (Scott Butt Quarry). Forcett Lake SINC and Dairy Wood SINC (deleted SINC) also circa 1 km away.</p> <p>Priority habitats: Deciduous wood immediately adjacent to north (with very slight overlap) and east of site. No ancient woodland on site – nearest c400m to east. Green Infrastructure (GI) network: site is within Forcett/Cliffe District Level GI Network supported by Richmondshire Local Plan. Site visit noted ephemeral pond and some boundary trees, woodland and hedgerow perimeter planting.</p> <p>Summary of effects on designated sites and important features for biodiversity / geo-diversity Considering sources, pathways and receptors for this site it is considered that there would be no significant effect on any Natura 2000 site. Similarly, there is unlikely to be impacts on SSSIs. It is possible there</p> | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | - | + | + |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|--------|--------|--------|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| | <p>would be impacts to the two SINC's bordering the proposed site. However, there is a lack of up-to-date survey information for these SINC's, so further information on the current ecological interest and the proposed quarry operation is needed to fully assess any impacts.</p> <p>Based on the habitats on or adjacent to the site (mainly arable with boundary hedges & trees) protected species present could include: badger, bats, nesting birds, and possibly water vole along the beck to the west of the site. There is also a possible loss of some mature trees along site boundaries (there is a risk that without careful design there will be a detrimental impact on Hallmires Plantation by it becoming isolated on a promontory).</p> <p>The SA notes that, although the proposed restoration is likely to be agriculture, there are opportunities to create significant areas of priority habitats e.g. species-rich limestone grassland by extension of the existing restoration scheme for Forcett Quarry and by linking to the two former quarry SINC's bordering the site. These SINC's are shown as already supporting priority habitats and opportunities for the enhancement and appropriate long term management of these could be taken.</p> <p>In terms of geodiversity, there could be minor positive impacts as there is a possibility that this site could create a future Regionally Important Geological Site (RIGS).</p> | | | | | | | |
| 2. To enhance or maintain water quality and improve efficiency of | <p>Proximity of water quality / quantity receptors Site is in a Nitrate Vulnerable Zone (Surface water) (NVZ); Not in a Source Protection Zone; Site is in Northumbria River Basin Management Plan (RBMP). Nearest section of river is Forcett Park Catchments (tributary of Aldborough Beck) 400m north. Current ecological status is good. Current overall potential is good by 2015. Status objective 'good by 2015'. Groundwater: Site is in 'Tees Carboniferous Limestone and Millstone Grit' groundwater body: Current</p> | | | | | 0 ? | 0 ? | 0 ? |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|----|----|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| water use | <p>overall quality is good. Objective: Good quantitative status by 2015, good chemical status by 2015.</p> <p>Site is in Tees Catchment Abstraction Management Strategy (CAMS): CAMS: surface water resources available at less than 30% of the time. New extraction licenses are likely to be restricted¹</p> <p>Summary of effects on water quality Maps do not show any surface connectivity with the Forcett Park catchment (though aerial photos show a small beck with an unknown destination several meters to the west (separated by a vegetated buffer), while the current quality of the groundwater unit is good. It seems unlikely that a site of this scale and type would hinder the achievement of water quality objectives (which are already at or close to being achieved). Although there may be minor risks to groundwater and surface water from fuel spills etc. this is not expected to pose a major risk and could potentially be mitigated. A greater risk would come from extraction below the saturated zone however it is not known if this would be the case, so uncertainty is highlighted until such time that a hydrological survey can be undertaken.</p> <p>Uncertainty over water availability is also noted, which will need to be resolved through the licensing regime if water extraction is needed.</p> | | | | | | | |
| 3. To reduce transport miles and associated emissions from transport and encourage the use of sustainable | <p>Proximity of transport receptors Site is within 5 miles of the A1 giving reasonably good access to markets to the north of the Plan Area; Access: Would be worked direct from existing Forcett Quarry and stone would leave using the existing access onto Limekiln Lane (unclassified U1330) & existing private quarry haul road (which bypasses the village to the west of Moor Lane) onto Moor Lane (U1333) and then to A66. No direct access from MJP03 site to public highway.</p> <p>Light vehicles: 20 (based on most recent application for an extension to Forcett Quarry NY/2007/0024/ENV); HGV vehicles: Estimate 80-110 (based on most recent application for an extension to Forcett Quarry NY/2007/0024/ENV).</p> | | ✓ | ✓ | | - | - | - |
| | | | | | | -- | -- | -- |
| | | | | | | | ? | 0 |

¹ Water may still be available for further licensing at high flows with appropriate restrictions. Water may be available if you can buy (known as licence trading) the amount equivalent to recently abstracted from an existing licence holder.

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| modes of transportation | <p>Net change in daily two-way trip generation: Light vehicles: 0; HGVs: 0. Traffic assessment rating: yellow.</p> <p>Public Right of Way (PROW): Site is not affected by a registered PROW. However, part of Limekiln Lane (the access road) is also a bridleway.</p> <p>Rail: 12.5km east (nearest station Darlington 13km east) Strategic Road: A66 2km south / A1 6km east. Canal / Freight waterway: none within 20km.</p> <p>Summary of effects on transport Site would generate 80-110 HGV and 20 light vehicle movements, however, these are at similar levels to the existing site (which has planning consent until 2016) at this location (so traffic would not get worse, though without this site the generation of these vehicles would be expected to cease). HGV movement is acceptable onto Moor Lane and the A66 (existing haul road bypasses the village and links to Moor Lane using a routing agreement); however, minor works may be required to improve the existing access arrangements (and without such a routing agreement East Layton could be affected by traffic from this site).</p> <p>There may also be a need to mitigate impacts on the bridleway at Limekiln Lane. No sustainable transport is likely to contribute to the site. Proximity to the A1 and northern markets is relatively good. As traffic from this site is expected to bypass settlements (providing the routing agreement is maintained) and proximity to the A1 and northern markets is relatively good, impacts are considered to be minor for the duration of the operation (prior to mitigation, including the routing agreement impacts would be moderate), The traffic assessment also recommends that Personal Injury Collision data for the A66 junction is reviewed at the time of any future planning applications as despite a recent road safety scheme at the junction onto the A66 the collision record for this area is still emerging (this adds a degree of uncertainty to this assessment).</p> | | | | | | | |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| 4. To protect and improve air quality | <p>Proximity of air quality receptors Not within a hazardous substances consent consultation zone. Not within 2km of an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). Applying the 1km buffer around a site for possible impacts advised by MPS2 shows that it is possible that areas of East Layton are in range of dust (circa 650m S).</p> <p>Summary of effects on air quality Although dust could be a risk to East Layton and buildings at Carkin Fields, East Layton is relatively well protected by intervening plantation woodlands. There could be possible dust impacts on adjacent priority woodland. Traffic impacts could lead to quite substantial numbers of lorries per day (150,000 tonnes to be transported annually, estimated 80-110 HGV movements daily), though as lorries from this site are expected to bypass settlements (providing the routing agreement is maintained) air pollution impacts are considered to be negligible for the duration of the operation. However, unmitigated, if access to the A66 were to route in close proximity to residential properties minor dust and air pollution impacts could occur. Uncertain to minor negative impacts anticipated.</p> | | ✓ | ✓ | | ? | ? | ? |
| 5. To use soil and land efficiently and safeguard or enhance their quality | <p>Proximity of soil and land receptors Best and Most Versatile Land (BMV): Most of site is grade 3 Agricultural Land, c20% of site is Grade 2 (at southern end); Greenfield site - no known risk factors in relation to contaminated land. In terms of land stability development does not lie within or adjacent to a Coal Board development high risk area.</p> <p>Summary of effects on soil / land Up to 13.3 ha of best and most versatile land could be lost in the short and medium term, possibly continuing to the long term. However, if restoration is to be to agriculture this farmland loss will not be permanent.</p> | | ✓ | ✓ | | - | - | - |
| 6. Reduce the causes of climate change | <p>Proximity of factors relevant to exacerbating climate change Deciduous wood immediately adjacent to north (with very slight overlap) and east of site. Trees and hedgerows noted at site boundaries during site visits.</p> <p>Summary of effects on climate change There would be some loss of vegetation including hedgerows and trees from the site, while dust impacts on nearby woodland may reduce its productivity. However, these impacts are small scale and likely to be insignificant. A higher order impact would come from traffic</p> | ✓ | | | ✓ | - | - | - |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| | from the site which would eventually need to ship limestone offsite at a rate of 150,000 tonnes per year. The site is reasonably proximal to the strategic road network and markets to the north of the Plan Area. A minor negative impact is therefore anticipated in the short term and a moderate negative impact in the medium and long term (as impacts are cumulative and permanent). | | | | | | | |
| 7. To respond and adapt to the effects of climate change | <p>Proximity of factors relevant to the adaptive capacity² of a site Site is in flood zone 1. Surface water flooding only affects 2% of the site at a 1 in 30 risk. No EHN adjacent. CAMS: surface water resources available at less than 30% of the time. New extraction licenses are likely to be restricted.</p> <p>Summary of effects on climate change adaptation Flooding is not a particular risk to this site and it is unlikely to impair the movement of species vulnerable to climate changes. Uncertainty over water availability is also noted, which will need to be resolved through the licensing regime if water extraction is needed.</p> | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8. To minimise the use of resources and encourage their re-use and safeguarding | <p>Proximity of factors relevant to the resource usage of a site No spatial factors identified.</p> <p>Summary of effects on resource usage This site will contribute to the need for limestone. However, depending on whether it is extracted as crushed rock or whether some building stone is extracted it may to a degree offset recycled materials that could potentially replace them. However, this impact can only be considered at the plan level rather than in relation to an individual site. All that can be said here is that 150,000 tonnes of virgin minerals would be extracted each year which will be unavailable for future use (unless recycled). This works against the SA objective and is scored as a moderate negative impact.</p> | | | | | - | - | - |

² Adaptive capacity is defined as the ability of a system to adjust to climate change to moderate potential; damage or take advantage of opportunities (adapted from CARE International, 2015. Adaptive Capacity [URL: http://www.careclimatechange.org/tk/integration/en/key_concepts/adaptive_capacity.html]

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|-------|----|----|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| 9. To minimise waste generation and prioritise management of waste as high up the waste hierarchy as practicable | <p><u>Proximity of factors relevant to managing waste higher up the waste hierarchy</u> No spatial factors identified.</p> <p><u>Summary of effects on the waste hierarchy</u> The site would not deal with waste and no details are provided of how waste would be managed on site.</p> | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10. To conserve or enhance the historic environment and its setting, cultural heritage and character | <p><u>Proximity of historic environment receptors</u> East Layton conservation area is 0.5km to the south. Forcett Hall Grade 2 registered park and garden (ID1,001,063) is 0.5km north east.</p> <p>Several scheduled monuments within 2km: ‘Stanwick Late Iron Age Oppidum, iron age and medieval settlement, early Christian church and sculpture and post-medieval emparkment’ (ID 1,016,199) is 350m east at closest point (this is a nationally important proto town and fortifications of the town spread out to the site location); ‘Two moated sites (the site of a dovecote and further associated features 120m northwest and 180m north of the Old Hall- ID 1,021,039)’ are located 560m south of the site.</p> <p>In addition to the above constraints, the site is 430m from the ‘named designed landscape’ Forcett Park, which lies to the east, while Stanwick Park also lies around 1.5 km to the east (this dataset is purely contextual and merely flags up the potential for impacts as the data set does not provide information the extent of survival of those assets.)</p> <p>Historic Land Characterisation (HLC) Broad type - Enclosed land: HLC Type - Unknown planned enclosure.</p> <p><u>Summary of effects on the historic environment</u> The HLC type of this area is unknown planned enclosure and the allocation site is a smaller part of a larger area of similar character type, of which the</p> | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | -- | -- | -- |
| | | | | | | ? | ? | ? |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|--------|--------|--------|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| | <p>legibility is partial. The proposed extraction is unlikely to have a major impact upon the historic landscape character of the immediately surrounding area, although it is acknowledged that within the site the historic landscape character will become invisible as development will replace an earlier field system. As 17% of the whole HLC project area has been identified as planned enclosure, this effect is not considered to be significant.</p> <p>There is high archaeological potential for the survival of archaeological remains within the site from the later prehistoric period onwards and, although the site has not been archaeologically evaluated, it is assumed that allocating this site would be likely to cause the loss of these archaeological remains if the site is extracted without mitigation. Archaeological potential is deemed uncertain until such time as an archaeological field evaluation is carried out.</p> <p>It is assumed that the archaeological impact will occur throughout the duration of extraction for however many years this will be. It is assumed that mineral extraction will result in the total destruction of the undesignated archaeological remains. As archaeology is a finite, irreplaceable resource, the impact will therefore be significant.</p> <p>The impact upon historic landscape character is not felt to be significant.</p> | | | | | | | |
| 11. To protect and enhance the quality and character of landscapes and townscapes | <p>Proximity of landscape / townscape receptors and summary of character National Parks / Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBS): None within 10km; Heritage Coast: None within 10km; Inheritance Tax Exemption Land (ITE): None within 5km; District level landscape designations: none within 5km (but site is close to an area which had a local landscape designation under the previous Richmondshire Local Plan. It is also 0.5 km from Forcett Park, which is grade II on the Historic England Register).</p> <p>National Character Area (NCA): 'Tees Lowlands'; North Yorkshire Landscape Character Assessment (NYLCA): Landscape Character Type 13 'Moors Fringe' but towards its northern edge and is transitional in character with Type 27 Vale Farmland with Dispersed Settlements (Farmed, Lowland and Valley</p> | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | - ? | - ? | - ? |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| | <p>Landscapes Broad Type). The inclusion of this area within the Tees Lowlands NCA shows that it has affinities with lower lying areas; Local LCA: - none available for Richmondshire; Intrusion: Undisturbed³.</p> <p><u>Summary of effects on landscape / townscape</u> There are unlikely to be effects on nationally or locally identified landscapes.</p> <p>There would probably be little or no effect on the setting of settlements, as there is already an existing active quarry close to the village. East Layton lies on a minor ridge at around 165-170m AOD, whilst the quarry site lies on lower ground at around 140-145m AOD to the north. Hallmires Plantation, which currently intervenes, has been greatly reduced in size by the expansion of the existing quarry. The restoration plan for the current quarry to the south of the site shows land sloping steeply from the ridge, down to a lake, with a wide belt of plantation woodland to the west, thinning to the boundary with the proposed site. There is therefore potential for the site to be visible in the short and medium term, depending on the restoration programme.</p> <p>The site lies in an area of undulating topography that is transitional in character, between the Pennine Fringe and the Tees Lowlands. The local area has a remnant estate character, with plantations and other historic landscape features present, as well as extensive historic quarrying. The varied topography, together with intervening hedgerows, trees and areas of woodland will help to reduce visual impact if the proposed site is quarried. There will however be cumulative effects with existing and previous areas of</p> | | | | | | | |

³ In terms of urban intrusion this is not a particularly tranquil area. Although the wider landscape is undisturbed the existing quarry represents an area of local intrusion (disturbance to cultural landscape features and pattern, noise when active). The area lies 2 km from the A1 and could also be affected by distant traffic noise. In terms of light pollution, the area is relatively dark (score is 40 on CPRE scale of 1-255, with 1 representing maximum darkness). Overall, the locality has a low-moderate level of intrusion.

