

The long-term future of this area is being decided right now.

---

## Background

Harrogate Borough Council (HBC) wants to allow a new **town-sized development** to be built on land around **Cattal Station**.

With an estimated population of up to 10,000, it will be similar in size to Thirsk.

What will this new town be like?

The **policies** that will be used to decide this are set out in what's called a "Development Plan Document" (**DPD**.)

**This document is now being consulted on by the Council.**

If you wish to take part in the Consultation **YOU HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT on FRIDAY 25th NOVEMBER.**

The DPD is a dense, technical, and jargon-heavy document so it's not the easiest document for people to read and respond to.

We've put together these notes to help you respond in the right way.

**Please note, the consultation isn't about whether or not there *should* be a town (or "New Settlement") in this location.**

There will be.

Rather, the purpose of the consultation is to establish if the policies in the DPD are **SOUND**. That is:

Are they based on **evidence**? (Are they 'justified'?, in planning speak)

Can the policies actually be **delivered**? (Are they 'effective'?)

Also to be established is whether the policies are **consistent with other policies**.

In particular with the National Planning Policy Framework (**NPPF**)

We can also ask whether the DPD is **legally compliant** - for instance, has HBC engaged with other bodies and residents constructively and actively?

---

## The New Settlement Vision

Paragraph 2.2 of the DPD sets out the 30-year Vision and Objectives of the New Settlement (which HBC call 'Maltkiln').

The new town will

- be a Garden Village with a distinctive identity;
- be an 'exemplar' of sustainability;
- not be car dependant;

- have a vibrant local centre
- have an employment area, with offices & warehouses
- give priority to walking and cycling

The local Parish Councils are broadly supportive of these.

We also need to note that when the Planning Inspector made his report on the Council's overall planning strategy (the '**Local Plan**') in 2020 he was very particular that the DPD should address 'very carefully the implications for nearby villages'.

We are certainly supportive of this.

**However, the local Parish Councils have little confidence that the DPD is the right document to deliver on this vision.**

**Certainly not with the care demanded by the Planning Inspector.**

**We think the DPD is not "sound".**

**Key policies are not justified.**

**There is little sense that the Vision can actually be delivered.**

---

## The Main Objections

To help you in your own responses we refer to the policy names used in the DPD.

### **Traffic:**

#### **Policy NS36 - 'Traffic Mitigation' - Not Justified or Effective**

The DPD presents the Vision of a garden village not dependent on cars. But a third of its infrastructure cost is on roads.

There's no evidence given to justify the infrastructure that *has* been identified; and in any case the costings look inadequate.

And then there are big questions about the infrastructure that *hasn't* been identified - eastwards along the A59 for example; and about the overall traffic modelling, in particular the effects in the existing villages.

---

### **Secondary School:**

#### **Policy NS28; 'Education' - Not Justified or Effective; Not Consistent with HBC's Local Plan; Not Consistent with other aims of the DPD**

The New Settlement will have no Secondary School until the second half of the century, if at all. Pupils will travel by bus and car to an expanded Boroughbridge High School.

A Settlement of this size cannot be an exemplar of sustainability without its own secondary school; but it looks to be undeliverable with one.

*Local Plan Policy DM4 and DPD Policy NS1 state that education must be provided on-site.*

---

---

**Flood risk (Policy NS11) - Not justified, not effective**

There's no proper data-based evidence that the surface water from the proposed settlement has been properly considered. Concern therefore exists about the impact of increased flooding to Cattal, Kirk Hammerton, Skipbridge, A59, and Moor Monkton.

There's concern that without the modelling, key infrastructure won't be costed

---

**Village Relationships:**

**Policy NS2 Strategic Green Gap - Not Justified, Not Consistent with National Policy**

We support the principle of a Strategic Green Gap (SGG), but the implementation proposed in the DPD isn't justified or effective.

It's inconsistent with local and national policies, incoherent with regard to other implications of the DPD, and, most importantly, can't demonstrate that it achieves the goal of protecting the rural setting of nearby villages.

