



**NON-LANDSCAPE CONSIDERATION OF THE SITES ASSESSED BY LUC
IN THEIR OCTOBER 2018 REPORT TO THE PARISH COUNCIL**

REPORT FOR PANNAL AND BURN BRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL

NOVEMBER 2018

Conyngham Hall Knaresborough Yorkshire HG5 9AY (01423) 869547 info@aapanning.co.uk

Arrowsmith Associates LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England No. OC375369
Registered office: Conyngham Hall, Knaresborough, Yorkshire.
Partners: George Arrowsmith BA(hons), MCD, MRTPI & Richard Clark BA(hons), DipTP, MRTPI.
Associate: Mike Croft MA, DipTP, MRTPI.

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The Parish Council commissioned LUC consultants to carry out a landscape appraisal of sites which might be more suitable for housing and employment development than those proposed in the Pannal area in the publication draft of the emerging local plan. LUC appraised sites in the Council's December 2017 Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA), excluding those that already have planning permission. The LUC appraisal comprised all potential housing sites with an area greater than 10ha and all employment sites in the vicinity of Pannal and Knaresborough. In total LUC appraised 73 sites.
- 1.2 The value of the LUC report is that it can potentially provide evidence that there are other sites that could be developed with less landscape damage than those sites being opposed by the Parish Council. It should however be noted that the LUC report does not make a judgement on the acceptability in landscape terms of developing any of the 73 sites in their appraisal.
- 1.3 Harrogate Borough Council have carried out their own landscape assessments of sites, which formed one of the criteria in their 2018 Sustainability Appraisal. This appraisal included a colour coded assessment for each criterion. The colour codes ranged from red, through orange and yellow to green (i.e. from seriously adverse to acceptable). Some elements in the Sustainability Appraisal, including landscape, were derived from detailed assessments in the Council's earlier October 2016 and July 2017 Built and Natural Environment Site Assessments. These more detailed assessments also used the colour code system for their summaries.
- 1.4 The LUC report has no equivalent to Harrogate BC's colour coded assessments.
- 1.5 Landscape is not the only relevant criterion in determining whether a site should be developed. In order to reach any persuasive conclusion on the comparative merits/demerits of the sites appraised by LUC and draft allocations around Pannal it is necessary to consider all the other criteria affecting a site's suitability. As far as Harrogate Borough Council are concerned, these criteria are

summarised in their Sustainability Appraisal. In relation to the Pannal sites, the summaries were considered in our August 2017 report to the Parish Council.

- 1.6 The Parish Council have now commissioned Arrowsmith Associates to report on the non-landscape criteria affecting the sites appraised by LUC.
- 1.7 It would be a mammoth task to independently assess all the non-landscape considerations affecting each of the LUC sites. The Council's Sustainability Appraisal covers 16 main criteria, most of which are broken down into sub-categories. A typical site assessment therefore contains around 50 separate judgements. What we have done, constrained by the limits of our brief, is summarise the findings of the Council's Sustainability Appraisal (in some cases with additional comments) for each of the LUC assessed sites. In some cases, we have also noted the SHELAA assessment of the site. The summaries follow:¹

¹ The Sustainability Appraisal frequently refers to the effect of development on local distinctiveness: we have taken this to be a component of its landscape effect. In very many cases the development of greenfield sites entails the loss of grade 3 agricultural land. We have not identified this in our summary, but it is specified in the Appraisal itself. When mitigation of a cost (i.e. adverse effect) is considered feasible the cost is not cited in our summary.

2. HARROGATE BOROUGH COUNCIL'S ASSESSMENT OF THE SHELA SITES APPRAISED BY LUC

2.1 *Housing Sites*

B12	Allocated.
B21	Allocated
BK2	Sustainability Appraisal (SA) found landscape, biodiversity, accessibility, transport & school capacity costs
CA4	SA found landscape, accessibility, transport & heritage costs and loss of grade 2/3 agricultural land
CA5	SA found landscape, accessibility and heritage costs
DF7	SA found landscape, biodiversity, accessibility & transport costs and loss of some grade 2 agricultural land
FX1	POTENTIAL NEW SETTLEMENT SA found accessibility, transport and school capacity costs SHLAA found suitable if required but with mitigation
FX2	POTENTIAL NEW SETTLEMENT SA found landscape, biodiversity, accessibility and school capacity costs and loss of grade 2 agricultural land SHLAA found suitable if required but with mitigation
FX3	POTENTIAL NEW SETTLEMENT SHLAA found suitable if required but with mitigation
GH8	NEW SETTLEMENT identified as preferred site for new settlement
GH11	NEW SETTLEMENT identified as preferred site for new settlement
GH12	NEW SETTLEMENT identified as preferred site for new settlement
H1	SA found landscape, accessibility & school capacity costs
H8	SA found landscape, accessibility, transport & school capacity costs
H9	Green Belt site SA found Green Belt, landscape, biodiversity, accessibility, transport & school capacity costs