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|----|----|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| | <p>extraction, leading to an area of future landscape with even greater disturbance to topography and historic landscape features than at present⁴.</p> <p>It is likely that the varied topography, together with intervening hedgerows, trees and areas of woodland will help to reduce visual impact if the proposed site is quarried. However this would need to be checked.</p> <p>In terms of urban intrusion this is not a particularly tranquil area. Vehicle movements are not expected to change the character of the existing area.</p> <p>This assessment is dependent on a) further information on cumulative effects with historic quarrying and on historic landscape and b) the timescale for working and restoration of the adjoining active quarry to the south, south west and west.</p> | | | | | | | |
| 12. Achieve sustainable economic growth and create and support jobs | <p><u>Proximity of factors relevant to sustainable economic growth</u> Site is within 5 miles of the A1 giving reasonably good access to markets to the north of the Plan Area.</p> <p><u>Summary of effects on sustainable economic growth</u> This site would ultimately result in 3 million tonnes of limestone being made available to the market. This would make a significant contribution to the building sector by helping to boost supply of a key building material. It would also directly support jobs in extraction and freight. In the medium to long term (depending on the actual lifetime of the site) conditions would return to the baseline.</p> | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | + | + | + |
| | | | | | | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| | | | | | | | 0 | 0 |

⁴ The local landscape has been subject to considerable change over the last century or so as small quarries have developed into larger ones. The 1st edition and 5th edition OS maps show that an area of mixed deciduous and coniferous woodland (possibly an estate plantation associated with Forcett Park) called Fox Covert was lost from the SE corner of the site between 1954 and 1978 (air photo evidence). Similar plantations are still characteristic of the area, although Hallmires Plantation to the south has been greatly reduced by the expansion of the current quarry. Small, sometimes odd, areas of new woodland have been established in conjunction with quarrying.

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|-------|----|----|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| 13. Maintain and enhance the viability and vitality of local communities | <p><u>Proximity of factors relevant to community vitality / viability</u> Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD): Newsham and Eppleby - rank- 19,997 - Not in most deprived 20%.</p> <p>East Layton is the nearest Settlement at 650m south. The following significant settlements are within 2km of MJP03: East Layton, West Layton, and Forcett. These are defined as 'elsewhere in the plan area'. 5% of housing development is directed towards 'Elsewhere in the Plan Area'. The site is located in the North Richmondshire sub area of the district and in this area housing growth is low (there are no major housing developments proposed).</p> <p><u>Summary of effects on vitality / viability</u> Job opportunities arising from this site are likely to be limited, and while the site would provide a source of limestone which could aid future development, the immediate settlements are unlikely to directly benefit in any significant way. The site is unlikely to either hinder or boost local tourism. Overall any effect is considered to be insignificant.</p> | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14. To provide opportunities to enable recreation, leisure and learning | <p><u>Proximity to recreation, leisure and learning receptors</u> No PROW adjacent to site, though site access is shared with a bridleway on part of Limekiln Lane. Bridleway 20.23/2/1 is 510m south-west and running parallel to the west of the site. A footpath also follows a similar route to the bridleway though gets slightly closer to the western point of this site (600m west). Footpath 20.30/3/1 is 340m south-east. No village greens or common land within 500m.</p> <p><u>Summary of effects on recreation, leisure and learning</u> Public Rights of Way are relatively distant from this site, though a bridleway runs along part of Limekiln Lane which is also used for site access. Given the levels of traffic generated an acceptable form of mitigation, such as separating out traffic will be needed. Intervening woodland should to a degree help partially screen this footpath from dust, noise and visual impacts from the site, though views from the footpath and bridleway to the west may be more open. Effects are considered to be moderate negative.</p> | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | - | - | - |
| 15. To protect and improve the wellbeing, | <p><u>Proximity to population / community receptors / factors relevant to health and wellbeing</u> No schools or health centres within 1km. Nearest settlement is East Layton 650m to the south.</p> <p><u>Summary of effects on health and wellbeing</u> Without mitigation it is possible that noise, dust, traffic and</p> | | ✓ | ✓ | | - | - | - |
| | | | | | | -- | -- | -- |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| health and safety of local communities | fumes could affect East Layton and nearby properties at Carkin Fields, so full assessment of these impacts will be needed, though intervening blocks of trees and distance suggests the significance of any impacts from dust would be relatively low. Increased traffic on the A66 in proximity to this site may have an uncertain negative impact in terms of health and safety as this is an undulating, single carriageway stretch with a high level of accidents occurring. | | | | | ? | ? | ? |
| 16. To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding | <p><u>Proximity to flood zones</u> Site is in flood zone 1. Surface water flooding only affects 2% of the site at a 1 in 30 risk.</p> <p><u>Summary of effects on flooding</u> Flooding is not a significant issue.</p> | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17. To address the needs of a changing population in a sustainable and inclusive manner | <p><u>Proximity to factors relevant to the needs of a changing population</u> The site does not conflict with any known allocations in other plans.</p> <p><u>Summary of effects on a changing population</u> The site would make a significant contribution to self-sufficiency in the supply of Magnesian limestone and may also support markets outside of the plan area.</p> | | ✓ | ✓ | | + | 0 | 0 |
| Cumulative effects | <p><u>Cumulative / Synergistic effects</u></p> <p><u>Planning context:</u> East Layton is the nearest Settlement at 650m south. The following significant settlements are within 2km of MJP03: East Layton, West Layton, and Forcett. These are either defined as 'elsewhere in the plan area'. 5% of housing development is directed towards 'Elsewhere in the Plan Area'. The site is located in the North Richmondshire sub area of the district and in this area housing growth is</p> | | | | | | | |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|--|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L | |
| | <p>low (there are no major housing developments proposed).</p> <p>Policy 23 of the earlier local plan is the only saved policy within that plan, which allows development within development limits. As the site does not lie within any settlement limits it does not conflict with any allocations.</p> <p><u>Other Joint Minerals and Waste Plan Sites:</u> No other MWJP sites lie within 2km.</p> <p><u>Historic Minerals and Waste Sites:</u> Several previous applications have been associated with Forcett Quarry, including for extraction and plant. Further (1.8km) west lies West Layton Quarry (granted 1970s).</p> <p>There are opportunities to create significant areas of priority habitats e.g. species-rich limestone grassland by extension of the existing restoration scheme for Forcett Quarry and by linking to the two former quarry SINC's bordering the site.</p> <p>In terms of landscape and visual impacts, there will be cumulative effects with existing and previous areas of extraction, leading to an area of future landscape with even greater disturbance to topography and historic landscape features than at present⁵.</p> | ✓ | | ✓ | | 0 | + | + | |
| | | ✓ | | ✓ | | - | - | - | |
| Limitations / data gaps | No significant data gaps. More detailed assessment would be required to fully evaluate a number of effects however. This should be addressed at any subsequent planning application stage. | | | | | | | | |

⁵ The local landscape has been subject to considerable change over the last century or so as small quarries have developed into larger ones. The 1st edition and 5th edition OS maps show that an area of mixed deciduous and coniferous woodland (possibly an estate plantation associated with Forcett Park) called Fox Covert was lost from the SE corner of the site between 1954 and 1978 (air photo evidence). Similar plantations are still characteristic of the area, although Hallmires Plantation to the south has been greatly reduced by the expansion of the current quarry. Small, sometimes odd, areas of new woodland have been established in conjunction with quarrying.

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|--|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L | |
| Score | | | | | | | | | |
| ++ | The Site option is predicted to have major positive effects on the achievement of the SA objective. For example, this may include a significant contribution to issues or receptor of more than local significance, or to several issues or receptors of local significance. | | | | | | | | |
| + | The Site option is predicted to have minor positive effects on achievement of the SA objective. For example, this may include a significant contribution to an issue or receptor of more local significance. | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | The Site option will have no effect on the achievement of the SA objective ⁶ . | | | | | | | | |
| - | The Site option is predicted to have minor negative effects on the achievement of the SA objective. For example, this may include a negative contribution to an issue or receptor of local significance. | | | | | | | | |
| -- | The Site option is predicted to have major negative effects on the achievement of the SA objective. For example, this may include a significant negative contribution to an issue or receptor of more than local significance. | | | | | | | | |
| ? | The impact of the Site option on the SA objective is uncertain. | | | | | | | | |

| Mitigation Requirements |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design to mitigate impact on ecological issues • Design to mitigate impact on best and most versatile agricultural land • Design to include suitable flood risk assessment, attenuation and surface water drainage • Design to include landscaping to mitigate impact on heritage assets (Scheduled Monuments, other potential archaeological remains, listed buildings, registered park and garden, Conservation Area) and their settings, and on local landscape features • Design to include suitable arrangements for access and local roads • Appropriate arrangements for control of and mitigation of the effects of noise and dust, etc. on amenity |

⁶ This includes where there is no clear link between the site SA objective and the site

- Appropriate restoration design including potential for habitat creation

MJP62 – Land at Toft Hill, near Kiplin

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Site Name | Land at Toft Hill, Near Kiplin, Sled Lane, Ellerton upon Swale, Richmondshire |
| Current Use | Agriculture |
| Nature of Planning Proposal | Extraction of sand and gravel |
| Size | 8.7 ha |
| Proposed life of site | Commence in 2015-16, with 8 – 10 year life |
| Notes | Proposed new quarry with mineral to be processed at existing Kiplin plant site. Possible restoration: lake with partial reed fringe, extension to Toft Hill copse & grassland (to be managed for a species-rich sward) & new/reinforced hedgerow along B6271 & Sled Lane. |

SA FINDINGS SUMMARISE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS ONLY. A WIDER RANGE OF CONSTRAINTS AND OPPORTUNITIES WERE INITIALLY ANALYSED AND DISTILLED DOWN TO ONLY THOSE WITH THE POTENTIAL TO BE SIGNIFICANT (SEE ALSO SITE ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY SUMMARY REPORT FOR A FULL LIST OF CONSTRAINTS AND OPPORTUNITIES).

