

ALLERTON WASTE RECOVERY PARK  
WEST YORKSHIRE

LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL APPRAISAL

In support of local opposition to the proposed AWRP

January 2012

Produced by TPM Landscape Ltd

Chartered Landscape Architects

ISSUE2

## **REVIEW OF APPLICANTS ES CHAPTER AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

### **1.0 Introduction**

- 1.1 TPM Landscape are chartered landscape architects with many years experience in the preparation of Landscape and Visual Assessment.
- 1.2 We were commissioned in December 2011 to assist a consortium of opposition groups to the proposed Allerton Waste Recovery Park (AWRP) at Allerton West Yorkshire. We were asked whether a case against the development could be prepared on landscape and visual grounds, and on a consideration of the available information at the time we determined that we would be able to assist the group through the preparation of an initial study document. This study will seek to firstly evaluate the ES and planning submission and secondly explore the proposals and the impacts.
- 1.3 The first section of this report seeks to analyse the submitted ES for the AWRP and to understand how the summary and conclusions drawn out from the landscape and visual section (ES Chapter 4) have been arrived at.
- 1.4 The second section of this report seeks to identify areas of particular concern identified through our own process of evaluation and the concerns of the local parish councils and residents.

### **2.0 Methodology**

- 2.1 The ES methodology with regards to landscape and visual effects or impacts follows guidance set out by both the Landscape Institute and other regulatory and advisory bodies with experience and expertise in the field of landscape assessment. The ES assessment identifies a criteria and threshold for sensitivity and change for both landscape and visual impacts and offers a significance rating for the combination of these elements in conclusion. All of these criteria appear reasoned and reasonable and to follow industry standard practice. As a consequence the initial evaluation of the landscape and visual impacts of the project have been carried out using the applicants methodology and terms of reference.
- 2.2 In the second section of the report elements of the methodology are discussed with regard to their use within the document and their content in terms of clarity and the wider considerations of industry standard approaches and other precedents.

### **3.0 Site Description**

Amey Cespa has selected Allerton Park Quarry near Knaresborough, North Yorkshire to accommodate its proposed facility. The full Planning Application Boundary includes approximately 24.5 hectares of land, including that required for the underground grid connection cabling.

- 3.1 The Proposed Development Site is used to describe the area of and to the east of the A1M. The Site includes approximately 19.4 hectares of land. The western boundary of the Site is marked by the A168 and the south and eastern boundaries are bounded by the adjacent landfill. Moor Lane runs to the north of the Site. The A168 runs in a north/south direction and connects with the A1(M) in the north, at Junction 48 (Boroughbridge), and in the south with the A59 and A1(M) at Junction 47.

- 3.2 The Site is made up of the following keys areas:
- The Core Application Area (CAA)
  - Restoration Regularisation Area (RAA)
  - Claro House and Access Area
  - Lagoon, Sand Hill and Landscaping Area
- 3.3 The CAA comprises circa 4.2 hectares of land required for the development of the main waste management facility. The CAA is presently used for the processing and storage of minerals (sand and gravel) extracted from the Holly Bank Farm quarry to the north. A free-standing minerals and aggregate process plant currently occupies most of the site. The minerals processing plant will be removed and the vacant Site made available for the development of AWRP.
- 3.4 Claro House, a residential property in the ownership of the Allerton Mauleverer Estate, situated to the north-west of the CAA will be converted to form the AWRP's Visitor, Education and Office buildings.
- 3.5 The remaining land within the Site comprises an area:
- to the north of the quarry processing area which is currently an attenuation lagoon for activities at Allerton Park Quarry, and will form the attenuation lagoon for AWRP;
  - a strip of land to the south of the private access road to Wall Close, which is currently vegetated and will be further landscaped and maintained under the new scheme
  - an area of land to the south of the site which is called Sand Hill and will be raised in profile to provide screening from the south.
  - a strip of land adjacent to the A168 which is currently vegetated and will be further landscaped and maintained under the new scheme.
- 3.6 The area of land required for these purposes will be circa 10.7 hectares.

