

FAO Joan Jackson  
Planning Services

**Heritage Services**

Growth, Planning and Trading Standards  
Business and Environmental Services  
North Yorkshire County Council  
Northallerton  
DL7 8AH

**Your ref:** NY/2022/0103/FUL  
**Our ref:** 220621 Gayles Quarry  
**Date:** 21 June 2022

Contact: John Wainwright  
Principal Landscape Architect  
Email: john.wainwright@northyorks.gov.uk  
Tel: 01609 5322115

Dear Sir/Madam

Consultation on planning application for the purposes of the Extraction of sandstone at Gayles Quarry, near Gayles Village on land at Gayles, Quarry Near Gayles Village, North Yorkshire

Thank you for your consultation on the above application.

I have reviewed details of the application, in particular:

- Supporting Statement for Extraction of Sandstone at Gayles Quarry, April 2022
- Plan GQW21-1 Phased Working Scheme Phase A
- Plan GQW21-2 Phased Working Scheme Phases B & C
- Plan GQW21-3 Conceptual Restoration Design
- Plan GQW21-1 Phased Working Scheme Phase A
- Design Cross Sections
- Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal, January 2022
- LVIA Figure 4: Restoration Strategy

Background

Gayles Quarry is an old sandstone quarry that has been exploited for sandstone in the past.

The proposal is to quarry stone for building and walling purposes at a maximum rate of 15,000 tonnes per annum over a 15-year period.

Landscape and Visual Effects

Generally, I agree with overall method and conclusions of the Applicant's Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal (LVIA).

The local landscape is considered to be Medium/High sensitivity and the operational effects of the proposed mineral extraction are considered to be Moderate Adverse (proposed 15 year operational period, which is long-term), with Minor Adverse landscape effects after restoration.

I would agree that the location and orientation of the site is such that there are relatively few viewpoints close to the existing quarry, as stated in the LVIA. However, there are notable exceptions with both Major and Moderate adverse visual effects likely to be experienced by a footpath adjacent to the site

(PROW 20.32/5/1), residential receptor Quarry House to the NE side of the site, the unnamed track adjacent to Gayles Quarry east side, and other local footpaths (PROW 20.32/4/2, PROW 20.55/3/1 and PROW). These adverse effects are likely to be reduced following restoration, but this may take many years.

I would generally support the principle of progressive working and restoration set out on the submitted phased working plans.

The existing quarry and tip workings have become re-vegetated and softened but this is likely to have taken considerable time due to poor ground conditions and exposed elevated location.

There are very few photographs and limited plan information in the application documents of the site to explain the existing landscape baseline.

Existing vegetation, hedgerows and boundary walls to be retained are not clearly described on the plans. I would wish to see a clearer record of the existing baseline landscape within and around the existing quarry, to ratify the assessment and in order to guide future restoration.

Unless necessary for operational working or screen mitigation, I would wish to see existing peripheral soils and vegetation retained and left undisturbed with these areas clearly identified on the plans.

The plans suggest that some advanced landscape works may be possible which might provide overall benefit in reducing or offsetting some of the local adverse operational effects identified and I would welcome some further discussion or proposals for this.

While both the LVIA and the Application Supporting Statement set out a number of mitigation measures these are not all explained on the supporting application plans (LVIA Chapter 10). I would wish to see further clarification of proposed mitigation shown on plans, existing topography, site boundaries and vegetation to be protected and retained, grading and restoration of the upper void 45-degree slopes (para. 4.20 Supporting Statement).

I would also wish to see further consideration and clarification of screening and views between nearby receptors and operational areas of the quarry (together with detailed cross sections) and whether screening can be improved (particularly views from Quarry House and the local access track to the east side of the quarry, including views directly into the quarry from the proposed site entrance).

Operational noise from the quarry has potential to adversely affect tranquillity, local character and setting. The Noise Impact Assessment summarises noise levels in Tables 3.7.1, 3.7.2 and 3.7.[3] on page 10. I would question whether the figures presented in the tables are correct and I would like further clarification of the figures, and that the proposed noise levels can be achieved and mitigated as suggested.

### Recommendations and Summary

I would recommend further clarification, information and consideration of the following:

- Clarify existing landscape baseline; as a photo survey of the existing site and immediate surroundings, to validate the assessment, guide mitigation and restoration.
- Clarify landscape mitigation (LVIA Chapter 10) / potential for advanced landscape works on plans (LVIA Restoration Strategy and Conceptual Restoration Design / phasing plans), to reduce adverse effects and assist with progressive restoration.
- Potential to further reduce Major and Moderate Adverse visual effects to local residential properties, local access track and PROW users by woodland screening and earthworks (Quarry

House, unnamed track adjoining the east boundary, PRoW 20.32/4/2, PRoW 20.55/3/1 and PRoW).

- Detailed cross sections between sensitive receptors and operational areas of the quarry (as item above). Show working faces, stocking and loading area, max height of stockpiles, likely plant and machinery.
- Clarify / mark on plans existing peripheral vegetated / topography areas to be protected and retained / proposed areas to be re-graded (existing / proposed contours, existing and proposed working landform).
- Demonstrate sufficient suitable retained soils for formation of access ramp and restoration following imported fill material (approx. 4000m<sup>3</sup>, para 4.18 Supporting Statement).
- Clarify that the Noise Impact Assessment noise levels in Tables 3.7.1, 3.7.2 and 3.7.[3] on page 10 are correct.

Notwithstanding the above, if the scheme were to be approved I would recommend the following to be secured by suitably worded condition or legal agreement:

- Detailed landscaping scheme, including outline specification, planting schedule and implementation programme (minimum 5 year defects replacement).
- Details of proposed boundary fencing, entrance gates and drystone wall adjustment at the entrance.
- Details of the proposed footpath during the temporary diversion and footpath reinstatement after restoration (way marking, surfacing, access control).
- Protect and retain all existing stone boundary walls, established perimeter vegetation and hedgerows, identified on plans to retain.
- Landscape and biodiversity management plan (secured by legal agreement where this is for an extended timescale beyond 5 years).
- Control of night-time lighting.

Please contact me if you have any queries or wish to discuss the above.

John Wainwright  
Principal Landscape Architect

Business and Environmental Services 