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| 1. To protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and improve habitat connectivity | <p><u>Proximity of international / national and local designations and key features</u> Natura 2000: 8.9km north-west; North Pennine Dales Meadows; SSSI: 0.565 km from nearest SSSI (Swale Lakes); SINC: Nearest SINC 800m away (SE29-04 River Swale, Great Langston to Kiplin).</p> <p>UK Priority Habitats: Deciduous woodland c0.37 km to south. Site visit: The following features were found on site – Pasture / grassland, hedgerows, one standalone tree, (and aerial photos indicate occasional arable use); Eco networks: Site almost entirely within NY08 Swale Washlands Living Landscape; site within Bee Lines buffer; GI: Site lies entirely in R13 Swale Regional GI Corridor. Supported by Richmondshire's local plan policy CP12.</p> <p><u>Summary of effects on designated sites and important features for biodiversity / geodiversity</u> No significant effects predicted for Natura 2000 sites. However, hydrological links with the nearby Swale Lakes SSSI will need investigating (uncertainty noted). No direct impacts are predicted for local SINC sites, though any impact of dewatering on SINC's will need to be investigated. Protection of the river corridor from indirect</p> | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | - | | + |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| | <p>impacts will need to form part of any application.</p> <p>Protected species associated with habitats on site include bats, badger, water vole, great crested newt, birds and brown hare. There are trees associated with field boundaries at the site, which will need to be identified.</p> <p>Restoration is noted as being to open water with nature conservation habitats. There are opportunities to create priority habitats for biodiversity. Long term management of this area will be key to the delivery of the benefits. There is, however, a need to consider MoD bird strike issues (the site lies within Leeming aerodrome and technical consultation zone) so that there are not conflicts with the intended after use. It is not clear how achievable the nature conservation element will be.</p> <p>Japanese knotweed and Himalayan Balsam are known from the river corridor.</p> <p>Cumulative impacts related to disturbance to species and loss of habitat in conjunction with Killerby (MJP21), Home Farm (MJP33) and existing sites at Scorton and Ellerton are possible. However, if high quality habitat is created as the predominant after use and the management of the site can be secured then there is the potential for significant cumulative benefits for biodiversity.</p> <p>To summarise, in the short term there would be impacts relating to loss of habitat and disturbance to species. In the medium term these impacts would largely be neutral, but in the long term positive effects may occur depending on the level of biodiversity measures incorporated into the scheme and the degree to which these are secured in the long term.</p> | | | | | | | |
| 2. To enhance or maintain water quality and improve efficiency of water use | <p>Proximity of water quality / quantity receptors No NVZ or groundwater source protection zone present. RBMP: In SUNO Management Catchment. Boundary of site seemingly connected with Scorton Beck from Source to River Swale. Moderate ecological status / chemical: does not require assessment. Floodplain may connect the corner of the site to Swale from Muker Bk to Bedale Beck (Ecological quality - moderate potential / chemical: does not require assessment with overall potential moderate. Objective is good by 2027. No RBMP lakes. Groundwater: SUNO Magnesian Limestone (overall status: good / objective: good by</p> | | ✓ | ✓ | | - | - | 0 |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| | <p>2015).</p> <p>CAMS: surface water resources available at least 50% of time. At low flows new extraction licenses may be more restricted.</p> <p>Summary of effects on water quality This is a small site, though there could be pollutant impacts that occur through fuel / chemical spills or run off of overburden when moved. There may also be impacts on groundwater or surface water flow. Impacts are likely to be relatively easy to mitigate, as there are no major constraints, though the Scorton Beck to River Swale water body may, if pollution episodes do occur repeatedly, be less likely to achieve its WFD status objective. Minor impacts could be cumulative with other nearby quarries draining to the Swale.</p> | | | | | | | |
| 3. To reduce transport miles and associated emissions from transport and encourage the use of sustainable modes of transportation | <p>Proximity of transport receptors The site is reasonably close to the A1 (1.8km although the distance to the nearest junction would be c. 5km) giving access to York, Leeds and Teesside. Access: Confirmed access to be onto Sled Lane (U1423 unclassified road) which is 85m from Ellerton Cross junction with B6271 at Ellerton, with options for transport of the as-raised material being by road on B6271 to the Kiplin Hall Plant site (MJP46) for processing & distribution; or by conveyor or an off-road haul route to the Kiplin Hall Plant site (MJP46) for processing & distribution; or by taking the material to another location with existing processing facilities; Light Vehicles: estimate of 6 two-way daily movements; HGV Vehicles: estimate of 24 two-way daily movements; PROW: This site is not affected by a registered public right of way.</p> <p>Rail: 7.7km south; Strategic Road: A1 1.8km west; Canal / Freight waterway: Tees Navigation 17km north-east.</p> <p>Summary of effects on transport An estimated 24 two-way HGV movements and 6 two-way light vehicle movements would occur daily. This site does however lie in close proximity to Kiplin Hall processing plant where the mineral may be processed depending if permission is granted for the retention of the site. There is also the possibility that material would be transported to the processing plant via a conveyor system thereby reducing the number of on road vehicle movements (this is uncertain at present). The initial highways assessment indicated that movement of HGVs on to the B6271 would be acceptable however</p> | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | - | - | |
| | | | | | | ? | ? | |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|--------|--------|---|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| | <p>works will be required to improve safety at the site access. As there is a lot of cumulative development in this area (existing and proposed quarries, A1 upgrade) the cumulative impact would need to be considered in terms of capacity of the local road network. A traffic assessment would be required for this site.</p> <p>There could be some minor positive impacts associated with this site should a conveyor be installed to transport material to the nearby processing plant thereby reducing overall road transport miles, though there would still be small scale indirect negative effects as the processed mineral would still need to reach market. There is a great deal of uncertainty in this assessment pending the traffic assessment and confirmation of transport arrangements.</p> | | | | | | | |
| 4. To protect and improve air quality | <p><u>Proximity of air quality receptors</u> No Hazardous substances consent sites and no AQMAs within 2km.</p> <p><u>Summary of effects on air quality</u> Although this is a relatively small site Ellerton is potentially in range of dust impacts (particularly when overburden is removed and potentially if processes such as drying out of materials takes place on site, or if reprofiling occurs during restoration). Other properties, e.g. at Ellerton Hill may also occasionally be affected at a low level without mitigation. In summary, this is a relatively small site but with proximal receptors, equating to minor negative impacts. However, traffic would route to the nearby Kiplin Plant meaning that receptors would be those between the two sites (i.e. Ellerton Hill which is greater than 250m from the transit route and out of reach of significant traffic pollutants and traffic generated dust⁷) and priority woodland at the side of the road (possibly vulnerable to minor impacts through dust deposition).</p> | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | - | - | 0 |
| 5. To use soil and land efficiently and safeguard or enhance their | <p><u>Proximity of soil and land receptors</u> ALC Grade 3. Greenfield site - No known risk factors for contaminated land. Coal mining subsidence: none noted.</p> <p><u>Summary of effects on soil / land</u> 8.7 hectares of possible Best and Most Versatile land (it is not known if this land is grade 3a or grade 3b) would be lost and it is not intended that this site would be restored to</p> | ✓ | | ✓ | | - ? | - ? | - |

⁷ Citations needed – Design Manual Roads and Bridges have 200m significance threshold for pollutants and dust from roads (Volume 11, Section 3 Environmental Assessment Techniques). MPS2 looks at small particles from dust from a quarry itself as travelling 1000m or more, but recognises rapid drop off rates moving away from source.

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|------------|------------|------------|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| quality | agricultural land. | | | | | | | |
| 6. Reduce the causes of climate change | <p>Proximity of factors relevant to exacerbating climate change Site visit: The following features were found on site – Pasture / grassland, hedgerows, one standalone tree.</p> <p>Summary of effects on climate change Traffic from the site will be relatively low level and only move a short distance to processing. On site habitats have insignificant carbon storage potential. Arguably ensuring local processing would have some benefits for climate change.</p> | ✓ | | | ✓ | 0 + | 0 + | 0 + |
| 7. To respond and adapt to the effects of climate change | <p>Proximity of factors relevant to the adaptive capacity⁸ of a site South west and south east corners (total <5%) in flood zone 3. Further 15% in flood zone 2 mainly in south east corner and a small patch in the west. There are a few small patches of 1 in 1000 year surface water flooding risk and a tiny (c1%) patch of 1 in 100 risk flooding. Ouse CFMP - Unit: Swale Washlands / Policy 6. Site in SUNO CAMS. Eco networks: Site almost entirely within NY08 Swale Washlands Living Landscape; site within Bee Lines buffer.</p> <p>CAMS: surface water resources available at least 50% of time. At low flows new extraction licenses may be more restricted.</p> <p>Summary of effects on climate change adaptation Although the site is barely affected by flooding and is water compatible, there is the prospect that Flood Zone 3, which overlaps the corners of this site could drain into the site during extraction. While it is not known if this site would be wet worked, whether wet or dry worked under such a scenario water levels could rise – so appropriate emergency procedures will need to be planned for. In the longer term there could be an advantage to having water bodies on this site in terms of their flood storage capacity, which would be consistent with the CFMP policy. The site is unlikely to block</p> | | ✓ | | ✓ | - + | - + | + + |

⁸ Adaptive capacity is defined as the ability of a system to adjust to climate change to moderate potential; damage or take advantage of opportunities (adapted from CARE International, 2015. Adaptive Capacity [URL: http://www.careclimatechange.org/tk/integration/en/key_concepts/adaptive_capacity.html]

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|-------|----|----|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| | ecological networks significantly, but could contribute to them in the future through ecological restoration. | | | | | | | |
| 8. To minimise the use of resources and encourage their re-use and safeguarding | <p><u>Proximity of factors relevant to the resource usage of a site</u> No spatial factors identified.</p> <p><u>Summary of effects on resource usage</u> This site will contribute to the need for sand and gravel. However, it may to a degree offset recycled materials that could potentially replace sand and gravel. However, this impact can only be considered at the plan level rather than in relation to an individual site. All that can be said here is that 500,000 tonnes of virgin minerals would be extracted which will be unavailable for future use (unless recycled). This works against the SA objective, so it is scored negatively. The impact would continue until such time as extraction ceases.</p> | ✓ | | ✓ | | - | - | - |
| 9. To minimise waste generation and prioritise management of waste as high up the waste hierarchy as practicable | <p><u>Proximity of factors relevant to managing waste higher up the waste hierarchy</u> No spatial factors identified.</p> <p><u>Summary of effects on the waste hierarchy</u> The site would not deal with waste and no details are provided of how waste would be managed on site.</p> | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10. To conserve or enhance the historic environment and its setting, cultural heritage and | <p><u>Proximity of historic environment receptors</u> Conservation areas: None within 1km. Nearest is Bolton on Swale Conservation area at 1.1 km north-west. Registered Parks and Gardens: Hornby Castle Park (Grade II) is 3.72 km SW. Registered Battlefields: None within 5km. World Heritage Sites: None within 5km; Scheduled Monuments: 4 within 2km. These are: Castle Hills medieval motte and bailey castle, and 20th century airfield defences, 700m north east of Oran House (850m SW of site); World War II fighter pens and associated defence at former RAF Catterick, 120m south and 340m north east of Oran House (1.24 and 1.61 km SW); Bainesse Roman roadside settlement and Anglian cemetery (1.89 Km SW); and Pallet Hill</p> | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | -- | -- | -- |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| character | <p>motte and bailey, 80m north west of St Anne's Church (1.92 km W of site).</p> <p>Listed buildings: 6 listed buildings within 1km (2 at Ellerton, both Grade II; 3 at Kiplin Hall, all grade II). Nearest are at Ellerton (350 - 400m SW); Named designed landscapes: Kiplin Hall (Designed Landscape - unidentified parkland) 570m SE. Killerby Hall 1.4 km S.</p> <p>HLC Broad type - Enclosed land / HLC Type - piecemeal enclosure. Undesignated archaeology in this area includes the remains of former medieval field systems. There is potential for evidence of earlier settlement and activity pre-dating the medieval period to be present in the area. Although current archaeological evidence for earlier activity in this area is limited, it can be inferred from similar areas of sand and gravel alongside the River Swale where archaeological evaluation has been carried out, which have revealed remains of early human activity in the Mesolithic period, and subsequent settlement and burial activity dating from the later prehistoric period onwards.</p> <p>Summary of effects on the historic environment The HLC type of this area is piecemeal enclosure. The allocation site is a small part of a larger area of similar character type, of which the legibility is significant. It is felt that the proposed extraction is unlikely to have a major impact upon the historic landscape character of the immediately surrounding area, although it is acknowledged that within the site the historic landscape character will become invisible as development will replace an earlier field system. As 14% of the whole HLC project area has been identified as planned enclosure, this effect is not considered to be significant.</p> <p>Castle Hill Scheduled Monument lies 850m from the site and impacts upon this designated asset would need to be considered.</p> <p>There is high archaeological potential for the survival of archaeological remains within the site from the later prehistoric period onwards and, although the site has not been archaeologically evaluated, it is assumed that allocating this site would be likely to cause the loss of these archaeological remains if the site is extracted without mitigation.</p> <p>Archaeological potential is deemed uncertain until such time as an archaeological field evaluation is carried out. The results of such work would provide more certainty about the nature and significance of below</p> | | | | | | | |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|----|---|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| | <p>ground deposits.</p> <p>It is assumed that the archaeological impact will occur throughout the duration of extraction. It is assumed that mineral extraction will result in the total destruction of the undesignated archaeological remains. As archaeology is a finite, irreplaceable resource, the impact will therefore be significant.</p> | | | | | | | |
| 11. To protect and enhance the quality and character of landscapes and townscapes | <p>Proximity of landscape / townscape receptors and summary of character National Parks / AONBs: None within 10 km; Heritage Coast: None within 10 km; ITE: No. Locally protected landscape: no.</p> <p>NCA: Vale of Mowbray; NY LCA: 24 - River Floodplain. This has high visual sensitivity due to open / flat landform; high ecological sensitivity due to patchwork of habitats; high landscape and cultural sensitivity due to lots of historic assets and 'dynamic' landscape pattern of narrow river corridors. Local LCA: Not covered in local LCA. Light pollution: The site scores 60 on a scale of 1-255, with 1 representing maximum darkness.</p> <p>Summary of effects on landscape / townscape No impact predicted on nationally or locally designated landscapes. However, the site would have a negative impact on the approach to the small settlement of Ellerton-on-Swale.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to the Ellerton Quarry site, although the quarry itself lies to the south and it does not appear that the field to the east has been excavated. To the east lies Kiplin Hall Quarry. There are obviously cumulative effects - the local area is dominated by sand and gravel extraction, past and present, the threshold for it to be accommodated without change in character having been exceeded many years ago. This site would be more conspicuous than some, being bounded on three sides by roads or lanes.</p> <p>There would be no impact on urban intrusion, although the CPRE map does show it as undisturbed. However the Ellerton-on-Swale area is affected by extensive historic or current quarrying. Overall, this is not a particularly tranquil area, with moderate intrusion.</p> | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | -- | -- | ? |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| | The site is mostly open and not well screened. 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 the café at Ellerton. Vehicle movements would not change the character of the area. There would be a loss of productive agricultural land, and yet another water body but as the site is above the floodplain the water level may be lower than at Ellerton Quarry and therefore less capable of satisfactory integration into the landscape. | | | | | | | |
| 12. Achieve sustainable economic growth and create and support jobs | <p><u>Proximity of factors relevant to sustainable economic growth</u> The site is reasonably close to the A1 giving access to York, Leeds and Teesside.</p> <p><u>Summary of effects on sustainable economic growth</u> This site would ultimately result in 500,000 tonnes of sand and gravel being made available to the market. This would make a modest contribution to the building sector by helping to boost supply of a key building material.</p> | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | + | + | 0 |
| 13. Maintain and enhance the viability and vitality of local communities | <p><u>Proximity of factors relevant to community vitality / viability</u> IMD Area is Brompton on Swale and Scorton – Not in the most deprived 20%. Nearest settlement is Ellerton at 90 metres. The larger Catterick lies 1.5km west while 3.5 km to the north west is Brompton on Swale. Kirkby Fleetham lies 3.4 km south-east.</p> <p><u>Summary of effects on vitality / viability</u> This is a relatively small site that would provide limited jobs, so positive effects are limited. It would however help supply the nearby Kiplin Plant with material, helping to sustain jobs there. There is however some concern that Ellerton on Swale may be affected by dust and the comings and goings of lorries which might have a slightly deleterious effect on community interactions in the settlement. Local people are likely to benefit from the restoration in the longer term in terms of access to accessible countryside.</p> | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | + | + | + |
| 14. To provide opportunities to enable recreation, leisure and | <p><u>Proximity to recreation, leisure and learning receptors</u> Bridleway 20.26/2/1 is 350m north-west. No common land or village greens within 500m. GI: Site lies entirely in R13 Swale Regional GI Corridor. Supported by Richmondshire's local plan policy CP12.</p> <p><u>Summary of effects on recreation, leisure and learning</u> The site does not have any rights of way</p> | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | - | - | + |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| learning | immediately adjacent. While there is a bridleway to the north. Short intervening hedges downslope from this receptor may mean that the site is still visible and possibly susceptible to limited noise. Minor negative in the short term, but longer term restoration is likely to be positive. | | | | | | | |
| 15. To protect and improve the wellbeing, health and safety of local communities | <p>Proximity to population / community receptors / factors relevant to health and wellbeing No schools or health centres with 1km. Nearest settlement is Ellerton at 90 metres.</p> <p>Summary of effects on health and wellbeing Although this is a relatively small site Ellerton is potentially in range of noise and dust impacts (particularly when overburden is removed and potentially if processes such as drying out of materials takes place on site, or if reprofiling occurs during restoration). Other properties, e.g. at Ellerton Hill may also be affected. In summary, this is a relatively small site but with proximal receptors, equating to minor negative impacts. However, traffic may be cumulative with MJP46 and MJP33, depending on the route, so there is uncertainty as to whether dust, noise, vibration, road safety and congestion impacts may combine with the aforementioned proximal impacts to create a lower order major negative effect.</p> | | ✓ | | ✓ | - | - | 0 |
| 16. To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding | <p>Proximity to flood zones South west and south east corners (total <5%) in flood zone 3. Further 15% in flood zone 2 mainly in south east corner and a small patch in the west. There are a few small patches of 1 in 1000 year surface water flooding risk and a tiny (c1%) patch of 1 in 100 risk flooding. Ouse CFMP - Unit: Swale Washlands / Policy 6.</p> <p>Summary of effects on flooding Flood risk to this site is very small scale and it is water compatible. Nonetheless, it is possible the very small overlap with Flood zone 3 could cause wider flooding (as site would drain the floodplain) depending on which part of the site is being worked so appropriate emergency planning would need to be in place. In the medium to long term flood storage could be offered by this site with small scale positive effects on the catchment.</p> | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | 0 | 0 | + |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| 17. To address the needs of a changing population in a sustainable and inclusive manner | <p><u>Proximity to factors relevant to the needs of a changing population</u> The site does not conflict with any known allocations in other plans.</p> <p><u>Summary of effects on a changing population</u> The site would make a modest contribution to self-sufficiency in the supply of sand and gravel.</p> | | ✓ | | ✓ | + | + | 0 |
| Cumulative effects | <p><u>Cumulative / Synergistic effects</u></p> <p><u>Planning Context:</u> Within 2km the nearest settlement is Ellerton at 90 metres. The Catterick lies 1.5km west. Catterick is a Primary Service Village (provide for fewer services than Local Service Centres that support the needs of rural communities – 13% of housing is directed to these settlements), while Ellerton is ‘elsewhere in the plan area’ (5% of housing development is directed towards ‘Elsewhere in the Plan Area’). Policy 23 of the earlier local plan is the only saved policy within that plan, which allows development within development limits. As the site does not lie within any settlement limits it does not conflict with any allocations.</p> <p><u>Other Joint Minerals and Waste Plan Sites:</u> MJP46 is 600m south-west; MJP21 is 800m south; MJP33 is 1.6km south-east.</p> <p><u>Historic Minerals and Waste Sites:</u> to the south of the site lie historic applications (granted 1950s and 1990s) associated with extraction at the River Swale (650m) and Manor House Farm (immediately adjacent). Kiplin Hall extraction is 300m south-east. An historic landfill site, Swale Quarry, lies 720m north-west, with waste disposal taking place at 3 locations across this site. A cluster of historic applications group around Tancred Quarry form 1.6km north-west and beyond.</p> | | | | | | | |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-------|----|---|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| | <p>Biodiversity: Cumulative impacts related to disturbance to species and loss of habitat in conjunction with Killerby (MJP21), Home Farm (MJP33) and existing sites at Scorton and Ellerton are possible. However, if high quality habitat is created as the predominant after use and the management of the site can be secured then there is the potential for significant cumulative benefits for biodiversity.</p> <p>Landscape: The site is adjacent to the Ellerton Quarry site, although the quarry itself lies to the south and it does not appear that the field to the east has been excavated. To the east lies Kiplin Hall Quarry. There are obviously cumulative effects - the local area is dominated by sand and gravel extraction, past and present, the threshold for it to be accommodated without change in character having been exceeded many years ago. This site would be more conspicuous than some, being bounded on three sides by roads or lanes.</p> | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | - | | + |
| | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | -- | -- | + |
| Limitations / data gaps | No significant data gaps. More detailed assessment would be required to fully evaluate a number of effects however. This should be addressed at any subsequent planning application stage. | | | | | | | |
| Score | | | | | | | | |
| ++ | The Site option is predicted to have major positive effects on the achievement of the SA objective. For example, this may include a significant contribution to issues or receptor of more than local significance, or to several issues or receptors of local significance. | | | | | | | |
| + | The Site option is predicted to have minor positive effects on achievement of the SA objective. For example, this may include a significant contribution to an issue or receptor of more local significance. | | | | | | | |
| 0 | The Site option will have no effect on the achievement of the SA objective ⁹ . | | | | | | | |
| - | The Site option is predicted to have minor negative effects on the achievement of the SA objective. For example, this may include a negative contribution to an issue or receptor of local significance. | | | | | | | |

