

PANNAL & BURN BRIDGE
NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
2021-2035

BASIC CONDITIONS STATEMENT

APPENDICES 1 TO 3

- APPENDIX 1: Sustainability Assessment**
- APPENDIX 2: Draft Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) Screening Report (April 2022)**
- APPENDIX 3: Historic England comments on Draft SEA and HRA Screening Report**

APPENDIX 1: Sustainability Assessment

PANNAL & BURN BRIDGE NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2021-2035
SUSTAINABILITY ASSESSMENT

PREPARED ON BEHALF OF
PANNAL & BURN BRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL



Prepared By:
Mike Dando BA (Hons) BPI
23 Victoria Avenue
Harrogate
HG1 5RD

Tel: 01423 525456
Email: m.dando@directionsplanning.co.uk

17th October 2022

THE BENCHMARK CRITERIA

These are the definitions, with illustrative examples, of the criteria that have been used in order to assess/benchmark the impact of each policy, representing the environmental, social and economic dimensions of sustainability:-

Biodiversity – wildlife sites, habitats, features plus geological sites and features. Also strategic wildlife value, i.e. green and blue infrastructure.

Landscape – character, views, attractiveness. Taking account of Special Landscape Areas and conservation areas.

Heritage – conservation area, listed buildings, positive buildings, non-designated heritage assets, archaeological interest.

Natural Resources – covering air, water and soil quality/pollution.

Movement – traffic levels/congestion/flow, public transport, cycling, walking and accessibility to facilities.

Open Spaces – spaces available for outdoor recreation and leisure.

Community – health, education, social, cultural and indoor leisure and recreation facilities.

Housing Provision – housing levels.

Safety/Security – e.g. in relation to crime, traffic, health/safety.

Social Inclusion – inclusion/exclusion, equality/inequality. Taking account of poorer and disadvantaged members of society, e.g. older people, the very young, non-car owners.

Businesses – local businesses, business/industrial sectors more generally.

Jobs/Training – levels of and opportunities for.

THE SCORING OF IMPACTS

significant positive impact = ++

some positive benefit = +

no overall impact or not applicable = 0

some negative impact = -

significant negative effects = --

uncertain as to benefits/effects/impact = ?

POLICY GNE1: GREEN & BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE		
BENCHMARK CRITERION	IMPACT	EXPLANATION
Biodiversity	+	The wildlife corridor function of green infrastructure should be both protected and enhanced through the policy's operation.
Landscape	+	The amenity function of green infrastructure should be both protected and enhanced through the policy's operation.
Heritage	0	While there is heritage interest within and/or close to identified GBI, there is unlikely to be any noticeable positive or negative overall impact on that interest.
Natural Resources	0	While the Crimple Beck/River Crimple and minor tributaries are features of identified GBI, there is unlikely to be any noticeable positive or negative overall impact on those water resources.
Movement	+	The proposed PROW improvements highlighted elsewhere in the NDP represent specific proposed movement enhancements within GBI, and constitute a likely measurable positive impact.
Open Spaces	+	The recreational corridor function of green infrastructure should be both protected and enhanced through the policy's operation.
Community	0	No likely overall impact.
Housing Provision	0	No likely overall impact.
Safety/Security	0	No likely overall impact.
Social Inclusion	+	The recreational corridor function of green infrastructure should be both protected and enhanced through the policy's operation, maintaining/improving the opportunities for all to enjoy the many benefits of outdoor recreation.
Businesses	0	No likely overall impact.
Jobs/Training	0	No likely overall impact.

POLICY GNE2: CRIMPLE VALLEY SPECIAL LANDSCAPE AREA		
BENCHMARK CRITERION	IMPACT	EXPLANATION
Biodiversity	+	By working to prevent serious harm to landscape character and special features, many of which contribute positively to biodiversity, there should be little or no overall impact. By also urging a positive contribution to landscape restoration or enhancement, there may in fact be some positive benefits.
Landscape	+	By working to prevent serious harm to landscape character and special features, there should be little or no overall impact. By also urging a positive contribution to landscape restoration or enhancement, there may in fact be some positive benefits.
Heritage	+?	By working to prevent serious harm to landscape character and special features, some of which (i.e. field patterns of early enclosure, traditional buildings and their setting) contribute positively to local heritage, there should be little or no overall impact. By also urging a positive contribution to landscape restoration or enhancement, there may in fact be some positive benefits, although the effects are uncertain.
Natural Resources	0	By working to prevent serious harm to landscape character and special features, some of which (i.e. valley watercourses) constitute valuable local natural resources, there should be little or no overall impact. By also urging a positive contribution to landscape restoration or enhancement, there may in fact be some positive benefits, although the effects on for example water quality/pollution levels are uncertain.
Movement	0	No likely overall impact.
Open Spaces	0	By working to prevent serious harm to landscape character and special features, many of which contribute positively to the quality of open spaces available for outdoor leisure/recreation, there should be little or no overall impact. By also urging a positive contribution to landscape restoration or enhancement, there may in fact be some positive benefits to the quality of such spaces, although the effects are uncertain.
Community	0	No likely overall impact.
Housing Provision	0	No likely overall impact.
Safety/Security	0	No likely overall impact – not applicable.
Social Inclusion	0	No likely overall impact.
Businesses	0	Could be considered as placing restrictions on existing rural businesses wishing to develop within these special landscapes. On the other hand, could be argued that development in accordance with policy provisions will lead to a high quality development beneficial to the business and attractive to its clients.
Jobs/Training	0	No likely overall impact.