#### **4.0 Legislation and Policy Context**

- 4.1 The Planning framework for the proposed development with regards to landscape matters is set out in part within the ES by figures 4.2 and 4.3 which indicate planning and other designations relevant to the application over a map of the 20 km study area.
- 4.2 A brief summary of the development frameworks is as follows (*Figure 5.0, appendix B*):
- Harrogate Borough Council Core Strategy Document 2009;
  - North Yorkshire Waste Local Plan;
  - Harrogate District Local Plan

#### **5.0 Baseline Conditions**

- 5.1 The ES concerns itself with landscape, townscape and visual receptors within a 20km radius of the application site. For the purposes of this study we concentrate on the receptors within each of these categories which fall within a 5 km radius of the site (*Figure 1, appendix B*) where, in our judgement, significant landscape and visual impacts are likely to occur. The ES considers the detailed makeup of the landscape and townscape areas through an exploration of the existing published material on the surrounding landscape and relies heavily on the Harrogate Council Landscape Character Assessment 2004 which sub divides the Natural England Character areas into smaller sub sets.

- 5.2 The sensitivity of landscape and townscape areas are determined through the consideration of each area in the context of the proposed development and a table (ES 4.3) is produced indicating the criteria for a high, medium and low sensitivity. The specific landscape sub area descriptions are produced in appendix 4B of the ES (table 2) and sensitivity and impacts are indicated in appendix 4D of the ES (table 2).
- 5.3 Visual receptors have been identified through the production of a ZVI map and site visits and consultations with the local authority. A total of 30 views have been selected as representative of the whole 20 km study area.

## 6.0 Project Description

- 6.1 The AWRP facility comprises an integrated waste treatment facility with three main elements:
- A Mechanical Treatment (MT) facility
  - An Anaerobic Digestion (AD) plant
  - An Energy from Waste (EfW) plant.
- 6.2 In addition to the waste treatment facility, the planning application also includes for a range of ancillary services. These are as follows:
- Incinerator Bottom Ash Recycling Facility (IBA)
  - Visitor and Education Centre, including ancillary staff office accommodation
  - Welfare block and ancillary buildings, including weighbridges and gatehouse
  - Staff and visitor's car park
  - Improved access arrangements onto the A168
  - Surface water attenuation measures
  - New landscaping and planting; and
  - Connection to the electricity grid.

The physical scale and massing of the proposed development is summarized in table 1 below:

TABLE 1

Element	Max Height (m) *	Dimensions L x W (m) **	Areas
Tipping Hall	14.7	92.9 x 33	3067m <sup>2</sup>
MT	19.8	103.4 x 51.55	5311m <sup>2</sup>
Odour Stack	28	1.1 Ø	N/A – 1 flue
AD	32	15.72 Ø	N/A
Gas Engine Stack	26	0.4 Ø	N/A – 2 flues
EfW	36.4	72.7 x 62.8	4087m <sup>2</sup>
EfW Stack	70.0	5.72Ø (external diameter)	N/A – 2 flue
Staff Amenity Building	4.8	18.3 x 19.3	351m <sup>2</sup>
Substation	3.5	20 x10	200m <sup>2</sup>
ACC	24.0	28.2 x 40.2	1109m <sup>2</sup> (elevated)
IBA Store	12.3	20 x 30	600m <sup>2</sup>
IBA Process	14.8	25 x 50	1250m <sup>2</sup>
Claro House – Visitor and Education Centre	8.9 (exc chimney)	30.25 x 30	655m <sup>2</sup>
Hard standing/ Roads/Buildings			3.5hectares

## **7.0 Impact Evaluation within the ES**

7.1 Although the landscape and visual assessment has set a study area extending to 20 km from the application site boundaries it is clear that the majority, if not all of the potential *significant* impacts will occur within 5 km of the site (*Figure 1, appendix B*).

7.2 As a response to this the focus of this evaluation, although noting the study area outwith this distance, concentrates on the landscape within 5 km of the site boundary.

## **8.0 Visual Impacts**

8.1 The visual impacts identified within the ES are divided into construction effects, effects following 1 year of operation and effects after 15 years of operation. Additionally comment is given to night time impacts.