⁹ This includes where there is no clear link between the site SA objective and the site

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|--|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L | |
| -- | The Site option is predicted to have major negative effects on the achievement of the SA objective. For example, this may include a significant negative contribution to an issue or receptor of more than local significance. | | | | | | | | |
| ? | The impact of the Site option on the SA objective is uncertain. | | | | | | | | |

MJP46 – Kiplin Plant Processing Site

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Site Name | Site MJP46 (Kiplin Processing Plant Site, Kiplin, Richmondshire) |
| Current Use | Current Use: Quarry processing plant site |
| Nature of Planning Proposal | Nature of Planning Proposal: Retention of processing plant site to serve future extraction in the local area |
| Size | Size: 6.7 ha |
| Proposed life of site | Proposed life of site: 12 years |
| Notes | Notes: Proposal to retain processing plant (which is currently only permitted until 4 June 2017). Current permission requires restoration to agriculture. |

SA FINDINGS SUMMARISE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS ONLY. A WIDER RANGE OF CONSTRAINTS AND OPPORTUNITIES WERE INITIALLY ANALYSED AND DISTILLED DOWN TO ONLY THOSE WITH THE POTENTIAL TO BE SIGNIFICANT (SEE ALSO SITE ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY SUMMARY REPORT FOR A FULL LIST OF CONSTRAINTS AND OPPORTUNITIES).

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|-------|---|-----|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| 1. To protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and improve habitat connectivity | <p>Proximity of international / national and local designations and key features Natura 2000 sites- 10km north-west - North Pennine Dales Meadows. The site lies 1.59 km from nearest SSSI (Swale Lakes). Nearest SINIC 445m south (SE29-04 River Swale, Great Langston to Kiplin) - Functional connectivity- floodplain. In terms of Priority Habitat, the site lies adjacent to / has some overlap with deciduous woodland to the south, east and north.</p> <p>Ecological Networks- Around 30% of the site is covered by core England Habitat Network (eastern area). Site lies within R13 Swale regional GI corridor and entirely within NY08 Swale Washlands Living Landscape (key habitats- River Swale, wetlands. Management issues- Aggregate extraction site restoration).</p> <p>Summary of effects on designated sites and important features for biodiversity / geodiversity The plant site and access track are currently in existence and active – therefore unless they were to lie dormant for a period of time it is not considered that there would be any significant impact on international or national sites, priority habitats or protected species or ecological networks as a result of the proposals</p> | ✓ | | | ✓ | 0 | 0 | ?/+ |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| | <p>(however, there would still be a need to investigate dust deposition and water extraction / discharge impacts on wildlife as conditions may have changed since the site was established).</p> <p>The current permission requires restoration to agriculture which would have limited benefits for biodiversity. It is considered that minor positive impacts could arise should biodiversity enhancements be included or should a non-agricultural restoration scheme be implemented (as this site lies in a Living Landscape this represents an opportunity to restore the site in a way that is sympathetic to this designation) and therefore a result of +/- has also been recorded.</p> | | | | | | | |
| 2. To enhance or maintain water quality and improve efficiency of water use | <p><u>Proximity of water quality / quantity receptors</u> Site does not lie within a Nitrate Vulnerable Zone. Site is located in Groundwater Source Protection Zone 3.</p> <p>The site is in the Humber RBMP and an RBMP watercourse, Scorton Beck from Source to River Swale, passes through the site (it crosses the access track in the north of the site). This watercourse has moderate status in terms of ecological quality and does not require assessment for chemical quality. In terms of groundwater the RBMP identifies the site as being in the SUNO Sherwood Sandstone water body which has good quantitative quality / poor chemical quality.</p> <p>CAMS: surface water resources available at least 50% of time. At low flows new extraction licenses may be more restricted.</p> <p><u>Summary of effects on water quality</u> The retention (and thus extended operation of the plant) will potentially draw on and dispose of water for screening and washing into the future. While this appears to be acceptable at present (notwithstanding the presence of a source protection zone), the disposal of water has the potential to affect the status of local water bodies and the drawing of water has potential impacts upon water quantity/availability. Until it can be shown that impacts on water are acceptable the effect will remain uncertain.</p> | | ✓ | | ✓ | ? | ? | 0 |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| 3. To reduce transport miles and associated emissions from transport and encourage the use of sustainable modes of transportation | <p>Proximity of transport receptors Site is close to the A1 (2.5km) giving reasonably good access to York, Leeds and Teesside. Access: existing Kiplin Plant site access onto B6271 approximately 440m west of entrance to Kiplin Hall & then via B6271 & A6136; Light Vehicles: 10 two-way daily movements; HGV Vehicles: 24 two-way daily movements; PROW: This site is not affected by a registered public right of way.</p> <p>Rail: Nearest national rail network 7.2km E4.7km south (nearest station Leeming Bar 5.4km south-east); Strategic Road: A1 2.5km west; Canal / Freight waterway: Tees Navigation 16.5km north-east.</p> <p>Summary of effects on transport The retention of this site would mean that existing traffic flows would continue for a further 12 years. As there is a lot of cumulative development in this area (existing and proposed quarries, A1 upgrade) the cumulative impact of retaining this facility would need to be considered in terms of capacity of the road network. The initial highways assessment indicates that HGV movement would be acceptable on to the B6271 although some minor works may be required to upgrade the existing access arrangements. It is not likely that any sustainable modes of transport would be utilised at this site (although there is a possibility that material could arrive at MJP46 from the nearby Toft Hill site via a conveyor- uncertain). Impacts are considered to be minor negative with some uncertainty.</p> | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | - | - | 0 |
| 4. To protect and improve air quality | <p>Proximity of air quality receptors Site is not within a hazardous substances consent consultation zone or an AQMA. The site is around 800m from the nearest settlement, Kiplin although a number of isolated properties lie in closer proximity (nearest property 80m NE). The site is bordered by deciduous woodland to the north, east and south and these may be receptors for dust.</p> <p>Summary of effects on air quality Given that the site is some distance from the nearest settlement and individual properties are well screened by intervening woodland, air quality impacts to residential receptors are predicted to be largely insignificant, though there may be small scale minor impacts on the priority woodland surrounding the site (e.g. reduction in tree health) which should be further investigated.</p> | | ✓ | | ✓ | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| 5. To use soil and land efficiently and safeguard or enhance their quality | <p>Proximity of soil and land receptors Site in on Grade 3 agricultural land though this has already been developed. In terms of land stability development does not lie within or adjacent to a Coal Board development high risk area.</p> <p>Summary of effects on soil / land Under the current planning permission, the site would be restored to agriculture after 2017. This allocation would prolong the amount of time that the site is not available for agricultural use. A minor negative impact is therefore recorded during the possible extended operation period of the processing plant.</p> | | ✓ | ✓ | | - | - | 0 |
| 6. Reduce the causes of climate change | <p>Proximity of factors relevant to exacerbating climate change Woodland lies adjacent to the site. Some woodland and standalone trees lie on site.</p> <p>Summary of effects on climate change This site is already in place although possible minor loss of productivity to on site and adjacent trees and woodland from dust deposition on leaves may occur. The continued operation of the site would result in continued vehicle movements to and from site (10 two-way light goods movements and 24 two-way HGV movements) however as material is being received from the nearby Toft Hill site, the retention of this site may negate the need for minerals to be transported further to another processing site. Overall impacts are considered to be largely neutral.</p> | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7. To respond and adapt to the effects of climate change | <p>Proximity of factors relevant to the adaptive capacity¹⁰ of a site Surface water flooding affects around 20% of the site at 1000 year return period. C. 75% of site lies in flood zone 3 and 25% in flood zone 2. Ecological Networks- Around 30% of the site is covered by core England Habitat Network (eastern area). Site lies within R13 Swale regional GI corridor and entirely within NY08 Swale Washlands Living Landscape (key habitats- River Swale, wetlands. Management issues- Aggregate extraction site restoration). CAMS: surface water resources available at least 50% of time. At low flows new extraction</p> | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 |

¹⁰ Adaptive capacity is defined as the ability of a system to adjust to climate change to moderate potential; damage or take advantage of opportunities (adapted from CARE International, 2015. Adaptive Capacity [URL: http://www.careclimatechange.org/tk/integration/en/key_concepts/adaptive_capacity.html]

