

# Malkiln New Settlement Consultee Responses



**Malkiln New Settlement  
Consultation Report**

<b>Revision</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Quality Check</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Independent Review</b>	<b>Date</b>
00							



Project:

**Contents**

- 1 Public Consultation ..... 2**
- 1.1 Public Consultation Strategy ..... 2
- 1.2 Responses ..... 2
- 1.3 Masterplan Comments ..... 2

# **1 Public Consultation**

## **1.1 Public Consultation Strategy**

- 1.1.1 Policy NS3 of the Maltkiln Development Plan Document requires the preparation of a comprehensive, allocation-wide masterplan for the new settlement. This must be developed collaboratively with the Council, the local community, and other key stakeholders, and subsequently agreed by the local planning authority.
- 1.1.2 To allow local residents to have an input and provide comments on the proposal, a public consultation event was held at Kirk Hammerton Village Hall. This took place on Thursday 15<sup>th</sup> of January between 2 and 7pm, and approximately 200 people attended.

## **1.2 Responses**

- 1.2.1 A total of 95 responses were received as part of the public consultation event. These were found to fall into three clear themes: comments relating to the principle of development, comments addressing matters relevant to the outline planning stage, and comments specifically concerning the masterplan. For clarity and ease of analysis, the responses were categorised accordingly. This resulted in 24 responses relating to the principle of development, 49 responses addressing outline-stage matters, and 22 responses focused on the masterplan.
- 1.2.2 Due to the main aim of the consultation event being to receive feedback on the masterplan of the new settlement, an overview of the main concerns raised is provided below. A full table of responses for each category can be found in the appendices. Appendix C highlights the comments relevant to the masterplan and our response to each comment.

## **1.3 Masterplan Comments**

- 1.3.1 One of the main concerns regarding the current masterplan of the New Settlement is a view that development is taking place within the 'strategic green gap'. The boundary of the settlement was amended during the DPD examination and extended into the green gap to enable access on the eastern side of the settlement. Whilst the plans show an area of development taking place in an earlier version of the green gap, this is now in accordance with the adopted green gap boundary. On this basis the development in the masterplan framework is fully in accordance with the adopted DPD.
- 1.3.2 Another main concern was the provision of enhanced parking at Cattal Station being deemed inadequate. No details of the car park are provided as part of the Masterplan Framework, as this level of detail is for the planning application stage. To provide clarity that a car park is required, text has been added into the Masterplan Framework Document requiring a car park.
- 1.3.3 Finally, a number of comments were raised on the lack of pedestrian and cycle routes crossing the A59 to enable residents of Green Hammerton to access the facilities. Crossing points will be included across the A59, the details of which will be included at the planning application stage. For clarity, crossing points across the A59 have now been indicated on the plans within the Masterplan Framework Document.

## **1.4 Consultee Comments**

- 1.4.1 Additionally, as part of the consultation process, a briefing was held for key stakeholders on 8 January 2026 followed by a steering group meeting for the Parish Council. The stakeholder briefing included National Highways, Network Rail, Environment Agency, Historic England, Leeds City Council, York City Council and a representative on behalf of Hargreaves Land.

- 1.4.2 Since that time, we have received consultee responses in response to the consultation on the Masterplan Framework Document from Whixley Parish Council, Yorkshire Wildlife Trust, Historic England, British Horse Society and Green Hammerton Parish Council. A summary of the responses received are provided below.

### **Yorkshire Wildlife Trust**

- 1.4.3 The response received from Yorkshire Wildlife Trust is supportive and recognises the emphasis within the document on biodiversity and green and blue infrastructure. The comments note that this approach should be strengthened as the design develops to make a meaningful contribution to nature's recovery while delivering a high-quality place for people to live, work and enjoy. This is noted and detailed ecological assessments will be undertaken and submitted as part of future planning applications.
- 1.4.4 No changes are required to the Masterplan Framework Document.

### **Historic England**

- 1.4.5 The response received from Historic England is generally supportive of the indicative land use plan, noting that careful consideration will need to be given to the detailed design, scale, massing, orientation and landscaping of the development parcels at the planning application stage. The intention to prepare Design Codes is also supported.
- 1.4.6 Specific comments have been made in relation to the content of the Framework Document, in particular:
- Providence House referred to as Grade II\* rather than Grade II.
  - That the final sentence of paragraph 3.5 should be amended to refer to the design of development minimising the impact on the setting of both conservation areas.
  - Additional sentence being required to ensure suitable management measures to protect the pair of Bronze Age burial mounds at the southeast corner of the site.
- 1.4.7 These comments have been noted, and amendments will be made to the final document to reflect them.

### **Whixley Parish Council**

- 1.4.8 Comments received from the Parish Council relate to the detail within the document. In particular, that the document does not show active travel crossing locations on the A59 or parking for the station.
- 1.4.9 Comments have also been made in relation to phasing. The Parish Council consider that development should proceed from the village centre outwards and have requested clarification of how the Council can ensure the centre is delivered in a first phase.
- 1.4.10 Questions have also been raised with regards to the potential CPO of the land in the south and west of the new settlement and whether this will impact on delivery. In particular, they consider that the sports hub should be delivered early on in the development.
- 1.4.11 The Parish Council have noted that one parking space per dwelling seems low. They have also queried whether traffic calming will be provided through existing villages and suggest this should be shown in the document. Similarly, it has been suggested that a wider plan showing active routes linking existing settlements to Maltkiln should be shown.
- 1.4.12 These comments are noted however are detailed matters which will be part of future planning applications rather than the Masterplan Framework Document.

### **British Horse Society**

- 1.4.13 The response from the British Horse Society is split into two parts. The first part of the letter provides comments made to the outline planning application in August 2024 and are not related to the Masterplan Framework Document itself. The comments made in relation to the outline planning application are noted and will be addressed when the application is amended following adoption of the Masterplan Framework.
- 1.4.14 The second part of the letter provide comments on the Masterplan Framework Document. Questions have been raised in relation to bridleways and segregated footway/cycleways and clarification sought. Specifically, where the document mentions pedestrian and cycle use, it has been requested that this should also reference horse riders.
- 1.4.15 These comments are noted and references to horse riders will also be made within the Framework Document where applicable.

### **Green Hammerton Parish Council**

- 1.4.16 The Parish Council have noted their support of the location of the local centre and the good provision of open space, education and recreation.
- 1.4.17 Support is also made to the additional roundabout from the A59 (the eastern roundabout) however raise concerns about potential ran runs through Green Hammerton from York bound traffic along the B6265 and request that the link road between the B6265 and A59 roundabout are delivered as part of phase 1. The phasing of the delivery of this will be determined at the planning application stage and will be based on detailed highway modelling.
- 1.4.18 Suggestion has been made that once the link road is delivered, the redundant section of the B6265 should become part of the Strategic Green Gap and used for allotments and recreational space. This section of the B6265 is already shown as Strategic Green Gap within the Masterplan Framework.
- 1.4.19 Comments have been made in relation to the connections to surrounding villages needing improvements and that it isn't clear how pedestrians will cross the A59 safely. A crossing point will be provided across the A59, and the Masterplan Framework Document will be amended to show this indicatively.
- 1.4.20 It has been suggested that the car park by station needs to be shown on the plans. Showing the car park on the plans is too detailed for the Masterplan Framework Document however reference will be made within the text to a car park being required.
- 1.4.21 The Parish Council has requested phasing details and questioned the timing of the CPO. This is not a matter for the Masterplan Framework and will be discussed at the planning application stage.
- 1.4.22 The Parish Council have queried for the permanence of Strategic Green Gap will be sustained in future years. The Masterplan Framework Document shows the Strategic Green Gap on the plans, as per the requirement of the DPD. Policy NS2 of the adopted DPD then provides a policy to safeguard it and ensure that it is kept free from development.

### **Collation of Local Councils**

- 1.4.23 Within their response, the Parish Councils have raised concerns that the Framework Document defers too much detail to later stages while already fixing the overall direction of development.
- 1.4.24 They have also raised concern that the process has not involved meaningful collaboration with the local community.
- 1.4.25 A request has been made for the Framework Document to be re-issued with clear parameters, governance agreements and a genuine, staged approach to community engagement.

- 1.4.26 Extensive public consultation has previously taken place through the Local Plan and the Maltkiln New Settlement DPD, which establishes the land use parameters and policies. The Framework Document builds upon these adopted parameters and policies.
- 1.4.27 As set out in the Framework Document, its purpose is to provide an overall development framework for the site to ensure a coordinated approach and to avoid piecemeal development. It is intended to guide the appropriate land use mix, scale, layout, access and landscaping principles. The outline planning application stage will develop these parameters further and introduce more detailed design criteria through Design Codes. Reserved matters applications will subsequently address detailed matters such as design, scale, appearance, layout and landscaping for each plot.

## 2 Appendices

### 2.1 Appendix A

Principle of Development	
9	<p>I object to the proposed framework, that it is unsound for the following reasons: The Framework is centred around Cattal railway station, and this is the principal reason for locating Maltkiln Town. The York-Harrogate railway line is already a principal commuter route at passenger capacity. It is a single-track line and with services every 30 minutes is at maximum carrying capacity for this system. The trains carry 200 passengers; longer trains cannot be utilised due to the lengths of the platforms. Currently in peak travel hours 07:00 - 09:00 the trains are full of standing on at Knaresborough and into York. The framework does not seem to recognise that this train station serves Cattal, Whixley and local farms and hamlets, it is well used for commuting and secondary school children and is not at the sole disposal of Maltkiln. Maltkiln population will be 10,000-15,000. This is a doubling of the population that the trainline currently serves. The cost of increasing the line capacity is very significant and not included. The Framework is unsound as it assumes the use of a public service capacity which is already fully utilised. The Framework Soley relies on the A59 for 20 years of construction traffic, and all goods and services and commuting of a population of 10000-15000 (4000 - 8000 cars) and also bus services. The A59 is already at capacity for traffic in peak hours. Although the provision of roundabouts on the A59 is welcomed, this will not reduce the volume of traffic or make it easier to cross the road by foot or bicycle. The number of RTA at n of clockhill field lane, Whixley crossroads and green Hammerton are unacceptable, there have been a number of fatalities and near misses occur on an hourly basis every day in peak hours. If there is any doubt that the A59 is at capacity, then I challenge the developers and council to drive the area in peak hours or try crossing the road on foot or bicycle. The Framework does make reference of the dualling of the A59, this should not be included as part of a transport policy unless there is certainty of it being implemented. (we remind that York has failed to dual the York ring road for over 20 years). The mention of the dualling indicates that the A59 is not capable of carrying the additional loads, yet there are no plans to do so. The framework is unsound as regards its transport policy for road. The Maltkiln development will house 10000-15000 people. The total population of the surrounding 4 villages is around 2000. The Framework does not take a holistic approach to the impact of such a huge development on the surrounding villages and farms, it has not been developed with the Parish councils of those villages and farms. Local traffic: Traffic loads and speeding are already a very substantial issue in the surrounding villages, especially Whixley which is used as a rat run. Though roundabouts may improve use of the Boroughbridge road, there is a concern that the very considerable traffic load from Maltkiln will impact our villages. The Framework has been constructed by developers who are interested only in the Maltkiln site. The size of Maltkiln (5 times the population of the surrounding area) warrants a more holistic approach to protect the local villages from traffic issues. Pedestrian and bicycle road safety are a considerable safety issue on the A59. Crossing of this road to access the station is dangerous due to the continuous stream of high speed traffic and there is no provision in the framework to improve this. A suggestion would be a speed limit between the roundabouts with a pedestrian crossing/underpass. Access to the railway station. The railways station is a key public transport link for the local community, and this is growing with the increase in managing congestion in our local cities of York and Leeds. Currently there is free roadside parking which is relatively secure. The framework does not protect this facility for the local communities and though parking has been promised many times, the framework should ensure that free secure parking is provided for use by the surrounding community so that they do not suffer loss from the development. Dark Skies and noise free nights In the past the council have failed to protect the local area from light pollution, the biggest example being Queen Ethelbergers school sports facilities. In more recent times LED lighting (though more energy efficient) has become a plague to the sanctity of our night skies, for which many in rural communities hold great value. The impact of Maltkiln on the rights of the residents of Whixley gate and surrounding villages to dark skies and noise free nights has not been referenced in the framework and assurance should be given that measures are taken to preserve the nature of the countryside. Maltkiln should be a town built into the countryside and not a replacement. This framework is unsound as it does not extend outside its site boundaries in managing its impact on the local communities or ensuring that facilities of the local community or right to dark skies and low noise are preserved. The Framework does not bear consideration for protecting the river Nidd from environmental impacts of the development. The Nidd currently has scored the lowest scoring for bathing water quality since monitoring began 2 years ago, the microbiology of the water is not fit for human bathing and is unacceptable. The Nidd principally receives contamination from Knaresborough (15,000 population). Though the sewage will be treated, the treatment is not complete and still will release considerable microbiological, nutrient and micro pollutant loads. The doubling of the treated wastewater load and surface water loads on this beautiful river from Maltkiln will result in a considerable impact. The Framework is unsound as it does not consider this impact and should be ensuring improvements to the Nidd water quality and not detriment.</p>

14	The plan fails to address the already burden on the road infrastructure and the impact on residents throughout the development and beyond.
15	I am completely baffled as to why such a large development needs to be put in a rural, quiet peaceful area. There were clearly better sites such as on the A59 at flaxby. As someone who lives in Cattal I am extremely concerned about the impacts this development will have. In particular on the amount of cars that will then drive through our village, which is already used as a thoroughfare where car drives far too fast and often dramatically in excess of the speed limit. This is already dangerous to me and my family with a number of near misses in the last few months alone and the sheer volume of additional cars in the area associated with the development increases this risk, as well as noise and pollution. The proposed road plans will not mitigate this, fullstop. The broader reaction from the public tells you how unwanted this is, with a whole host of valid social and environmental reasons that appear to have been ignored. The potential use of a CPO is completely immoral. Digging up more and more land to build houses is not sustainable when there are other options. There should be more respect for existing villages, where people have lived for many years with their families. The distance of the proposed site to Cattal for example is disrespectful and far too close. The same is true for villages like Kirk Hammerton. If it has to go ahead, the size should be massively reconsidered, the suggested scale of this is outrageous and without infrastructure to support it. And those locals like myself do want all the associated infrastructure, we moved here and spending our hard-earned money on our homes and raising our family because we wanted rural living. And in any case, we all know the infrastructure like schools and sports facilities will get done last and probably never at all. I cannot even begin to get my head around how the planning process has even got this far and how anyone thinks this is a good idea. It is wrong on all counts - for people and for the environment. Respect for existing villages that have been there for years should be higher priority, and the current plan especially given its size completely goes against that, from eyesores to traffic to noise to pollution to environmental.
16	I object to the proposed development due to its adverse effect on the existing village communities in its immediate vicinity and on the local transport infrastructure and services structure. The majority of Maltkiln residents will commute to work and while it is claimed the location was chosen around Carral railway station to provide railway-based commuting, in reality the majority of residents will commute to work by car. That this is the case is proven by the changes proposed to the A 59. More traffic will mean more delays and accidents, particularly at the morning and evening rush hour periods. on a road that is already extremely busy during the above periods. I would urge NYC to abandon the Maltkiln project and instead provide the required housing need by housing development over the whole of North Yorkshire. The county is essentially rural, with over 500 settlements, the vast majority being small settlements of less than 1500 people. The 3,000 new houses proposed for the Maltkiln development could be distributed pro rata across all the settlements in the county with minimal adverse effect on their local populations, services and transport infrastructure. The complete opposite to the proposed Maltkiln proposal.
21	I do not feel the plans are sustainable to local infrastructure. I think they look to have some elements to try to address this but in reality, how much of that would end up being pushed back or done last while the actual houses are built and sold first leave stain on services like the nhs and schools, not to mention the roads. there is still a need for undeveloped countryside and land which is needed for crops and cattle etc.
23	We were able to engage in the past week directly with Caddick Land on the sustainability aspects of the Maltkiln development. As an organisation that engaged with the former planning authority, Harrogate Borough Council, on the development of Maltkiln, we would welcome a continued engagement with NYC in the way that the planning of this important development unfolds
24	I am absolutely appalled by the process adopted by NYCC in securing this development. Residents have not been listened to. This development is far too large for the existing infrastructure. I have attended the developer's presentations and its obvious to everyone that a small-town needs road and rail expansion, schools and GP surgery. The developer's plans have not included the infrastructure. The development will ruin the local area due to its size, this part of North Yorkshire is already a building site of massive estates, and this is going to be more of the same. Shame on you for not protecting the environment you have a duty to serve.
30	I object to the development of Maltkin in its current form due to the impact it had on surrounding villages and the residents. The current services are already stretched, and no thought has been given to poor rail infrastructure, the already dangerous and busy A59, the schools, community services such as district nurses, lack of recreational space, noise, the already poor waste collection service.
36	I do not think the plan considers the impact of this development will have on neighbouring villages. We don't have a problem with progress and welcome those that want to move into the area.

37	The size of Maltkiln is absolutely horrendous, up to the edges of several villages. A whole town connecting to several other villages. Aren't they laws stopping this from happening?
38	I am not against more houses, but I think this location is the wrong location given the size of the existing conurbation and local flooding and associated traffic issues. Other locations should be considered first before this location e.g. Tockwith as it already has services and is a larger conurbation.
39	<p>I consider this masterplan fails in many areas</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There has been very poor consultation with the local residents who are going to be impacted - not just Green and Kirk Hammerton and Whixley, but Tockwith, Cattal, and all other villages nearby, not to mention all the many visitors and businesses - the consultation with the public has been appalling and this is too little too late.</li> <li>2. As regards the plans - I note with interest the focus on non-car transport - clearly all the roads leading to the A59 will eventually be blocked with huge numbers of traffic jams, trying to enter and exit the area - it attempts to see the new 'settlement' as separate from the outlying areas, yet it is in every respect going to dominate - 3-4000 new residents/homes will create massive road use despite your attempts to focus on ecology focused alternatives. There is simply not the infrastructure to rely on. The result will be mayhem, and many serious accidents - if the A59 is due to be created into a dual carriageway, as mentioned in one small paragraph - then let that happen FIRST before this terrible new settlement is created - in addition all the local roads nearby will become gridlocked, as many commuters and business owners come via the current Cattal Bridge area to access the A59 - no mention is made of this in your very poor plan - no mention of the current high use of this route to access the A59, the local villages, the local businesses and those who all live and work nearby anticipate that our lives will be far poorer as a result. I anticipate quite an exodus if the plans are actually approved. I also note the comments on drainage and flood plains - just a few hundred yards down the road from the station, Cattal Bridge is a regular flood magnet - this is completely ignored in the plan as it is outside the area of the settlement but I assure you this will be highly impacted - it is used regularly by all locals and we all imagine that it will become a victim with new damage, traffic jams etc. not to mention run off from the settlement impacting further on this area - has anyone done any projections of how it will be impacted?</li> <li>3. The use of the Cattal Station as a hub - It is not clear how this hub will be accessed beyond the actual settlement itself - yet there are already many users of this fine little station - it already has no decent parking areas, and if you wanted to create a good change, then a plan to offer better parking would be a good prospect, but I see the opposite! Encouragements to have no cars in the Cattal Station area I see that the plan is for the crossing to be closed and access to be changed somehow - how will the many local residents who have lived here all their lives actually get to the station now? And will the owners of the station be alongside, helping develop what is a very small and rural train station, so that it can serve the extra 4.6000 new residents!! - if you know anything of the British Rail fiasco in Oxford, where the expansion of Botley Road has taken so far 3 years - I don't imagine this to be even a remote possibility. I believe all this is far from well thought out and is in fact done with no apparent local knowledge of the area, the logistics, the local population and our many patterns of transport and our needs. It is an appalling travesty to focus on the cycling, public transport and walking possibilities and clearly done purely as the site does not lend itself to easy access to main roads and indeed creates serious danger to those using both the local roads in and around Cattal, and the A59 which will get enormously bigger as a result. In my opinion this is a very poorly thought through framework, cobbled together to meet the needs of a planning department desperate to fulfil a promise and perhaps make some money in the process, and it is not considerate of any local resident nearby in all the many villages. I am shocked that this would pass a planning committee in its current state and can only surmise it has been created by those who know absolutely nothing of this area, despite all the emphasis on heritage, ecology etc - and will do all I can to try and object to the many points against it. It is too large, in the wrong area and will cause serious danger, congestion in a beautiful area and will completely destroy this part of North Yorkshire. And that is without the many ecological disasters it throws up. I am already preparing to put my house on the market.</li> </ol>
40	A59 overloaded now, dangerous driving always in a race, lack of manners on road, etc what will be traffic be like after all those houses built!!
45	I have to say that I do not agree with upcoming settlement Maltkiln. To take away fertile used agricultural land is nothing short of criminal. There are other places for example Flaxby that has a disused train station that would benefit not just new housing but also the people who work at the industrial estate and ease the congestion on the A59, but no let's put it somewhere no one wants. you devaluing homes - destroying farmland and taking away people's livelihoods.
46	Oversized development which current road and rail infrastructure cannot possibly support unless this is completed before development is commenced.
48	The village already becomes flooded yearly and you're adding 3,000 homes to the mix. There have been several almost fatal clashes on the A59 already without you adding your homes. Go elsewhere and do not ruin the countryside you greedy pigs.