8.2 15 of the original 25 views assessed fall within 5 km of the site. Of these 15 viewpoints 8 will experience significant adverse visual effects (*Figure 5, appendix B*). All of these views bar one will experience no change to this significant and adverse impact after the passing of 15 years of landscape mitigation proposals. The conclusions to the ES landscape chapter acknowledge that:

*The additional screening benefits of this maturing vegetation, relative to the scale of the stack and larger buildings, would generally be of insufficient magnitude to result in a reduced magnitude of adverse effects.*

8.3 In addition the ES accepts that these are merely representative of the effects on the visual amenity within the study area and that:

*At some locations within approximately 3.5 km radius of the site, some of the receptors of high sensitivity, such as local residents and users of public rights of way, would experience Large Adverse and Moderate to Large Adverse daytime effects.*

## **9.0 Landscape Impacts**

9.1 The landscape character areas identified for the study area within 10 km are taken from the Harrogate District Landscape Character Area. Of these LCA's 7 fall within a 5 km radius from the site (*Figure 3, appendix B*).

9.2 As with the visual impacts, the ES assesses construction, operational year 1 and operational year 15 effects as well as considering night time impacts.

9.3 Of these 7 LCA's all will experience adverse impacts on their character with Allerton Park assessed as experiencing a significant adverse impact which extends through the construction phase and is unaffected by any landscape mitigation. In addition the ES accepts that even when the impacts are not regarded as significant:

*Visual effects on some parts of LCA 16 & 31, within close proximity of the site, may be sufficient to result in a localized significant effect on landscape character.*

## **10.0 Townscape Impacts**

10.1 13 townscape areas are assessed by the ES of which 11 fall within 5 km of the site. 6 of these townscapes will experience adverse impacts on their character through the introduction of the AWRP (*Figure 3, appendix B*).

## 11.0 Summary and analysis of ES and planning application documents

- 11.1 The AWRP will clearly be a prominent and intrusive introduction into a landscape which has no existing development of similar scale or extent.
- 11.2 By the definitions and methodology set out within the ES it is clear that the introduction of such a facility will be viewed, when visible or able to exert an influence over its surroundings, as adverse in nature.
- 11.3 By the definitions and methodology set out within the ES the AWRP will have adverse effect on landscape, townscape and visual receptors throughout an area which extends up to 5 km distant from the site. It will also create **significant** landscape and visual impacts as defined by the regulations governing the preparation of Environmental Statement and these will extend through the construction phase and across the years of operation identified up to 15 years. Furthermore it is acknowledged that such is the scale of the development that the additional planting and screening illustrated will not result in a reduced magnitude of effect.
- 11.4 Although further mitigation planting is suggested at offsite locations *no further on site mitigation is proposed and, at this stage no precise detail for off site mitigation has been defined.*

## 12.0 ADDITIONAL STUDY WORK

- 12.1 The ES covers a large 20 km study area and is naturally given to representative statements drawn from a relatively small number of sample viewpoints. As the majority of landscape impacts are also heavily influenced by any change to the visual amenity a full exploration of changes to this visual amenity is critical to a full understanding of the overall landscape and visual impacts.
- 12.2 Prior to the submission of the ES as part of the planning application Amey Cespa had provided a series of views and view points for consultation from an area principally within 5 km of the application site. This additional work is alluded to in the ES and the explanation given is that the study included visits and photography of a larger magnitude than was ultimately presented in the completed ES and that the resultant final views are representative of the range of receptors across the study area.
- 12.3 Although the document correctly identifies that all of the potential receptors identified within the ZVI cannot be surveyed as part of an ES the final submission states that the chosen approach is representative of key views, landscape and townscapes. We seek to test the validity of this by exploring other potential key view points within 5 km of the application site but not included within the ES.
- 12.4 This section of the report will seek to consider a number of different elements which may have a bearing on the conclusions presented in the ES for landscape and visual impacts, they are:
- Whether the views chosen are truly representative of the visual amenity of the study area, particularly that within 5 km of the application site;
  - Whether there are other view points from Amey Cespa or our own site work which might be considered as representative of locations, communities or receptors which did not make the final edit of the ES document;

- Whether as a consequence of this the landscape and townscape assessment does not fully take on board visual impacts which in turn affect the landscape and townscape impacts; and
- Whether the assignment of sensitivity and change is done consistently following a reasoned methodology.