POLICY GNE3: LOCAL GREEN SPACE PROTECTION		
BENCHMARK CRITERION	IMPACT	EXPLANATION
Biodiversity	++	Designates and so bestows effective Green Belt protection to a number of sites with local and or infrastructure/habitat network value for biodiversity, so making a positive contribution.
Landscape	++	Designates and so bestows effective Green Belt protection to a number of sites with acknowledged landscape value (e.g. within the NA's conservation areas and green infrastructure), so making a positive contribution.
Heritage	++	Designates and so bestows effective Green Belt protection to a number of sites with acknowledged heritage value (e.g. within the NA's conservation areas), so making a positive contribution.
Natural Resources	0	No likely overall impact.
Movement	0	No likely overall impact.
Open Spaces	++	Designates and so bestows effective Green Belt protection to a number of sites with local and or infrastructure value for open space recreation, so making a positive contribution.
Community	0	No likely overall impact.
Housing Provision	0	No likely overall impact.
Safety/Security	0	No likely overall impact.
Social Inclusion	+	The recreational function of a number of open spaces will be protected through the policy's operation, maintaining/improving the opportunities for all freely to enjoy the many benefits of outdoor recreation.
Businesses	+/-?	The designation may have implications for some of the sites in private ownership/with commercial interests in terms of restrictions on future development. Conversely, owners may welcome the protected open space use which the designation confers.
Jobs/Training	0	No likely overall impact.

POLICY GNE4: GREEN SPACE ENHANCEMENT		
BENCHMARK CRITERION	IMPACT	EXPLANATION
Biodiversity	0	Enhancement could result in biodiversity benefits but impossible to be certain at time of assessment.
Landscape	0	Enhancement could result in landscape benefits but impossible to be certain at time of assessment.
Heritage	0	Enhancement could result in heritage benefits but impossible to be certain at time of assessment.
Natural Resources	0	Enhancement could result in natural resource benefits, e.g. to soil or water but impossible to be certain at time of assessment.
Movement	0	Enhancement could result in accessibility benefits but impossible to be certain at time of assessment.
Open Spaces	++	Enhancement very likely to result in open space benefits.
Community	0	No likely overall impact.
Housing Provision	0	No likely overall impact.
Safety/Security	0	Enhancement could result in safety/security benefits but impossible to be certain at time of assessment.
Social Inclusion	0	Enhancement could result in social inclusion benefits (e.g. greater access to sites for all where current access limited or prevented) but impossible to be certain at time of assessment.
Businesses	0	Enhancement could result in benefits for private owners but impossible to be certain at time of assessment. Owners unlikely to agree to enhancements that would impact negatively on their interests.
Jobs/Training	0	Enhancement could have implications for jobs/training but impossible to be certain at time of assessment.

POLICY GNE5: PROVISION OF NEW OPEN SPACE		
BENCHMARK CRITERION	IMPACT	EXPLANATION
Biodiversity	0	New open space provision of the type supported by the policy is unlikely to result in biodiversity benefits.
Landscape	0	New open space provision of the type supported by the policy is unlikely to result in landscape benefits.
Heritage	0	No likely overall impact.
Natural Resources	+?	New open space provision of allotments could result in soil, water and air benefits but impossible to be certain at time of assessment.
Movement	+?	New open space provision could result in accessibility benefits, but impossible to be certain at time of assessment.
Open Spaces	++	Policy is very likely to result in open space benefits.
Community	+?	There is a possible associative positive relationship between new outdoor sports provision and indoor community facilities, in that the new space may enclose/include the facilities as well as having a symbiotic functional relationship with them. As such, there may be some positive overall impact regarding indoor community facilities in terms of new provision but impossible to be certain at time of assessment.
Housing Provision	0	No likely overall impact
Safety/Security	+?	New open space provision could result in safety/security benefits but impossible to be certain at time of assessment.
Social Inclusion	+	New open space provision likely to result in social inclusion benefits (e.g. access to open space for more people where previously limited or no access).
Businesses	+?	New open space provision could have positive implications for local businesses i.e. more work, but impossible to be certain at time of assessment.
Jobs/Training	+?	New open space provision could have implications for jobs/training but impossible to be certain at time of assessment.

POLICY GNE6: LAND AT ALMSFORD BRIDGE		
BENCHMARK CRITERION	IMPACT	EXPLANATION
Biodiversity	++	New open space provision as proposed by the policy is very likely to result in biodiversity benefits.
Landscape	+	New open space provision as proposed by the policy is likely to result in landscape benefits.
Heritage	0	New open space provision as proposed by the policy is unlikely to result in heritage benefits.
Natural Resources	0	No likely overall impact.
Movement	++	New open space provision as proposed by the policy could result in movement benefits, in terms of new footpath, bridleway and cycle paths linked into the existing PROW network.
Open Spaces	++	Policy is very likely to result in open space benefits.
Community	0	No likely overall impact.
Housing Provision	0	No likely overall impact.
Safety/Security	0	No likely overall impact.
Social Inclusion	+	New open space provision likely to result in social inclusion benefits (e.g. access to open space for more people where previously limited or no access).
Businesses	+	New open space provision could have positive implications for local businesses i.e. more work, but impossible to be certain at time of assessment.
Jobs/Training	+	New open space provision could have implications for jobs/training but impossible to be certain at time of assessment.

POLICY GNE7: DEVELOPMENT AND TREES		
BENCHMARK CRITERION	IMPACT	EXPLANATION
Biodiversity	+	Policy will have a positive impact on tree cover in the Neighbourhood Area area and is likely to make a related positive contribution to biodiversity.
Landscape	++	Policy will have a very positive impact on tree cover in the Neighbourhood Area.
Heritage	+	In working to enhance the public realm, policy may have some positive impact on the setting of heritage assets, e.g. the conservation area, although impossible to say with certainty.
Natural Resources	++	In working to combat climate change and create high quality healthy living environments, the policy is very likely to benefit air and soil resources and may also have benefits to local water resources.
Movement	0	No likely overall impact.
Open Spaces	0	No likely overall impact.
Community	0	No likely overall impact.
Housing Provision	0	No likely overall impact.
Safety/Security	0	No likely overall impact.
Social Inclusion	0	No likely overall impact.
Businesses	0	No likely overall impact.
Jobs/Training	0	No likely overall impact.