13	<p>My comments are based on reviewing all of the development proposals, discussions with North Yorks Council Planning representatives, Caddick representatives, local knowledge as a resident of Green Hammerton and professionally as a Director of a Building Services Consultancy. The results of attending the consultation event in Kirk Hammerton has raised more questions than answered, which is concerning. Planning strategy not meeting standards. All housing development and planning, according to the local authority and consensus, must consider the site on balance, considering housing need, ecology and wildlife, farming and agriculture, impact on existing settlements, existing and resultant proposed infrastructure, impact on local resources and infrastructure. The size and scale of the proposed development and its close proximity to central North Yorkshire rural villages simply does not work. The existing infrastructure and amenities scarcely serve the existing communities, adding large scale construction and creeping housing numbers is just not sustainable without first improving existing infrastructure and amenities before commencing with housing. This includes the road network, drainage, water supplies, electrical power supply quality, telecommunications, schools, GPs., The existing area is not configured to increase the load before tackling the supply. Sacrificing working farmland. The UK as a whole, does not produce even 50% of the food from domestic agriculture, we are in a very critical position in the UK where we actually need to increase domestic farming and produce production. Reducing farmland at this point, for housing that is not required should be a common sense and instant decline of any application and there should be no conservation to ever lose any farmland, anywhere in the UK, let alone in the heart of the North Yorkshire farming area. Planning should be restricted to land which is available to develop without sacrificing critically needed farming land. National target of 4,500 homes per county, per year. (rolling to subsequent years if target has not been met) Let it roll over. There is no housing crisis/need in the UK and there certainly is not one in North Yorkshire. Existing mass developments in the local area, including Knaresborough and Boroughbridge are examples of the over development of North Yorkshire. Developments at both sites are significant and over-sized. Both have substantial of vacant plots that could not be occupied, so the developers and local authority have had to sign them over to other local authorities including Wakefield and Leeds City Councils for them to use as their supported/housing stock, resulting in migrating people across the country just to fill the empty communities. This is not morally or economically right and should be scrutinised immediately, so this same mistake does not keep occurring. negative impact through increased pollution. Rural North Yorkshire has better than average standards for noise, light and air pollution. The construction traffic and works along with the permanent addition of 10,000 people (a small town) into the middle of the area will irrevocably impact the entire area in a significant and negative way. Air pollution will increase, light pollution will increase, noise pollution will increase to the permanent detriment of all residents in the local rural villages, before even considering the impact on 100,000s of the local wildlife. Environmental risks the size and scale of the development, expanding across a significant area of flooding in North Yorkshire will worsen the situation for the future residents of Maltkiln and all existing residents of the local villages. No amount of design in flood mitigation/defence will circumvent the level of flooding that occurs annually across such a low-lying area of North Yorkshire. It is just bad planning and design to consider a development of such magnitude in an area that floods as frequently and easily as here does. I've seen in countless times across the UK, the target housing numbers are just was in excess of what the topology is capable of receiving. The maximum number for that area should not exceed 500 dwellings, and that is probably too many. Copley and Mytholmroyd in West Yorkshire area excellent examples of the nightmares that ensue by over developing in the centre of such a blatant flood risk. transport networks The A59 between Whixley and Kirk Hammerton is already host to countless traffic collisions resulting in severe injuries and even death and has long been overdue corrective works to focus on the safety of residents and commuters. The proposal seeks to not address this in any way and will only add to the problem for the entirety of the construction period (estimating 10 long year) and does not solve any of the issues that exist today. If the road network is severely dangerous now, what will adding 3500-7000 more vehicles to the area do? Diversion of B6265 problem the proposed diversion simply cannot exist as it has been proposed currently. This position of the diversion intends to block current access to the A59 from the B6265 and divert westward, through a field just after the junction of the B6265 and Boroughbridge Road into Green Hammerton. The placing of this junction will see commuters travelling to and from the B6265 and York to divert through Green Hammerton itself. The proposal has just intended to indirectly create a rat run of increased traffic for all drivers/delivery vans/google maps followers, to instantly increase traffic flow through a small and quiet rural village. The proposal increases pollution in the village, it increases the risk of traffic collisions, and it increases the risk of injury and death to residents including a high percentage of elderly and young children.</p>
14	<p>Infrastructure!! Where is it? Our doctors and schools are oversubscribed - traffic is already heavy how do you mitigate that? impact on Green Hammerton and Kirk Hammerton not addressed at all. lack of substantial information re parking, re the station, re traffic. It's basically crazy to build so many houses at a time - scale it down so that all these points can be addressed organically. LISTEN to local people!</p>
19	<p>I am writing to formally object to the proposed development of 3,000 new dwellings in the area, and to request that the planning authority gives serious consideration to the significant and lasting negative impacts this proposal would have on the surrounding villages and countryside. First and foremost, the scale of this development is wholly disproportionate to its rural setting. The surrounding villages are small, established communities whose character is defined by their countryside environment. The construction of a development of this magnitude would fundamentally and irreversibly alter the area, changing residents outlook from open</p>

	<p>countryside to an urban townscape. This loss of rural character cannot be mitigated once it has occurred. The disruption caused during the construction phase alone would be severe and prolonged. Years of heavy vehicle movements, noise, dust, and road closures would significantly affect residents' quality of life across neighbouring villages. Local roads, many of which are narrow and unsuitable for sustained heavy traffic, would be placed under unacceptable strain, increasing congestion and raising serious safety concerns. The environmental impact of the proposal is also of deep concern. The loss of greenfield and agricultural land represents a permanent reduction in productive farmland, at a time when food security and sustainable land use should be prioritised. In addition, the development would cause unavoidable harm to local wildlife habitats, displacing species and fragmenting ecological corridors that currently support biodiversity. No amount of landscaping can adequately replace established natural habitats. Infrastructure in the area is already under pressure and is not capable of supporting a development of this scale. Local schools, GP surgeries, dentists, and public transport services are operating at or near capacity. The road network lacks the resilience required to accommodate a significant increase in traffic, and there is no credible evidence that proposed infrastructure improvements would be delivered in a timely or sufficient manner to address this. Furthermore, the cumulative impact on surrounding villages must be considered. What may be presented as a single development will result in urban sprawl that erodes the distinct identities of neighbouring communities, effectively merging villages into a larger town without the infrastructure or planning safeguards such a transformation would require. For these reasons, I strongly urge the planning authority to reject this application. The proposal represents overdevelopment, causes unacceptable harm to the environment, undermines rural communities, and fails to demonstrate that essential infrastructure can be delivered to meet the needs of both existing and future residents. Thank you for considering my objection.</p>
27	<p>I am concerned about the inadequate transport links especially the increased traffic in A 59. The road is already busy and dangerous. Increased traffic will result in congestion. There is no reliable public transport. The trains are often late or cancelled. Traffic will also spill over into back routes, using the old bridge at Cattal and into Tockwith which is already grid locked down the Main Street.</p>
28	<p>The original proposal did not cross the A59 why has this changed? having watched this development evolve over the last 10 plus years, it still remains a mystery that this proposal made more economic sense vs Flaxby, with readymade employment accessible in walking distance (thus environmentally friendly) and next to transport.</p>
45	<p>A lot of the transport plan is built around there being a railway station at Cattal - It needs to be full upgraded before the houses are lived in as it is not fit for purpose. Secondly the York outer ring road has long traffic jams with the houses there are now made worse in summer by holiday makers. it seems there are government building targets, so this has to be built - but is it in the right place are there enough local employment opportunities? Do enough people wish to live here, some of the new builds in Great Ouseburn remain unsold.</p>
46	<p>The consultation process came very late, lacks detail and seems to be a box-ticking exercise after the horse has bolted, which will lead many people to simply not engage with it as it appears that doing so will have no influence on the outcome of the process/development. This has been the case with several other developments in the area, with the result that locals feel excluded, powerless and that their views are not being considered. There is also a feeling that with so many housing developments in this area in recent years, housing has been dumped on us from both Harrogate Council and NYC. The development will introduce yet more cars into the area when the local road network already cannot cope. There doesn't seem to be any viable plan in the development for Cattle railway station, which already has such meagre parking space availability that cars are forced to park on the main road, resulting in a hazard. To introduce yet more cars risks disaster. A viable plan simply must have a sizeable park and ride facility at Cattal station. Another issue is the widespread flooding in the area, particularly at and around Cattal bridge, where the proposed development will compound the problems. Relationships with local landowners seem to have broken down, with two of them withdrawing and the threat of compulsory purchase orders being used. There seems to be a lack of foresight and planning at all stages. This is no way to plan or proceed with a development that will be so impactful for generations.</p>
48	<p>I am writing as a local resident to formally object to the above-referenced planning application. I have lived at xxx for years and believe this proposal will significantly impact the local area. I wish to object on the following grounds: 1. The proposed development is out of character with the surrounding area. The scale of the development does not respect the local villages significantly their proportions. 2. The proposal will cause a significant impact on already significantly struggling infrastructure such as water demand, sewage, and already unreliable and struggling transport links including road and rail. 3. Inability to police, the local area adequately due to increase in population within 5 miles of the proposed development. 4. Pressure on emergency services to respond and attend to emergencies within the national guidelines along with the Emergency Preparedness, Resilience and Response (EPRR). 3. The increase in traffic will exacerbate existing congestion on the A59 and within Whixley, Green Hammerton, Kirk Hammerton, Cattal and other surrounding villages, is already a hazard for pedestrians and cyclists. In conclusion, I believe the proposal</p>

	constitutes inappropriate development and fails to comply with. I would like to be notified of the decision and any future committee meetings regarding this case.
51	This proposal is an abomination. The whole area has been completely obliterated from mass development. Whether every small village put under massive pressure to the size of Knaresborough doubled plus Harrogate. This are all. Can't ever get out of the crossroads there are no jobs in area. People being sent home from Harrogate H as there's no beds free. No go appointments. No school places. Local houses aren't selling you can't get into town so stop shopping which is killing off business. Local town has already doubled in All surrounding villages seen mass development already. How much more development does a rural area need/ how much more can it take?! More arable land being destroyed when this country is facing a food security crisis On a Grand scale. To build on more fertile arable land is either blindingly stupid or quite treacherous. The U.K. is full to bursting. The huge increase of immigration is overwhelming everything in this small island. Services are buckling under the weight of its burden. And the U.K. is losing so much of its biodiversity which cannot afford. A study found the U.K. is one of the world's most nature depleted countries, with on average about half its bio- diversity left. And according to government figures I last saw in November 2020, 268,385 homes in England had been empty for at least six months. They should be sold for rock bottom prices for first time buyers to invest and do up, which would give people a step in the housing ladder whilst helping do U.K. local areas. Then look at all the potential housing we have above shops, commercial premises that have closed down etc. Apple-converted-space which would all help to regenerate the areas. At no cost to the council whilst giving people steps into the housing ladder and creating great investments. But it's always the easy option to let housebuilding companies have more green field sites. Building on green belt should be made illegal. This is a rural area not a town!
61	The consultation process has been deeply flawed and lacks credibility. Communication has been consistently poor, with conflicting and at times contradictory information provided. Basic questions regarding infrastructure, timelines, costs, and delivery have gone unanswered or been met with vague, evasive responses. The absence of clear detail suggests that key elements have not been properly considered, calling into question whether this consultation is meaningful or merely a procedural exercise. Confidence in North Yorkshire County Council has been further eroded by bully tactics of threatening a CPO. This also raises serious concerns about the credibility of the consultation and whether stakeholder input is being meaningfully considered at all.
66	We do not support this development and believe it will have significant and lasting negative impacts on our local area, particularly in relation to road congestion, road safety, and environmental damage. Traffic and Road Safety Concerns. The existing road network serving Cattal and the surrounding villages is already under strain. The roads are narrow, rural in nature, and unsuitable for a substantial increase in daily traffic. The scale of the proposed development will inevitably result in significantly higher vehicle movements, including commuter traffic, delivery vehicles, and construction traffic. We are particularly concerned about: Increased congestion during peak hours Reduced safety for pedestrians, cyclists, and horse riders Increased risk of accidents on roads not designed for this level of use We do not believe that the proposed mitigation measures adequately address these issues, and we are concerned that traffic modelling underestimates real-world impacts on surrounding villages. Environmental Impact The area surrounding Cattal is environmentally sensitive and valued for its countryside, wildlife, and rural character. The proposed development risks: Loss of green space and wildlife habitats. Disruption to local ecosystems and biodiversity Increased noise, light, and air pollution Long-term environmental degradation that cannot be fully mitigated Construction activity itself will also have a prolonged negative impact, including heavy vehicle movements, noise, dust, and disturbance to wildlife and residents. This development prioritises large-scale housing growth at the expense of existing communities. The cumulative impact on villages such as Cattal has not, in our view, been given sufficient weight. We are concerned that once approved, the consequences for local residents will be permanent and irreversible. For the reasons outlined above, we strongly object to the Maltkiln development. We urge the planning authority to fully reconsider the scale and location of this proposal and to place greater emphasis on protecting existing communities, rural infrastructure, and the natural environment. Thank you for taking our concerns into account.
68	With the number of serious accidents that are happening already due to the speed & the volume of traffic on the a59 I think you will be creating more incidents and danger to life, also the cattail bridge can't cope with the volume of traffic, the train station and line is not big enough. Then there is the fact that we are trying to take away good British farmland and scenic countryside. there will also be too much strain on the exciting infrastructure there are plenty more well-suited locations that could be used without all these problems you will be creating with the Maltkiln.
72	Total lack of clarification, communication and detail of the whole of the Maltkin development. Unless you are on fakebook there seems to have been no other publicised meetings. As a Green Hammerton resident of the last 30 years I am obviously opposed to this plan, making our village into a small town. Over the last 10 years we have had new estate upon new estate added to the nucleus of our village changing what was once a quaint Yorkshire village and now with the Maltkin development you are proposing to change it from a village

	altogether. As normal the areas outside of Harrogate get the brunt of government development and as long as it's not in the councillors back garden, whatever happens outside of that is fine!!
73	I live in Tockwith so regularly drive and walk through the areas on the map. I see numerous deer, hares, buzzards, kites and a whole host of other wildlife that will have swathes of their homes destroyed. My son has special needs and cycles to the station. He will not be safe with increased traffic travelling at speed through country lanes nor will other walkers and cyclists.
80	The planned settlement is far too large. It is to be built on productive agricultural land. It will swamp the established settlements of Cattal, Green Hammerton, Kirk Hammerton and Whixley. Insufficient land to be left between settlements. No predestination access across A59 has been planned separate.
91	I'm a resident in the area and want to express how concerned my family is over the plans to dwarf our villages with this huge project. I believe it will worsen the conditions for everyone living in the area, saturating the roads, our schools and NHS. I strongly oppose Maltkiln.
117	I have to say that I do not agree with upcoming settlement Maltkiln. To take away fertile used agricultural land is nothing short of criminal. There are other places for example Flaxby that has a disused train station that would benefit not just new housing but also the people who work at the industrial estate and ease the congestion on the A59 but no let's put it somewhere no one wants you devaluing homes - destroying farm land and taking away people's livelihoods all for.
121	I am writing as a long-standing resident of Green Hammerton to formally express my strong objection to the proposed Maltkiln development and to convey the depth of upset, anxiety, and sense of loss this proposal has caused within our community. Green Hammerton is a small rural village. Many of us chose to live here and invested significant personal and financial resources in our homes precisely because of its character, scale, and surrounding countryside. The proposal to build a settlement of 3,500 homes immediately adjacent to the village represents a fundamental and irreversible change to everything that made this area desirable. Despite repeated assurances, it is impossible to see how a development of this magnitude will not overwhelm local infrastructure, place intolerable pressure on roads, schools, healthcare, and services, and permanently erode the rural identity of our village. The scale is entirely disproportionate to its surroundings and effectively forces Green Hammerton to become a satellite or suburb of a new town it did not choose and does not need. What has been particularly distressing is the feeling that local voices carry little weight compared to abstract housing targets. Consultation has felt performative rather than meaningful, with decisions appearing predetermined regardless of the strength of local opposition. This has led many residents to feel powerless, ignored, and sacrificed for wider strategic aims that offer them no tangible benefit. The emotional and mental toll of this proposal should not be underestimated. For many residents, this development represents the loss of peace, identity, and certainty about the future losses that cannot be mitigated by landscaping plans or aspirational promises about infrastructure delivery. I support the principle of providing new homes where they are genuinely needed. However, housing need alone cannot justify the imposition of such profound harm on an existing community, particularly when alternative approaches and locations could distribute growth more fairly and sustainably. I urge those responsible for this proposal to reconsider both the scale and location of this development, to properly account for its impact on existing residents, and to demonstrate that planning decisions are being made with fairness, proportionality, and genuine respect for established communities. This email is submitted as a formal expression of objection and should be recorded as such.

## 2.2 Appendix B

Matter for Outline	
3	I am concerned in particular regarding 4 elements of the proposed development; 1. Lack of parking provision at Cattal station. I live in a nearby village and to encourage use of public transport in the outlying areas, appropriate parking is needed. Currently train users have to park at the roadside in either Cattal or Kirk Hammerton. Ideal opportunity is being missed. 2. Sewage treatment. new treatment facility is vital in order to process the waste from 3-4000 new houses. Expecting the current treatment works in Kirk Hammerton to handle this is a non-starter. Or will Yorkshire water simply pump it into the Nidd?? 3. Parking for 1 car only. This is totally unrealistic in a rural area, people will have at least 2 cars, so they will have to park on the roadside. No reduction in number of vehicles, but plenty of obstructions on estate roads for bin collections, emergency services etc, not to mention the friction caused between neighbours. 4. Increased traffic on other local roads. In particular, Cattal village/bridge, Rudgate crossroads Tockwith.