### **13.0 VISUAL AMENITY AND VISUAL EFFECTS**

#### **Amey Cespa Views (Figures 13.0 & 14.0, appendix B)**

- 13.1 Views Within 5 km of the application site which were assessed within the ES site are shown in table7 Appendix A. Amey Cespa also used additional photomontage information for consultation purposes prior to the ES submission which did not make the final edit of the assessment, views within this group considered not to be replicated through other included viewpoints are listed in Table 8 of appendix A.
- 13.2 Both tables indicate the impacts assigned within the ES and gives an assessment using the ES methodology of those views which were not included. Notes are included which discuss any difference or consideration which we have felt is relevant to the final stated impacts.

#### **Additional TPM viewpoints (Figures 6.0 - 12.0, appendix B)**

- 13.3 In studying the above range of views a number of areas appeared under represented when considering the conclusions which have been drawn from these within the ES. Impacts for landscape, townscape and visual amenity are all wholly or heavily influenced by the visual impacts which would occur as a result of the AWRP and so a thorough understanding of this is essential in determining landscape and visual impacts. Of particular concern were:
1. Views from Coneythorpe and Clareton are only represented in the EA through a view taken from the road and given a medium sensitivity. Visiting the site it is clear that views from within both settlements, residential properties and from public footpaths will be possible. Coneythorpe is included within the townscape character study of the ES (appendix 4D)
  2. No views from Flaxby are considered although views of the development will be possible from the road and footpath network which surround the village. Flaxby is not included within the townscape character study of the ES.
  3. No views are considered from Flaxby Golf course although a view from this was used by Amey Cespa at consultation. The impact on amenities of the Golf Course are not considered directly within the ES.
  4. A limited number of views are taken from the extensive public footpath network both to the east and west of the A1. It appears likely that almost all of the footpaths within at least 3 km of the site will be visually affected by the proposed AWRP but that this is not represented in the ES through the chosen view points.
  5. The selected view from Goldsborough is not representative and a large number of other locations where the proposed AWRP will be visible throughout the village and the public footpath network have not been considered within the ES. Goldsborough is included within the townscape character study.

13.4 To understand what impact may be attributable to these areas where we consider the ES has not thoroughly explored, a series of site visits and photographs were undertaken from locations which are directly representative of the above areas of concern. These are listed in table 2 below as proposed additional views for study:

TABLE 2

TPM View	Location	Notes
1	Footpath to the rear of Coneythorpe <i>(Fig 6.0, appendix B)</i>	The existing view is a pleasant rural scene where the A1M is in cutting and not visible. The footpath runs directly in front of the viewer towards the Mill Hill woodland copse. The village of Coneythorpe is directly behind the camera with rear gardens and windows likely to experience a similar view.
2	Footpath from Clareton-Flaxby <i>(Fig 7.0, appendix B)</i>	The existing view is dominated by the woodland grouping of Mill Hill with the golf course visible to the right. Allerton Castle and the Temple of Victory are easily identifiable on the horizon and signage from the A1M can also be made out rising above the road cutting.
3	Footpath <i>(Fig 8.0, appendix B)</i>	The view includes elements of the A1M with signage and larger vehicles rising out of the cutting visible. It is not dominated by the road and remains a rural view with hedgerows and woodland blocks creating much of the character. The Temple of Victory is visible on the horizon adding to the parkland appearance.
4	Footpath Knaresborough Round-Flaxby <i>(Fig 9.0, appendix B)</i>	The view, to the north of the village is taken from the footpath but is representative of views from the rear of properties within the village. The A1M is not visible but the landscape appears classically parkland in appearance with the Temple of Victory dominating the horizon. The golf course and woodland blocks complete the view.
5	Goldsborough <i>(Fig 10.0, appendix B)</i>	The view is taken from the edge of the village very close to the location of view 6 in the ES. Allerton Castle and the Temple of Victory are clearly visible on the horizon giving a parkland element to this essentially rural view.
6	Footpath Goldsborough <i>(Fig 11.0, appendix B)</i>	The view is taken from the north of the village on a footpath which links the cemetery to Goldsborough Hall. Allerton Castle and the Temple of Victory are clearly visible on the horizon giving a parkland element to this essentially rural view.
7	Goldsborough <i>(Fig 12.0, appendix B)</i>	The view is taken from the western edge of the village overlooking the cricket green and from a public footpath. The Temple of Victory is visible on the horizon.