POLICY BE1: PANNAL CONSERVATION AREA - DEVELOPMENT AND DESIGN		
BENCHMARK CRITERION	IMPACT	EXPLANATION
Biodiversity	+?	By working to retain the form and character of the conservation area's becks, there may be some positive impact on biodiversity.
Landscape	+	Policy is likely to have a positive impact on townscape within the conservation area.
Heritage	++	Design and development respecting key architectural and historic features within the conservation area very likely to have positive heritage impacts.
Natural Resources	0	No likely overall impact.
Movement	0	No likely overall impact.
Open Spaces	0	No likely overall impact.
Community	-?	Some possible negative impact on the ability of community facilities housed in conservation area buildings to adapt in order to continue to/better provide facilities/services.
Housing Provision	0	No overall likely impact.
Safety/Security	0	No overall likely impact.
Social Inclusion	0	No overall likely impact.
Businesses	-?	Some possible negative impact on the ability of businesses housed in conservation area buildings to adapt in order to maintain/improve their commercial operations.
Jobs/Training	-?	Possible negative impacts on businesses/community facilities may have possible knock-on effects on job/training opportunities.

POLICY BE2: LOCAL HERITAGE AREAS		
BENCHMARK CRITERION	IMPACT	EXPLANATION
Biodiversity	+?	This policy defines 4 local heritage areas and by doing so represents the basis for the Local Heritage Area Design and Development policy (BE3), the implementation of which could lead to some biodiversity benefits, e.g. provision of native species hedgerows and in relation to large gardens/grounds and wooded areas. This policy also encourages sympathetic enhancement to local heritage areas which could lead to positive impacts in relation to green space, trees and hedges that would benefit wildlife.
Landscape	+?	This policy defines 4 local heritage areas and by doing so represents the basis for the Local Heritage Area Design and Development policy (BE3), the implementation of which could lead to some general landscape benefits (e.g. in relation to views/vistas, green space, large gardens/grounds and wooded areas). This policy also encourages sympathetic enhancement to local heritage areas which could lead to positive landscape impacts.
Heritage	++	This policy defines 4 local heritage areas and by doing so represents the basis for Local Heritage Area Design and Development policy (BE3), the implementation of which is very likely to lead to the conservation of heritage features in the defined areas. This policy also encourages sympathetic enhancement to local heritage areas which could lead to further positive heritage impacts.
Natural Resources	0	No likely overall impact
Movement	+?	This policy defines 4 local heritage areas and by doing so represents the basis for Local Heritage Area Design and Development policy (BE3), the implementation of which could in some cases lead to positive movement impacts (e.g. maintaining/enhancing pedestrian permeability). This policy also encourages sympathetic enhancement to local heritage areas which could lead to further positive movement impacts.
Open Spaces	+?	This policy defines 4 local heritage areas and by doing so represents the basis for Local Heritage Area Design and Development policy (BE3), the implementation of which could lead to some general open space benefits. This policy also encourages sympathetic enhancement to local heritage areas which could lead to positive open space impacts in relation to green space, large gardens/grounds and wooded areas.
Community	-?	Some possible negative impact on the ability of community facilities housed in listed/key unlisted buildings and NDHA and maybe other local heritage area buildings to adapt in order to continue to/better provide facilities/services.
Housing Provision	0	No likely overall impact
Safety/Security	0	No likely overall impact
Social Inclusion	0	No likely overall impact
Businesses	-?	Some possible negative impact on the ability of businesses housed in listed/key unlisted buildings and NDHA and maybe other local heritage area buildings to adapt in order to maintain/improve their commercial operations.
Jobs/Training	-?	Possible negative impact on community facilities and businesses may possibly have negative effects on local jobs/training.

POLICY BE3: LOCAL HERITAGE AREAS – DEVELOPMENT AND DESIGN		
BENCHMARK CRITERION	IMPACT	EXPLANATION
Biodiversity	+?	Policy could lead to some biodiversity benefits, e.g. provision of native species hedgerows and in relation to large gardens/grounds and wooded areas.
Landscape	+?	Policy could lead to some general landscape benefits (e.g. in relation to views/vistas, green space, large gardens/grounds and wooded areas).
Heritage	++	Policy is very likely to lead to the conservation of heritage features in the defined areas.
Natural Resources	0	No likely overall impact
Movement	+?	Policy could in some cases lead to positive movement impacts (i.e. maintaining/enhancing pedestrian permeability).
Open Spaces	+?	Policy could lead to positive open space impacts in relation to green space, large gardens/grounds and wooded areas.
Community	-?	Some possible negative impact on the ability of community facilities housed in listed/key unlisted buildings and NDHA and maybe other local heritage area buildings to adapt in order to continue to/better provide facilities/services.
Housing Provision	0	No likely overall impact
Safety/Security	-?	Retention of cobbled surfaces may have some negative impacts on pedestrian safety, particularly older people and the disabled, e.g. possible slip/trip hazard.
Social Inclusion	-?	Retention of cobbled surfaces may have some negative impacts on the ability of older people, the disabled and mothers with prams to move around the affected areas.
Businesses	-?	Some possible negative impact on the ability of businesses housed in listed/key unlisted buildings and NDHA and maybe other local heritage area buildings to adapt in order to maintain/improve their commercial operations.
Jobs/Training	-?	Possible negative impact on community facilities and businesses may possibly have negative effects on local jobs/training.

POLICY BE4: PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF NON-DESIGNATED HERITAGE ASSETS		
BENCHMARK CRITERION	IMPACT	EXPLANATION
Biodiversity	0	No likely overall impact.
Landscape	0	No likely overall impact.
Heritage	++	Conservation and/or sympathetic enhancement of assets very likely to have positive impact on heritage assets.
Natural Resources	0	No likely overall impact.
Movement	0	No likely overall impact.
Open Spaces	0	No likely overall impact.
Community	+/-?	One of the assets is a local community facility. Possibility of either positive or negative impacts on the community facility value of those assets. Impossible to be certain either way at time of assessment.
Housing Provision	0	No likely overall impact.
Safety/Security	0	No likely overall impact.
Social Inclusion	0	No likely overall impact.
Businesses	0	No likely overall impact.
Jobs/Training	0	No likely overall impact.