6	<p>The new development is unwelcome in any shape by local communities, but given that you are intent on proceeding regardless, there are a number of especially unwanted elements to this proposal. The proposed boundary is far too close to the current boundary of Green Hammerton. While I recognise the need for new houses, the proposed boundary all-but links what is currently an isolated and long-established village to this new development. It seems this has been done with little regard to the structure of our village or impact on its residents. There needs to be a far more established border between the two, to avoid the area merging into a settlement the size of a small town (or larger if it were to creep towards Whixley and/or Kirk Hammerton). There also seems to be a blatant disregard for the additional requirements this will place on local travel infrastructure. The proposal is full of half-promises and things that won't address this issue, when what we actually need is the following guaranteed up front: increased road capacity through dualling the A59 between York and the A1; dualling of the rail line between Poppleton and Knaresborough; and a pre-agreed bus service, that serves York-Harrogate, rather than a half-baked statement saying it 'should' be discussed further. The wider area is chronically under-connected for pedestrians and cyclists, so as a gesture to support the wider community of surrounding villages, there needs to be a substantial investment by the developer in a series of all-weather, well lit, and well considered pedestrian/cycle routes. These need to link the new development to the surrounding villages, but also the villages of Green Hammerton, Kirk Hammerton and Whixley to each other. These routes need to provide safe crossings (ideally tunnels) across the A59 and railway line. Finally, there needs to be serious work completed on local utilities to improve resilience and supply for pre-existing and new residents. The area has recently suffered from a major sewage drain failure, requiring weeks of work to fix. We also have long-standing low water pressure, which a new development will only exacerbate, and again, a recent burst water main, causing substantial disruption. Likewise, the wider area needs a full fibre upgrade, as we are stuck with an overpriced fibre broadband offer, with no competition. The local mobile phone network is also shockingly bad, and that's before the substantial increase in local population. We are also poorly placed to receive support from the police - given the substantial increase in local population, have you even considered how we will be supported by the emergency services? In summary, your plan seems poorly put together (either wilfully or through sheer neglect), completely disregarding a substantial number of issues that would both directly affect the new residents, as well as affecting existing residents of neighbouring villages. This gives local communities very poor confidence in the intent of the developer and provides substantial evidence to the future potential of neglect in developing this new settlement.</p>
10	<p>Our concern is the increased volume of traffic using the roads in our Parish and in particular the Rudgate crossroad. With the recent and projected increase in residential units in Tockwith and Wetherby, the addition of a further 3,000 units on Maltkiln will exacerbate the problem further. We request that the Council and their Infrastructure Delivery Strategy Unit take into account the developments in the surrounding area as well as that specific to Maltkiln.</p>
11	<p><b>TRAFFIC ROUTE CROSSING PROVISION</b> - New roundabouts on A59 should not be along the original route and should be planned with traffic light control during peak periods and subways for pedestrians and for provision of wildlife corridors. There have been numerous crashes along the A59 over the last 26 years that I am aware of being a resident. Most of these were associated with junctions, but the result was often that vehicles ploughed off the road into the field boundaries and vegetation. Cyclist have been killed by careless drivers on the Boroughbridge road. Few cyclists use the A59 during the working week as it is recognised to be too dangerous. This situation is unlikely to diminish in the future without taking positive steps to reduce both the traffic speed and volume using the A59 &amp; other routes. The new Maltkiln development will be introducing more traffic onto the network, so positive planning is required to ensure accident reduction measures and physical separation to keep pedestrians safe is at the heart of the road network plans. Roundabouts with underpasses are a realistic and affordable solution. Curving approaches to roundabouts will mean drivers wishing to continue on their routes (primarily along the A59) cannot see the continuation of the road from a distance away and so it reduces the potential for drivers to misjudge the absence of crossing or slow-moving traffic. Not being able to see a safe exit from a distance away obliges drivers to slow down. This will make accidents less likely and slow the speed of traffic using the roundabout making it safer for mopeds and slower vehicles such as farm vehicles. Developers can construct the roundabouts away from the current roads leaving just the final road tie-ins having impact on the current roads. This will minimise disruption and other detriments to current road users &amp; villages. It would minimise queues both on the A59 and the other roads/villages access points with their associated noise &amp; pollution during the construction process. It is safer for the contractor's workforce to construct away from live traffic streams. Also safer for A59 traffic as it would not have to negotiate road works and any task lighting would not be in the line of sight of the road users. There is a high disparity between respective traffic volumes and vehicle types which use the A59 when compared to the traffic from other joining directions. This means a roundabout will not work as a roundabout should during peak periods because traffic from the minor roads will not be able to access the roundabout due to the constant stream using the A59. Traffic lights can alleviate this and should be sensitive to both queues lengths and wait times to advise on the light sequencing. Underpasses beneath or in the proximity of roundabouts would ensure a safe pleasant mechanism to cross the A59 and other roads for cyclists, children, wheelchair users, people with prams and less mobile individuals. The currently suggested road level crossings do not reflect the Underpasses would not allow safe use by children, the visually impaired and numerous other users who may be less able to safely cross using pedestrian crossing. In</p>

addition, underpasses provide corridors for wildlife which will also mean less interaction with traffic making the road network safer for both animals and drivers. Allowing wildlife to circulate safely between existing green spaces will improve diversity in the breeding populations and the enhancement of green circulation corridors proving visual amenity value to crossing points. Underpasses will provide visual and physical separation between road traffic and pedestrians and in doing so, the pedestrians are less likely to be put in a dangerous area when collisions on the road do occur. Underpasses provide long-term health benefits to the community by physically separating people from the noise, dust, flying debris, rubbish and pollution from traffic. Underpasses beneath the railway should be provided in the master plan. Bridges and level crossings do not provide a safe method of crossing these transport corridors, but underpasses would do. Underpasses allow free, safe crossing movements of pedestrians including children, the visually impaired, wheelchair user's and cyclists etc. Underpasses do not restrict use by those with mobility issues, or parents with prams wheelchair users etc.

**TRAFFIC ROUTE CROSSING PROVISION** - New roundabouts on A59 should not be along the original route and should be planned with traffic light control during peak periods and subways for pedestrians and for provision of wildlife corridors. There have been numerous crashes along the A59 over the last 26 years that I am aware of being a resident. Most of these were associated with junctions, but the result was often that vehicles ploughed off the road into the field boundaries and vegetation. Cyclist have been killed by careless drivers on the Boroughbridge road. Few cyclists use the A59 during the working week as it is recognised to be too dangerous. This situation is unlikely to diminish in the future without taking positive steps to reduce both the traffic speed and volume using the A59 & other routes. The new Maltkiln development will be introducing more traffic onto the network, so positive planning is required to ensure accident reduction measures and physical separation to keep pedestrians safe is at the heart of the road network plans.

Roundabouts with underpasses are a realistic and affordable solution. Curving approaches to roundabouts will mean drivers wishing to continue on their routes (primarily along the A59) cannot see the continuation of the road from a distance away and so it reduces the potential for drivers to misjudge the absence of crossing or slow-moving traffic. Not being able to see a safe exit from a distance away obliges drivers to slow down. This will make accidents less likely and slow the speed of traffic using the roundabout making it safer for mopeds and slower vehicles such as farm vehicles. Developers can construct the roundabouts away from the current roads leaving just the final road tie-ins having impact on the current roads. This will minimise disruption and other detriments to current road users & villages. It would minimise queues both on the A59 and the other roads/villages access points with their associated noise & pollution during the construction process. It is safer for the contractor's workforce to construct away from live traffic streams. Also safer for A59 traffic as it would not have to negotiate road works and any task lighting would not be in the line of sight of the road users. There is a high disparity between respective traffic volumes and vehicle types which use the A59 when compared to the traffic from other joining directions. This means a roundabout will not work as a roundabout should during peak periods because traffic from the minor roads will not be able to access the roundabout due to the constant stream using the A59. Traffic lights can alleviate this and should be sensitive to both queues lengths and wait times to advise on the light sequencing. Underpasses beneath or in the proximity of roundabouts would ensure a safe pleasant mechanism to cross the A59 and other roads for cyclists, children, wheelchair users, people with prams and less mobile individuals. The currently suggested road level crossings do not reflect the Underpasses would not allow safe use by children, the visually impaired and numerous other users who may be less able to safely cross using pedestrian crossing. In addition, underpasses provide corridors for wildlife which will also mean less interaction with traffic making the road network safer for both animals and drivers. Allowing wildlife to circulate safely between existing green spaces will improve diversity in the breeding populations and the enhancement of green circulation corridors proving visual amenity value to crossing points. Underpasses will provide visual and physical separation between road traffic and pedestrians and in doing so, the pedestrians are less likely to be put in a dangerous area when collisions on the road do occur. Underpasses provide long-term health benefits to the community by physically separating people from the noise, dust, flying debris, rubbish and pollution from traffic. Underpasses beneath the railway should be provided in the master plan. Bridges and level crossings do not provide a safe method of crossing these transport corridors, but underpasses would do. Underpasses allow free, safe crossing movements of pedestrians including children, the visually impaired, wheelchair user's and cyclists etc. Underpasses do not restrict use by those with mobility issues, or parents with prams wheelchair users etc. Underpass allows wildlife connections without putting wildlife in contact with transport corridors. Underpasses provide opportunities for biodiversity and enhancement of green circulation corridors, enhancing the visual amenity value of a crossing point. In conclusion on points 1 & 2, although promoters/contractors may argue that road & rail underpasses and the suggested location for the roundabouts being away from the current road alignment may cause more initial expense, the reality is that the project is still affordable and these solutions align with the DPD for the aforementioned reasons, which the current scheme does not. These should not follow the A59 because being in proximity of this busy noisy road is not a sensible arrangement. Instead, these routes to connect to adjacent villages should be kept remote from the A59 along green routes and only connect through to the A59 at actual underpass locations.

**BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE & Drainage** The master plan must ensure a net reduction in water running into the Beck that flows into Kirk Hammerton. The beck currently floods the main street in Kirk Hammerton during periods of high rainfall. Climate change will increase the rainfall, and hence upstream inflow needs to be attenuated to better than current run-off rates to alleviate future flooding. Section 2.13 states that the strategy is to mimic the existing regime. It is considered normal practice to attenuate flows to green filed run off rates. Doing so will not address the existing downstream flooding in Kirk Hammerton. The master plan needs to have more

	<p>attenuation than green field run off rates, taking account of all perceived future development run-off. The masterplan must remove references to retaining existing hedges, tress and the like as only being retained 'where feasible'. This is not definitive language, and retention is feasible by accommodating it in the masterplan and it is not feasible if not accounted for specifically in the masterplan. So, this phrasing is not adequate to protect the existing planting. In addition, where any planting is to be removed in the masterplan, there should be 150% replacement elsewhere to discourage poor planning which removes the existing planting. The record of existing trees and hedgerows shown excludes the existing planting on the north and some areas to the south side of the A59. This should be retained and enhanced. Where it is unavoidable to have Pedestrian routes following the A59 across the green gaps, to Green Hammerton, the existing planting should be supplemented to provide a thicker wooded separator to mitigate the noise, dust and smells emanating from the Road. The 10% biodiversity net gain is the legal minimum. The masterplan should always seek to go above and beyond legal minimum. The masterplan should strive to capture as many opportunities as possible to deliver 'best in class's garden village development and future proof the development from any tendencies to under deliver. The masterplan appears weak in this section with no clear directions on the actual housing development areas. The net home density and building heights should be limited to ensure that the masterplan does not create green spaces outside of the housing areas to the detriment of the quality of the housing areas themselves. The master plan needs to stipulate clearly the aspects of the housing areas that allow them to create the reality of a garden village. The masterplan is weak in the proposed density, appearance and materiality of the housing and makes reference to these being detailed design parameters which will be set out in design codes. This makes it impossible to determine if it is even possible to deliver the required housing in accordance with the DPD. In addition, it makes no specific reference to what design codes are being referred to. If these are statutory design codes, this statement is irrelevant because the legal requirements would prevail. However, if these are new design codes being written to guide the development, it is essential that a full public consultation process on these is concluded and comments fed back and incorporated BEFORE approving the masterplan. How are North Yorkshire Council otherwise to be convinced that the masterplan will deliver the envisages exemplar garden village? In the absence of these key details being available, it is reasonable that the masterplan is more specific on these topics. To do otherwise risks the actual viability, deliverability and affordability of the masterplan. There is a risk that the actual allocated housing density within each area creates a stark, bleak urbanisation within an otherwise well thought out master plan for a garden village. To avoid this, each housing area should have minimum standards clearer identified that each developer has to adhere to. This would remove any ambiguity and provide clarity for all future planning submissions for the plot developments. The following should be defined to ensure compliance with the DPD. Maximum housing density. Statements that provisions must be made for wildlife corridors between gardens (and any other barriers to wildlife). Guidance on the minimum number of different planting species/ages sizes/types etc to ensure planting schemes attract biodiversity and retain pollinators. GARDENS to have planted boarders in preference to fences to promote biodiversity, provide visual amenity for house owners and a net green village feel to each housing area. The proportion of hard landscaping, roads etc (i.e. areas of tarmac, block pavers, asphalt, concrete et al) to gardens and green spaces. Details of natural and less carbon intensive materials that are deemed examples of appropriate alternatives to the defaults of tarmac, block pavers, asphalt, concrete et al. Pedestrian and cycling through routes should be provided in and around each housing area to encourage people to walk around neighbourhoods without dead ends. The height of housing should be kept to a ground and first floor dwelling height as far as possible to ensure sunshine can shine into homes and gardens. Where taller properties are envisaged the master plan needs to stipulate reasons for this and provide the associated minimum separation distances to ensure dark corridors are prevented and long shadows as far as possible do not compromise other dwellings and public spaces etc. Where taller buildings are envisaged, these should be limited to the village centre and limited to less than 3 stories to be consistent with the look and feel of larger neighbouring town centres like Weatherby and Knaresborough high street. Where any low-rise flats, maisonettes etc, are envisaged, the arrangement of buildings facades should step to allow sunlight to enhance the spatial planning of neighbouring dwellings. These stepped features would provide private open spaces (broad balconies) which can be used for planting, outside dining and give distance view across the built environment to the green spaces beyond. The master plan should stipulate the types and envisaged maturity of the planting (hedges &amp; trees) that should be planned within each housing area in locations which will remain in shared or public ownership to ensure the master plan was not undermined by future owner/occupiers. There needs to be a robust mechanism which prevents homeowners converting green space in front of their dwellings into addition</p>
13	<p>While I am concerned about the loss of green space in a rural area I understand the need for more housing across the country. Before supporting this development, I would like NYCC to ensure that the following elements are ensured by them in terms of public traffic and amenities and that they are prepared to censure the developers if they fail to make provision for which they are responsible. NYCC must ensure development must be served by good public transport i.e. with a usable timetable including bus services linking nearby villages, including Cattal, Tockwith, Cowthorpe, Bickerton and Bilton with the new development and the railway station. This will improve the service to existing resident of these villages and enable them to access amenities such as GP and local shops based in the new development. This will reduce the inevitable increase in private car traffic to and from a development of this size. It will also help to reduce pollution and enable the young and older generations access to amenities in health services. It will also enable people who cannot drive due to health or age to remain in their communities. Adequate parking around the station must be</p>

	<p>provided to ensure on street parking is not required. This should be free parking to encourage use of public transport. On a wider issue Skew Kirk Bridge should finally be reinstated to provide access across the river. This should then be linked to the green path enabling cyclists, walkers and horse riders to avoid having to use narrow rural roads. During the building process access to the site must be strictly controlled to avoid damage to road verges on narrow rural roads and most importantly ensure that large vehicles prohibited from travelling across Cattal Bridge do not attempt to cross. This is a vital route and closure due to damage by prohibited vehicles in the past has necessitated lengthy detours to access local amenities including health services and trunk roads. Road closures during the development must be carefully planned to ensure the least disruption to local residents and not for prolonged lengths of time before alternative routes through the area are available. There is a distinct shortage of affordable homes in rural communities meaning many young people are forced to move away from their family and community, as are older residents wishing to downsize when on a pension. It is important that sufficient affordable (truly affordable) housing forms a significant part of the development and the developers are not allowed to reduce this number once building is approved. To avoid urbanisation of the rural environment other proposed or sites recognised for housing development in the surrounding area should be curtailed.</p>
20	<p>I feel development really needs to make more of Cattal station as a transport hub for people beyond Maltkiln development. Cattal has a wide catchment area for users from surrounds villages such as Tockwith, Cowthorpe, Thorpe Underwood, Bickerton, Green Hammerton, Whixley, Great Ouseburn, Little Ouseburn, Linton on Ouse, Newton on Ouse. This is increasingly as York Council make travel to the railway station in York increasingly difficult and time consuming, extending commuter journey times for people who work in York and Leeds. The current situation is laughable where the station had no parking at all. In a time when Government policy is to encourage people to use public transport, new development also need to consider making stations accessible to those within a reasonable catchment area. Tockwith is only 3.2 miles away, yet has no all round walking or cycling route to Cattal. So, connectivity to enable nearby villages use the facilities and infrastructure of Maltkiln should be considered.</p>
22	<p>We farmland up to the eastern boundary of the proposed Maltkin development. This land lies downstream of this development therefore we would like more detail of the proposals for the capture and release of the surface water from the site. We would also like more detail of your proposals for the disposal of sewage. Having studied the display boards at the recent meeting we have concerns over the future of Parker Lane and how it could affect the social flow of the village. It is now becoming apparent how very much everyday life in Kirk Hammerton will be affected both during and after the construction of the new roundabouts and road layout, and this disruption will continue for many years as this is such a massive development.</p>
26	<p>Proposed Maltkin Development. Public event 15/1/2026. Which I attended and these are my thoughts. 1. Poor Communication before the event. Many individuals were unable to access the consultation documents in advance of the meeting. Leading to lots of frustration and people not being able to prepare sensible questions for discussion. 2. Lack of clear identification of representative. Not all had name badges, and this makes the discussions difficult. 3. Inability to answer questions. Being passed from NYCC and Caddick was frustrating and often questions couldn't be answered. I found it strange that the representatives didn't want to make notes of useful points that may be helpful. This would help to develop a feeling that residents are being listened to. We know the development will happen but just want to be listened to. Local residents will have some very good ideas. 4. One Parking Space per dwelling. Type into AI and I think you've got this concept wrong. 5. Presentation of the development as a whole. The development was presented as a single, comprehensive scheme, despite it being known that not all the land is currently available. This constitutes a misrepresentation of the deliverability of the proposals to the public. 6. Green Gap Assessment. Previous documents stated that the original green gap was the minimum required. Latest appraisal has reduced this gap. What new evidence supports this and where can residents review this evidence. 7. Flooding of beck in Kirk Hammerton. Over 30 years of living here. I have witnessed on three occasions the beck flood into Kirk Hammerton main street. Please get the flood risk right. 8. Cattal railway station and parking. I believe Maltkin is fundamentally centred around Cattal station. Given that many rail users drive from nearby villages and park on surrounding roads and cause congestion. It is fundamental to build a car park at Cattal first thing with the involvement of Network rail. Sorry, this seems like basics to me. 9. Traffic Management and Through routes. Unclear what measures are being proposed to prevent traffic from Maltkin using Kirk Hammerton as a through route. Gilthswaite lane labelled as a quiet lane and no representatives could explain how this would work. Yorkshire water at present moment has a major problem on A59. Traffic this morning backed through Kirk Hammerton to try to take shortcuts through village. Anybody doing this would have then witnessed the effect of the KH railway gates closing for trains, so a good example of how our local transport system gets easily jammed up. Visit Facebook to witness the poor PR for Yorkshire water. Three way traffic light system is helping KH residents get safely onto A59 however how this junction is going to be managed when Mailkin begins. Ignoring it sorry isn't a safe answer. Risk of closure of Parker Lane. Deep concern that Parker Lane will be closed to cars and pedestrians. I believe that a representative said it would be closed by Network rail and then a new bridge built to the west for Maltkin. This would be great for Maltkin. When building Maltkin do</p>