13.5 A collection of views including those within the ES, those previously used by Amey Cespa for consultation and those selected by ourselves are presented in this report as a more thorough and representative collection of viewpoints from which an understanding can be gained as to the true nature of visual impacts which will result from the construction of the AWRP.

## Visual Assessment

13.6 A process of assessment and re-assessment was carried out for each of these views, the details of which are included in tables 7-9 of appendix A. A summary of these viewpoints and the visual impacts which will occur as a result of the AWRP is produced in table 3 below:

13.7 Statements of significance of effect not attributable to the ES documents are highlighted in italics.

TABLE 3

VISUAL EFFECTS			Statement of Significance
Viewpoint	Location	Original source	Visual Impact –Operational Daytime
View 1	Staveley	ES	Neutral
View 2	Footpath, Ferrensby	ES	<i>Large</i>
View 3	Arkendale	ES	<i>Large</i>
View 4	Lidget Lane	ES	<i>Large</i>
View 6	Goldsborough	ES	<i>Moderate-Large</i>
View 7	A59 layby	ES	<i>Moderate Large</i>
View 8	Lylands Farm	ES	<i>Moderate-Large</i>
View 9	Walls Close House	ES	Moderate-Large
View 10	Allerton Quarry	ES	Moderate-large
View 11	Ninevah Farm	ES	Large
View 12	A1 Overbridge	ES	Slight adverse
View 13	Minskip	ES	Slight adverse
View 14	Marton cum Grafton	ES	Moderate-Large
View 15	Great Ouseburn	ES	Slight-Moderate
View 16	Whixley	ES	Slight-Moderate
View 25	Sleeper Farm	ES	Moderate-Large
View 26	A59 Overbridge	ES	
View 27	A59 east	ES	<i>Moderate-Large</i>
View 28	Allerton Park- Temple of victory	ES	<i>Large</i>
View 29	Allerton Park	ES	<i>Large</i>

View 30 and 31	Allerton Castle	ES	<i>Large</i>
A	Clareton Lane	Amey Cespa consultation issue	<i>Large</i>
B	Flaxby Golf Course	Amey Cespa consultation issue	<i>Large</i>
TPM 1	Footpath to the rear of Coneythorpe	TPM additional view	<i>Large</i>
TPM 2	Footpath from Clareton-Flaxby	TPM additional view	<i>Large</i>
TPM 3	Footpath	TPM additional view	<i>Large</i>
TPM 4	Footpath Knaresborough Round-Flaxby	TPM additional view	<i>Large</i>
TPM 5	Goldsborough	TPM additional view	<i>Moderate-Large</i>
TPM 6	Footpath Goldsborough	TPM additional view	<i>Moderate-Large</i>
TPM 7	Goldsborough	TPM additional view	<i>Moderate-Large</i>

### **SUMMARY –Visual Effects**

- 13.8 View 1-4 have been re-assessed as likely to experience a higher level of visual impacts than indicated within the ES. This is principally due to a disagreement regarding the level of magnitude of change.
- 13.9 View 6 within the ES is reviewed under view TPM 5 of the additional views.
- 13.10 View 7 and 8 have been re-assessed as likely to experience a higher level of visual impacts than indicated within the ES. The reason for this is due to a disagreement regarding the level of magnitude of change to the views.
- 13.11 View 10 will continue to experience significant effects up to 15 years from the operational start of the project.
- 13.12 Views 13,14 and 25 have been re-assessed as likely to experience a higher level of visual impacts than indicated within the ES. The reason for this is again due to a disagreement regarding the level of magnitude of change to the views.
- 13.13 A further 13 views were assessed as additional to what appears within the submitted ES. All of these views were selected by either Amey Cespa or TPM because of their ability to represent a location or receptor which is not repeated elsewhere in the study. All of these

13 views were assessed as experiencing significant adverse effects as a result of the proposed AWRP facility.