POLICY BE5: VILLAGE CHARACTER AREAS – DEVELOPMENT AND DESIGN		
BENCHMARK CRITERION	IMPACT	EXPLANATION
Biodiversity	+?	Policy could lead to some biodiversity benefits, e.g. provision of native species hedgerow boundaries and new native tree planting.
Landscape	+	Policy should lead to both townscape (i.e. architectural design) and general landscape benefits (e.g. in relation to views/vistas, tree and hedgerow planting).
Heritage	0	No likely overall impact.
Natural Resources	0	No likely overall impact.
Movement	0	No likely overall impact.
Open Spaces	0	No likely overall impact.
Community	0	No likely overall impact.
Housing Provision	0	No likely overall impact.
Safety/Security	+?	Policy provisions for Rossett Green may have some positive impacts in relation to security against crime.
Social Inclusion	0	No likely overall impact.
Businesses	0	No likely overall impact.
Jobs/Training	0	No likely overall impact.

POLICY TTT1: IMPROVED WALKING, HORSE RIDING AND CYCLING PROVISION		
BENCHMARK CRITERION	IMPACT	EXPLANATION
Biodiversity	0	Improvement routes 2, 3 and 4 have the potential for minor impacts on local biodiversity within areas of Green & Blue Infrastructure (3, 4 & 5 e.g. the bridging of the River Crimple re 4 and in relation to verges/hedgerows re 5). Green & Blue Infrastructure policy GNE1 may serve to mitigate impacts in all cases.
Landscape	0	Improvement routes 1-4 fall within Green & Blue Infrastructure with some scope for minor landscape impacts. Any improvement works would however be subject to this plan's provisions in respect of infrastructure enhancement (Policy GNE1).
Heritage	-	Part of improvement route 3 falls within the conservation area, with some scope for minor heritage impacts.
Natural Resources	+	Policy seeks to improve public rights of way/cycling provision, reducing motorised vehicle, particularly private car, use as a result, with a possible positive impact on traffic congestion and local air quality.
Movement	+	Policy seeks to improve public rights of way/cycling provision, reducing motorised vehicle, particularly private car, use as a result, with a possible positive impact on traffic congestion.
Open Spaces	+	Improvement of the highlighted routes will have positive benefits in terms of spaces available for outdoor recreation and leisure.
Community	0	No likely overall impact.
Housing Provision	0	No likely overall impact.
Safety/Security	+	Policy seeks to improve public rights of way/cycling provision, reducing motorised vehicle, particularly private car, use as a result, with a possible positive impact on local air quality/health. Policy clauses re improving the user's experience of the networks specifically address cycle parking/storage facilities and designing-in of safety for all users.
Social Inclusion	+	Policy seeks to improve public rights of way/cycling provision impacting positively on non-car users such as older people, the disabled and young people and on poorer members of society.
Businesses	+?	If development to improve highlighted routes takes place, it could have positive implications for local businesses i.e. more work, but impossible to be certain at time of assessment.
Jobs/Training	+?	If development to improve highlighted routes takes place, it could have positive implications for jobs/training, but impossible to be certain at time of assessment.

POLICY TTT2: PANNAL STATION CAR PARK CAPACITY		
BENCHMARK CRITERION	IMPACT	EXPLANATION
Biodiversity	0	No likely overall impact.
Landscape	0	No likely overall impact.
Heritage	0	No likely overall impact.
Natural Resources	0	No likely overall impact.
Movement	++	Retention of station parking capacity reduces parking problems and resultant congestion in the surrounding streets. It also encourages use of the railway for commuting purposes. Policy provision in support of cycle parking/storage should also have a positive impact.
Open Spaces	0	No likely overall impact.
Community	0	No likely overall impact.
Housing Provision	0	No likely overall impact.
Safety/Security	+	Policy provision in support of cycle parking/storage should have a positive impact.
Social Inclusion	+	Policy provision in support of cycle parking/storage should have a positive impact in terms of encouraging a more affordable transport mode.
Businesses	0	No likely overall impact.
Jobs/Training	0	No likely overall impact.

POLICY TTT3: CAR PARKING STANDARDS FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT IN THE VICINITY OF PANNAL STATION AND PANNAL PRIMARY SCHOOL		
BENCHMARK CRITERION	IMPACT	EXPLANATION
Biodiversity	0	No likely overall impact.
Landscape	0	No likely overall impact.
Heritage	0	No likely overall impact.
Natural Resources	0	No likely overall impact.
Movement	++	Any additional car parking capacity over and above adopted standards, provided as a result of any development, would make a positive contribution to the management/use of the local highway network within the vicinity of the station and school by not precipitating further on-street car parking in an area with serious existing on-street parking/congestion issues.
Open Spaces	0	No likely overall impact.
Community	0	No likely overall impact.
Housing Provision	0	No likely overall impact.
Safety/Security	+	Any additional car parking capacity over and above adopted standards, provided as a result of any development, would make a positive contribution to the management/use of the local highway network within the vicinity of the station and school by not precipitating further on-street car parking in an area with serious existing on-street parking/congestion issues. This would result in increased road safety for both vehicle users and pedestrians and allow for unimpeded access by emergency vehicles as and when needed.
Social Inclusion	0	No likely overall impact.
Businesses	0	No likely overall impact.
Jobs/Training	0	No likely overall impact.

POLICY TTT4: PANNAL PARK AND STRIDE		
BENCHMARK CRITERION	IMPACT	EXPLANATION
Biodiversity	-?	The provision of a surfaced parking area plus a new footpath, including River Crimple footbridge (i.e. footpath improvement route 4), have the potential for minor impacts on local biodiversity, but policy makes it clear that proposals will be implemented in accordance with NP policies covering Green & Blue Infrastructure, Crimple Valley Special Landscape Area and trees, which should serve to adequately mitigate impacts.
Landscape	-?	The provision of a surfaced parking area plus a new footpath, including River Crimple footbridge (i.e. footpath improvement route 4), have the potential for minor impacts on the local landscape, but policy makes it clear that proposals will be implemented in accordance with NP policies covering Green & Blue Infrastructure, Crimple Valley Special Landscape Area, trees, Pannal Conservation Area and village character areas, which should serve to adequately mitigate impacts.
Heritage	-?	The provision of a surfaced parking area adjacent to the conservation area and the listed parish church has the potential for minor impacts on local heritage, but policy makes it clear that proposals will be implemented in accordance with NP policy covering Pannal Conservation Area, which should serve to adequately mitigate impacts.
Natural Resources	0	It is envisaged that the parking area will be surfaced using some sort of naturalist permeable material to minimise impacts on soils and drainage. No likely overall impact.
Movement	++	Provision of the park and stride facility is designed to reduce severe parking problems and resultant congestion in the streets surrounding the primary school. The new footpath/bridge will improve village pedestrian access to Pannal Community Park.
Open Spaces	0	No likely overall impact.
Community	0	No likely overall impact.
Housing Provision	0	No likely overall impact.
Safety/Security	+	The new footpath/bridge will provide a safer off-road pedestrian access route to Pannal Community Park.
Social Inclusion	+?	The new footpath/bridge represents improved access using a more affordable transport mode which may have social inclusion benefits.
Businesses	+?	Development of the park and stride area, plus path and bridge may provide work for local businesses.
Jobs/Training	+?	Any work for local businesses may have attendant positive impacts on jobs/training.