	it but don't do it to the detriment of local villages. At the very least a foot bridge at Paker lane. In every Maltkin consultation none of the Representatives ever pick up the how Parker Lane works for KH and GH
28	I spoke with the developer at the consultation. They seem fixated on delivering the development with little interest in local requirement and opinion. In principle I am not opposed to the project, and I appreciate the need for new housing stock. However, the lack of infrastructure plans for phase 1 especially strikes me as a PR disaster in waiting for NYC and the developer! Especially the lack of investment consideration for schools, doctors and roads. A sweeping response from them of well get to this once we have the green light on the just shows lack of empathy and interest! I am sure many people have highlighted this already... If 350 to 500 houses (around 800-1000 people) for phase 1 are built with little investment in infrastructure I expect the standard of living to be heavily reduced for the residents of Green Hammerton and Kirk Hammerton. I hope NYC and the developer start to listen to those that live locally and will be greatly affected by the lack of planning.
29	Good morning, I have reviewed the proposed plans and have no issues with the elements located within the village itself. However, I would like to raise a concern regarding the and the current speed limit on the approach to the village from Knaresborough and extending beyond Kirk Hammerton. While the plans include two roundabouts that will act as traffic 'calming features, there remains a significant stretch of road that would still benefit from additional measures. This is particularly important given the presence of another entrance/exit onto the A59 from Green Hammerton, which is already recognised as a hotspot for road traffic collisions and attracts regular police mobile speed cameras to combat the risk. To reduce the risk of further RTCs and to improve safety for residents, road users, and those accessing the A59, I would strongly recommend implementing a 40mph speed limit from the start of the settlement until clear of all residential and business properties in both directions, can be coordinated with static average speed cameras. This would provide a consistent, safer speed environment and contribute to lowering collision risks along this stretch. Not only would this save lives it is also good for the environment.
32	I am elderly resident on Parker Lane and am worried regarding the access to Kirk Hammerton if there are changes to the railway crossing giving me essential access to the village. I also use the facilities at Green Hammerton for a shop, doctors and social activities and at present Parker Lane is a quiet lane allowing easy access, and I am worried that it may become a rat run between the villages and make it difficult for residents to walk and cycle to Green and Kirk Hammerton amenities.
35	Upgrades to local infrastructure needs to happen especially the A59 which is an awful road. The amount of accidents on this stretch of road is horrendous and the with addition of several thousand more vehicles is totally absurd and it can't cope.
40	There is already a problem, occasionally, in Kirk Hammerton with flooding in the beck. More homes upstream with extra water runoff will make the flooding risk even worse.
44	I am writing as a local resident of Whixley, to formally object to the proposed Maltkiln Village development at Cattal. My objection is based not only on the significant traffic impacts of the proposal, but also on its wider and long-term consequences for local infrastructure, services, countryside, and the overall quality of life for existing and future residents. Scale and Overdevelopment: The proposal to deliver approximately 3,000-4,000 new homes within a relatively small and constrained area is fundamentally disproportionate to the size, capacity, and character of the surrounding settlements. The scale of development does not align with the land available nor with the existing infrastructure required to support a sustainable community. In its current form, the proposal risks creating an over-dense settlement that fails to deliver a reasonable minimum standard of living for residents. Impact on Local Services and Infrastructure Local services are already under considerable strain. GP surgeries, dental practices, schools, and emergency services across nearby towns and villages such as Tockwith, Wetherby, Knaresborough, and Boroughbridge are operating at or beyond capacity. The proposed development would place additional and unsustainable pressure on these services, with no realistic assurance that infrastructure upgrades would be delivered in advance of occupation. Traffic and Transport Constraints The local road network is wholly unsuitable for the scale of development proposed. The A59 is already heavily congested, and surrounding villages are served by narrow rural roads not designed to accommodate significant increases in traffic or construction-related HGV movements. There is a high likelihood that surrounding villages will experience increased rat-running, safety risks, and persistent disruption for many years. Public transport provision in the area is limited and does not provide a credible alternative to private car use, undermining claims of sustainable travel and further compounding congestion and environmental impacts. Impact on Countryside and Rural Character. The development would result in a substantial and irreversible loss of countryside, fundamentally altering the rural character of the area. This landscape provides environmental value, local identity, and separation between settlements. The scale of construction and urbanisation proposed risks coalescence, visual harm, and long-term degradation of the local environment. Long-Term Construction Impacts. The construction phase alone is likely to span a generation, subjecting surrounding villages to prolonged disruption, noise, pollution, construction traffic, and environmental harm. These impacts would not be short-term or temporary but sustained over many years,

	<p>significantly affecting existing communities who receive little or no benefit from the development. Alternative Sites It is particularly concerning that more suitable and strategic brownfield or previously developed sites, such as the abandoned golf course at Flaxton, appear to have been discounted. Such sites are better aligned with sustainable development principles, reduce countryside loss, and offer improved access to existing infrastructure. The decision to prioritise the Cattal site over more appropriate alternatives is difficult to justify. Taken as a whole, the proposal appears to conflict with core planning principles of sustainable development. The combination of excessive scale, inadequate infrastructure, traffic constraints, environmental harm, and service overload suggests that this development is not in the long-term interests of local communities or the wider region. For the reasons outlined above, I strongly object to the Maltkiln Village development at Cattal and urge North Yorkshire Council to reconsider the suitability, scale, and location of this proposal. I respectfully request that these concerns are fully considered as part of the planning process.</p>
50	<p>I do not feel that the volume of houses has taken into consideration the current network the volume which will travel over historical bridges such as cattle to Tockwith a long side additional routes that are small, and dangerous as it will be inundated with additional cars. Consider Rudgate crossroads both ends we have seen fatalities with the current traffic volumes. we also have the railway, there is no way to expand the track and dual it or add additional trains onto the route due to the nature of the land, and general route. Finally, we need to consider the parking for the railway. We will need an increase of users who will take alternative routes, such as parking at Green Hammerton or Poppleton whereby they will try and avoid the cattle rush/risk of missing the train due to additional numbers and reduced space.</p>
52	<p>I was incredibly disappointed to discover the lack of infrastructure being put in place to cope with this development. I found the host of the recent event (caddock) to be very unsympathetic and unable to provide locals with facts. It is unbelievable that they are being allowed to go ahead with such weak plans for ensuring the local area can cope with the development, road network, train lines, schools, shops etc. We are aware there is a need for housing, but this development is not being thought through and has not considered the local environment, communities and the historical environment they plan to build on.</p>
54	<p>I am concerned that the early phases will be occupied before key services such as primary schools, healthcare facilities and the local centre are delivered. The Masterplan indicates that primary school provision is not anticipated until Phase 2, with healthcare facilities also coming forward later, creating a significant gap between population growth and service availability. Without on-site provision from the outset, this is likely to place unsustainable pressure on local education and healthcare services, reducing access for both existing residents and new arrivals. These risks creating avoidable impacts on neighbouring communities. In the absence of schools, healthcare and day-to-day facilities in the early phases, residents will have little choice but to rely on private cars for most journeys. These risks increased congestion on the A59 and surrounding local roads, as well as rat-running through nearby villages. While public transport enhancements are referenced, there is insufficient clarity or certainty that frequent and viable bus services, or necessary highway improvements, will be in place from first occupation rather than at a later stage. Similarly, increased use of Cattal railway station may result in parking overspill unless this is proactively managed. In addition, construction traffic, noise and disruption over a prolonged period are likely to have a significant impact on nearby communities. I would ask the Council to give careful consideration to: How transport impacts during the early phases will be monitored and mitigated if they exceed expectations; and What protections will be put in place to manage construction impacts on surrounding villages. would urge the Council to work with local village parish councils to ensure that the phasing and delivery of infrastructure are aligned with housing delivery, in order to protect both new and existing residents and to support genuinely sustainable growth.</p>
57	<p>Engagement and transparency. I have submitted multiple representations on the Maltkiln proposals over several years. It is unclear how those comments have informed the evolving scheme. I would welcome confirmation that this submission will be reviewed in detail. Please also confirm whether the Council will publish a summary of consultation responses and resulting amendments to the Masterplan. This would help demonstrate meaningful engagement. Employment, Land Use and Spatial Strategy. Loss of existing employment. The Masterplan does not appear to strengthen local employment provision. In particular, it proposes the relocation of Johnsons of Whixley, the largest existing employer within 5 miles. It is unclear why development is not focused further west and south, where there are fewer residents and employers. Retaining established employment would better support sustainable travel and economic resilience. Positive elements acknowledged the provision of green infrastructure, village screening, on-site paths, sports facilities and a community hub is welcomed, subject to high-quality delivery and long-term management. Governance, Boundaries and Certainty. The development footprint has shifted again, moving significantly closer to Kirk Hammerton. The current boundary now lies only tens of metres from the village edge, apparently contrary to previous consultation feedback. At the same time, substantial meadow land is proposed to buffer development from open countryside to the west. No buffering is required to the west. Please clarify whether the Council retains firm control over site boundaries. Inadequate external cycle connections Despite claims of a comprehensive cycle network, off-site provision is extremely limited. Beyond a route to Green Hammerton, cyclists are expected to use local roads that will be heavily trafficked by Maltkiln-related vehicles. There are no safe, segregated cycle routes to: Hunsingore and on ward to the existing A168 Walshford Wetherby</p>

	<p>cycleway Cattal and villages to the south Knaresborough style The A59 is not a viable cycling corridor. Cycling on site is limited to a few hundred metres: not enough to justify the purchase of a cycle. The Masterplan would materially reduce cycling safety and attractiveness of cycling across the wider area. Unrealistic assumptions on car ownership. The sustainability case relies on low car ownership, yet rail destinations from Cattal are limited and many journeys will require onward travel, carrying goods, or access to dispersed destinations. Significant volumes of traffic are likely to access the A1(M), with vehicles diverting through Cattal and surrounding villages to avoid congestion at A59 junctions. This would materially harm road safety and residential amenity. While rail is a useful option, it is not a realistic alternative for most daily journeys. Services are small, noisy diesel, and result in door-to-door travel times of up to two hours for 20 miles to Leeds. My experience from living in a neighbouring village is that most use rail occasionally, and most journeys are made by car. The Masterplan does not demonstrate how car ownership will be reduced below one vehicle per household, nor how daily movements of several thousand vehicles will be avoided. Flood Risk and Drainage. Downstream flood risk to Kirk Hammerton. The Inspectorate requires that flood risk in Kirk Hammerton is not worsened. Extensive impermeable surfaces will increase peak runoff into Kirk Hammerton Beck. While SuDS will regulate most events, exceedance during increasingly frequent extreme rainfall is not addressed. The Masterplan does not explain how overflow would be safely managed, nor provide a firm commitment to the latest NTC SuDS standards or downstream diversion strategies. Digital Infrastructure and Utilities. Digital connectivity. Home and hybrid working are core objectives, yet commitments to full-fibre broadband and 5G are weak. Given the scale of development, guaranteed full-fibre connectivity should be a firm requirement from first occupation. Wastewater and sewage resilience. There is insufficient clarity on foul drainage for approximately 4,000 dwellings. It is unclear where wastewater will be treated (is this on land close to Kirk Hammerton? and whether discharge will be to Kirk Hammerton Beck or directly to the River Nidd. The Masterplan does not address failure scenarios. Given the frequency of sewage overflows in the region, explicit mitigation and overflow routing must be identified. Railway Crossings and Visual Impact. Proposed railway bridges. Indicative proposals for new road bridges particularly close to Kirk Hammerton are of concern. The railway is elevated and surrounding land floods, making underpasses impractical. Any bridge is therefore likely to be 8-10 metres high and visually dominant, comparable to a multi-storey structure when viewed from Parker Lane and Kirk Hammerton Lane. The Masterplan does not assess visual impact or propose mitigation. Estimated bridge heights and design responses should be disclosed. The Masterplan contains positive aspirations but leaves critical issues unresolved, particularly around transport realism, flood risk, infrastructure capacity and governance certainty. These matters require clearer resolution at masterplan stage to demonstrate that the proposal is deliverable, sustainable and policy compliant.</p>
58	<p>Contents of the draft masterplan. Don't feel that the plan gives any clear answers for local residents. Lacks specific details. My concerns are as follows: this is a plan for Maltkiln only and does not seem to include anything outside the boundary of the development like Kirk and Green Hammerton. There is no detail on delivery and the impact on existing communities. For example, at the meeting, it was suggested that the level crossing at Parker Lane may be closed. Closing this level crossing would cut off the main existing active travel route between Kirk and Green Hammerton. The new active travel routes proposed in the masterplan are a long diversion for residents of Kirk and Green. At the meeting on 15th Jan, despite asking, NYCC and Caddick were not prepared to give any detail on the following: density, affordable housing, sustainability, the proposed phasing of the project. When I tried to ask questions about the proposed development of 350 houses in Phase 1 which has been set out in a 'Screening opinion' document, they would not give any detail. the situation with the purchase of Johnson's land and the compulsory purchase proposed for land at the Cattal end of the development. contingencies for infra-structure development if only part of the plan is completed. This consultation was about the 'Masterplan' as a whole, rather than the realities that are likely to happen. There did not seem to be any consideration of mitigations for only partial development. the security of the 'green gap'. On transport, there is no detail on how the extra traffic on A49 would be alleviated. Also how to make this road safer. Needs to become 40mph limit from Skip bridge (to the East) to beyond Whitley crossroads to the West. NYCC/Caddick were unable to answer any questions on the train as said this would be down to Network Rail. Don't feel enough consideration has been given to parking. In the plan there is an area highlighted for parking in the centre of the settlement for the shops and the station, but this was not designed for a park and ride facility. The roads around Cattal and Hammerton stations have become unofficial park and ride sites for many people across Yorkshire who use it to avoid the traffic getting into York and Harrogate. The car park needs to cater for more than just the population of Maltkiln. (This is a good example of only looking at the development in isolation and not the wider picture). The active transport plan does not go beyond the boundaries of the plan. Who wants to cycle in a circle to nowhere? NYCC need to think more broadly and look at active travel routes to Knaresborough, Wetherby, Boroughbridge and York. Feedback on consultation event at KH village hall 15th Jan. Good to see a substantial number of representatives from Caddick and NYCC who we found were willing to take part in conversations with visitors. However, given the number of visitors, there should have been more staff. Event should have gone longer into the evening to allow people who work more time to attend. Would have helped if the Caddick/Stantec staff had had some sort of ID badge stating which of the organisations they were from and their specialist area. NYCC staff did have lanyards, but these did not give clear indication of their role. Documentation and survey on the consultation accessed via a QR code was pointed out at the front desk by the Caddick staff upon entry. Use of QR codes excludes certain sections of the community and although paper copies of the survey were</p>

	available these were not on the front welcome desk and were not highlighted. Information panels had key information on the bottom which has hard to read if you could not squat down.
59	We'd like to query what considerations have been made re. additional demand the settlement will bring to the emergency services. Will there be any additional data masts built to serve the area? Currently coverage is poor. We'd like to specifically state our disapproval of the four-story buildings proposed in the town centre near the train station - we feel to be in keeping with the existing surrounding area this is unnecessary and does the opposite from keeping the natural beauty of the area. We're in support of design plans being specified for contractors and would welcome the opportunity to comment on these. We were also happy to see the volume of active travel routes planned.
65	I support the need for new housing, but I have serious concerns about the scale and location of the proposed development. The proposal is not an extension of Kirk Hammerton, but the construction of a new town of around 4,000 homes in open countryside immediately adjacent to an existing rural village. In practice, this would lead to the coalescence of the new settlement with Kirk Hammerton, eroding its identity, rural setting and independence. There is also insufficient clarity on how essential infrastructure including healthcare, schools, transport, drainage and utilities will be delivered in a timely and funded way. Without firm commitments, both new and existing residents' risk being left with overstretched services for many years. A development of this size will also generate very high levels of traffic and commuting. Without genuinely high-quality public transport and local employment, the proposal risks becoming a car-dependent commuter town, which conflicts with the principles of sustainable development. I therefore urge the Council to reconsider the scale and form of this proposal and to pursue more balanced and sustainable ways of meeting housing need.
4	Comments on the Consultation meeting and process - 15th Jan 2026. This consultation lacks the necessary detail expected for this stage in the development process and to be considered as a proper well-executed consultation. It feels rushed and raises concerns that this is a tick box exercise to claim residents have been consulted but without presenting any detail so the team are not challenged. Poor Communication and Access to Information. Communication prior to the consultation meeting on 15th Jan was extremely poor. Many individuals were unable to access the consultation documents in advance of the meeting and were therefore unable to prepare informed questions or comments for discussion with representatives from North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) and Caddick. On the day of the consultation, the room was extremely busy, making it difficult to view the noticeboards properly or spend sufficient time comprehending the information presented. This significantly limited the effectiveness of the consultation. Lack of Clear Identification of Representatives. Representatives at the consultation meeting on 15 Jan were not clearly identifiable. Caddick representatives had no visible name badges or indication of their role, and not all NYC representatives were wearing their lanyards. As a result, it was difficult to identify appropriate individuals to discuss specific posters or issues. This created the impression that representatives were not adequately prepared or willing to engage openly with the public. Inability to Obtain Clear Answers. People who attended the meeting were often passed between Caddick and NYC representatives, with neither able to answer questions. This lack of clarity and accountability was frustrating and undermined confidence in the consultation process. Comments on the content of the draft Maltkiln Masterplan framework. Framework only covered area within the redline. This was a plan for Maltkiln only and did not seem to include anything outside the boundary of the development. There must be far greater consideration of how the Maltkiln development will impact Kirk Hammerton and Green Hammerton. At present, there appears to be a lack of understanding of these impacts and insufficient mitigation proposed. This is unrealistic. The reality will be that most households will have at least 2 cars as the main form of transport for Maltkiln residents will be by road. Any buses that may serve the settlement won't appear until a much later phase in the development when there is sufficient demand. The concern is that the development has been presented as "sustainable", including the basis of a parking policy that in reality will be unworkable. Presentation of the Development as a Whole. The development was presented as a single, comprehensive scheme, despite it being known that not all the land is currently available. NYC were not prepared to comment on what might happen if the land cannot be acquired. This constitutes a misrepresentation of the deliverability of the proposals as presented to the public. NYCC were not prepared to suggest any mitigations if only some of the development is delivered which is likely to be the reality. Green Gap Assessment and lack of trust of NYC. Previous documents stated that the original Green Gap was the minimum required to avoid harm and coalescence. The latest appraisal reduces this gap but concludes that the impact is now only "minor". This significant change in such a fundamental requirement, insisted upon by the planning inspector, demonstrates that NYC can and is already willing to back track on its own policy and raises concerns on how residents and local councillors can trust NYC. Furthermore, the details on this change to the green gap with respect to types of properties and land use is not available. It is difficult to make an informed assessment without understanding what is being proposed and therefore this consultation has failed. It is unacceptable for NYC to assume this loss of the green gap is justified and acceptable without providing more detail. Given how vulnerable the green gap is to being developed now and later, the land should be forested or better still given a designation that makes it more difficult to be developed in the future. This should be done if NYC are genuine that this strip is a strategic green gap. There does not seem to be a plan to provide the necessary parking for the use of Cattal station as a park and ride. In recent years Cattal station has become an unofficial park and ride for people to get into York and Harrogate. Given that Maltkiln