H10	Green Belt site SA found Green Belt, landscape, biodiversity, accessibility, transport & school capacity costs
H11	Green Belt site SA found Green Belt, landscape, accessibility, & school capacity costs
H24	SA found biodiversity costs and some landscape, accessibility, transport & school capacity costs
H31	Green Belt site SA found landscape, accessibility, & school capacity costs
H32	SA found landscape, accessibility, transport & school capacity costs
H34	Green Belt site SA found landscape, biodiversity, accessibility and transport costs
H39	SA found landscape, accessibility, & school capacity costs
H49	Allocated
H51	Allocated for mixed use
H52	SA found landscape, accessibility, transport & school capacity costs
H58	Green Belt site SA found landscape, accessibility, & school capacity costs
H66	Green Belt site SA found landscape, biodiversity and accessibility costs
H70	Allocated
H73	Unable to trace SHLAA or SA assessment but not allocated
H86	SA found landscape, accessibility, & school capacity costs SHLAA said might be achievable on parts of the site closest to Harrogate
HB1	Green Belt site SA found landscape, biodiversity, accessibility, heritage & school capacity costs SHELAA found unsuitable – Green Belt, adverse effect on character of village
HP7	SA found landscape, accessibility, biodiversity & heritage costs and loss of grade 2 agricultural land
K20	SA found landscape, accessibility, transport heritage & school capacity costs and loss of grade 2/3 agricultural land
K25	Allocated

- K27 SA found landscape, accessibility, & school capacity costs
- K28 SA found landscape, biodiversity, accessibility, & school capacity costs
- KB4 SA found landscape, accessibility & school capacity costs and loss of grade 1 agricultural land. **However, SHELAA found suitable with mitigation**
- KB5 SA found landscape, accessibility & school capacity costs and loss of grade 1/2 agricultural land. **However, SHELAA found suitable with landscape mitigation**
- KH6 **NEW SETTLEMENT**
- KH7 SA found landscape and accessibility costs
- KL5 SA found landscape, accessibility and school capacity costs
- KL15 SA found landscape, accessibility and school capacity costs
- LM4 Site in York Green Belt SA found accessibility & heritage costs and loss of grade 2 agricultural land. SHELAA found could be suitable if removed from Green Belt
- OC2 SA found landscape, accessibility & heritage costs and loss of grade 2 agricultural land
- OC4 SA found accessibility, transport, heritage & school capacity costs and loss of grade 2 agricultural land **SHELAA found that might be suitable for employment development if with mitigation**
- OC5 SA found landscape, accessibility, transport & school capacity costs. **However, SHELAA found that could be suitable for a new for a new or expanded settlement if required during the plan period. There would need to be landscape mitigation and a flood risk assessment.**
- OC6 SA found landscape, accessibility, transport & school capacity costs
- OC8 SA found landscape, accessibility, transport & school capacity costs
- OC11 SA found landscape, accessibility, transport & heritage costs
- PN2 Site in Green Belt. SA found landscape, accessibility, transport, heritage and school capacity costs
- PN13 **Part allocated** SA found landscape, biodiversity, some accessibility and school capacity costs **However, SHELAA**

considered that part of the site could be developed subject to landscape mitigation