POLICY TTT5: ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING INFRASTRUCTURE		
BENCHMARK CRITERION	IMPACT	EXPLANATION
Biodiversity	0	No likely overall impact.
Landscape	0	No likely overall impact.
Heritage	0	No likely overall impact.
Natural Resources	+	Policy requires electric vehicle charging infrastructure provision to minimum standards in new development. The increased provision for electric vehicles will have likely positive impacts on electric vs petrol/diesel vehicle use, thereby positively impacting air quality and pollution levels across the Neighbourhood Area.
Movement	+?	Hoped for increased electric vehicle use and improved air quality as a result of policy may encourage greater levels of walking and cycle use.
Open Spaces	0	No likely overall impact.
Community	0	No likely overall impact.
Housing Provision	0	No likely overall impact.
Safety/Security	+?	Hoped for increased electric vehicle use and improved air quality as a result of policy may have knock-on health benefits.
Social Inclusion	+?	Hoped for increased electric vehicle use and improved air quality as a result of policy may encourage greater levels of walking and cycle use, to benefit of non-car users such as older people, the disabled and young people and on poorer members of society.
Businesses	+?	If development to install infrastructure takes place, it could have positive implications for local businesses i.e. more work, but impossible to be certain at time of assessment.
Jobs/Training	+?	If development to install infrastructure takes place, it could have positive implications for jobs/training, but impossible to be certain at time of assessment.

POLICY TTT6: HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT SCHEMES		
BENCHMARK CRITERION	IMPACT	EXPLANATION
Biodiversity	0	No likely overall impact.
Landscape	0	No likely overall impact.
Heritage	0	No likely overall impact.
Natural Resources	0	No likely overall impact.
Movement	++	Policy supports improvement schemes which would address congestion, speeding and pedestrian access problems within the Neighbourhood Area, so would have a definite positive impact on local movement.
Open Spaces	0	No likely overall impact.
Community	0	No likely overall impact.
Housing Provision	0	No likely overall impact.
Safety/Security	+	In reducing traffic speeds and providing a new pavement on a busy stretch of road, the policy will have a positive impact on the safety of road users.
Social Inclusion	+?	In providing a new pavement, the policy may facilitate increase walking, i.e. a more affordable transport mode.
Businesses	0	No likely overall impact.
Jobs/Training	0	No likely overall impact.

POLICY CFS1: PROTECTION & ENHANCEMENT OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES		
BENCHMARK CRITERION	IMPACT	EXPLANATION
Biodiversity	0	No likely overall impact.
Landscape	0	No likely overall impact.
Heritage	+/-?	Loss of any facilities provided by designated heritage buildings, e.g. Pannal Memorial Hall, Church of St Robert of Knaresborough, Pannal Methodist Church/Hall, leading to change of use/changes to buildings could conceivably have either positive or negative impacts on their heritage value but it is impossible to predict these at the time of the assessment.
Natural Resources	0	No likely overall impact.
Movement	0	No likely overall impact.
Open Spaces	0	No likely overall impact.
Community	++	Retention of and possible improvements to listed facilities will have a definite positive impact on community facilities.
Housing Provision	0	No likely overall impact.
Safety/Security	0	No likely overall impact.
Social Inclusion	++	Retention of and possible improvements to listed facilities which encourage the coming together of the community (i.e. all of the listed facilities) will have a definite positive impact on inclusiveness within the community.
Businesses	-	Restrictions placed by the policy upon commercially provided facilities (e.g. public house, post office/shop, dental clinic) may have some negative impact on the freedom of such businesses to for example change use and/or re-develop.
Jobs/Training	0	No likely overall impact.

POLICY CFS2: PROVISION OF NEW COMMUNITY FACILITIES		
BENCHMARK CRITERION	IMPACT	EXPLANATION
Biodiversity	0	No likely overall impact.
Landscape	0	No likely overall impact.
Heritage	0	No likely overall impact.
Natural Resources	0	No likely overall impact.
Movement	0	No likely overall impact.
Open Spaces	0	No likely overall impact.
Community	++	Any provision of new community facilities meeting demonstrable need will have a definite positive impact on community facilities.
Housing Provision	0	No likely overall impact.
Safety/Security	0	No likely overall impact.
Social Inclusion	++	Provision of new community facilities which encourage the coming together of the community will have a definite positive impact on inclusiveness within the community.
Businesses	+	Provision of any new commercially-run community facilities would make a positive contribution to the NA's business base.
Jobs/Training	+?	Provision of any new commercially-run community facilities could result in more jobs and/or training opportunities within the NA.