	<p>is fundamentally centred around Cattal station, this should be a priority within the plans. Currently, many rail users drive from other areas and park on surrounding roads, already causing congestion. Cattal station must remain easily accessible, attractive, and viable for non-residents, including adequate car parking. Failure to address this will displace parking problems to Hammerton station, where curbside parking issues already exist. Traffic Management and Through-Routes. It was unclear what measures are being proposed to prevent traffic from Maltkiln using Kirk Hammerton as a through-route. Gilsthwaite Lane was described as a "quiet lane", but no clear explanation was provided as to how this would operate in practice. Also seemed to be a lack of consideration for the impact of flooding around Cattal bridge that regularly closes the route South from the settlement. Risk of Closure of Parker Lane. There is deep concern amongst residents that Parker Lane may be closed to vehicles and pedestrians in the future. While this is not explicitly shown on the maps as it is outside the development, documentation refers to the possibility that increased rail crossings within the Maltkiln development could impact and close other nearby crossings. This can only reasonably be interpreted as Parker Lane. Closing Parker Lane would have a severe impact on residents of Kirk Hammerton and Green Hammerton, who rely on Parker Lane for access between the villages and is an active travel route to the shops, post office, cafe, doctors, pub, school, and sports centre in Green Hammerton. Parker Lane is also a well-used recreational route. For Kirk Hammerton residents, effectively enclosed between the river and the A59, Parker Lane crossing being open to all traffic is crucial. The lane also provide access to the village in times of emergencies especially when there are road closures on Gilsthwaite Lane and Crooked Lane/Station Road and when the A59 is closed because of accidents which are happening more frequently. It would be unacceptable for Kirk Hammerton residents to lose this right of way as part of negotiations that solely help developers in their negotiations with Network Rail. Drainage and sewers. The building of a new sewer and water treatment works will likely have a huge impact on the village of Kirk Hammerton, but there is no detail about the plans or an impact assessment on Kirk Hammerton. The existing wastewater treatment works is too small to accommodate the expansion needed to treat water from a further 3000 - 4000 new households and commercial buildings being proposed so a new one will need to be built. There is no assessment of how this enlarged treatment works will fit in the current landscape. There is no impact assessment of what a town-sized treatment works will have on Kirk Hammerton and its conservation area. Large treatment works bring large HGV vehicle movements, increased odour issues, vermin, insects, noise and light pollution -none of which has been considered. It is also proposed that the upgrade to the sewer network will have to be along Gilsthwaite Lane through the centre of Kirk Hammerton along Chapel Street. Most of this route is barely suitable for two-way traffic and the impact of this work will cause considerable harm to the village and its residents. It was not clear at the consultation about the phasing of the sewer, and the water treatment works. Will the existing sewage network and wastewater treatments works have enough capacity for any more new connections.</p>
6	<p>Compulsory purchase to pay landowners inflated prices is a poor use of taxpayer's money. The bridleway ending on the A59 is dangerous. There is not nearly enough infrastructure being planned and paid for by the developers, and it will mean scarcity of access to medical services, schools and food shops. The local house prices will increase. Whilst some perceive this as a positive outcome, it will unfairly disadvantage younger people and those trapped in renting accommodation from getting on to the housing ladder. This development will increase the divide between those fortunate enough to own their homes and those less fortunate, trapped in rented accommodation. The Framework produced by Maltkiln covered area within the redline only and did not include anything outside the boundary of the development. There needs to be transparent plans on how the Maltkiln development will impact Green Hammerton and Kirk Hammerton residents, community resources, and businesses and transport infrastructure in surrounding areas. The one parking space per dwelling policy is frankly ridiculous and totally unrealistic in how modern families operate in the countryside with poor transportation links and unaffordable public transport. This also links to Cattal Railway Station and the lack of parking provision available. There are major issues with drainage and sewerage in Green Hammerton, and the existing wastewater treatment works is too small to accommodate the expansion needed handle and treat water and sewerage from a further 3000 - 4000 new households and commercial buildings being proposed. There is no detail about plans or an impact assessment on building a new sewer and water treatment works which would likely have a huge impact on the local villages</p>
7	<p>The sewage works at Kirk Hammerton are already beyond capacity resulting in too many + probably illegal discharges into the River Nidd - surely the upgrade to the sewage work needs to be complete before any houses are built? The A59 has a poor safety record + despite proposed roundabouts in the immediate vicinity of the proposed new Town it is about what will happen 2 miles beyond this with the A1 M roundabout + also towards York - this road is already congested at rush hour. Where are the Police, Ambulance services, Health visitors + all the necessary local community services required with a development of this size going to come from? The Hospitals at York + Harrogate are land locked + already struggling with capacity. How are children of secondary school age going to get to schools in Knaresborough or Boroughbridge when NYC is no longer going to fund transport + there will be no viable alternative for parents to use car transport. There are no children's nurseries, playgroups, libraries or any amenities for pre or primary school children in our local area unless parents use cars to take them there. A single-track branch railway which cannot be improved without vast investment which is not within the gift of the developer or NYC running Diesel trains does not support the idea of NYC or the Developer that people will use the train for commuting to work + not require cars. A two-person household living in Maltkiln will definitely require 2 cars especially with children. The location of this</p>

	<p>development with no amenities + the necessity of travelling by car to work/children's nurseries/ schools/ after school's activities / supermarket etc will deter people especially on low wages from buying these houses if they are built &gt;NYC should be focusing on building in areas that have amenities already which could be expanded response to demand + preserving agricultural land to ensure food security going forwards as this will be a very pressing issue going forwards. Kirk Hammerton sewage works is already operating beyond capacity with too many + probably illegal discharges into river Nidd. Where are Police, Fire + Ambulances services coming from to supply demand. Along with Health Visitors, District nurses + other necessary community services coming from. The 2 hospitals are landlocked + already struggling with patient demand. The A59 does not have a good safety record + is already congested + using TRICS will have another 15,000-21,000 extra car movements per day along it. How are children of pre + primary school age going to get to nursery/school other by car? How are secondary children going to get to school in Knaresborough/ Boroughbridge unless by car. There are no facilities for children or young people like swimming/ football/ dancing/ guides/ scouts unless taken by car? No facilities for children of any age here A59 has poor safety record + is congested at rush hour how are par3nts going to take preschool or primary children to nursery/ school other than by car. No options to leave her other than drive a car Kirk Hammerton sewage works already operating beyond cavity hence so many discharges into River Nidd + these are probably illegal.</p>
16	<p>I am extremely concerned that this process is being rushed through without appropriate collaboration with local people. Staging a consultation in Kirk Hammerton on 15 January and then closing the consultation down two weeks later is completely wrong. NYC must not force this onwards with such haste. It is appalling and cynical to be rushing this through without starting a full year-long process to work with local people in the Kirk Hammerton, Green Hammerton, Cattal and surrounding areas. NYC should have a website portal purely for the Maltkiln Development where we can get in touch with staff in the development communication chain. Those staff members and other representatives (like Caddick) should be turning up at local meetings throughout this year ahead - so that residents can be more appropriately involved and feel their concerns area being properly considered. Plans to build 3000+homes without upgrading local sewage facilities is simply scandalous.... what will happen to our River Nidd? How will local road networks and a weak bridge crossing over the River Nidd cope with the additional vehicles. Plans to impose 1 x parking space per dwelling is laughable and will impact the community on the development before they've even had a chance to start living together (as anti-social behaviours are bound to come out of such a ridiculous proposal)! It feels extremely cynical on the part of NYC - to be shunting future potential social problems into our community before building work even begins. NYC have already backtracked on the initial Green Gap Assessment which further damages any chance that local residents might believe or trust Council evidence. It feels we are being lied-to before building work even begins. NYC still have not shared any information about the impact on Cattal Railway station and parking provision. We were expecting to learn about this at the public meeting on 15 January - to be proceeding "marching" onwards without detailing how the new public transport systems might look is extremely concerning.</p>
23	<p>Plans fail to address the challenges for traffic in the area. Currently the A59 has solid flows of traffic since the lights installed at the a1m roundabout traffic regularly queues back to where the proposed roundabout is. How does the plan with such a high amount of additional traffic provide sufficient.</p>
30	<p>Can you advise on what dataset the information regarding the number of cars per household decision is based? Please share the minutes of meetings with the council and the ICB or other NHS stakeholders on how the Maltkin plans are going to contribute to the delivery of NHS given the move to closer care to the community and diagnostic centres and how to manage the impact on existing NHS services during the phases before healthcare infrastructure is considered? For the primary school in phase can you advise where the children who move in during phase 1 and require primary school provision should attend given both Kirk and Green Hammerton schools are at capacity? Can you provide detail about where the sewage provision for the site is going to be located There is a lot of should when will these become firm commitments that you will not deviate from? Is there lawful protection in place on the green space between the Maltkiln boundary and the existing villages? When will you conduct a consultation event over a longer period than 6hours that takes into account the ability for working families to attend and will it include council representation?</p>
34	<p>Individual Representation Resident of Cattal. I am submitting this representation in my capacity as a local resident. 1. Uncertainty over scale, phasing, and commitments. The Masterplan continues to describe the proposal as at least 3,000 homes without providing a definitive housing number, binding phasing, or firm infrastructure triggers. From a resident's perspective, this lack of clarity makes it extremely difficult to understand what is actually being proposed, when impacts will occur, and whether essential services will be in place before housing is occupied. A masterplan should reduce uncertainty, not embed it 2. Ferral of fundamental infrastructure decisions. Repeated statements that key matters are too early to resolve are deeply concerning when those matters include foul drainage and sewage treatment. Healthcare provision. Public transport capacity. Safe pedestrian and cycle connections, particularly across the A59. These are not peripheral issues; they will shape daily life for both existing and future residents for decades. Deferring them risks a situation where housing is delivered while infrastructure lags behind, leaving surrounding villages to absorb the consequences. 3. Sewage treatment and foul drainage impacts on Kirk Hammerton. The</p>

	<p>Masterplan indicates that foul drainage for the new settlement would be routed through Kirk Hammerton, including a new main sewer and a substantially expanded treatment works. As a local resident, I am concerned that there is insufficient information on: The scale and visual impact of the works. Construction impacts within the village. Long-term operational effects. Cumulative impacts alongside other planned growth. Without this level of detail, it is not possible to assess whether the proposal is acceptable or proportionate. 4. Climate change and flood risk. It is well known that the River Nidd floods at Cattal multiple times each year. The Masterplan should acknowledge this and clarify how it intends to manage such events, particularly given that traffic cannot travel south via Cattal to Ox Moor Lane during floods. 5. Transport A59 and public transport. Traffic impacts, particularly on the A59, remain the single greatest local concern. The Masterplan does not yet demonstrate how: Increased vehicle movements will be accommodated safely Pedestrians and cyclists will cross the A59 safely and conveniently. Surrounding villages will be protected from rat-running and congestion. Cattal Station will cope with increased demand, including parking pressures. The absence of firm commitments risks locking in car dependency rather than reducing it. The Masterplan remains silent on bus services to the east and west. The current rail system is insufficient to support the level of growth proposed, and additional infrastructure will be required. 6. Density, landscape impact, and separation between settlements. The Masterplan suggests higher housing densities in areas adjacent to existing villages, raising concerns about coalescence and the loss of clear settlement boundaries. Land identified as part of the Green Gap appears particularly vulnerable to incremental erosion. Previous Council statements have acknowledged harmful landscape impacts in certain areas, yet the Masterplan does not clearly explain how these risks will be mitigated in practice. 7. Ecology and biodiversity. The Masterplan currently provides limited detail on ecological impacts and measures to protect or enhance biodiversity. Given the scale of the development, potential risks include Loss or fragmentation of habitats for protected or notable species (birds, bats, amphibians, and invertebrates) Impacts on hedgerows, woodland, and watercourses that support local ecosystems. Increased light, noise, and human activity disrupting wildlife corridors. The document does not clearly explain how these risks will be avoided or mitigated, particularly in sensitive areas identified in local ecological surveys. Any development of this scale should set out robust ecological parameters, including habitat retention, creation of green corridors, and long-term management responsibilities, to ensure biodiversity net gain is genuinely achieved. 8. Employment land and traffic generation. The largest employment area is located away from the A59, which risks directing traffic through the settlement and surrounding villages rather than intercepting it at the strategic road network. From a resident's perspective, this undermines claims that traffic impacts will be minimised. 9. Transparency and public confidence. I am aware that the Council has financial clawback arrangements relating to some of the land within the wider site. While this does not imply impropriety, it makes transparency essential. Residents need clear, on-the-record assurances that: Decisions are being taken on planning merit alone. Standards set through the DPD will not be diluted as later phases come forward. Infrastructure commitments will not be softened once development momentum is established 10. The role of the Masterplan. A masterplan should do more than illustrate aspiration, it should confront difficult trade-offs and provide firm parameters. In its current form, this Masterplan risks deferring key decisions until meaningful community influence has diminished. This approach undermines trust and makes it harder for residents to have confidence in the long-term outcome. I am not opposed to development in principle. However, scale, infrastructure, ecology, and transparency matter. Without clearer commitments at this stage, the Masterplan does not provide a sound or reassuring basis for a development of such significance and longevity.</p>
36	<p>1. This consultation lacks the necessary detail expected for this stage in the development process and to be considered as a proper well-executed consultation. It feels rushed and raises concerns that this is a tick box exercise to claim that residents have been consulted but without presenting any detail so the team are not challenged. Representatives at the consultation meeting on 15 January 2026 were not clearly identifiable. Caddick representatives had no visible name badges or indication of their role, and not all NYC representatives were wearing their lanyards. This was a plan for Maltkiln only and did not seem to include anything outside the boundary of the development. There must be far greater consideration of how the Maltkiln development will impact Kirk Hammerton and Green Hammerton. At present, there appears to be a lack of understanding of these impacts and insufficient mitigation proposed. 2. Drainage and sewers. At the meeting on 15 January 2026, I was assured by one of Caddick's representatives that the development will have standalone sewage treatment facilities within its own environs, and he stated that it would not be grafted onto existing provision in Kirk Hammerton. There was no indication on the posters of where this would go and of the phasing, yet it must start to be built as part of the initial work. I must question why the consultation was allowed to go ahead without such provision available for all to see. 3. Cattal Railway Station and Parking Provision There does not seem to be a plan to provide the necessary parking for the use of Cattal station as a park and ride which is a necessity to allow people to get into York, Harrogate and beyond Given that Maltkiln is centred around Cattal station, this should be a priority within the plans and it will also allow rail users to access the local facilities before and after their journey. This will surely help retail and hospitality outlets in the local centre. Cattal station must remain easily accessible, attractive, and viable for residents and non-residents, including adequate car parking. Failure to address this will displace parking problems to Hammerton station, where curb-side parking issues already exist. 4. Residential parking. One parking space per dwelling is unrealistic. The reality will be that a majority of households will have more than one car as the main form of transport for Maltkiln residents is likely to be by road. Residents will have visitors at times adding to congestion if a single space is allowed. Any buses that may serve the settlement are unlikely to</p>

	<p>appear until a much later phase in the development when there is sufficient demand. The concern is that the development has been presented as sustainable, including the basis of a parking policy that in reality will be unworkable. 5.Presentation of the Development. The development was presented as a single, comprehensive scheme, despite it being known that not all the land is currently available. NYC were not prepared to comment on what might happen if the land cannot be acquired. I believe this is a misrepresentation of the ability to deliver the proposals as presented to us. NYCC were not prepared to suggest any mitigations if only some of the development is delivered.</p>
39	<p>This was a plan for Maltkiln only and did not seem to include anything outside the boundary of the development. There must be far greater consideration of how the Maltkiln development will impact the current residents of the surrounding areas and the knock-on implications for the region as a whole. As someone who uses the A59 for work frequently, I am very aware that the road is rarely quiet. Even between the hours of 10pm and 6am (I work overnight), it is not unusual to be in a line of continuous traffic travelling well below the speed limit. From the information available, I see no mention of how traffic chaos will be mitigated? Duelling the A59 seems sensible but due to the roadside location of existing dwellings, I assume impossible. Further, as a resident of Long Marston I feel it is inevitable that the B1224 Wetherby Road will be used as an alternative. Not only is this B road not designed for that volume of traffic there is already a major an accident blackspot (Rudgate Crossroads) due to poor visibility, which increased volume of traffic will make worse. Rufforth also has the traffic calming measures in place which means queuing traffic forms quickly. A short period of temporary traffic lights on the A59 in the autumn for essential services maintenance caused the traffic in Rufforth to queue badly so this is not speculation but inevitable fact. Having previously lived in Knaresborough during the years of major housing developments in that area, I have firsthand experience that the disruption cause to existing residents not a concern nor consideration for the developers or the council and would like more concrete plans laid out on how this will be managed. Linked to the above traffic concerns, the insistence that the development will focus around the station and the residents using public transport seems farcical. Whilst some residents will no doubt work in York, Harrogate or Leeds, a huge amount will not and will commute by car adding to the already congested roads in the area, especially Harrogate and York - the roundabout at Poppleton already has standing traffic in all directions for several hours of the day as it is. Even hypothetically if as the developers suggest, huge numbers do commute by train, how will this be catered for? If 1500 people arrive at Cattal station each morning between 7am and 8:30am to get to work/school/college etc, what train are they going to board? The current service is a small local train of a few carriages. The frequency is q. 30 mins, and it is a single track so cannot be increased. The size of the development means that many will still drive to the station as the distance from the edges of the development to the station is not insignificant and there is no parking for the new residents or the existing ones who already use the station and park daily on a muddy grass verge.</p>
43	<p>As a local resident in Kirk Hammerton, I have significant concerns re increased sewage when further houses are built. Especially as the pipes would need to come straight through the village. I have concerns re extra surface water in a very small village which floods already when the rain is heavy. Also, as a keen walker, Parker Lane is an excellent short cut to access Green Hammerton and neighbouring villages. If the railway closed and the road was blocked off this would be catastrophic for our village. Many residents enjoy the lovely walk and fresh air this journey can give on foot or via a bicycle. The only other routes require a car or a certain level of fitness. Kirk Hammerton has many elderly residents.</p>
44	<p>1. Lack of detail. This consultation lacks the necessary detail expected for this stage in the development process and to be considered as a proper well-executed consultation. It feels rushed and raises concerns that this is a tick box exercise to claim residents have been consulted but without presenting any detail so the team are not challenged. 2. Poor Communication and Access to Information. Communication prior to the consultation meeting on 15th Jan was extremely poor. Many individuals were unable to access the consultation documents in advance of the meeting and were therefore unable to prepare informed questions or comments for discussion with representatives from North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) and Caddick. On the day of the consultation, the room was extremely busy, making it difficult to view the noticeboards properly or spend sufficient time comprehending the information presented. This significantly limited the effectiveness of the consultation. 3. Lack of Clear Identification of Representatives. Representatives at the consultation meeting on 15th Jan were not clearly identifiable. Caddick representatives had no visible name badges or indication of their role, and not all NYC representatives were wearing their lanyards. As a result, it was difficult to identify appropriate individuals to discuss specific posters or issues. This created the impression that representatives were not adequately prepared or willing to engage openly with the public. 4. Inability to Obtain Clear Answers. People who attended the meeting were often passed between Caddick and NYC representatives, with neither able to answer questions. This lack of clarity and accountability was frustrating and undermined confidence in the consultation process. Comments on the content of the draft Maltkiln Masterplan framework. 5. Framework only covered area within the redline. This was a plan for Maltkiln only and did not seem to include anything outside the boundary of the development. There must be far greater consideration of how the Maltkiln development will impact Kirk Hammerton and Green Hammerton. At present, there appears to be a lack of understanding of these impacts and insufficient mitigation proposed. 6. One Parking Space per Dwelling Policy This is unrealistic. The reality will be that most</p>