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| | licenses may be more restricted. Summary of effects on climate change adaptation As the plant site is already in place, no additional effects are predicted in relation to this objective. | | | | | | | |
| 8. To minimise the use of resources and encourage their re-use and safeguarding | Proximity of factors relevant to the resource usage of a site No spatial factors identified Summary of effects on resource usage This site will contribute to the need for minerals through processing. Although it does not directly lead to minerals extraction, keeping this plant and haulage road in situ will indirectly prevent other plant / roads being required. This is a minor positive impact. | | ✓ | ✓ | | + | + | 0 |
| 9. To minimise waste generation and prioritise management of waste as high up the waste hierarchy as practicable | Proximity of factors relevant to managing waste higher up the waste hierarchy No spatial factors identified. Summary of effects on the waste hierarchy No impact. | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10. To conserve or | Proximity of historic environment receptors No conservation areas within 1km. Hornby Castle Park (Grade 2) lies 4.1km south-west. No registered battlefields or World Heritage Sites within 5km. Two | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| enhance the historic environment and its setting, cultural heritage and character | <p>Scheduled Monuments within 2km- 1.5km south-west 'Castle Hills medieval motte and bailey castle, and 20th century airfield defences, 700m north east of Oran House' (ID 1,020,991), 1.7km south-west 'World War 2 fighter pens and associated defences at former RAF Catterick, 120m south and 340m north east of Oran House' (ID 1,020,990). 10 Listed Buildings within 1km (1 grade 1 and 9 grade 2). The majority of these are related to Kiplin Hall (Grade 1, ID 1,315,476) 280m south-east. Closest Listed Building to site - Boundary Stone (Grade 2, ID 1,150,997) 60m north-east. Site lies within Kiplin Hall Named Designed Landscape.</p> <p>HLC Broad type – Extractive, HLC Type – Quarry aggregates. Undesignated archaeology in this area includes the remains of former medieval field systems. There is potential for evidence of earlier settlement and activity pre-dating the medieval period to be present in the area, although current archaeological evidence for this is limited.</p> <p>Summary of effects on the historic environment The HLC type of this area is quarry aggregates. The allocation site is a smaller part of a larger area of similar character type, of which the legibility is partial. Within the allocation site the previous historic landscape character of piecemeal enclosure has already become invisible as the extractive development has replaced an earlier field system. Accordingly, the continued use of the site for the quarry processing purposes is assumed to have no overall impact. It is anticipated that there will no effect upon historic landscape character.</p> <p>It is anticipated that there will be no impact upon the archaeological resource as the proposed development is for the continuing use of a former quarry, where it is assumed with a high degree of certainty that any archaeological resource has previously been destroyed.</p> | | | | | | | |
| 11. To protect and enhance the quality and character of landscapes and | <p>Proximity of landscape / townscape receptors and summary of character No National Parks, AONBs or Heritage Coast within 10km. No Inheritance Tax Exemption Land within 5km. In terms of tranquillity landscape is 'disturbed'. Light pollution: In 2000, the site scored 57 on the CPRE scale of 1-255, with 1 as the maximum darkness, therefore had relatively low levels of light pollution. These may have subsequently increased.</p> | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | - | - | 0 |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| townscapes | <p>The site is not within a local landscape designation but it lies within the boundary of the undesignated historic designed landscape of Kiplin Hall, much of which is well maintained and a tourist attraction.</p> <p>Site lies within the Vale of Mowbray National Character Area and is categorised as '24 River Floodplain' in the North Yorkshire and York Landscape Character Assessment. This character type has high visual sensitivity (as a result of the predominantly open character and flat landform (which facilitates long distance open views across the landscape and promotes strong inter-visibility with adjacent Landscape Character Types). High ecological sensitivity as result of the patchwork of fen, flood meadows, floodplain mires, marsh and swamp, inland bare ground and calcareous grassland habitats. Several of these habitats are designated as SSSI and Ramsar sites. High landscape and cultural sensitivity as a result of the presence of numerous historic settlement sites and designated landscapes, coupled with a dynamic landscape pattern of narrow river corridors. The site lies in Richmondshire and is not covered by a district level LCA, however the site is adjacent to the district boundary with Hambleton. The Hambleton LCA identifies the adjoining Kiplin Hall area as 7b Estate Landscape (including parkland).</p> <p>Summary of effects on landscape / townscape It is considered that views from Kiplin Hall (a visitor attraction) would continue to be affected should the processing plant be retained. The site will not affect nearby settlements.</p> <p>The landscape in this area has already been disturbed by extraction of sand and gravel, and by the location of the processing plant on this site. However it is a very sensitive location and the impacts of re-siting the plant elsewhere need to be assessed against the further impact on the historic designed landscape of Kiplin Hall and the potential for restoration that is appropriate for the location. As the retention of the plant is linked to new areas of extraction in the vicinity, there will be new cumulative effects as well as the existing.</p> <p>In terms of visual intrusion, the site is in an area that is generally well screened from the public, though it is in an intrusive location in relation to Kiplin Hall as it is sited on land that was historically parkland (possibly pre-war though). It is partially screened from the remaining parkland and Hall in winter and</p> | | | | | | | |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|----------|----------|---|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| | <p>probably more effectively in summer.</p> <p>Although the site is not in a particularly tranquil area, it is in a transitional area between largely unspoilt countryside to the east, and areas affected by mineral extraction, settlement, roads and other urbanising activities to the west.</p> <p>In summary, impacts are considered to be minor negative for the additional 12 years that the site would be operational. Because the lifetime of the plant would be extended, effects are related to this continuation relative to the previously anticipated baseline which would have seen the site restored to agriculture after 2017. It is considered that the site may become more conspicuous in the landscape as other surrounding sites are restored. A more sensitive restoration scheme could fit in with the surrounding parkland.</p> | | | | | | | |
| 12. Achieve sustainable economic growth and create and support jobs | <p><u>Proximity of factors relevant to sustainable economic growth</u> Site is close to the A1 giving it good access to key markets such as Darlington (16km) and Middlesbrough (26km) to the north.</p> <p><u>Summary of effects on sustainable economic growth</u> The site is reasonably proximal to possible markets so will help support growth there. Limited numbers of jobs will be supported, which may support a few workers in nearby areas (most likely existing workers at the site). The site, being for processing, adds value and creates a high quality product using existing infrastructure (which at least in terms of the embodied energy of plant is more sustainable), though does not particularly represent low carbon development however as possible markets are accessed by road, which could increase the carbon footprint of building, though not particularly significantly. The effect overall is however positive during the operational period of the site.</p> | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | + | + | 0 |
| 13. Maintain and enhance the viability and vitality of local | <p><u>Proximity of factors relevant to community vitality / viability</u> IMD area is Brompton-on-Swale and Scorton. Not in worst 20%. Nearest significant communities: Kiplin 800m south-east, Ellerton-on-Swale 1.2km west. Properties 80m north-east, Several properties 150m-200m east, Kiplin Hall 250m east, properties as Ellerton Hill 600m north-west and Plantation Farm 720m north.</p> <p><u>Summary of effects on vitality / viability</u> Given that the site is well screened from nearby receptors,</p> | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | +/ ++ | +/ ++ | 0 |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| communities | visual amenity impacts are considered to be negligible. The processing plant site forms part of the Kiplin Hall Estate and it is understood (from the supporting statement for consent C1/21/16H/CM) that revenues gained from the processing plant site have been re-invested into Kiplin Hall and Estate, an important historic asset and successful tourist attraction. It is therefore considered that the retention of this site may enhance the viability of Kiplin Hall whilst also enabling the provision of locally available construction materials. A moderate positive impact is therefore recorded under this objective. | | | | | | | |
| 14. To provide opportunities to enable recreation, leisure and learning | <p><u>Proximity to recreation, leisure and learning receptors</u> Bridleway 20.26/2/1 begins 150m NW of the site.</p> <p><u>Summary of effects on recreation, leisure and learning</u> The site is well screened and so visual impacts upon users of nearby rights of way are considered to be negligible. The retention of the site would lead to the continued use of B6271 by site traffic although the impacts of this upon users of rights of way that adjoin this road are considered to be negligible.</p> | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15. To protect and improve the wellbeing, health and safety of local communities | <p><u>Proximity to population / community receptors / factors relevant to health and wellbeing</u> No hospitals, clinics or health centres within 1km. The village of Kiplin lies 800m south-east and Ellerton-on-Swale 1.2km west. Individual properties lie 80m north-east, several properties 150m-200m east, Kiplin Hall 250m east, properties as Ellerton Hill 600m north-west and Plantation Farm 720m north.</p> <p><u>Summary of effects on health and wellbeing</u> The retention of this facility would result in the continuation of existing amenity issues including noise, dust and traffic impacts for a further 12 years. This is considered to constitute a minor negative impact in the short and medium term.</p> | | | | | - | - | 0 |
| 16. To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding | <p><u>Proximity to flood zones</u> Surface water flooding affects around 20% of the site at 1000 year return period. Circa 75% of the site lies in flood zone 3 and 25% in flood zone 2.</p> <p><u>Summary of effects on flooding</u> This allocation would seek to retain a processing site in an area of high flood risk and will be subject to sequential testing as part of the SFRA. Impacts are uncertain pending the outcome of this assessment.</p> | | | | | ? | ? | 0 |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|--------|--------|---|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| 17. To address the needs of a changing population in a sustainable and inclusive manner | <p><u>Proximity to factors relevant to the needs of a changing population</u> The site does not conflict with any known allocations in other plans.</p> <p><u>Summary of effects on a changing population</u> The site would make a small contribution to self-sufficiency in the supply of sand and gravel products and may also support markets outside of the plan area.</p> | | ✓ | | ✓ | 0 + | 0 + | 0 |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| Cumulative effects | <p><u>Cumulative / Synergistic effects</u></p> <p><u>Planning Context:</u> Nearest significant communities: Kiplin 800m south-east, Ellerton-on-Swale 1.2km west. Catterick is 2km west at the nearest point.</p> <p>Catterick is a Primary Service Village in Richmondshire (provide for fewer services than Local Service Centres that support the needs of rural communities – 13% of housing is directed to these settlements), while Ellerton and Kiplin are ‘elsewhere in the plan area’ (5% of housing development is directed towards ‘Elsewhere in the Plan Area’). Policy 23 of the earlier local plan is the only saved policy within that plan, which allows development within development limits. As the site does not lie within any settlement limits it does not conflict with any allocations.</p> <p><u>Other Joint Minerals and Waste Plan Sites:</u> Other possible allocations lie within 2km of MJP46. These are: MJP62 500m west, MJP21 500m south, MJP33 1.3km south-east.</p> <p><u>Historic Minerals and Waste Sites:</u> to the south of the site lie historic applications (granted 1950s and 1990s) associated with extraction at the River Swale (400m) and Manor House Farm (immediately adjacent). Kiplin Hall extraction is adjacent to the south-east. An historic landfill site, Swale Quarry, lies 1.7km north-west, with waste disposal taking place at 3 locations across this site.</p> <p>Landscape: As a number of other existing and proposed quarries exist in the area, the retention of this processing plant combined with other cumulative development may have a cumulative impact upon Kiplin Hall (visual amenity, visitor experience, site traffic etc.).</p> | | ✓ | | ✓ | - | - | 0 |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|--|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L | |
| Limitations / data gaps | No significant data gaps. More detailed assessment would be required to fully evaluate a number of effects however. This should be addressed at any subsequent planning application stage. | | | | | | | | |
| Score | | | | | | | | | |
| ++ | The Site option is predicted to have major positive effects on the achievement of the SA objective. For example, this may include a significant contribution to issues or receptor of more than local significance, or to several issues or receptors of local significance. | | | | | | | | |
| + | The Site option is predicted to have minor positive effects on achievement of the SA objective. For example, this may include a significant contribution to an issue or receptor of more local significance. | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | The Site option will have no effect on the achievement of the SA objective ¹¹ . | | | | | | | | |
| - | The Site option is predicted to have minor negative effects on the achievement of the SA objective. For example, this may include a negative contribution to an issue or receptor of local significance. | | | | | | | | |
| -- | The Site option is predicted to have major negative effects on the achievement of the SA objective. For example, this may include a significant negative contribution to an issue or receptor of more than local significance. | | | | | | | | |
| ? | The impact of the Site option on the SA objective is uncertain. | | | | | | | | |

¹¹ This includes where there is no clear link between the site SA objective and the site

WJP01 – Hillcrest, Harmby

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Site Name | Site WJP01 Hillcrest, Harmby, Richmondshire |
| Current Use | Current Use: Scrap yard including end of life vehicle dismantling |
| Nature of Planning Proposal | Nature of Planning Proposal: Waste transfer station (including recycling) |
| Size | Size: 0.64 |
| Proposed life of site | Proposed life of site: Permanent |
| Notes | This allocation would include a building 30m by 24m, 10m high to be located at the east end of site together with an office/toilet facilities (10m by 7m, one or two storey) by entrance gate |

SA FINDINGS SUMMARISE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS ONLY. A WIDER RANGE OF CONSTRAINTS AND OPPORTUNITIES WERE INITIALLY ANALYSED AND DISTILLED DOWN TO ONLY THOSE WITH THE POTENTIAL TO BE SIGNIFICANT (SEE ALSO SITE ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY SUMMARY REPORT FOR A FULL LIST OF CONSTRAINTS AND OPPORTUNITIES).