POLICY CFS3: EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES FOR PANNAL PRIMARY SCHOOL		
BENCHMARK CRITERION	IMPACT	EXPLANATION
Biodiversity	+	Policy provisions regarding tree/hedgerow retention, compensatory tree/hedgerow planting and new buffer planting is likely to have a positive impact.
Landscape	+	Policy provisions regarding tree/hedgerow retention, compensatory tree/hedgerow planting and new buffer planting is likely to have a positive impact.
Heritage	0	No likely overall impact.
Natural Resources	+?	Policy provision re electronic vehicle charging infrastructure in new parking areas may have a small positive local impact on air quality.
Movement	+	Policy provisions regarding cycle parking and storage facilities is likely to have a positive impact.
Open Spaces	0	No likely overall impact.
Community	0	No likely overall impact.
Housing Provision	0	No likely overall impact.
Safety/Security	0	No likely overall impact.
Social Inclusion	+?	Policy provisions regarding cycle parking and storage facilities may have some positive impact on the use of a more affordable transport mode.
Businesses	0	No likely overall impact.
Jobs/Training	0	No likely overall impact.

POLICY H1: SMALL SCALE AND INFILL HOUSING DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE DEVELOPMENT LIMIT		
BENCHMARK CRITERION	IMPACT	EXPLANATION
Biodiversity	0	Compliance with the policy's design requirements should mitigate any impacts there may be on receptor sites. No overall impact likely.
Landscape	0	Compliance with the policy's design requirements should mitigate any impacts there may be on receptor sites. No overall impact likely.
Heritage	0	Compliance with the policy's design requirements should mitigate any impacts there may be on receptor sites. No overall impact likely.
Natural Resources	-?	Any development could have negative impacts on local air, water or soil resources, but it is impossible to be certain without knowledge of the receptor sites.
Movement	-	Even small scale development is likely to have some negative impacts on local movement in terms of increased vehicular traffic.
Open Spaces	0	No likely overall impact.
Community	0	No likely overall impact.
Housing Provision	+	Policy is likely to have a positive impact.
Safety/Security	0	No likely overall impact.
Social Inclusion	0	No likely overall impact.
Businesses	+?	Small scale/infill housing development may benefit local building/building supply businesses.
Jobs/Training	+?	Benefit to local building/building supply businesses may bring attendant positive impacts on jobs and training.

POLICY H2: DEVELOPMENT OUTSIDE THE DEVELOPMENT LIMIT		
BENCHMARK CRITERION	IMPACT	EXPLANATION
Biodiversity	-?	Could have some negative impact on biodiversity depending on the biodiversity value of any proposed receptor site.
Landscape	-?	Could have some negative impact on landscape depending on the landscape value of any proposed receptor site.
Heritage	-?	Could have some negative impact on heritage depending on the heritage value of any proposed receptor site or of buildings/the area in its setting.
Natural Resources	+/-?	Development is likely to have at least some impact on air, water and soil resources. Without information on the land to be developed, it is impossible to predict whether positive or negative at time of assessment.
Movement	0	Policy should work to balance any development impacts against highway capacity. As such no likely overall impact.
Open Spaces	-?	Could have some negative impact on open spaces depending on the open space value of any proposed receptor site for leisure/recreation.
Community	+?	Could result in new school, health, local service provision to meet need generated by new development resulting in some overall positive impact.
Housing Provision	++	Development will have a positive impact on local housing numbers.
Safety/Security	0	No likely overall impact.
Social Inclusion	+	Availability of school and patient places will have some positive impact on social inclusion and equality.
Businesses	++	Development is likely to have a positive impact on the housebuilding industry.
Jobs/Training	+	Development is likely to have some positive impact on jobs and training.

POLICY H3: HOUSING MIX		
BENCHMARK CRITERION	IMPACT	EXPLANATION
Biodiversity	0	No likely overall impact.
Landscape	0	No likely overall impact.
Heritage	0	No likely overall impact.
Natural Resources	0	No likely overall impact.
Movement	0	No likely overall impact.
Open Spaces	0	No likely overall impact.
Community	0	No likely overall impact.
Housing Provision	++	Development will have a positive impact on the provision of the types of housing required by the NA community.
Safety/Security	+	Development may possibly lead to safer, more secure accommodation for the older community, i.e. accessible housing.
Social Inclusion	+	A housing mix which meets the needs of smaller households (e.g. starter homes) and of the older community is likely to have some positive impact on social inclusion and equality.
Businesses	0	No likely overall impact.
Jobs/Training	0	No likely overall impact.

POLICY ED1: PROTECTION OF EXISTING EMPLOYMENT SITES		
BENCHMARK CRITERION	IMPACT	EXPLANATION
Biodiversity	0	No likely overall impact.
Landscape	0	No likely overall impact.
Heritage	0	No likely overall impact.
Natural Resources	0	No likely overall impact.
Movement	0	No likely overall impact.
Open Spaces	0	No likely overall impact.
Community	0	No likely overall impact.
Housing Provision	0	No likely overall impact.
Safety/Security	0	No likely overall impact.
Social Inclusion	+	Keeping jobs local may have some positive benefits for local people in terms of ease/low cost of travel to work for the poorer paid.
Businesses	++	Policy is very likely to have positive effects on businesses by protecting businesses uses on identified sites.
Jobs/Training	+	By protecting businesses uses on identified sites, there is likely to be an attendant positive impact on jobs/training.

POLICY ED2: EMPLOYMENT SITE SOUTH OF ALMSFORD BRIDGE – DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS		
BENCHMARK CRITERION	IMPACT	EXPLANATION
Biodiversity	+?	Policy provision regarding new boundary planting may have a positive impact, depending on species used.
Landscape	+	Policy provisions regarding new boundary planting, retention of key views and requirement for a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment are likely to have a positive impact on landscape.
Heritage	0	No likely overall impact.
Natural Resources	+?	Policy provision re electronic vehicle charging infrastructure in new parking areas may have a small positive local impact on air quality.
Movement	++	Policy provisions regarding a required transport assessment, a pedestrian/cycle crossing, cycle parking and storage facilities and a bus shelter are very likely to have positive impacts, in terms of sustainable transport usage and traffic management.
Open Spaces	0	No likely overall impact.
Community	0	No likely overall impact.
Housing Provision	0	No likely overall impact.
Safety/Security	+	Policy provision regarding a pedestrian/cycle crossing is likely to have a positive impact in terms of highway safety. Electronic vehicle charging infrastructure provision may have a small local impact on air quality/health.
Social Inclusion	+?	Policy provisions regarding cycle parking/storage facilities and bus shelter may have some positive impact on those using more affordable transport modes.
Businesses	0	No likely overall impact.
Jobs/Training	0	No likely overall impact.