- 13.14 Following the re-evaluation of visual effects 23 of the 39 views considered within a 5 km study area returned visual impacts which can be considered significant and adverse.
- 13.15 Significant visual impacts are pervasive within this 5 km radius of the application site and can be found across all the represented receptor groups. Footpaths and settlements within 3.5km distance to the site will be particularly affected with the AWRP appearing dominant, out of character with the rural setting and a strong detracting element.
- 13.16 The setting of the Allerton Park estate within the wider landscape will be harmed through the introduction of a large and prominent industrial feature alongside a well established set of historic landmarks which identify the skyline for the whole 5 km study area. The identification of the landscape outwith the modern estate boundaries as being part of the original estate through visual connections, landscape features and woodland copses will be substantially harmed.

#### **14.0 LANDSCAPE AND TOWNSCAPE CHARACTER AND EFFECTS**

- 14.1 The ES identifies both landscape and townscape character areas over the whole 20 km study area. This study focuses on those landscape and townscape areas which fall within 5 km of the application site as we consider that it is within this area that significant landscape effects are likely to occur. As with the visual analysis an investigation as to how the ES conclusions have been arrived at for each of the included areas has been carried out and an explanation of this is reproduced in appendix A table 10 and 11. Suggested additional areas of study are listed in table 12 and a re-evaluation of landscape impacts in the light of the visual study result (above table 3) is carried out in Appendix A.

#### **15.0 ADDITIONAL AREAS OF STUDY**

- 15.1 The ES and Landscape and Visual Assessment do not consider the settlement of Flaxby within the Townscape study. This would appear to be an omission worthy of correction and so we have assessed this along the lines of the other 13 townscapes listed within the ES documents.

TABLE 4

Townscape Character Area	Location	Sensitivity (TPM)	Notes
TCA14	Flaxby	medium	The village of Flaxby is located approximately 2km from the proposed AWRP and south of Coneythorpe. It is a small compact hamlet of traditional vernacular buildings, attractive in appearance and centred around the road. It does not have conservation area status.

A summary of the findings for the re-evaluation of Landscape Character areas are included in table 5 below:

Statements of significance of effect not attributable to the ES documents are highlighted in italics

TABLE 5

Landscape Effects			Statement of Significance
Ref	Location	Original source	Landscape Impact – Operational Daytime
LCA 14(HBC CA 67)	Goldsborough and Ribston Park	ES	Slight adverse
LCA 15(HBC CA 68)	Hunsingore and Hooperton Wooded Farmland	ES	Slight adverse
LCA 16(HBC CA 69)	East Knaresborough Arable Farmland	ES	<i>Moderate-Large adverse</i>
LCA 30(HBC CA 90)	Marton cum Grafton	ES	Slight adverse
LCA 31(HBC CA 91)	Marton Rolling Arable Farmland	ES	<i>Moderate –Large adverse</i>
LCA 32(HBC CA 92)	Ouseburn Village and Vale Farmland	ES	Slight adverse
LCA 36(HBC CA 95)	Whixley Arable Farmland	ES	Slight adverse
LCA 37	Allerton Park	ES	<i>Moderate-Large adverse</i>

A summary of the findings for the re-evaluation of Townscape areas are listed in table 6 below:

Statements of significance of effect not attributable to the ES documents are highlighted in italics

TABLE 6

Townscape Effects			Statement of Significance
Ref	Location	Original source	Landscape Impact – Operational Daytime
TCA3	Knaresborough East	ES	Neutral
TCA4	Staveley	ES	Neutral
TCA5	Minskip	ES	neutral
TCA6	Boroughbridge	ES	Neutral
TCA7	Marton cum Grafton	ES	Slight adverse
TCA8	Arkendale	ES	Slight adverse
TCA9	Coneythorpe	ES	<i>Moderate-Large</i>
TCA10	Goldsborough	ES	<i>Slight-Moderate</i>
TCA11	Whixley	ES	Neutral-slight adverse

TCA 12	Little Ouseburn	ES	neutral
TCA 13	Great Ouseburn	ES	Slight adverse
TCA 14	Flaxby	TPM additional	<i>Slight adverse</i>