- PN14 **Allocated** Smaller site forming part of PN13. SA found accessible and that the landscape has the capacity to accommodate development with mitigation. SA found biodiversity and school capacity costs
- R4 SA found landscape and pedestrian accessibility costs
- R13 SA found landscape, biodiversity, accessibility & school capacity costs and loss of grade2/3 agricultural land
- R17 SA found landscape & heritage costs and loss of grade 2/3 agricultural land
- R19 SA found landscape, accessibility, school capacity and flooding costs
- R24 **Allocated**
- R25 **Allocated for mixed use**
- SH3 SA found landscape, biodiversity, accessibility, heritage and school capacity costs. **However, SHELAA found suitable for development with mitigation**
- TW8 SA found accessibility and school capacity costs. Development would regenerate a derelict area. **SHELAA found site suitable for development with mitigation**
- TW11 SA found landscape, accessibility & school capacity costs and loss of grade 2 agricultural lane. **However, SHELAA found suitable for development with mitigation**
- WB1 SA found landscape, accessibility, transport & school capacity costs and loss of grade2/3 agricultural land. **However, SHELAA found suitable for development with mitigation**
- WB3 Site in Green Belt SA found landscape, accessibility, transport & school capacity cost. **However, SHELAA found suitable for development with mitigation**

2.2 **Employment Sites**

- H60 The site is a council depot. The SA found accessibility costs but also that there would be environmental benefits through the re-use of a brownfield site. No explicit reason for not allocating. **However, SHELAA considered site suitable for employment development**
- H67 Appears to have been considered as a housing site. SA considers unsuitable for housing for a number of reasons including accessibility. However, landscape and transport concerns also affect an employment allocation.
- K14 Considered as a residential/mixed use site. Existing employment site. SA considered unsuitable because it would involve the loss of an employment site
- K30 Public car park. SA finds unsuitable for transport reasons – presumably its value as a car park
- K33 Site in Green Belt. Assessed as a mixed-use site SA found landscape, heritage and school capacity costs
- K34 SA found landscape costs and adverse effect on watercourse. **However, SHELAA considered suitable with mitigation**
- K35 SA found landscape, accessibility (including severance) and transport costs. **However, SHELAA considered suitable with mitigation**
- H16 **Allocated**
- H28 **Allocated**

3. FINDINGS

- 3.1 The above analysis shows that Harrogate Borough Council rejected no site solely for landscape reasons although in the vast majority of cases landscape figured as one of the reasons for rejecting the site. In some cases [site KH7 (a site on the edge of Kirk Hammerton considered for housing), R4 (site at Hutton Bank, Ripon considered for mixed use) and K34 (a site to the east of St James Business Park, Knaresborough considered for employment use)] landscape was one of only two identified costs. In all other cases landscape was one of at least three reasons given for rejecting the site.
- 3.2 As part of our investigation we have found that 12 of the sites appraised by LUC (9 identified by Harrogate Council as potential housing sites and 3 as possible employment sites) were identified by the SHELAA as suitable for development. One of these sites was PN13, which has in fact been allocated in the plan in two parts as PN18 and 19.
- 3.3 The other 11 sites are:

Potential Housing Sites

KB5	Up to 2655 houses	East of Rooker Hill and Kirby Hill (considered for new/expanded settlement)
OC4	136 houses	North of Racecourse Approach near Wetherby
OC5	825 houses	Deighton Grange Farm, near Kirk Deighton (considered for new/expanded settlement)
SH3	206 houses	Land to the west of Lister Farm, Sharow
TW8	446 houses	Tockwith Airfield
TW11	242 houses	Land adjacent to Tockwith Airfield
WB1	231 houses	Land north west of Wetherby
WB3	474 houses	Land to the north east of the A168, Wetherby

Potential Employment Sites

H60	6,720sq m yield	Claro Road Depot, Harrogate
K34	21,743sq m yield	Land to the east of St James Business Park, Knaresborough
K35	5,249sq m yield	Land adjacent to roundabout at B6164 and A658, Knaresborough

4. CONCLUSION

- 4.1 Within the limits of our brief we have been able to establish a context for the LUC landscape appraisals.
- 4.2 We have identified 11 alternative sites which the LPA acknowledged as having no major constraints (or constraints which could be mitigated).
- 4.3 Of these, 8 are housing sites (KB5, OC4, OC5, SH3, TW8, TW11, WB1 and WB3) which the Council assess on the basis of providing a potential of between 136 and 2,655 houses and up to a cumulative total of 5,215 houses.
- 4.4 The other 3 are employment sites (H60, K34 and K35) providing potential yields of between 5,249 and 21,743sq m of floor space and a cumulative figure of 33,712sq m.
- 4.5 Assuming that the Council are correct in their assessment of these sites, the development of these sites would not result in the same planning problems as have been identified on behalf of the Parish Council by their various professional advisors.

Arrowsmith Associates
November 2018