SUMMARY ANALYSIS

Summary Impact 1 = impact/contribution of policies as a whole on/to individual sustainability benchmark criteria

- Overall +ve
- No negatives
- No weak positives (i.e. positive score of 2 or less)

Summary Impact 2 = Impact/contribution of individual policies on sustainability/benchmark criteria as a whole

- Overall +ve
- No negatives
- Weak positives (i.e. positive score of 2 or less) – GNE4; BE3; BE4; BE5; TTT5

**APPENDIX 2: Draft Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and
Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) Screening Report
(April 2022)**

THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT OF PLANS AND PROGRAMMES REGULATIONS 2004
AND HABITATS REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT

DRAFT SEA and HRA SCREENING REPORT
PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT PANNAL AND BURN BRIDGE NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT
PLAN

This document is a draft screening consideration of the need to carry out a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and/or a Habitats Regulation Assessment for the Pre-Submission Consultation Draft Pannal and Burn Bridge Neighbourhood Development Plan.

The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 implement the requirements of the European Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment. Before deciding whether significant environment effects are likely, the local planning authority should take into account the criteria specified in Schedule 1 to the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004.

Regulation 5(6) of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 states that:

- (6) An environmental assessment need not be carried out—
- (a) for a plan or programme of the description set out in paragraph (2) or (3) which determines the use of a small area at local level; or
 - (b) for a minor modification to a plan or programme of the description set out in either of those paragraphs,
- unless it has been determined under regulation 9(1) that the plan, programme or modification, as the case may be, is likely to have significant environmental effects, or it is the subject of a direction under regulation 10(3).

Regulation 9(1) of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 states that:

- 9.—(1) The responsible authority shall determine whether or not a plan, programme or modification of a description referred to in—
- (a) paragraph (4)(a) and (b) of regulation 5;
 - (b) paragraph (6)(a) of that regulation; or
 - (c) paragraph (6)(b) of that regulation,
- is likely to have significant environmental effects.
- (2) Before making a determination under paragraph (1) the responsible authority shall—
- (a) take into account the criteria specified in Schedule 1 to these Regulations; and
 - (b) consult the consultation bodies.
- (3) Where the responsible authority determines that the plan, programme or modification is unlikely to have significant environmental effects (and, accordingly, does not require an environmental assessment), it shall prepare a statement of its reasons for the determination.

Despite the UK leaving the EU on the 31st January 2020, the SEA Regulations will continue to apply as before unless and until new legislation is introduced.

Therefore before the Council makes a decision whether or not the Pre-Submission Consultation Draft Pannal and Burn Bridge Neighbourhood Development Plan is likely to have significant environmental effects it must consider the plan proposals against the criteria specified in Schedule 1 of the Regulations and consult the consultation bodies (Historic England, Natural England and the Environment Agency). A copy of Schedule 1 of the Regulations is provided at Appendix 1.

A copy of the Pre-Submission Consultation Draft will be sent to the environment assessment consultation bodies as part of the April 2022 consultation and this screening document will be updated by Harrogate Borough Council once comments have been received by them. This screening report should therefore be considered a draft until these comments have been received.

In accordance with Regulation 9 of the SEA Regulations 2004, Harrogate Borough Council, as the responsible authority, considers that at this stage, an environmental assessment and/or Habitats Assessment of the Pre-Submission Consultation Draft Knaresborough Neighbourhood Plan is not required as it determines the use of a small area at local level and is unlikely to have significant environmental effects. In coming to this conclusion the Council has had regard to Schedule 1 of the Regulations. This conclusion could change however, once comments have been received from the statutory consultation bodies. The Council's consideration of the Pre-Submission Consultation Draft Pannal and Burn Bridge Neighbourhood Plan against Schedule 1 is set out in Appendix 2.

Appendix 1: Schedule 1 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004

SCHEDULE 1	Regulations 9(2)(a) and 10(4)(a)
<p>CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING THE LIKELY SIGNIFICANCE OF EFFECTS ON THE ENVIRONMENT</p>	
<p>1. The characteristics of plans and programmes, having regard, in particular, to—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(a) the degree to which the plan or programme sets a framework for projects and other activities, either with regard to the location, nature, size and operating conditions or by allocating resources;(b) the degree to which the plan or programme influences other plans and programmes including those in a hierarchy;(c) the relevance of the plan or programme for the integration of environmental considerations in particular with a view to promoting sustainable development;(d) environmental problems relevant to the plan or programme; and(e) the relevance of the plan or programme for the implementation of Community legislation on the environment (for example, plans and programmes linked to waste management or water protection). <p>2. Characteristics of the effects and of the area likely to be affected, having regard, in particular, to—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(a) the probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of the effects;(b) the cumulative nature of the effects;(c) the transboundary nature of the effects;(d) the risks to human health or the environment (for example, due to accidents);(e) the magnitude and spatial extent of the effects (geographical area and size of the population likely to be affected);(f) the value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to—<ul style="list-style-type: none">(i) special natural characteristics or cultural heritage;(ii) exceeded environmental quality standards or limit values; or(iii) intensive land-use; and(g) the effects on areas or landscapes which have a recognised national, Community or international protection status.	