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | Score | | | | | | |
|---|---|-------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| 1. To protect and enhance biodiversity and geo-diversity and improve habitat connectivity | <p>Proximity of international / national and local designations and key features Natura 2000: 4km- North Pennine Moors SAC/SPA, 12km North Pennine Dales Meadows SAC/SPA. 6 SSSIs within 5km. Closest to site is Leyburn Glebe 2.75km west of the site. Others include River Ure Grasslands 3.2km south-east, East Nidderdale Moors (Flamstone Pin-High Ruckles) 4.75km south, Thowker Corner 4.6km west, Bellerby Fields 3.5km north-west and Lovely Seat - Stainton Moor 4.1 km north-west.</p> <p>9 SINC/s/former SINC/s within 2km. Closest is Pasture at Harmby (SE18-16, Deleted SINC) adjacent to the site to the south. All other SINC/s/former SINC/s lie in excess of 500m from the site.</p> <p>In terms of Priority Habitat, an area of coastal and floodplain grazing marsh lies adjacent to the site to the south and an area of deciduous woodland lies circa 65m to the west.</p> <p>Ecological Networks: Site lies entirely within the Ure regional GI corridor.</p> <p>Summary of effects on designated sites and important features for biodiversity / geo-diversity It is</p> | | ✓ | ✓ | | - | 0 | 0 |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| | <p>considered unlikely that there would be any significant effects on Natura 2000 sites, SSSIs or SINCs due to the type and location of development. The site is an existing scrap yard but contains vegetated areas with tall herbs, bramble, scrub, mature trees and ruderal vegetation with potential for protected species such as roosting bats (mature trees) and nesting birds. It is considered that there may be a possible impact on protected species during the construction of the waste transfer/recycling site, particularly if mature trees are affected (there are a number of Tree Preservation Orders locally). Following construction, it is not considered that any further biodiversity impacts would arise during the operation of the site.</p> <p>This is a small site with not many restoration opportunities however things like integrating habitats into buildings and maintaining standoff from trees could be pursued.</p> | | | | | | | |
| 2. To enhance or maintain water quality and improve efficiency of water use | <p><u>Proximity of water quality / quantity receptors</u> The site is not located within a Nitrate Vulnerable Zone or a Groundwater Source Protection Zone.</p> <p>Humber RBMP: RBMP water body 'Ure from Duerley Beck to Thornton Steward Beck' lies c. 570m E. Ecological Quality: moderate status / Chemical quality: 'does not require assessment'. No local RBMP lakes. RBMP Groundwater: 'SUNO Millstone Grit and Carboniferous Limestone': current quantitative quality - good / chemical quality - poor.</p> <p>CAMS: surface water resources available at least 50% of time. At low flows new extraction licenses may be more restricted.</p> <p><u>Summary of effects on water quality</u> Site is for waste transfer and recycling so potential impacts will result from construction run off, leachate from storage of waste in the transfer facility and fuel spills / run off from vehicles. These are all expected to be readily resolvable through good site management / vehicle washing etc. Overall impacts in relation to this objective are considered to be neutral as it is assumed that the relevant environmental permits and regulations will operate effectively.</p> | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| 3. To reduce transport miles and associated emissions from transport and encourage the use of sustainable modes of transportation | <p>Proximity of transport receptors The site is fairly distant from larger markets and other recycling facilities. There are however two additional waste transfer stations located within 4km. Access: Confirmed to be as existing, which is onto A684 at Harmby, approximately 205m east of the junction with C42 road to Spennithorne; Light Vehicles: estimate of 1-2 two-way daily movements; HGV Vehicles: estimate of up to 10 two-way daily movements;</p> <p>Net change in daily two-way trip generation: Light vehicles: 0; HGVs: 0. Traffic assessment rating: yellow.</p> <p>PROW: This site is not affected by a registered public right of way.</p> <p>Rail: Nearest national rail network 24km east (a private rail network lies c. 100m North); Strategic Road: A684 adjacent to the site to the north; Canal / Freight waterway: none within 20km.</p> <p>Summary of effects on transport This site would generate a relatively small amount of light vehicle and HGV movements (none above the current site, so the limited number of vehicles associated with this site are a continuation of traffic when traffic from this site would have been expected to cease). The initial Highways Assessment found that HGV movement would be acceptable onto the A684, however works will be required to improve the existing major road and existing site access. The site is not likely to generate significant travel demand and sustainable modes of transport are considered unlikely to contribute to access to the site.</p> <p>Aside from local effects this site is a transfer station, so it will serve a role in bulking waste from smaller to larger vehicles, this saving on net journeys, which is positive. The site may also be affected by a Highway Authority improvement scheme. Therefore there is an element of uncertainty in this assessment.</p> | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | + | + | + |
| 4. To protect and improve air quality | <p>Proximity of air quality receptors No AQMAs lie within 2km and the site does not lie within a hazardous substances consent consultation zone. In terms of receptors for dust and odour Harmby lies 150m south, Spennithorne 830m south-east, Leyburn 900m west. Individual properties- Argill Farm 280m north, Property 120m north-east, Woodlands 550m north. A primary school lies 900m south-east.</p> <p>Summary of effects on air quality The site lies in close proximity to a number of residential receptors and</p> | ✓ | | ✓ | | - | - | - |
| | | | | | + | + | + | |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| | therefore dust (from construction and vehicles travelling to/from site) and odour may be an issue. It is considered that practices such as vehicle washing and could reduce this impact. Emissions would be generated by vehicles delivering waste to site and possibly by onsite operations (however this process will facilitate the bulking of waste so that it can be transported onwards in a more efficient manor). Positive and negative impacts. | | | | | | | |
| 5. To use soil and land efficiently and safeguard or enhance their quality | <p>Proximity of soil and land receptors Site is located in an area of ALC Grade 3 land however the site currently constitutes a scrap yard and end of life vehicle dismantling facility and historic maps indicate it was previously a quarry. In terms of land stability development does not lie within or adjacent to a Coal Board development high risk area.</p> <p>Summary of effects on soil / land The site is currently developed and therefore no further agricultural land would be lost to the site. Neutral impact.</p> | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6. Reduce the causes of climate change | <p>Proximity of factors relevant to exacerbating climate change In terms of Priority Habitat, an area of coastal and floodplain grazing marsh lies adjacent to the site to the south and an area of deciduous woodland lies circa 65m to the west. Trees are located onsite in the west and south of the site area. Various areas of woodland lie in close proximity to the site including: unnamed wood abutting south-east corner; Harmby Gill is 65m west/south-west; copse on south side of railway is 60m north; unnamed wood is 230m south-east (north of Colliwath Lane U1137).</p> <p>Summary of effects on climate change Should the development of the site lead to the removal of mature trees in the southern and western site area, this would result in a loss of carbon storage. Due to the small area involved, this would constitute a very minor negative impact. It is acknowledged that areas of woodland lie in close proximity to the site and is considered that dust deposition on leaves may lead to a minor loss of productivity; however the effect on this objective is considered to be insignificant. It is estimated that the site would receive between 10,000 and 15,000 tonnes of waste per annum. The site would allow waste material to be sorted and bulked up for more efficient transit or recycled, ultimately diverting waste from landfill and saving carbon emissions in waste transportation. Overall, both minor</p> | ✓ | | | ✓ | + | + | + |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|-------|----|----|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| | positive and minor negative impacts are recorded. | | | | | | | |
| 7. To respond and adapt to the effects of climate change | <p>Proximity of factors relevant to the adaptive capacity¹² of a site Site is not affected by surface water flooding. Site is in Flood Zone 1. CAMS: surface water resources available at least 50% of time. At low flows new extraction licenses may be more restricted.</p> <p>Summary of effects on climate change adaptation The site is not located in an area that is likely to flood and is considered unlikely to block the ability of neighbouring land uses to adapt to climate change. Neutral impact.</p> | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8. To minimise the use of resources and encourage their re-use and safeguarding | <p>Proximity of factors relevant to the resource usage of a site The site would transfer/recycle 10,000 to 15,000 tonnes of waste per annum.</p> <p>Summary of effects on resource usage A waste transfer station (including recycling) would ultimately help to get waste to recycling and other treatment centres (assisting the circular economy by ultimately reducing resource consumption). Its indirect beneficial effect would be dependent on the final destination of the waste.</p> | ✓ | | | ✓ | + | + | + |
| | | | | | | ++ | ++ | ++ |

¹² Adaptive capacity is defined as the ability of a system to adjust to climate change to moderate potential; damage or take advantage of opportunities (adapted from CARE International, 2015. Adaptive Capacity [URL: http://www.careclimatechange.org/tk/integration/en/key_concepts/adaptive_capacity.html]

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|-------|----|----|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| 9. To minimise waste generation and prioritise management of waste as high up the waste hierarchy as practicable | <p><u>Proximity of factors relevant to managing waste higher up the waste hierarchy</u> No spatial factors identified.</p> <p><u>Summary of effects on the waste hierarchy</u> A waste transfer and recycling facility would ultimately help to get waste to recycling and other treatment centres (moving it up the waste hierarchy in most cases). Its indirect beneficial effect would be dependent on the final destination of the waste.</p> | ✓ | | ✓ | | + | + | + |
| | | | | | | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| 10. To conserve or enhance the historic environment and its setting, cultural heritage and character | <p><u>Proximity of historic environment receptors</u> Spennithorne conservation area lies 450m south-east. Constable Burton Hall (Grade 2, ID 1,001,060) Registered Park and Garden lies 2.4km north-east. No Registered Battlefields or World Heritage Sites lie within 5km. No Scheduled Monuments lie within 2km. 5 listed buildings lie within 1km (all Grade 2), nearest to site- Manor House (Grade 2, ID 1,130, 934) 300m south-west.</p> <p>In terms of historic landscape character, the site lies in HLC Broad Type- Enclosed Land, HLC Type- Open Field. Undesignated archaeology in this area includes former quarrying activity and evidence for medieval and later field systems.</p> <p><u>Summary of effects on the historic environment</u> The HLC type of this area is open field, however, the allocation site has been characterised as such as part of a larger area even though the historic landscape character has already been replaced by the current and previous land use as a quarry and scrapyard, and is therefore invisible. It is anticipated that there will no effect upon historic landscape character. It is anticipated that there will be no impact upon the archaeological resource as the proposed development is for the use of a former quarry/ scrapyard, where it is assumed with a high degree of certainty that any archaeological resource has previously been destroyed.</p> | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|--------|--------|--------|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| 11. To protect and enhance the quality and character of landscapes and townscapes | <p><u>Proximity of landscape / townscape receptors and summary of character</u> Yorkshire Dales National Park lies 3.2km west and Nidderdale AONB lies 5.2km south.</p> <p>Bolton Castle Estate Inheritance Tax Exempt land lies 2.5km west.</p> <p>The site is located in Pennine Dales Fringe National Character Area. The North Yorkshire and York Landscape Character Assessment identifies the site as 'Moors Fringe (upland, fringe and valley landscapes)' landscape character type. This area is characterised by: High visual sensitivity as a result of strong inter-visibility with adjacent higher and lower Landscape Character Types; Moderate ecological sensitivity overall as a result of the numerous small woodlands and hedgerows which provide key habitats. These have, however, been depleted in places by agricultural improvement; 'High landscape and cultural sensitivity as a result of the predominantly intact pattern of hedgerows and dry stone walls at field boundaries, the patchwork of historic designed landscapes, predominantly rural character and relatively strong sense of tranquillity. In terms of tranquillity the site is classed as 'undisturbed'.</p> <p><u>Summary of effects on landscape / townscape</u> The site currently detracts from the setting of Harmby as it is visible on the approach from the east on the A684. Although this is a small site, it lies within the Lower Wensleydale sub-area of Richmondshire and constitutes a relatively large development in the local context. There is a former landfill site across the road, which has now been restored therefore no cumulative effects are anticipated. There are mature trees on the boundaries, with a stone wall between the site and the road. A waste transfer station could be as (or more) intrusive as the existing use as new buildings will be required, and mature trees could be damaged. However the site is largely screened from the wider landscape.</p> <p>In summary, minor negative impacts are anticipated in the short, medium and long term as it is considered that a waste transfer station would be likely to require more permanent infrastructure, areas of hard standing and may involve a more densely developed site. There is some uncertainty in this assessment until detailed site layout information is provided.</p> | ✓ | | ✓ | | - ? | - ? | - ? |
| 12. Achieve sustainable | <p><u>Proximity of factors relevant to sustainable economic growth</u> The site is fairly distant from larger markets and other recycling facilities. There are, however, two additional waste transfer stations located</p> | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| economic growth and create and support jobs | <p>within 4km.</p> <p>Summary of effects on sustainable economic growth Whilst the site would create a limited number of employment opportunities, it would be replacing an existing facility and the jobs that it supports. It is considered that the recycling element of the site would allow value to be added to waste products, however the existing scrap yard and end of life vehicle dismantling would also allow for this. The site lies in close proximity to two existing waste transfer stations and would need to be considered at a plan level to determine whether demand exists for another facility in the area. Should demand exist, this waste transfer station/recycling facility will be an important part of ensuring that waste can be transported to disposal or recycling / reuse in a more cost effective way. As it is considered that the site would divert waste from landfill it is considered that financial savings would be made in terms of landfill tax. Overall the impact in relation to this objective is considered to be neutral to minor positive.</p> | | | | | + | + | + |
| 13. Maintain and enhance the viability and vitality of local communities | <p>Proximity of factors relevant to community vitality / viability IMD area is Leyburn. This is not in the worst 20%. Harmby, Leyburn, Spennithorne and Middleham all lie within 2km of the site. Leyburn is identified as a Local Service Centre in the Richmondshire Local Plan Core Strategy, whilst Middleham is a Primary Service Village and Harmby and Spennithorne are Secondary Service Villages. Spatial Principle SP2 of the Core Strategy states that Local Service Centres should 'provide appropriate levels of market and affordable housing, job opportunities and assist in achieving long term economic and social sustainability'. Primary and Secondary Service Villages provide fewer services that support the needs of rural communities.</p> <p>Summary of effects on vitality / viability Although this site may provide a small number of jobs (this may be offset by job opportunities that would be lost at the existing facility), it is considered that there are unlikely to be any significant benefits to local communities. The site is located in close proximity to properties and settlements including tourist facilities such as a caravan park c. 200m from the site. Whilst the site is already developed, a change of use to a waste transfer/recycling facility may have additional impacts on nearby facilities/attractions for example odour and traffic impacts. The site would however provide local infrastructure to enable and encourage the treatment of waste higher up the waste hierarchy. On balance, minor positive and minor negative impacts may arise in relation to this objective.</p> | ✓ | | | ✓ | + | + | + |
| | | | | | | - | - | - |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|--------|--------|--------|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| 14. To provide opportunities to enable recreation, leisure and learning | <p><u>Proximity to recreation, leisure and learning receptors</u> In terms of public rights of way, six short stretches of local footpaths lie within 250m of the site concentrated in Harmby to the south-west (closest path to site- 70m west). Site lies 80m from an area of draft common land and is entirely within the 250m buffer.</p> <p><u>Summary of effects on recreation, leisure and learning</u> Recreational routes in close proximity to the site are likely to be of local use/importance. A change in use of the site may impact upon users of the rights of way in different ways for example, should the new site use lead to an increase in traffic movements, odour, noise etc. These impacts are uncertain however it is considered that in comparison to the existing baseline situation, impacts are likely to be negligible.</p> | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | 0 ? | 0 ? | 0 ? |
| 15. To protect and improve the wellbeing, health and safety of local communities | <p><u>Proximity to population / community receptors / factors relevant to health and wellbeing</u> Nearby Populations: Harmby 150m south, Spennithorne 830m south-east, Leyburn 900m west. Individual properties- Argill Farm 280m north, Property 120m north-east, Woodlands 550m north. No hospitals, health centres or clinics within 1km. Primary school 900m south-east.</p> <p><u>Summary of effects on health and wellbeing</u> Waste Transfer Stations can have noise, dust and odour impacts on receptors, which may affect wellbeing. The site lies in close proximity to Harmby and individual properties and therefore it is considered that a minor negative impact may result in relation to this objective.</p> | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | - | - | - |
| 16. To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding | <p><u>Proximity to flood zones</u> Site is not affected by surface water flooding. Site is in Flood Zone 1.</p> <p><u>Summary of effects on flooding</u> No significant impacts anticipated.</p> | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| 17. To address the needs of a changing population in a sustainable and inclusive manner | <p><u>Proximity to factors relevant to the needs of a changing population</u> The site does not conflict with any known allocations in other plans.</p> <p><u>Summary of effects on a changing population</u> No real benefits to a changing population.</p> | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cumulative effects | <p><u>Cumulative / Synergistic effects</u></p> <p><u>Planning context:</u> Harmby, Leyburn, Spennithorne and Middleham all lie within 2km of the site. Leyburn is identified as a Local Service Centre in the Richmondshire Local Plan Core Strategy, whilst Middleham is a Primary Service Village and Harmby and Spennithorne are Secondary Service Villages.</p> <p>Spatial Principle SP2 of the Richmondshire Core Strategy states that Local Service Centres should 'provide appropriate levels of market and affordable housing, job opportunities and assist in achieving long term economic and social sustainability'. Primary and Secondary Service Villages provide fewer services that support the needs of rural communities. Policy 23 of the earlier local plan is the only saved policy within that plan, which allows development within development limits. As the site does not lie within any settlement limits it does not conflict with any allocations.</p> <p><u>Other Joint Minerals and Waste Plan Sites:</u> No other potential MWJP sites lie within 2km</p> <p>Historic Minerals and Waste Plan Sites: Harmby dormant carboniferous limestone quarry (with associated historic applications) lies 500m north-west.</p> <p>No significant cumulative impacts are anticipated as a result of the development.</p> | | | | | | | |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|--|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L | |
| Limitations / data gaps | No significant data gaps. More detailed assessment would be required to fully evaluate a number of effects however. This should be addressed at any subsequent planning application stage. | | | | | | | | |
| Score | | | | | | | | | |
| ++ | The Site option is predicted to have major positive effects on the achievement of the SA objective. For example, this may include a significant contribution to issues or receptor of more than local significance, or to several issues or receptors of local significance. | | | | | | | | |
| + | The Site option is predicted to have minor positive effects on achievement of the SA objective. For example, this may include a significant contribution to an issue or receptor of more local significance. | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | The Site option will have no effect on the achievement of the SA objective ¹³ . | | | | | | | | |
| - | The Site option is predicted to have minor negative effects on the achievement of the SA objective. For example, this may include a negative contribution to an issue or receptor of local significance. | | | | | | | | |
| -- | The Site option is predicted to have major negative effects on the achievement of the SA objective. For example, this may include a significant negative contribution to an issue or receptor of more than local significance. | | | | | | | | |
| ? | The impact of the Site option on the SA objective is uncertain. | | | | | | | | |