	<p>households will have at least 2 cars as the main form of transport for Maltkiln residents will be by road. Any buses that may serve the settlement won't appear until a much later phase in the development when there is sufficient demand. The concern is that the development has been presented as sustainable, including the basis of a parking policy that in reality will be unworkable. 7. Presentation of the Development as a Whole. The development was presented as a single, comprehensive scheme, despite it being known that not all the land is currently available. NYC were not prepared to comment on what might happen if the land cannot be acquired. This constitutes a misrepresentation of the deliverability of the proposals as presented to the public. NYCC were not prepared to suggest any mitigations if only some of the development is delivered which is likely to be the reality. 8. Green Gap Assessment and lack of trust of NYC. Previous documents stated that the original Green Gap was the minimum required to avoid harm and coalescence. The latest appraisal reduces this gap but concludes that the impact is now only minor. This significant change in such a fundamental requirement, insisted upon by the planning inspector, demonstrates that NYC can and is already willing to back track on its own policy and raises concerns on how residents and local councillors can trust NYC. Furthermore, the details on this change to the green gap with respect to types of properties and land use is not available. It is difficult to make an informed assessment without understanding what is being proposed and therefore this consultation has failed. It is unacceptable for NYC to assume this loss of the green gap is justified and acceptable without providing more detail. Given how vulnerable the green gap is to being developed now and later, the land should be forested or better still given a designation that makes it more difficult to be developed in the future. This should be done if NYC are genuine that this strip is a strategic green gap. 9. Cattal Railway Station and Parking Provision. There does not seem to be a plan to provide the necessary parking for the use of Cattal station as a park and ride. In recent years Cattal station has become an unofficial park and ride for people to get into York and Harrogate. Given that Maltkiln is fundamentally centred around Cattal station, this should be a priority within the plans. Currently, many rail users drive from other areas and park on surrounding roads, already causing congestion. Cattal station must remain easily accessible, attractive, and viable for non-residents, including adequate car parking. Failure to address this will displace parking problems to Hammerton station, where curbside parking issues already exist. 10. Traffic Management and Through-Routes. It was unclear what measures are being proposed to prevent traffic from Maltkiln using Kirk Hammerton as a through-route. Gilsthwaite Lane was described as a quiet lane, but no clear explanation was provided as to how this would operate in practice. Also seemed to be a lack of consideration for the impact of flooding around Cattal bridge that regularly closes the route South from the settlement. 11. Risk of Closure of Parker Lane There is deep concern amongst residents that Parker Lane may be closed to vehicles and pedestrians in the future. While this is not explicitly shown on the maps as it is outside the development, documentation refers to the possibility that increased rail crossings within the Maltkiln development could impact and close other nearby crossings. This can only reasonably be interpreted as Parker Lane. Closing Parker Lane would have a severe impact on residents of Kirk Hammerton and Green Hammerton, who rely on Parker Lane for access between the villages and is an active travel route to the shops, post office, cafe, doctors, pub, school, and sports centre in Green Hammerton. Parker Lane is also a well-used recreational route. For Kirk Hammerton residents, effectively enclosed between the river and the A59, Parker Lane crossing being open to all traffic is crucial. The lane also provide access to the village in times of emergencies especially when there are road closures on Gilsthwaite Lane and Crooked Lane/Station Road and when the A59 is closed because of accidents which are happening more frequently. It would be unacceptable for Kirk Hammerton residents to lose this right of way as part of negotiations that solely help developers in their negotiations with Network Rail. 12. Drainage and sewers. The building of a new sethe and water treatment works will likely have a huge impact on the village of Kirk Hammerton, but there is no detail about the plans or an impact assessment on Kirk Hammerton. The existing wastewater treatment works is too small to accommodate the expansion needed to treat water from a further 3000- 4000 new households and commercial buildings being proposed so a new one will need to be built. There is no assessment of how this enlarged treatment works will fit in the current landscape. There is no impact assessment of what a town-sized treatment works will have on Kirk Hammerton and its conservation area. Large treatment works bring large HGV vehicle movements, increased odour issues, vermin, insects, noise and light pollution -none of which has been considered. It is also proposed that the upgrade to the sewer network will have to be along Gilsthwaite Lane through the centre of Kirk Hammerton along Chapel Street. Most of this route is barely suitable for two-way traffic and the impact of this work will cause considerable harm to the village and its residents. It was not clear at the consultation about the phasing of the sewer, and the water treatment works. Will the existing sewage network and wastewater treatments works have enough capacity for any more new connections?</p>
47	<p>Lack of consideration of impact beyond boundary line, traffic issues and pedestrian restrictions, sewage issues, impact of drive through other villages once slip road is in place, no clear plan of what will come in first phase, lack of planning g for consideration.</p>
50	<p>This consultation lacks the necessary detail expecting for this stage in the development process and to be considered as a proper well-executed consultation. It felt rushed and raises concerns that this is a tick box exercise to claim residents have been consulted but without presenting any detail so the team are not challenged. Communication prior to the consultation meeting on 15 Jan was extremely poor. Many individuals were unable to access the consultation documents in advance of the meeting and were therefore unable to prepare informed questions or comments for discussion with representatives from North Yorkshire County</p>

	<p>council and Caddick. On the day of the consultation, the room was extremely busy, making it difficult to view the noticeboards properly or spend sufficient time comprehending the information presented. This significantly limited the effectiveness of the consultation. Representatives at the consultation meeting on the 15 Jan were not clearly identifiable. Caddick representatives had no visible name badges or identification of their role, and not all NYCC representatives were not wearing lanyards. As a result, it was difficult to identify appropriate individuals to discuss specific posters or issues. This created the impression that representatives were not adequately prepared or willing to engage openly with the public. People who attended the meeting were often passed between Caddick and NYCC representatives, with neither able to answer questions. This lack of clarity and accountability was frustrating and undermined confidence in the consultation process. This was a plan for Maltkiln only and did not seem to include anything outside of the boundary of the development. There must be far greater consideration of how the Maltkiln development will impact on Kirk Hammerton and Green Hammerton. At present, there appears to be a lack of understanding of those impacts and insufficient mitigation proposed. One parking space per dwelling policy. This is unrealistic. The reality will be that most households will have at least 2 cars as the main form of transportation for Maltkiln residents will be by road. Any buses that may serve the settlement won't appear until a much later phase in the development when there is sufficient demand. The concern is that the development has been presented as sustainable, including the basis of a parking policy that in reality will be unworkable. The development was presented as a single, comprehensive scheme, despite it being known that not all the land is currently available. NYC were not prepared to comment on what might happen of the land cannot be acquired. This constitutes a misrepresentation of the deliverability of the proposals as presented to the public. NYCC were not prepared to suggest any mitigation if only some of the development is delivered which is likely to be the reality. Previous documents stated that the original green gap was the minimum required to avoid harm and coalescence. The latest appraisal reduces that gap but concludes that the impact is only minor. This significant change in such a fundamental requirement, insisted upon by the planning inspector, demonstrates that NYCC can and is already willing to back track on its own policy and raised concerns on how residents and local councillors can trust NYCC. Further mor, the details on this change to the green gap with respect to types of properties and land is not available. It is difficult to make an informed assessment without understanding what is being proposed and therefore the consultation has failed. It is unacceptable for NYCC to assume this loss of the green gap is being developed now and later, the land should be forested or better still given a designation that makes it more difficult to be developed in the future. This should be done if NYC are genuine that this strip is a strategic green gap. There doesn't seem to be a plan to provide the necessary parking for the use of Cattal station as a park and ride. In recent years Cattal station has become an unofficial park and ride for people to get to York and Harrogate. Given Maltkiln is fundamentally centred around the station, this should be a priority within the plans. Currently, many rail users drive from other areas and park on surrounding roads, already causing congestion. Cattal station must remain easily accessible, attractive, and viable for non-residents, including adequate car parking. Failure to address this will displace parking problems to Hammerton station, where curb side parking already exists. It was unclear what measures are being proposed to prevent traffic from Maltkiln using Kirk Hammerton as a through-route. Gilsthwaite Lane was described as a quiet lane, but no clear explanation was provided as to how this would operate in practise. Also seemed to be a lack of consideration for the impact of flooding around Cattal bridge that regularly closes the route south from the settlement. There is deep concern amongst residents that Parker Lane may be closed to vehicles and pedestrians in the future. While this is not explicitly shown on the maps as it is outside the development, documentation refers to the possibility that increased rail crossing within the development could impact and close nearby crossings. This can only reasonably be interpreted as Parker Lane. Closing Parker Lane would have a severe impact on residents of Kirk Hammerton and Green Hammerton, who rely on Parker Lane for access to local amenities. The lane also provide access to the village in time of emergencies especially when the A59 is closed because of accidents which are happening more frequently. It would be unacceptable for Kirk Hammerton residents to lose this right of way as part of negotiations that solely help developers in the negotiations with Network Rail. The building of a new sewer and water treatment works will likely have a huge impact on Kirk Hammerton, but there is no detail about the plans or an impact assessment on that village. The existing treatment works is too small to accommodate the expansion needed to treat water from a further 3000-4000 new households and commercial buildings being proposed. There is no assessment of how this enlarged treatment works will fit in the current landscape. There is no impact assessment of what a town sized treatment works will have on Kirk Hammerton and its conservation area. Large treatment works bringing large HGV vehicle movements, increased odour issues, vermin, insects, noise and light pollution, none of which have been considered. It is also proposed that the upgrade to the sewer network will have to be along Gilsthwaite Lane through the centre of Kirk Hammerton along Chapel Street. Most of this route is barely suitable for the two-way traffic and the impact the work will cause considerable harm to the village and its residents. It was not clear at the consultation about the phasing of the sewer and treatment works. Will the existing sewer network and wastewater treatment works have enough capacity for any more new connections.</p>
52	<p>I have read that the sewerage for the new Maltkiln estate will use existing infrastructure. I would expect that a development of that size would require new infrastructure to cover the sewerage of 3,000 homes. There have been challenges with existing sewers in Green Hammerton and this will surely be exacerbated.</p>

53	<p>As a Parish Council we have received the following comments: Climate change/flooding. Residents from the development travelling south and west and those from the south and west to the development will at times be impacted by flooding at Cattal. The Masterplan should acknowledge this and demand inclusion of an early warning flood scheme. As well as reducing inconvenience to residents it will reduce wasted road trips thus improving the scheme's sustainability. It is a wasted journey of 12+ miles to avoid the flood. Residents have noted that North Yorkshire have introduced a just in time digital warning system in the Dales. Also, Lincolnshire have just embarked on developing such a system. Other examples will no doubt be emerging. They will provide a foundation for Maltkiln to become best in class. Public transport the document remains silent on bus provision east/west. The rail system alone is insufficient and by its nature does not provide connectivity to the wider area along the A59. An east/west service must be provided. The loop road is believed to present a racing circuit opportunity! Safety issues should be a major issue in the Masterplan for this and other highways, in particular the A59. The primary loop road should be closer to the railway line using the topography to reduce visual intrusion into the wider area. The lower part of the loop road from Stephenson Lane south should be of a lower status to discourage traffic flow south. Residential development serviced off this section of downgraded loop road is perceived to be more desirable. Access and movement The DPD reference a link road. The Masterplan should acknowledge this and provide for its eventuality. Such a link road will make the development more sustainable and attractive to a wider market with likely increased sales values and take up rates. Landscape and topography The Masterplan should seek to restrict development no further south than Cattal Grange Road. It should seek to blend hard development into the contours between here and the railway station. Enhanced buffer zone treatment should be promoted to restrict a hard edge to the development being created. Important views. The junction of Cattal Grange Road and Station Road provides one of the best views from within the Settlement boundary looking to the south and southwest. From this junction traveling northwards the view to the northeast should be sympathetically considered. Concern has been expressed that badger setts may have become established with the Settlement boundary and that ecological reports to date have been limited.</p>
54	<p>I attended the drop in event at KIRK HAMMERTON on January 15th. This is my feedback in no particular order. 1. These drop in events should take place at least in Green Hammerton AND Kirk Hammerton Village Halls. Kirk Hammerton village is nowhere near big enough to deal with the number of attendees and does not allow everyone to access the display boards, maps and talk to the relevant personnel. It became a queueing system and I'm sure some people will have left without being able to talk to who they wanted. 2. The hours of these events should be extended to 9pm in the evening so that people who work long or unsociable hours are given more of an opportunity to attend and air their voices. 3. THE MAPPING USED IS OUT OF DATE!!! I was completely incensed to note that EVERY map that was on display used out of date Ordnance Survey mapping. The maps of Green Hammerton showed the Hughlings Close (Strata) development and Ambretone Developments as fields. They also didn't show the new road layout of York Road leaving Green Hammerton onto the A59 and the changed junction crossroads into Kirk Hammerton, opposite. Does that make the documents illegal as they are not representative of the actual village of Green Hammerton and the size that it now is (an additional 180-200 homes have been built since those maps were published). I took this up with a Caddick representative who glossed over it saying that the information provided that day was an "overview". THAT IS NOT GOOD ENOUGH - the amounts of tens of thousands of pounds that have already been and will be invested into the millions, surely that detail should be CORRECT?? If this is the level of detail that Caddick and North Yorkshire Council are willing to work with then heaven help the rest of development and the detail that will be needed. 4. Has anyone in North Yorkshire Council considered what effect this will have to tourism in York City and the surrounding areas? The level of disruption that will happen over the next 30+ years during the creation of this town will undoubtedly have a profound effect on the way that tourists and businesspersons can enter and leave the city (other than by National Train). In a fictitious, ideological world that may be OK, but the reality is that people will want to travel by car, mostly from the A1 motorway, or by local train from Harrogate, Leeds etc. 5. The main A59 from the A1 to York is already chock a block with traffic, traffic jams and accidents that are too numerous. Unless there is a proposed upgrade to this road, there are going to be constant delays, tailbacks and more accidents as a result of queues for the duration of the building and thereafter with an additional 8-10,000 cars on the road coming from Maltkiln alone. Not properly thought out at all. 6. The Designated Green Space. PLEASE can this be written into the agreements LEGALLY that it is never built on. There is absolutely no reason why this should not be done unless someone is motivated by more greed. This space needs to be treated in exactly the same manner as the Stray in Harrogate. Protected for ALL for EVER, including our fast diminishing and already seriously affected wildlife. 7. Please can you confirm what the plans are for sewerage for the town. I cannot see where wastewater and sewerage are going to be disposed of??? Can we be informed of the plans for this vitally important part of the infrastructure framework of the development. 8. A real concern is that the size of the town of Maltkiln, and the sheer vast numbers of residential properties crammed into a relatively small footprint is quite likely to lead to unrest within the community. Has provision for improved policing, recreational areas etc been considered and at what time during the building and creation of the town will they be implemented. 9. Has North Yorkshire council put any provision for traffic calming in the centre of Green Hammerton. Especially, the main roads of York Road and Harrogate Road, which are most likely to be used as "rat runs" for people wanting to avoid queueing at the new roundabout, in both directions. You only must look at the A1037 York Ring Road to see what the traffic queues are likely on busy roads single carriageway roads with roundabouts on them. PLEASE don't decide to wait and see how it goes and have several accidents involving maim and death</p>

	<p>before this is addressed. There are numerous other subjects that I have probably not included, but this gives you an idea of the types of MAJOR CONCERNS that we and our fellow neighbours have with the lack of forethought that appears to have been given to this town project overall.</p>
56	<p>Dear North Yorkshire Council and Caddick team, thank you for holding the recent Maltkiln consultation event. It should have been helpful to see the proposals presented and to have the opportunity to ask questions. However, I wanted to share some honest feedback that reflects the general sentiment in the room that night. The strongest takeaway for many of us was not because people are unwilling to engage, but because key information remains vague or incomplete. Basic facts that residents have been asking about for some time, such as the total number of homes (still described as at least 3,000) and a clear, realistic timeline or phasing plan, remain unclear. These are fundamental details, and the made it difficult to feel confident about what is actually being proposed. There was also a sense that some questions were sidestepped or met with mixed messages. That led many attendees to feel the event risked coming across as a box-ticking exercise rather than a genuine two-way conversation. As a result, and that's something worth taking seriously. A recurring point raised that night concerned who was in the room. Residents were keen to engage directly with North Yorkshire Council officers, who had the authority to answer questions, rather than relying almost entirely on the developer. Many of us were passed from pillar to post and back again. Having the right people present, and visibly willing to engage would go a long way toward building confidence. Above all else, infrastructure anxiety dominated the discussion. Traffic, and particularly the impact on the A59, was by far the biggest concern. People are genuinely concerned about a significant increase in traffic and do not feel reassured that there is a credible or committed plan in place to address it. Linked to this were repeated calls for safe crossings and active travel infrastructure. Residents are looking for genuinely segregated, safe routes for pedestrians and cyclists including serious consideration of options such as an underpass or subway and clear, safe connections between Maltkiln, Green Hammerton, and Kirk Hammerton. Since the event, sewage has also been a major concern. The combined population of Whixley, Kirk Hammerton, and Green Hammerton in the 2011 census was 2,064 residents. Add the Maltkiln new settlement, and the population increases to more than 9,500 residents, with all the sewage waste flowing through Kirk Hammerton's undersized sewers and to the existing Wastewater Treatment Works in Kirk Hammerton. Clearly, the works won't have the capacity and will need to expand. But, by how much? People care deeply about their communities and want to engage constructively. Clearer information, greater transparency about what is and isn't decided, and firmer commitments especially on infrastructure would make a real difference going forward.</p>
59	<p>Lack of parking spaces per dwelling; one per property is unrealistic and would cause congestion on surrounding roads No plan to provide adequate parking at Cattal Station. Parking there is already insufficient with cars parked at the side of the road causing congestion. The station was cited as a one of the main reasons for locating Maltkiln on this side of the A1 as opposed to Flaxby (where there would not have been as many objections). How will the council ensure that the health facilities and schools promised in the plan are provided? There are considerably more houses than before in Tockwith due to new developments, and this is already placing a considerable burden on Springbank Surgery. Recent history shows that developers rush to build and sell houses with little or no intention of fulfilling their promises to support these new communities with adequate facilities. More than half of the land earmarked for Maltkiln is now off the table. A CPO is, in my opinion, absolutely disgusting. There are farms on this land that have been tenanted for centuries. Where are these farmers supposed to go if their homes are sold from under them?</p>
60	<p>There are a number of concerns that I hold in relation to the proposed Maltkiln development, to which I would appreciate a substantive response. 1. The information submitted to date is woefully light on detail and doesn't provide nearly enough information for consideration by the planners or the local community. 2. The application is being rushed through, for what seems to be a political or financial agenda and there is no evidence of substantial requirements for properties in a rural settlement in this area. It appears that the NYC are trying to achieve their housing quota obligations without thought for location or impact to the community. Rural life is a not for everyone and the facilities in a rural town won't meet the requirements of many. 3. There is no evidence that any previous feedback has been considered, what is the review process and where is the evidence that the developer has given any consideration to feedback. 4. The proposed development is a town (far larger than any of the local villages). The developer must be committed to provide the infrastructure and buildings sufficient to sustain a town and its residents. This must include primary and secondary schools, doctors, dentists, a High Street with shops, bars and restaurants, a post office, etc. Without all the above this development will be a rural housing estate with no soul or purpose, simply somewhere to house people. This is not in tune with the North Yorkshire landscape. 5. There is no discernible border between Whixley, Kirk Hammerton and Green Hammerton. The development will swallow up rural settlements and hugely impact the people that live in them. We live in rural settlements because that is what we have chosen, small communities of close-knit groups of people. 6. The roads and transport infrastructure are inadequate for the current traffic levels. There is no clear detail on how this will be addressed. 7. The railway station is a fabulous local asset, but essential parking is woefully inadequate. how will this be addressed with the massive amount of additional housing? 8. The parking provisions for each property need to reflect the rural position of the development, a minimum of 2 spaces per property is reflective of actual needs, 1 car per property is</p>