Appendix 2: Consideration of the Pre-Submission Consultation Draft Knaresborough Neighbourhood Plan against Schedule 1 of the SEA Regulations

Criteria for determining the likely significance of effects on the environment (Schedule 1)	Likely to have significant environmental effects	Consideration of effects
1 (a) the degree to which the plan or programme sets a framework for projects and other activities, either with regard to the location, nature, size and operating conditions or by allocating resources	No	The Neighbourhood Plan (NP) will set a policy framework for the determination of planning applications for future development projects. Once made the NP will form part of the Harrogate District Local Plan
1 (b) the degree to which the plan or programme influences other plans and programmes including those in a hierarchy	No	A neighbourhood plan is only able to provide policies for the area it covers. These policies need to have regard to national policy and be in general conformity with the Harrogate District Local Plan 2014 – 2035.
1 (c) the relevance of the plan or programme for the integration of environmental considerations in particular with a view to promoting sustainable development	No	The Pannal and Burn Bridge Neighbourhood Plan seeks to have a positive impact on local environmental assets with an emphasis on the protection and enhancement of the public realm, green spaces and historic buildings. The achievement of sustainable development is one of the basic conditions to be met by the NP and is at the heart of the plan's vision and aims.
1 (d) environmental problems relevant to the plan or programme	No	It is not considered that there are any particular environmental problems relevant to the plan.
1 (e) the relevance of the plan or programme for the implementation of Community legislation on the environment (for example, plans and programmes linked to waste management or water protection)	No	This criterion is unlikely to be directly relevant in regard to the Neighbourhood Plan.
2 (a) the probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of the effects;	No	The Plan provides a framework for guiding development and only specifically identifies land for the development of a park and stride car park and also open space at Almsford Bridge. It is likely that some other development will occur during the duration of the Plan within the area therefore an element of environmental change will take place. However, the Plan policies are designed to encourage new development that is sustainable and has the least negative and greatest positive environmental impacts.

2 (b) the cumulative nature of the effects;	No	Apart from the land identified for the small park and stride car park and Almsford Bridge open space, the Neighbourhood Plan does not allocate any sites for development and the main aim of the plan is to provide a framework for guiding development. There are unlikely to be significant impacts on the local environment. The effects of the NP need to be considered alongside the Harrogate District Local Plan which it is required to be in general conformity with. It is not considered that the NP introduces additional effects over and above those already considered in the SA for the Harrogate District Local Plan as it does not propose additional development.
2 (c) the transboundary nature of the effects;	No	The Neighbourhood Plan and the policies within are unlikely to have an impact beyond the Neighbourhood Area boundary.
2 (d) the risks to human health or the environment (for example, due to accidents);	No	No obvious risks have been identified.
2 (e) the magnitude and spatial extent of the effects (geographical area and size of the population likely to be affected);	No	The NP is concerned with development within the Pannal and Burn Bridge Neighbourhood Area. The potential for environmental impacts are likely to be limited, minimal and local.
2 (f) the value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to— (i) special natural characteristics or cultural heritage; (ii) exceeded environmental quality standards or limit values; or (iii) intensive land-use	No	The NP is unlikely to adversely affect the value and vulnerability of the area in relation to its special natural characteristics or cultural heritage. The policies within the plan seek to provide greater protection of the character of the area. Apart from the land identified for the small park/ stride car park and Almsford Bridge open space, the NP does not allocate sites, as such there are unlikely to be any intensive land-use concerns.
(g) the effects on areas or landscapes which have a recognised national, Community or international protection status.	No	It is not considered that the draft policies in the NP will adversely affect areas or landscapes which have a recognised national, community or international protection status. The plan does not specifically allocate land for development however does identify support for park and stride in the SLA and adjacent to the conservation area and listed church so clarification may be needed on this.

**APPENDIX 3: Historic England comments on Draft SEA and HRA
Screening Report**



Historic England

YORKSHIRE

Ms. Jane Marlow,
The Parish Clerk,
Pannal and Burnside Parish Council,
Pannal Parish Hall,
Station Rd,
Pannal,
Harrogate,
HG3 1JJ

Our ref: PL00752529

Your ref:

Telephone 01904 601 879

Mobile

31st May 2022

Dear Ms. Marlow,

**Pannal and Burnside Neighbourhood Plan
Draft Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Consultation Response**

Thank you for consulting Historic England in connection with the Draft Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening report for the Pannal and Burnside Neighbourhood Plan.

For the purposes of this consultation, Historic England will confine its advice to the question, “Is it likely to have a significant effect on the environment?” in respect to our area of concern, cultural heritage. Our comments are based on the information supplied within the Pannal and Burnside Neighbourhood Plan.

The Draft Neighbourhood Plan indicates that within the plan area there is a wide range and number of designated cultural heritage assets. There are also likely to be other features of local historic, architectural or archaeological value, and consideration should also be given to the wider historic landscape.

On the basis of the information supplied, and in the context of the criteria set out in Schedule 1 of the Environmental Assessment Regulations [Annex II of ‘SEA’ Directive], Historic England concurs with the conclusion that the preparation of a Strategic Environmental Assessment is not required for the Pannal and Burnside Neighbourhood Plan.

The views of the other two statutory consultation bodies should be taken into account before the overall decision on the need for an SEA is made. We should like to stress that this opinion is based on the information available in the Pannal and Burnside Neighbourhood Plan.



Historic England, 37 Tanner Row, York YO1 6WP
Telephone 01904 60 1948 HistoricEngland.org.uk

Please note that Historic England operates an access to information policy.

Correspondence or information which you send us may therefore become publicly available.



To avoid any doubt, this does not reflect our obligation to provide further advice on later stages of the SEA process and, potentially, object to specific proposals which may subsequently arise (either as a result of this consultation or in later versions of the plan/guidance) where we consider that, despite the SEA, these would have an adverse effect upon the environment.

We would be pleased if you can send a copy of the determination as required by REG 11 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004.

Historic England strongly advises that the conservation and archaeological staff of the Harrogate District Council and the [North Yorkshire County Council Historic Environment Record](#) are closely involved throughout the preparation of the plan and its assessment. They are best placed to advise on; local historic environment issues and priorities, including access to data held in the HER (formerly SMR); how the policy or proposal can be tailored to minimise potential adverse impacts on the historic environment; the nature and design of any required mitigation measures; and opportunities for securing wider benefits for the future conservation and management of historic assets.

We look forward to receiving a consultation on the Final Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening report and Submission Draft of the Pannal and Burnside Neighbourhood Plan in due course.

Yours sincerely



Craig Broadwith
Historic Places Adviser
E-mail: Craig.Broadwith@HistoricEngland.org.uk



Historic England, 37 Tanner Row, York YO1 6WP
Telephone 01904 60 1948 HistoricEngland.org.uk

Please note that Historic England operates an access to information policy.
Correspondence or information which you send us may therefore become publicly available.