We propose that, as a minimum, the area formerly called the 'Broad Location for Growth' is given a status similar to that of Green Belt; and that the same status is given to land between the new settlement and the villages of Whixley and Cattal.

*Inconsistent with Local Plan policies DM4 and GS3*

*Not consistent with NPPF (2021) para 139*

---

**Walking and Cycling (Policy NS31) - Not Justified; Not effective; Contrary to National Planning Policy**

Walking and cycling are key to the DPD's vision of a sustainable new settlement. Exemplary facilities early in the life of the settlement are essential to promote these.

The availability of exemplary sustainable connections can be a key attraction for new residents, - making a car-independent settlement more possible.

But while the DPD allocates tens of millions to road traffic infrastructure - including over £20m on yet another round of improvements to the A1(M) J47 - it allocates just over £2m to walking and cycling infrastructure.

There's no bridge or underpass across the (dualled) A59; no links to the cycle network; no improved paths and footways along local roads in neighbouring areas that will now see a huge increase in traffic.

*Key infrastructure not considered.*

*No assurance that promised infrastructure is deliverable (land ownership)*

*Contrary to the overall vision of DPD and Local Plan policy DM4, which promised exemplary sustainability.*

*Contrary to NPPF para 122a*

*applications for development should give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas*

---

### **Affordable Housing:**

#### **(Policy NS23) - Not Justified; Not Effective; Not Consistent with aims of DPD; Contrary to Local Plan Policy HS2**

The DPD sells the new settlement as important for the delivery of affordable homes. But viability issues mean it can't then deliver them.

Affordable housing is being sacrificed to make such a large development and associated infrastructure works affordable for the developer.

This does not meet the vision of affordable housing because of the need for, and cost of, extensive infrastructure work.

*Local Plan policy required number of affordable houses to be identified*

*No evidence presented of the required, or the deliverable, number.*

*Local Plan policy HS2 requires 40% affordable housing on all qualifying greenfield developments*

---

### **Open Space and Sport Provision (Policy NS14)**

The DPD only mentions outdoor sports facilities - apparently some pitches and changing rooms.

But this is to be a town the size of Thirsk.

To be effective, this policy should specify the indoor facilities - in particular

- a leisure-centre / swimming-pool
- sports for older people

appropriate to the scale, sustainability, and identity of the new settlement.

These should be included early in the Phasing / Funding to agree with the settlement Vision.

---

### **Delivery and Phasing - Not Effective**

Delivery and phasing seems to be a hastily inserted draft, with no indication of where and when costings originate. (Two versions were uploaded during the consultation.)

---

## **Next steps**

We expect to participate in the collective Parish Councils' response and are inputting to the process of gathering all the views, and we'll keep you updated on that.

Of course, if anyone has any further insights or views that they feel might support the Parish Councils' joint submission please let me know asap so I can feed that into their process.

But we also wanted to let everyone know of the deadline, and of the importance of submitting your own views to Harrogate Borough Council if you feel strongly about how Maltkiln could evolve.

### **How can I respond directly?**

**You can submit a response in the following ways:**

**Email: [planningpolicy@harrogate.gov.uk](mailto:planningpolicy@harrogate.gov.uk)**

Online at the Harrogate Borough Council Consultation Portal,  
<https://consult.harrogate.gov.uk/kse>

Fill in the official **Comment Form** that can be downloaded from  
<https://www.harrogate.gov.uk/newsettlementdpd>

Pick up the official **Comment Form** from a local library and complete it, or  
Simply write your own email or letter.

Paper forms or letters should be sent to:

**Policy and Place Team**  
**Harrogate Borough Council**  
**PO Box 787**  
**Harrogate**  
**HG1 9RW**

All submissions must reach HBC before **MIDNIGHT on FRIDAY 25th NOVEMBER**

## What if I'd like further information?

If you'd like some supporting information to help your personal submission, then let us know and I'll be happy to share more of the details that we're accessing through the collective process.

It's pretty certain that development of some sort is coming to this area, but we want to make sure that it is considerate and reflects the views and concerns of local residents.