| Mitigation requirements identified through Site Assessment process |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design to mitigate impact on ecological issues • Design of development and landscaping of site to mitigate impact on village, users of rights of way and local landscape features • Design to include suitable flood risk assessment, attenuation and surface water drainage • Design to include suitable arrangements for access and local roads • Appropriate arrangements for control of and mitigation of the effects of noise, dust, odour, etc. |

¹³ This includes where there is no clear link between the site SA objective and the site

WJP18 – Tancred, near Scorton

Site Assessment Framework Template

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Site Name | WJP18, Tancred, Near Scorton, Tancred landfill and Recycling Facility, Brompton Road, Scorton |
| Current Use | Waste transfer and recycling, open windrow composting and landfill. |
| Nature of Planning Proposal | Proposed retention of landfill, recycling (including treatment, bulking and transfer) and open windrow composting facilities |
| Size | 10.0 ha – inert landfill, 1.98 ha – recycling and composting facility |
| Proposed life of site | 15-20 years |
| Notes | Compost to be used in restoration to agriculture of the landfill site near Tancred Grange (which is currently permitted until June 2016). Operation of the transfer station / recycling facility and composting area is currently permitted until March 2025 with restoration to agriculture. Possible restoration: not specified. |

SA FINDINGS SUMMARISE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS ONLY. A WIDER RANGE OF CONSTRAINTS AND OPPORTUNITIES WERE INITIALLY ANALYSED AND DISTILLED DOWN TO ONLY THOSE WITH THE POTENTIAL TO BE SIGNIFICANT (SEE ALSO SITE ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY SUMMARY REPORT FOR A FULL LIST OF CONSTRAINTS AND OPPORTUNITIES).

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| 1. To protect and enhance biodiversity and geo-diversity and improve habitat | <p>Proximity of international / national and local designations and key features Natura 2000: 6km W-North Pennine Dales Meadows SAC, 13km west - North Pennine Moors SAC/SPA; SSSI: 650m from nearest SSSI (Swale Lakes to the south); SINC: 4 SINCS within 2km (various statuses). Nearest are Scorton Quarry (NZ20-04) 110 m north; Catterick Gravel Pitts (SE29-16) 100m north and Howe Hill Riverside (deleted SINC) (SE29-08) - 190m south.</p> <p>Priority habitats: Deciduous woodland borders the northern, western and southern boundaries; Site visit: The following features were noted on site: woodland / copse; Eco networks: circa 45% of site within NY08</p> | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | - | - | |
| | | | | | | + | + | |
| | | | | | | ? | ? | |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| connectivity | <p>Swale Washlands Living Landscape; GI: Site in Scorton / Croft Regional GI Network (D67). Supported by Richmondshire's local plan policy CP12.</p> <p><u>Summary of effects on designated sites and important features for biodiversity / geodiversity</u> No significant effects expected on Natura 2000, SSSI or SINC sites. Protected species likely to be present would be associated with farmland and boundary features such as badger, breeding birds, foraging bats. There is woodland on boundaries of site – with effective mitigation no impacts would be expected.</p> <p>Imported materials have the potential to include invasive species. Japanese Knotweed and Himalayan Balsam are along the River Swale corridor just to the south. Cumulative effects in terms of disturbance to habitats and species in combination with adjacent works at Scorton Quarry. Sympathetic restoration of the two sites has the potential to lead to cumulative benefits for biodiversity although there are some concerns about the juxtaposition of the landfill element of this site with the lake being formed at Scorton Quarry.</p> <p>However, in the short and early medium term this proposal is about retention of facilities so impacts are not expected. In the later medium and longer term it is possible those facilities will operate for longer meaning that impacts endure into the future.</p> <p>There are opportunities to include benefits for biodiversity within any future restoration scheme, including agricultural schemes (farmland birds are important in this area and restoration to wildlife friendly farming may be beneficial), such as species rich hedgerows, native trees and field margins. In order to minimise impacts during operation, the introduction of buffers to the margins of the site could be considered.</p> | | | | | | | |
| 2. To enhance or maintain water quality and improve efficiency of water use | <p><u>Proximity of water quality / quantity receptors</u> No Nitrate Vulnerable Zones, No Groundwater Source Protection Zone. In SUNO Management Catchment. Boundary of site seemingly connected with Scorton Beck from Source to River Swale. Moderate ecological status / chemical status: does not require assessment. Floodplain may connect the corner of the site to Swale from Muker Bk to Bedale Beck (Ecological quality - moderate potential / chemical quality: does not require assessment with overall potential moderate). Objective is good by 2027. NO RBMP lakes. Groundwater: SUNO Magnesian Limestone (overall status: good / objective: good by 2015).</p> | | ✓ | ✓ | | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|----|----|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| | <p>CAMS: For most of site surface water resources available at least 50% of time. At low flows new extraction licenses may be more restricted.</p> <p>Summary of effects on water quality The transfer station/ recycling facility and composting area are already in place and permitted until 2025. As such they are considered to have no short or medium term impacts. In the long term, although runoff from these facilities could make its way into watercourses. This may have occasional residual impacts on the Muker Beck to Bedale Beck catchment without mitigation to which there is connectivity and may contribute to a diminished chance of achieving its RBMP / Water Framework Directive objectives. Impacts are seen a lower order as site is not in a Nitrate Vulnerable Zone, and would likely be dealt with via environmental permit.</p> | | | | | | | |
| 3. To reduce transport miles and associated emissions from transport and encourage the use of sustainable modes of transportation | <p>Proximity of transport receptors This site is close to the A1 (c.1.1km) making it easily accessible from nearby settlements. Access: Existing onto B6271 at c. 1400m west of Scorton village.</p> <p>Light Vehicles: estimated 20 daily two-way movements; HGV Vehicles: estimated 218 daily two-way movements.</p> <p>Net change in daily two-way trip generation: Light vehicles: 0; HGVs: 0. Traffic Assessment rating: yellow.</p> <p>PROW: This site is not affected by a registered public right of way.</p> <p>Rail: 8.6km east; Strategic Road: A1 1.1km west; Canal / Freight waterway: Tees Navigation 17km north-east.</p> <p>Summary of effects on transport A relatively large amount of vehicle movements would result from this development, however in the short and early medium term there would be little change from the baseline situation as the site is consented until 2025 so some elements are on-going (beyond that, even though vehicle numbers are large, they should be seen as a continuation of current vehicles (which would have been, by this time, expected to cease)). An initial Highways Assessment found that HGV movement is acceptable on to the B6271 although minor works may be required to improve the existing access arrangements. No modes of sustainable transport are likely to contribute to access the site. A Travel</p> | | ✓ | ✓ | | 0 | 0 | - |
| | | | | | | | - | -- |
| | | | | | | | -- | + |
| | | | | | | | + | ? |
| | | | | | | | ? | |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-------|----|----|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| | <p>Assessment and Travel Plan would be required.</p> <p>The Joint Plan Traffic Assessment reports that “to minimise traffic impacts, HGVs exporting waste are required to route to the west and along the A6136 to travel to and from the A1”. However, the restriction does not apply to vehicles delivering waste, some of which pass through Scorton, though these are mostly lighter refuse vehicles. That assessment recommends that the existing mitigation measures on HGV routing are retained.</p> <p>Overall impacts are considered to be largely neutral in the short and early medium term as transport miles are likely to remain similar to the baseline situation. In the late medium term and long term impacts are likely to be minor to moderate negative (due to lorries passing settlements, but at existing levels) though some positive impacts are noted because the waste transfer element effectively bulks up waste for more efficient transit.</p> <p>Some uncertainty is noted as the Highway Assessment notes that a highway authority improvement scheme may in the future affect the site.</p> | | | | | | | |
| 4. To protect and improve air quality | <p>Proximity of air quality receptors Not within a Hazardous Substances Consent Zone or within 2km of an AQMA.</p> <p>Summary of effects on air quality The transfer station / recycling facility and composting area are already in place and permitted until 2025. As such they are considered to have no short or early medium term impacts. After 2025 windrow composting may have an effect in terms of bio-aerosol release to air. Bio-aerosols are not expected to impact on Scorton due to its distance (650m east)¹⁴. Pollution from transport may combine with that of quarries to the west to create a minor negative effect on receptors around the edge of Brompton on Swale, or without a traffic routing agreement could affect receptors to the east (with</p> | | ✓ | ✓ | | 0 | 0 | + |
| | | | | | | | + | - |
| | | | | | | | - | -- |
| | | | | | | | -- | |

¹⁴ See HSE. 2010. Bio aerosol emissions from waste composting and the potential for worker’s exposure [URL: <http://www.hse.gov.uk/research/rrpdf/rr786.pdf>] which concludes that “Downwind of compost handling activities, although at some sites the bio-aerosol levels at times were higher than upwind, even at 100 to 250 m distance.....there was little evidence therefore that the composting operations studied made a major contribution to the overall bio-aerosol burden by a distance of 250m from activities”

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|--------|--------------|-------------|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| | moderate negative effects) . However, aside from these local effects, waste transfer will take traffic off the roads, which is positive for pollution. | | | | | | | |
| 5. To use soil and land efficiently and safeguard or enhance their quality | <p>Proximity of soil and land receptors This site is on ALC Grade 3 land, though was not being farmed according to aerial photos. In addition a previous planning application at the site (MIN3111) reported no Best and Most Versatile Land. Most of the site is covered by historic permissions. Legacy of waste management (inert landfill). Site needs further investigation for contaminants. Coal mining subsidence: none noted.</p> <p>Summary of effects on soil / land Although the site is a little less than 12 hectares, and is already in place this proposal may delay any restoration. There are some positive effects as compost will be produced and used in the restoration of a landfill site. Current permissions require the site to be restored to agriculture.</p> | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | 0 + | 0 + | + |
| 6. Reduce the causes of climate change | <p>Proximity of factors relevant to exacerbating climate change Priority habitats: Deciduous woodland borders the northern, western and southern boundaries; Site visit: The following features were noted on site: woodland / copse.</p> <p>Summary of effects on climate change Arguably windrow composting would prevent anaerobic degradation of future waste (a contributor to climate change). As there is existing waste transfer at the site, this would, presumably shorten onward journeys for waste (though may also generate some journeys of its own). No significant impacts on carbon storing habitats. Overall a positive impact is anticipated.</p> | ✓ | | | ✓ | 0 | 0 + ++ | + ++ |
| 7. To respond and adapt to the effects of climate change | <p>Proximity of factors relevant to the adaptive capacity¹⁵ of a site 30% of site (mainly in the west) is in flood zone 3. Additional 5% in flood zone 2 (mainly in the west). Surface water flooding affects about 10% the site, mainly in the west. This is mainly high risk (1 in 30 year) flooding. Eco networks: c. 45% of site within NY08 Swale Washlands Living Landscape. Ouse CFMP / Unit: Catterick / Policy 5.</p> <p>CAMS: surface water resources available at least 50% of time. At low flows new extraction licenses may be</p> | | ✓ | ✓ | | 0 | 0 - ? | -- ? |