	<p>frankly ridiculous. In summary, the development appears to be ill-thought-out and rushed, in an attempt to fulfil the NYC housing quota and to fill the pockets of an uncaring developer. There is no consideration for the rural community and whilst we accept that the development will happen, it must be executed correctly, or it will have a reputation for all of the wrong reasons. The fate of this area lies in the hands of the planning department, and I hope we can all live with the outcome.</p>
62	<p>To keep points, brief. I question that the gap between Kirk Hammerton and new Maltkiln has decreased. This was not the original plan, and risks Kirk Hammerton losing its distinct character Car Parking. It is nonsense to think that properties will have one car only. The result will be cars parked on the roadside causing obstruction. No mention is made of specific provision for the station. Car users already park in numbers on the roadside at Cattal Station Sewage. Of greatest concern would be plans to increase capacity at the current Kirk Hammerton sewage plant. The disruption to the village whilst considerable works took place would cause chaos. The proposed size of any such treatment works would considerably impact the inhabitants of Kirk Hammerton. The odour the pollution, the noise, the vermin, the light pollution would irretrievably destroy the character of Kirk Hammerton. Provision should be made for sewage processing away from habitation. Land acquisition Caddick do not have access to the original imprint of land to deliver it's Maltkiln proposal. Any attempt to purchase this through CP is an obscene misappropriation of our council tax. This is to line the pockets of a private company at the expense of hard-working council taxpayers. To no benefit to them. Schools and health provision. At what stage would these provisions be put in place? The surrounding villages have already increased their population due to building estates, but with no increase in provision of either health of schooling. Our G.P practise is already beginning to see the strain, with having to wait much longer for appointments. Parker Lane There is potential that the access along this road may be affected. At present it is well used by both car traffic, cycles and pedestrians as access to the services (namely post office and G.P surgery) in Green Hammerton. Walking along the path from Kirk to Green along the A59 is difficult, noisy and polluted. Cars pass at 60 miles an hour, next to a very narrow path people use Parker Lane because it feels safer. Water runoff. The beck that runs alongside Gilsthwaite lane flows into Kirk Hammerton. It has historically been prone to flooding. No mention is made of the impact of increased flood risk due to hard surface run off. How will Kirk Hammerton be protected from flood risk. Flooding at Cattal and traffic flow and cars getting stuck on the road. Already an issue, this will only be made worse by hundreds of more cars using this route as a shorter way to get to Wetherby. Wetherby has the closest banking to Hammerton, as well as supermarkets and leisure centre. Human nature is such that people will use this route. These country roads, (road to Walshford via Hunsingore) cannot support a significant uptick in traffic. Representation. The Caddick event in Kirk did not provide an opportunity to get questions answered. Lack of wearing ID on their part made it difficult to know who you were talking to.</p>
63	<p>I am very concerned about the increased traffic on the A59 that will be caused by the settlement. It will be impossible to cross the road as there are no crossings or traffic lights. I have not seen any information about GP surgeries; dentists and I am not happy about sewage treatment potentially taking place in Kirk Hammerton. These plans are vague with a lack of information about infrastructure as thousands of new houses will put strain on local services.</p>
64	<p>I am extremely concerned with the development proposal as it does not seem to have taken into account any considerations outside of the development. Living in Cattal we face numerous flooding events each year in the field next to our house. When you take the extremely large area proposed and build upon it taking out acres of permeable land is going to drastically affect our home when the flooding inevitably will be higher as there is more run off and less land and trees to soak up this saturation. When I asked at the public consultation what environmental impact assessments and in particular flooding risk assessment has been done, I was dismissed and told " it has been completed". My question is where is the modelling and data on the surrounding area (cattal, skipbridge) for this flooding assessment? I do not believe that this will not have an impact on the surrounding area. This proposal is just being pushed through without any consideration of the surrounding homes, population or communities. At the event I had zero clear answers as I was passed between the council and Caddick with no clear comments and felt I was dismissed a number of times. I was also extremely disappointed that no one gave a clear indication that they were from Caddick I had to ask a number of representatives and none wore clear badges and gave me the impression they did not want to be open with the public. The bridge at Cattal is also a huge concern as this is a very small bridge on a quiet road. When you put thousands of houses next to it, a small village of Cattal becomes a through route for thousands of cars a day that want to drive south. It will ruin the entire area, let alone the small village. The development was presented as a single, comprehensive scheme, despite it being known that not all the land is currently available. NYC were not prepared to comment on what might happen if the land cannot be acquired. This constitutes a misrepresentation of the deliverability of the proposals as presented to the public. NYCC were not prepared to suggest any mitigations if only some of the development is delivered which is likely to be the reality. There does not seem to be a plan to provide the necessary parking for the use of Cattal station as a park and ride. In recent years Cattal station has become an unofficial park and ride for people to get into York and Harrogate. Given that Maltkiln is fundamentally centred around Cattal station, this should be a priority within the plans. Currently, many rail users drive from other areas and park on surrounding roads, already causing congestion. Cattal station must remain easily accessible, attractive, and viable for non-</p>

	<p>residents, including adequate car parking. Failure to address this will displace parking problems to Hammerton station, where curbside parking issues already exist. The plan is being bulldozed in to a place that is far from ideal the only thing that it is based on is that it has a train station, if it were to be progressed by the A1 there would be far fewer impact to locals villages and communities and there has been no listening to any communities regarding the matter. The people who live here know the area better than those looking at a map and it has just all been ignored by NYC. The most frustrating part is that everybody in the area pays an inflated council tax, and it seems that once again we are being stung from all sides. I strongly oppose the size of the development; it is just not suitable for the location surrounded by rural villages.</p>
65	<p>There is a Grade 2 listed milepost (Historic England ref 1189740) on the A59 immediately east of Station Road. Please can you ensure this is protected during any works. Thank you.</p>
67	<p>I'm not a big fan of the name. My suggestion (as a local in Whixley) is to call it, to signify the Rudgate Roman road the new town sits upon. An application to make the A59 a dual carriageway should be considered, as traffic is already full at commuting times.</p>
70	<p>Sir/Madam, here is no mention that I can see as to the fate of the residents of Cattal Village. The new settlement dwarfs the existing hamlet. I see reference that local traffic only SHOULD, not WILL ONLY be permitted. This level of access cannot be policed, a rat run already exists A59 to the employment areas in Tockwith and Thorpe Arch South of the proposed development there is a bridge. It is designated as a Grade II listed building (List Entry Number 1149960) by Historic England. The 18th-century stone arch bridge, which carries Tadcaster Road/Cattal Moor Lane over the River Nidd, is also a scheduled monument. It is recognized for its historical and architectural value as a three-arch, 18th-century limestone bridge. Protection Status: In addition to being listed, it is a protected Scheduled Monument. Added to this the bridge floods numerous times each year with several vehicles lost to water damage each year Reroute the road and build a new bridge. The existing structure and junction proximity cannot take several hundred ( if not thousand) vehicle movements in both directions each day especially at peak times when backed up traffic is already at a dangerous level (only 3 cars can queue up to rights) Close the bridge to all but emergency services / pedestrians and cyclists ( retractable bollards a sensible distance from the listed structure would only be operated by fire / police / ambulance).</p>
99	<p>I am very concerned about the increased traffic, particularly on the A59 which is already a very dangerous road. Will there be improvements and traffic calming measures in the area? I am also worried about speeding drivers cutting through Kirk Hammerton and down Red Lane (this has been happening only this week with road works on the A59.) I am interested to know about the architecture planned for the houses. Green Hammerton has already been spoilt by unsightly new builds which are completely out of character with the countryside/village environment. The estates are also blighted by parked cars. What provision will be made for cars, both parked near the station and outside the new houses? The 4 storey buildings planned for the centre of Maltkiln will be unlike any other buildings in the area and surely more suitable for a town or city. At what stage in the development will the new schools and Drs surgery be built? If they are not built in the initial stage, there will be increased pressure on the existing schools and surgery which will mean more traffic in the villages of Kirk and Green Hammerton. I also object to the destruction of the natural environment. I have regularly seen deer, barn owls, kestrels and stoats in Stephenson's Lane near PSN services. Will the train service to Leeds and York be improved with services running earlier in the morning and later at night? Presently the last train from Leeds is 9.30 pm which means that any night out in Leeds relies on driving/taxis which is a shame when Leeds is a cultural hub for theatre, opera, ballet as well as having great restaurants, bars, clubs etc.</p>
7	<p>General Comments: Too many instances of the word 'should' this is woolly and open to interpretation. Substitute the word 'Must'. Much is made of the green credentials of the plan. It is VITAL that existing features and their ecosystems are retained and when new planting and landscaping is required this MUST be carried out before or during the building phase. This will allow this planting to reach maturity at an early stage, and there will be no excuse of the developer running out of money. The site comprises largely open arable farmland, this is too important to be lost to a new town. Other suitable sites are available which will not destroy farmland. Why is land North of the A59, adjacent to Green Hammerton included? This does not appear to provide the promised buffer between the existing village and the new town. Urban Creep is mentioned. There MUST be hard limits to the size of this development! Can bus services be guaranteed for the next 20/30 years? Who will subsidise them? Land use: a mix of homes that satisfy local needs. Existing developments have been marketed much further afield. Will Maltkiln be for local needs or will it be a rural retreat from the southern cities? Education: The first primary school MUST be provided in stage 1, not anticipated in stage 2 this is a get-out clause for the developer. The secondary school MUST be delivered. Transport from this number of dwellings to other local towns is unsustainable. Local Centre. These facilities MUST be provided at an early stage of the development. Employment: Must be provided or the whole rationale of the development fails. Health: Existing health facilities are over-subscribed, Additional facilities MUST be built at an early stage. Open Spaces: These MUST be provided and maintained appropriately. The covid lockdowns showed us that it is also important that individual dwellings should have a good level of</p>

	<p>private garden space. Location near to Cattal station is irrelevant. Similar or better provision could be made at Flaxby. However, the York/Harrogate line has insufficient capacity, and it is unlikely that this can be increased. Energy Supply and demand. These aims can only be achieved if the building regulation pertaining to this site are rigorously applied. Experience shows that this is unlikely to happen. Solar panels MUST be applied to every suitable roof space in a manner that benefits the residents financially, not the leaseholder. Community heat hubs are unlikely to be cost effective compared with more traditional sources of heating. Residents MUST be given a guaranteed cost for heating their homes. Rainwater harvesting should be incorporated for individual homes. This will reduce water demand and flood risks. Much is made of using sustainable transport, but experience shows us that many of the residents will work in the local cities and transport to these will inevitably be by private car. Children and teenagers will take part in activities in local towns and villages, again this will involve much use of the private car. The A59 cannot sustain this increase in traffic. I have not been able to access the design code documents however it should be noted that the recent developments in the local area have been of very poor architectural quality. Very obvious are the use of inappropriate materials, incorrectly sized eaves, fake chimney stacks, excessive uniformity in design including doors, etc. A considerable degree of pattern book housing is in evidence. Further Notes: Disruption during the construction phase must be minimised. Rules were in place during the building of the Strata and Avant estates in Green Hammerton. These rules were routinely ignored. The developers and the council were unwilling to address this class. There must be a hard limit to the size of this development and there should be a ban on any sizeable developments within a 10-mile radius e.g. solar farms, industrial development at Allerton Park. Can a better name be found? Maltkin sounds like a 1970's children's TV programme. The developers must not be allowed to wriggle out of their promises, and all phases must be fully completed in the time scales set.</p>
<p><b>33</b></p>	<p>We are one of the only properties served by the south end of Parker Lane north of the railway crossing. We very concerned regarding the access to our property and the access to the village.</p>
<p><b>11</b></p>	<p>I want to start by commenting on the public engagement process, as this affects how meaningfully local people are able to engage with the proposals. The way this consultation has been structured makes effective engagement difficult. Accessing information, understanding what is being proposed, and responding in an informed way requires a significant time commitment, which is not realistic for many residents. This links to a second comment that while the consultation may meet procedural requirements, it does not feel genuinely accessible, and this undermines confidence that local concerns are being fully heard. The proposed Maltkiln new settlement represents a development of a scale and form that is fundamentally disproportionate to its rural context and insufficiently justified by the evidence base. While the Masterplan Framework seeks to characterise the proposal as a series of discrete character areas, this does not change the fact that the scheme would function as a single, dominant settlement whose scale would significantly exceed that of surrounding villages, thereby severely altering the established settlement hierarchy of the area. The justification advanced for this scale relies heavily on strategic assertions of self-containment, rail-led sustainability, and long-term growth management. However, these claims are not supported by a sufficiently detailed assessment demonstrating that housing need could not be met through a more distributed, incremental approach across smaller and less environmentally disruptive sites. Reasonable alternative spatial strategies were fully explored and discounted; The cumulative impacts of dispersal were demonstrably greater than those arising from a single large-scale intervention; The proposed settlement scale is the minimum necessary to achieve the stated objectives. As such, the proposal appears to prioritise delivery efficiency and land assembly convenience over proportionality, local character, and spatial restraint. Given the magnitude of the proposal, the proof required to justify such a change in development form is high. On the basis of the information currently presented, that proof threshold has not been met. I am also concerned that the Maltkiln proposal has not clearly demonstrated that it is deliverable in practice. The masterplan depends on a number of fixed and essential pieces of infrastructure, including new junctions on the A59, a new link road to the B6265, internal distributor roads, large drainage and flood mitigation areas, continuous green and blue corridors, and the strategic green gap between Maltkiln and neighbouring villages. These elements are not optional and cannot realistically be moved or reduced without undermining the scheme as a whole. However, the document does not explain how the land required to deliver this infrastructure will be brought together, nor does it say what would happen if key parcels of land are not available by agreement. This makes it difficult to understand how the scheme could be delivered as described. Given the scale of the development and the fact that it relies on land across multiple ownerships, this lack of clarity is a serious concern. At no point does the masterplan explain whether the scheme can proceed without the use of statutory land assembly powers, or how delivery risks linked to land control would be managed. For a development of this size, deliverability should be clearly addressed at this stage rather than assumed. As it stands, the proposal appears to rely on an expectation of comprehensive land availability which has not been evidenced, creating uncertainty about whether the settlement can be delivered in the form proposed. The concerns I have raised about the consultation process are reflected in the way the Strategic Green Gap is treated within the draft Masterplan. Previous planning documents described the Green Gap as the minimum necessary to prevent harm and coalescence with neighbouring villages. The draft framework now proposes a reduced gap, while concluding that the resulting impact is only minor. This represents a significant change in position on a fundamental safeguard, yet the reasoning and evidence behind this change are not clearly set out. This lack of transparency makes it difficult to assess whether the reduction is genuinely justified or simply</p>

	<p>convenient to the development. It also raises concerns about how robust and reliable such safeguards will be over time, particularly once the settlement is established and future pressures emerge. Are we to assume that safeguards are negotiable when they become an annoyance to the project? Where does that leave residents? Given that the Green Gap is presented as a key mitigation measure, the absence of detail about its long-term protection, land use, and resistance to future development undermines confidence that it will function as intended. This directly reinforces concerns that important decisions are being advanced without sufficient clarity or scrutiny. Finally, I note that while Cattal railway station is presented as central to the sustainability of the Maltkiln proposals, there is little clarity around parking provision at the station itself. Cattal already functions as an informal park-and-ride, and without adequate, planned parking, additional demand is likely to be displaced onto surrounding roads and neighbouring settlements. Given the reliance placed on the station within the masterplan, this feels like an unresolved practical issue that warrants clearer consideration at this stage. I appreciate the opportunity to submit these comments and look forward to receiving a response. Thank you for taking the time to consider them.</p>
12	<p>Having attended the recent "consultation" event at Kirk Hammerton village hall, it was evident to see that this is not a consultation, at least not in a meaningful way. The event lacked detail and information, poorly written boards which were hard to read and a lack of personnel to answer questions. The patronising manner of the person welcoming people to the event set the tone for the event. Why proper technical drawings are not provided is unclear, the impressions which are not to scale and very hard to see the overlay of different elements do not help people understand the plans. The master plan itself is poorly considered and conceived. There are a number of issues which are clearly not being addressed and whilst I have no doubt the views of local people will continue to be ignored, my comments are as follows: in routing the A59 via a roundabout you are in effect bringing traffic to a crossroads by the village hall in green Hammerton- this is increasing the danger to children in the village and you will be increasing the volume of traffic joining the B6265 opposite a recreational facility. there is no clear detail on how you will prevent rat running through Kirk and Green Hammerton, increasing traffic and risk to residents. The previous plans suggested Kirk Hammerton would become local access only, but this seems lacking in this new plan. how does the 1 car per household policy plan to be enforced? It's quite evident that many households have two or more cars, will you mandate residents of Maltkiln sell a car before they buy a house? your proposed green spaces etc include bridleways, which ultimately end up with you spat out onto the A59. I can only assume the developers or the councillors haven't tried to lead a 500kg scared animal in 60 mph traffic, or they wouldn't be proposing such a route. There is no clear plans for how riders will safely cross the A59, the British horse society have already raised this with you in previous consultations and I'm sure you are aware rider safety was recently discussed in Parliament so you do need to get the right people in the room to advise on this otherwise you are proposing something completely unworkable and therefore useless. The potential increase in traffic in both Kirk and Green Hammerton also puts existing riders at risk. Kirk Hammerton has a large equestrian centre for example, and both villages have some existing bridleways which require road use to access so the increase traffic from this development increases the risk further. the plans do not detail in anyway how the necessary infrastructure will be put in place to make this development workable. The risk is that this will become a housing development in a field. What are the plans for sewage? For building the roundabout? Closing the dangerous Whixley crossroads? Water? Buses etc? Recent water pipe failures in the local area shows just how fragile the ageing pipe work is, adding several thousand houses will cause failure inevitably. Until clear information on this is provided you cannot gain confidence of local people about this being sustainable the planned closure of Parker Lane/Kirk Hammerton Lane, this was not in any previous plans but in effect cuts residents off from being able to walk safely to green Hammerton, and vice versa. Again, I can only assume the councillors and developers haven't walked down the A59 recently, it's not a pleasant experience, and removing a safe walking route between villages- as well as another vehicle route in is ludicrous. Why this is planned is not clear. the repeated assertion of using compulsory purchases to buy the land for this development is outrageous. Buying land from businesses to force this through is not the answer. The money for said purchase is our money- from the taxes you continue to raise. How and why using public money to line the pockets of developers is in the public interest is not clear. This needs a major rethink. For example, your new roundabout and link road to the B6265 goes through the middle of a working farm! flooding at Cattal. In the last fortnight Cattal has flooded twice closing the road. Climate change is real and here. This will become the norm, including the rising of water levels. How this will be managed with this new development is not clear. Every time Cattal floods someone has to be rescued, requiring the fire brigade, you are potentially increasing this further and with no clear information on how it will be avoided. the merging of villages, it's not clear how you will protect the character and separation of Kirk Hammerton and Green Hammerton from this mega development. The bringing of traffic further down the b6265 means that the impact of the development on Green Hammerton becomes more acute not less. The blurring of boundaries between Maltkiln and the existing villages threatens to ruin the existing character of this area of the vale of York and the lack of provision of clear technical drawings does nothing to dissuade fears about that. I urge you to actually listen to and engage with local people- it will make this development better certainly and help avoid many of the pitfalls that are evident. A failed development will be on the council so actually engaging in a meaningful way would be a vital place to start.</p>