## 16.0 SUMMARY – Landscape and Townscape effects

- 16.1 The effect of re-evaluating the visual impacts of the proposed AWRP on the landscape and townscape character areas as defined within the ES documents is that, within a 5 km study area, a number of alterations to the potential impacts are recorded.
- 16.2 The character area of East Knaresborough Arable Farmland (LCA 16(HBC CA 69)) changes from an impact of Moderate adverse to Moderate- Large adverse. This is principally due to the consideration of what appears to be a much larger extent of visual impact over this area than is described within the ES combined with a specific sensitivity to this type of development as noted within the published landscape character descriptions (notes not included within the ES summary for this landscape character area).  
The character area of Marton Rolling Arable Farmland (LCA 31(HBC CA 91)) changes from an impact of Moderate adverse to Moderate-Large adverse. This is a direct result of the re-evaluation of the sensitivity of the landscape led by the clear and specific notes within the landscape character assessment for this area which suggest that this landscape would be particularly sensitive to this type of development.
- 16.3 Goldsborough and Flaxby both have increases noted to the assessed levels of impact as a result of the visual impacts within and around these settlements.

## 17.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 17.1 The proposed AWRP facility will have a significant and adverse impact on landscape and townscapes within the 5 km area of study with a pervasive and damaging effect most notable to the areas within 2-3 km of the application site.
- 17.2 The proposals will interfere from a number of locations with an existing appearance and character of the landscape which is rural but includes recognizable elements of a parkland landscape. The introduction of a large, incongruous and out of scale structure(s) will alter visual connections currently played out along the skyline of the Allerton Park Estate with the landmark features of Allerton Castle and the Temple of Victory becoming very much a secondary focus.
- 17.3 The landscape surrounding the proposed site is not a designated landscape but includes several conservation areas and a registered historic park and garden. A number of independent published landscape character descriptions, relied upon by the ES documentation in developing a baseline, outline clearly the special sensitivity of this landscape to large, visually intrusive development which might be considered out of character with the area. The AWRP is clearly all of these things within the landscape setting in question.

- 17.4 Local and National Planning Policy also offer a level of protection for the landscape and environment and a summary below is offered as to how the landscape and visual assessment within this study might be understood within the context of the development framework.

### **Local Planning Policy**

#### **Harrogate Borough Council Core Strategies Document 2009**

- 17.5 Policy EQ2: The Natural and Built Environment and Green Belt  
The AWRP will not protect the landscape character of the District and will fail to incorporate the required high quality, locally distinctive design.

#### **NY Waste Local Plan**

- 17.6 Policy 4/3 Landscape Protection  
The identification of significant visual and landscape effects as a result of the AWRP, and the fact that these cannot be mitigated over time clearly suggests that this Policy requirement is not met ie.

- There will be an unacceptable effect on the character and uniqueness of landscape and the proposals do not represent an enhancement to the local landscape character. It is also clear that the proposed facilities are not compatible with the local landscape in terms of their scale.

- 17.7 Policy 4/20 Open Space, Recreation and Public Rights of Way  
The significant visual impacts identified from public rights of way throughout a 5 km radius from the site suggests that the proposals do not meet the policy requirements ie.

- There will be an unacceptable impact on recreational amenity within the study area through impacts on views from footpaths and bridleways.

#### **Harrogate District Local Plan**

- 17.8 Policy HD7A Historic Parks and Gardens  
The impacts upon the Allerton Park estate do not comply with the policy requirements ie.

- The proposed AWRP will adversely affect the character and setting of Allerton Park through significant adverse landscape and visual effects.

- 17.9 Policy HD20

The proposed AWRP will not fully comply with this policy by virtue of its:

- adverse contribution to both the landscape and visual amenity within a radius of 5 km from the application site;
- disproportionate scale, proportions and height compared to neighbouring properties and the general landscape setting;
- significant adverse impact on the visual amenity within an area extending to 5km from the site.

- 17.10 Policy R11 Rights of Way

The proposed AWRP will adversely affect a large number of public footways and bridleways and some of these impacts will be significant as defined within the ES regulations. The development can be said to result in harm to both the character and recreational amenity associated with these rights of way and will not comply with policy.

17.11 Policy SG3 Settlement Growth

Due to the failure of the AWRP to comply with all of the above policy tests the proposed development should be described as inappropriate within the countryside setting and will also fail Policy SG3 as a result.