¹⁵ Adaptive capacity is defined as the ability of a system to adjust to climate change to moderate potential; damage or take advantage of opportunities (adapted from CARE International, 2015. Adaptive Capacity [URL: http://www.careclimatechange.org/tk/integration/en/key_concepts/adaptive_capacity.html]

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|-------|----|----|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| | <p>more restricted.</p> <p>Summary of effects on climate change adaptation This site may be vulnerable to future flooding, depending on the positioning of buildings on site. There may be opportunities to avoid flood risk through raising levels or co-ordinating drainage. These flood risks may get worse with climate change in the longer term. SUDS could be an option in this CFMP policy area. No effect on ecological networks, though the network could be enhanced, e.g. through SUDS.</p> | | | | | | | |
| 8. To minimise the use of resources and encourage their re-use and safeguarding | <p>Proximity of factors relevant to the resource usage of a site No spatial factors identified.</p> <p>Summary of effects on resource usage This site will produce a growing medium (compost). Positive.</p> | | ✓ | | ✓ | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| 9. To minimise waste generation and prioritise management of waste as high up the waste hierarchy as practicable | <p>Proximity of factors relevant to managing waste higher up the waste hierarchy No spatial factors identified.</p> <p>Summary of effects on the waste hierarchy This site would move waste up the waste hierarchy, but only to lower levels of the hierarchy.</p> | | ✓ | ✓ | | + | + | + |
| 10. To conserve or enhance the | <p>Proximity of historic environment receptors Conservation areas: Scorton (DNY1136) 700m east, Bolton-on-Swale (DNY1135) 900m south-east; Registered Parks and Gardens: None within 5km; Registered Battlefields: None within 5km; World Heritage Site: None within 5km; Scheduled Monuments:</p> | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| historic environment and its setting, cultural heritage and character | <p>880m south-west - 'Cataractonium Roman forts and town' (ID 1,021,181), 1.6km south - 'Pallet Hill motte and bailey castle, 80m north west of St Anne's Church' (ID 1,021,136), 1.8km north - 'Uckerby medieval village and open field system' (ID 1,017,691); Listed buildings: 23 Listed buildings within 1km (21 grade 2 and 2 grade 2*). 15 of these lie in Scorton c. 850m east and 7 lie in Catterick Bridge c. 880m south west. Nearest Listed Building to site- Old Rectory (Grade 2, NHLE no. 1,131,463) 800m east; Named designed landscapes: Brough Hall designed landscape 1.3km south-west.</p> <p>HLC Broad type - Enclosed land; HLC Type – Modern Improved Fields; Undesignated archaeology in this area includes evidence for prehistoric, Romano-British and early Medieval activity, as well as a later, modern, former airfield. The earlier remains comprise a range of monument, settlement and burial sites which are known from a variety of sources, including aerial photographic transcription and archaeological fieldwork conducted in advance of previous quarrying activities in the area.</p> <p>Summary of effects on the historic environment The HLC type of this area is modern improved fields. The allocation site is a smaller part of a larger area of similar character type, of which the legibility is fragmentary.</p> <p>It is assumed that within the allocation site the historic landscape character has already become invisible as the development has replaced an earlier field system.</p> <p>Accordingly, it is anticipated that there will no effect upon historic landscape character.</p> <p>It is anticipated that there will be no impact upon the archaeological resource as the proposed development is a continuation of an existing, permitted use in an area of former quarry, where it is assumed with a high degree of certainty that any archaeological resource has previously been destroyed.</p> | | | | | | | |
| 11. To protect and enhance the quality and character of landscapes | <p>Proximity of landscape / townscape receptors and summary of character National Park: Yorkshire Dales 8km W; AONBs: None within 10km; Heritage Coast: None within 10km; ITE: None within 5km; Locally protected landscape: None within 5km.</p> <p>NCA: Vale of Mowbray; NYLCA: 24 - River floodplain; Local LCA: Not included in local LCA; Intrusion: Most</p> | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | | ? | ? |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| and townscapes | <p>of site disturbed. Eastern fringe (c10%) undisturbed. On the 2007 CPRE map of urban intrusion most of the site is shown as disturbed and in fact quarrying has subsequently extended eastwards over adjacent land towards Tancred Grange. Light pollution: The area is shown on the 2000 CPRE map as having a level of 86 on a scale of 1-255, with 1 representing maximum darkness. Although this is moderate-low, it is very likely that levels have increased over the past 15 years.</p> <p>Summary of effects on landscape / townscape There are no effects on nationally or locally designated landscapes. The site lies next to the fairly busy B6281 between Scorton and Brompton-on-Swale, and could negatively affect the approach to both of them. There is existing roadside screening but this in itself indicates that this is not unspoilt countryside, and it is apparent that the site behind is very disturbed.</p> <p>The threshold for accommodation of landscape change has long been exceeded in this area, which is dominated by extensive past and present sand and gravel extraction and associated uses. 'Restored' areas are a mixture of wet and dry schemes, forming new sunken landscapes that rarely resemble original countryside and may include unnatural landforms. There is already a waste transfer station on the western part of the proposed allocation site and it is considered that this industrial development would be out of place with wider restorations. Sand and gravel extraction has been completed, and the eastern part is undergoing landfill, with an access strip connecting east and west parts of the site. The proposals appear to be a continuation of existing uses over a longer timescale. However, as the main transfer station for Richmondshire, if the site was not here it would have to go somewhere else (so it is not known if that would be a positive or negative impact).</p> <p>The site is screened although not completely effectively in winter. There is already a lot of vehicle movement so this won't change overall character. There is uncertainty over planned restoration however this site has a separate landform to surrounding sites and is higher than surrounding land. The restoration scheme for this site should therefore not necessarily directly reproduce more of the features of other quarry restorations surrounding the site as this is a different landform.</p> | | | | | | | |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|-------|-------------|--------------|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| 12. Achieve sustainable economic growth and create and support jobs | <p><u>Proximity of factors relevant to sustainable economic growth</u> This site is close to the A1 making it easily accessible from nearby settlements.</p> <p><u>Summary of effects on sustainable economic growth</u> The site, as it is retained for longer, may retain jobs for longer.</p> | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | 0 | 0 + | + |
| 13. Maintain and enhance the viability and vitality of local communities | <p><u>Proximity of factors relevant to community vitality / viability</u> IMD Area is Brompton on Swale and Scorton – not in the most deprived 20%. Nearest settlement is Scorton at 650m east. Brompton is 850m west. Catterick lies 1.2km. Catterick is a Primary Service Village in Richmondshire (13% of the housing – 240 houses across this category of settlement). Brompton is a Service Village in the Hambleton Local Plan (5% of housing directed to Service Villages).</p> <p><u>Summary of effects on vitality / viability</u> Jobs could be retained for longer, which might benefit some local people. There is also a potential housing extension to the north-west of the site and impacts in relation to this would need to be considered.</p> | | ✓ | | ✓ | 0 | 0 + ? | 0 + ? |
| 14. To provide opportunities to enable recreation, leisure and learning | <p><u>Proximity to recreation, leisure and learning receptors</u> Bridleway 20.58/11/1 is 40m south. No draft common land or village greens within 500m. Nearest draft common land is 'the Bogs, Scorton' 1.1 km east.</p> <p><u>Summary of effects on recreation, leisure and learning</u> It is possible users of the right of the way may experience additional noise, dust and odour in the medium and longer term. Negative.</p> | | ✓ | | ✓ | 0 | 0 - | - |
| 15. To protect and improve the wellbeing, health and safety of local | <p><u>Proximity to population / community receptors / factors relevant to health and wellbeing</u> No schools or health centres within 1 km. Nearest settlement is Scorton at 650m east.</p> <p><u>Summary of effects on health and wellbeing</u> The transfer station/ recycling facility and composting area are already in place and permitted until 2025. As such they are considered to have no short or early medium term impacts. After 2025 windrow composting may have an effect in terms of bio-aerosol release to air. Bio-</p> | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | 0 | 0 ? - | ? - -- |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|-------|----|---|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| communities | aerosols (and odour (subject to an assessment)) are not expected to impact on Scorton due to its distance (650m east) ¹⁶ . Pollution from transport may combine with that of quarries to the west to create a minor negative effect on receptors around the edge of Brompton on Swale, or without a traffic routing agreement could affect settlements to the east with moderate effects. | | | | | | -- | |
| 16. To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding | <p>Proximity to flood zones 30% of site (mainly in west) is in flood zone 3. Additional 5% in flood zone 2 (mainly in west). Surface water flooding affects about 10% the site, mainly in the west. This is mainly high risk (1 in 30 year) flooding. Ouse CFMP / Unit: Catterick / Policy 5.</p> <p>Summary of effects on flooding This site may be vulnerable to future flooding. There may be opportunities to avoid flood risk through raising levels or co-ordinating drainage. These flood risks may get worse with climate change in the longer term. SUDS could be an option in this CFMP policy area.</p> | | ✓ | ✓ | | 0 | 0 | - |
| 17. To address the needs of a changing population in a sustainable and inclusive manner | <p>Proximity to factors relevant to the needs of a changing population No spatial factors identified.</p> <p>Summary of effects on a changing population Site would manage waste, essential for a changing population.</p> | | ✓ | | ✓ | + | + | + |
| Cumulative effects | <p>Cumulative / Synergistic effects</p> <p>Planning Context: Nearest settlement is Scorton at 650m east. Brompton is 850m west. Catterick lies 1.2km south. Catterick is a Primary Service Village in Richmondshire (13% of the housing – 240 houses across</p> | | | | | | | |

¹⁶ See HSE. 2010. Bio aerosol emissions from waste composting and the potential for worker's exposure [URL: <http://www.hse.gov.uk/research/rrpdf/rr786.pdf>] which concludes that "Downwind of compost handling activities, although at some sites the bio-aerosol levels at times were higher than upwind, even at 100 to 250 m distance.....there was little evidence therefore that the composting operations studied made a major contribution to the overall bio-aerosol burden by a distance of 250m from activities"

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| | <p>this category of settlement). Brompton is a Service Village in the Hambleton Local Plan (5% of housing directed to Service Villages). Policy 23 of the earlier local plan is the only saved policy within that plan, which allows development within development limits. As the site does not lie within any settlement limits it does not conflict with any allocations.</p> <p><u>Other Joint Minerals and Waste Plan Sites:</u> Nearest is MJP62, 2.4km south-east.</p> <p><u>Historic Minerals and Waste Sites:</u> There are 2 authorised landfill areas (Tancred and Scorton) just to the east of this site and the site also overlays an authorised landfill area (another part of Tancred). Further historic landfilling extends westward associated with Catterick Bridge Civic Amenity Site. Further west (a little over 1 km) lies a transfer station for non-hazardous waste. A number of historic landfill sites lie to the south within 2km. Numerous historic applications cluster around this site, mainly associated with Scorton and Tancred quarries, with additional extraction at Minto Grange and Hollow Banks Quarries and to the south extraction at Catterick Racecourse and Bridge Farm, and Pallet Hill Quarry further south.</p> <p><u>Landscape:</u> The threshold for accommodation of landscape change has long been exceeded in this area, which is dominated by extensive past and present sand and gravel extraction and associated uses. This site and other sites would continue to exceed the landscape's capacity to accommodate impacts resulting in a negative impact.</p> <p>Traffic / Pollution / Health: Traffic may combine with that of quarries to the west to create a minor negative effect on receptors around the edge of Brompton on Swale</p> | | ✓ | | ✓ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | ✓ | ✓ | | 0 | 0 | - |

| Proposed Sustainability Objective | Key Facts for Consideration by the Assessment Panel and Initial Observations on Significance | | | | | Score | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|
| | | P | T | D | I | S | M | L |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Limitations / data gaps | No significant data gaps. More detailed assessment would be required to fully evaluate a number of effects however. This should be addressed at any subsequent planning application stage. | | | | | | | |
| Score | | | | | | | | |
| ++ | The Site option is predicted to have major positive effects on the achievement of the SA objective. For example, this may include a significant contribution to issues or receptor of more than local significance, or to several issues or receptors of local significance. | | | | | | | |
| + | The Site option is predicted to have minor positive effects on achievement of the SA objective. For example, this may include a significant contribution to an issue or receptor of more local significance. | | | | | | | |
| 0 | The Site option will have no effect on the achievement of the SA objective ¹⁷ . | | | | | | | |
| - | The Site option is predicted to have minor negative effects on the achievement of the SA objective. For example, this may include a negative contribution to an issue or receptor of local significance. | | | | | | | |
| -- | The Site option is predicted to have major negative effects on the achievement of the SA objective. For example, this may include a significant negative contribution to an issue or receptor of more than local significance. | | | | | | | |
| ? | The impact of the Site option on the SA objective is uncertain. | | | | | | | |

| Mitigation requirements identified through Site Assessment process |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design to mitigate impact on ecological issues • Design of development and landscaping of site to mitigate impact on: local landscape features, cumulative effects of quarrying and its associated restoration in vicinity |

¹⁷ This includes where there is no clear link between the site SA objective and the site

- Design to include suitable flood risk assessment, attenuation and surface water drainage
- Improvements to access
- Appropriate arrangements for control of and mitigation of the effects of noise and dust, etc.
- Appropriate restoration scheme using opportunities for habitat creation