## 2.3 Appendix C

Relevant to the Masterplan	Specific Masterplan Comments	Response
7	<p>General Comments: Too many instances of the word 'should' this is woolly and open to interpretation. Substitute the word 'Must'. Much is made of the green credentials of the plan. It is VITAL that existing features and their ecosystems are retained and when new planting and landscaping is required this MUST be carried out before or during the building phase. This will allow this planting to reach maturity at an early stage, and there will be no excuse of the developer running out of money. The site comprises largely open arable farmland, this is too important to be lost to a new town. Other suitable sites are available which will not destroy farmland. Why is land North of the A59, adjacent to Green Hammerton included? This does not appear to provide the promised buffer between the existing village and the new town. Urban Creep is mentioned. There MUST be hard limits to the size of this development! Can bus services be guaranteed for the next 20/30 years? Who will subsidise them? Land use: a mix of homes that satisfy local needs. Existing developments have been marketed much further afield. Will Maltkiln be for local needs or will it be a rural retreat from the southern cities? Education: The first primary school MUST be provided in stage 1, not anticipated in stage 2 this is a get-out clause for the developer. The secondary school MUST be delivered. Transport from this number of dwellings to other local towns is unsustainable. Local Centre. These facilities MUST be provided at an early stage of the development. Employment: Must be provided or the whole rationale of the development fails. Health: Existing health facilities are over-subscribed, Additional facilities MUST be built at an early stage. Open Spaces: These MUST be provided and maintained appropriately. The covid lockdowns showed us that it is also important that individual dwellings should have a good level of private garden space. Location near to Cattal station is irrelevant. Similar or better provision could be made at Flaxby. However, the York/Harrogate line has insufficient capacity, and it is unlikely that this can be increased. Energy Supply and demand. These aims can only be achieved if the building regulation pertaining to this site are rigorously applied. Experience shows that this is unlikely to happen. Solar panels MUST be applied to every suitable roof space in a manner that benefits the residents financially, not the leaseholder. Community heat hubs are unlikely to be cost effective compared with more traditional sources of heating. Residents MUST be given a guaranteed cost for heating their homes. Rainwater harvesting should be incorporated for individual homes. This will reduce water demand and flood risks. Much is made of using sustainable transport, but</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Must be a hard limit on the size of the development.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Masterplan follows the boundary outlined in the DPD.</li> </ul>

	<p>experience shows us that many of the residents will work in the local cities and transport to these will inevitably be by private car. Children and teenagers will take part in activities in local towns and villages, again this will involve much use of the private car. The A59 cannot sustain this increase in traffic. I have not been able to access the design code documents however it should be noted that the recent developments in the local area have been of very poor architectural quality. Very obvious are the use of inappropriate materials, incorrectly sized eaves, fake chimney stacks, excessive uniformity in design including doors, etc. A considerable degree of pattern book housing is in evidence. Further Notes: Disruption during the construction phase must be minimised. Rules were in place during the building of the Strata and Avant estates in Green Hammerton. These rules were routinely ignored. The developers and the council were unwilling to address this class. There must be a hard limit to the size of this development and there should be a ban on any sizeable developments within a 10-mile radius e.g. solar farms, industrial development at Allerton Park. Can a better name be found? Maltkin sounds like a 1970's children's TV programme. The developers must not be allowed to wriggle out of their promises, and all phases must be fully completed in the time scales set.</p>		
17	<p>This is a good plan which integrates reasonably well with the local area and will bring a lot of benefits. I'm delighted to see efforts being made to preserve and extend green space as well as consider pedestrian and cycle access so thoroughly. That said, as a Tockwith resident I do not think enough consideration has been given to local access from the south. With this in mind, I note three key omissions in the plan. The development will increase traffic flows heading south towards Wetherby/Tadcaster. As it stands, the single-track Cattal bridge is not fit for purpose, let alone for the additional volume of traffic combined with the regularity with which it floods. This needs to be upgraded or re-routed. 2. Parking at Cattal station is wholly inadequate. At present users are forced to park informally on the roadside. Will a car park be made available so local residents living outside of the Maltkiln development can use the station? Without doing this, the station becomes functionally useless for anyone outside of the Maltkiln/Green Hammerton area. 3. I do not see provision for cycle or pedestrian access to/from Tockwith. The village is three miles away on a fast 60mph road (Roman Road/Cattal Moor Lane), which will inherently become busier. There are good connections in the plan to Green Hammerton, but it is a major oversight not to consider Tockwith too, especially given the number of new housing developments there. It is natural for residents to want to use both the Maltkiln services and the train</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Not enough consideration given to local access from the south.</li> <li>▪ Parking at Cattal station is inadequate.</li> <li>▪ Provision for cycle or pedestrian access to/from Tockwith.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Illustrative Masterplan A1 now identifies parking at Cattal Station, as well as the shared footway and cycleway throughout the site.</li> </ul>

	<p>station at Cattal so by not providing this access you are reducing spillover benefits to the local area.</p>		
<p><b>18</b></p>	<p>This consultation lacks detail expected for this stage in the development process and to be considered as a proper well-executed consultation. It felt rushed and raises concerns that this was a tick box exercise to claim residents have been consulted but without presenting any detail so the team are not challenged. The outline of Maltkiln encroaches into the green gap an area meant to prevent coalescence between the new town and existing villages. This encroachment breaks promises before the ink has had time to dry. This breach only demonstrates that NYC can and is already willing to back track on its own policy and raises concerns on how residents and Local Councillors can trust NYC. Furthermore, the details on this change to the green gap with respect to types of properties and land use is not available. It is difficult to make an informed assessment without understanding what is being proposed and therefore this consultation has failed. The design codes should have been available at the presentation so that residents would have the opportunity to determine whether this breach / encroachment into the green gap is acceptable. It is unacceptable for NYC to assume this loss of the green gap is justified and acceptable without providing more detail. Given how vulnerable the green gap is to being developed now and later. The land should be forested or better still given a designation that makes it more difficult to be developed in the future. This should be done if NYC are genuine that this strip is a strategic green gap. It was not clear at the consultation and after talking to Yorkshire Water that the existing sewage network and wastewater treatments works will have enough capacity for any more new connections until there are significant upgrades. It is obvious that the footprint of the existing wastewater treatment works is too small to accommodate the expansion needed to treat a further 3000-4000 new households and commercial building being proposed. There is no assessment of how this enlarged treatment works, quite possibly ten times the area of the current works will fit in the current landscape. There is no impact assessment of what a town sized treatment works will have being in the centre of Kirk Hammerton a its conservation area. Large treatments work brings large HGV vehicle movements, increased odour issues, vermin, insects, noise and light pollution of which none of this has been considered. It is also proposed that the upgrade to the sewer network will have to be along Gilthswaite Lane through the centre of Kirk Hammerton along Chapel Street. Most of this route is barely suitable for two-way traffic and the impact of this work will cause considerable harm to the village and its residents. These two points are major infrastructure projects and will likely impact the village of Kirk</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Outline encroaches into the green gap. Land should be forested or given a designation that makes it more difficult for future development.</li> <li>▪ Closing the crossing at Parker Lane would be a huge loss of connectivity for visitors.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Green Gap was amended during the development of the DPD, and the Masterplan follows this boundary. Therefore, the Green Gap is not encroached by the Maltkiln boundary.</li> </ul>

	<p>Hammerton more than the Maltkiln developments itself. An enlarged treatment works will be no different to someone wanting to build a huge factory or amazon warehouse in the centre of the village. This is a major structure, and it is being overlooked. There are no plans for dealing with the increase demand for parking at Hammerton and Cattal stations, especially in the early phases. This is a huge concern for me and fellow residents as the roads around the stations are majorly constrained with parked cars reducing long stretches of road to single file traffic and creating bottle necks and hazards. Talking with representatives in the consultation it appears that the developers and NYC are negotiations with Network Rail for infrastructure and easement changes by agreeing to terms that will be unacceptable to Hammerton residents. Network Rail wanting to close the crossing at Parker Lane would be a huge loss to the connectivity for villagers and it is unreasonable for Maltkiln to sacrifice this asset to help with their negotiations. Parker/ Kirk Hammerton Lane is a critical link between Kirk Hammerton and Green Hammerton and part of a very popular loop for recreation walking and exercise. The lane also provide access to the village in times of emergencies especially when there are road closures on Gilthswaite Lane and Crooked Lane/Station Road and when the A59 is closed because of accidents which are happening more frequently. It is unacceptable that Kirk Hammerton residents lose this right of way as part of negotiations that solely help developers.</p>		
<p><b>33</b></p>	<p>We are one of the only properties served by the south end of Parker Lane north of the railway crossing. We very concerned regarding the access to our property and the access to the village.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Concerned regarding access to property as served by the south of Parker Lane.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Parker Lane crossing is being downgraded to pedestrian only access.</li> </ul>
<p><b>41</b></p>	<p>It would be great to have fully separated cycle ways connecting local villages such as Tockwith to Maltkiln so that more people will be able to access the facilities in Maltkiln car free. A secondary school should be provided in the first stage as this is needed locally. There isn't currently an in catchment secondary school in the area and the recent changes to bus provision for schools has caused major issues in local villages. A new secondary school with cycle paths connecting it to local areas would resolve this issue and encourage greener modes of transport to young people locally. This would also be useful if the proposed building on the Tockwith airfield site of an extra 1000+ houses are to be built. The addition of a site suitable for a local park run would also benefit local people and encourage the government's strategy as part of the 10-year health plan around prevention and people taking more accountability of their health.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Fully separated cycle ways connecting local villages would be great.</li> <li>▪ New secondary school with cycle paths connecting it to local areas would resolve bus issues to schools and encourage greener modes of transport.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Illustrative Masterplan A1 now shows the secondary school with shared footway/cycleways connecting to it.</li> <li>▪ Large areas of open space providing a variety of uses as shown on the landscape plans.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Addition of a site suitable for a local park run would benefit local people.</li> </ul>	
51	Please ensure that any crossings (or other features) are suitable for when the railway line is dualled. Otherwise, you will actively prevent future improvements.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Ensure any crossings are suitable when the railway line is dualled.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All crossings will be agreed in detail with Network Rail to ensure all relevant standards are met.</li> </ul>
60	At the last consultation I attended, I was completely assured that there would be a buffer area of at least 1 field between the new development and any existing villages. Living in Green Hammerton, I am now horrified to see that there is no buffer area at all shown on this latest plan. So effectively Green Hammerton will be lost and merged into the metropolis of this new town. I travel to the outskirts of York every morning by car and since the extra houses have been built locally, I now have to set off an extra 10 minutes earlier than I ever used to. If I was to leave at 8am like I used to, I would queue for over 5 minutes just exiting the village onto the A59 (and that's turning left) so I dread to think what this building will mean for future congestion. And apparently the answer is the train. My daughter had mock exams recently so decided for speed, to get the train to York. It was cancelled 3 of the 5 times she went for it. Or by waiting for the next train, she'd have arrived late for her exams. So, I had to driver her in any way! When people live out in the country they simply cannot rely on public transport, especially when its already known to be so unreliable! So, they will always have a car per driver in the household and to believe this won't be the case is fantasy. This is totally the wrong place for so many houses!	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No buffer area shown on latest plan – Green Hammerton will be lost.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Strategic Green Gap has not been encroached and is in line with the DPD. The allocated Green Gap continues to provide a buffer between Maltkiln and Green Hammerton, as shown on the Illustrative Masterplan A1.</li> </ul>
61	I attended your drop in event at Kirk Hammerton Village Hall and wish to record the following: It is deeply disappointing that the revision made to include a by-pass road on the east side of Maltkiln encroaches onto the already promised strategic green gap. This serves to damage trust in the Council and developers, despite assurances that sufficient building land is available within the site boundaries (Caddick) and planning policies would prevent further encroachment (Natasha for the council). I strongly suggest that the remaining green gap land, which Caddick state they have control of, be given over the landscaping including substantive tree planting and park land, sufficient to prevent any future appetite for its development for housing. The existing plans for footpaths alone do not give enough confidence that at some future stage it will not be replaced by more housing which links Maltkiln to neighbouring villages in the same way that trees and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ By-pass road on the east side of Maltkiln encroaches onto the already promised strategic green gap.</li> <li>▪ Suggest green gap land be given over the landscaping including substantive tree planting and park lane.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Green Gap was amended during the development of the DPD, and the Masterplan follows this boundary. Therefore, the Green Gap is not encroached by the Maltkiln boundary.</li> </ul>

	landscaped park land as a local amenity would do. This needs to be included in updated site plans and documented fully. The experience with other major developments across the country, including to a lesser degree the Manse Lane site at Knaresborough, has clearly been that promised infrastructure has been slow to be incorporated or even not built at all. The priority for developers is clearly to build housing and attract a revenue stream for their sale. This must not be allowed to happen with Maltkiln, and I expect Council planners to exert strong control over the developers. The consequences of not doing so would be for the residents of Maltkiln to look to existing facilities at Green and Kirk Hammerton, also Tockwith, which are already heavily subscribed due to substantial new housing in these villages. This would be totally unacceptable and predictable if the Council fail to grip the developers at all stages of the process. There is an acceptance that Maltkiln will be built, but it must be the exemplar, independent new settlement that has always been heralded, and not some second-rate large housing estate that becomes a nightmare burden to neighbouring communities.		
62	I am concerned how pedestrians from Whixley will cross the A59 to access the rail station and community hub. It is already dangerous crossing the A59, and increased vehicles will make this worse. Will there be some sort of a bridge or underpass for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders to use?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about pedestrian access to the rail station and community hub due to the crossing at the A59.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All crossings have been updated as reflected in the Illustrative Masterplan A1.</li> </ul>
63	After visiting the consultation at Kirk Hammerton Village Hall on 15/01/26, it appears there is lack of pedestrian/cycle routes and bridleways connecting Green Hammerton and Maltkiln. There are no proposed safe crossings over the A59 to connect the two settlements. As a result, people from Green Hammerton will be forced to use their cars to visit Maltkiln. The master plan shows a lot of green space, which will also benefit the people of Green Hammerton, so connecting the two villages in such way is vital.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of pedestrian/cycle routes and bridleways connecting Green Hammerton and Maltkiln – no proposed safe crossings of A59.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a segregated footway/cycleway as well as a proposed bridleway connecting Green Hammerton with Maltkiln.</li> <li>All crossings have been updated as reflected in the illustrative Masterplan A1.</li> </ul>
64	Can you confirm the bridleway near the Whixley (not the one at Cattal station) will still be there for horses and walkers with our workout dogs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirmation that bridleway near Whixley will be retained.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All Bridleways are being maintained and the various routes shown with both new and improved footpaths and bridleways.</li> </ul>

<p><b>11</b></p>	<p>I want to start by commenting on the public engagement process, as this affects how meaningfully local people are able to engage with the proposals. The way this consultation has been structured makes effective engagement difficult. Accessing information, understanding what is being proposed, and responding in an informed way requires a significant time commitment, which is not realistic for many residents. This links to a second comment that while the consultation may meet procedural requirements, it does not feel genuinely accessible, and this undermines confidence that local concerns are being fully heard. The proposed Maltkiln new settlement represents a development of a scale and form that is fundamentally disproportionate to its rural context and insufficiently justified by the evidence base. While the Masterplan Framework seeks to characterise the proposal as a series of discrete character areas, this does not change the fact that the scheme would function as a single, dominant settlement whose scale would significantly exceed that of surrounding villages, thereby severely altering the established settlement hierarchy of the area. The justification advanced for this scale relies heavily on strategic assertions of self-containment, rail-led sustainability, and long-term growth management. However, these claims are not supported by a sufficiently detailed assessment demonstrating that housing need could not be met through a more distributed, incremental approach across smaller and less environmentally disruptive sites. Reasonable alternative spatial strategies were fully explored and discounted; The cumulative impacts of dispersal were demonstrably greater than those arising from a single large-scale intervention; The proposed settlement scale is the minimum necessary to achieve the stated objectives. As such, the proposal appears to prioritise delivery efficiency and land assembly convenience over proportionality, local character, and spatial restraint. Given the magnitude of the proposal, the proof required to justify such a change in development form is high. On the basis of the information currently presented, that proof threshold has not been met. I am also concerned that the Maltkiln proposal has not clearly demonstrated that it is deliverable in practice. The masterplan depends on a number of fixed and essential pieces of infrastructure, including new junctions on the A59, a new link road to the B6265, internal distributor roads, large drainage and flood mitigation areas, continuous green and blue corridors, and the strategic green gap between Maltkiln and neighbouring villages. These elements are not optional and cannot realistically be moved or reduced without undermining the scheme as a whole. However, the document does not explain how the land required to deliver this infrastructure will be brought together, nor does it say what would happen if key parcels of land are not available by agreement. This makes it difficult to understand how the scheme could be delivered as</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Concerns regarding the strategic green gap and the change in position.</li> <li>▪ Little clarity around parking at Cattal Station. Given its reliance in the masterplan, this seems like an unresolved issue.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Green Gap was amended during the development of the DPD, and the Masterplan follows this boundary. Therefore, the Green Gap is not encroached by the Maltkiln boundary.</li> <li>▪ Illustrative Masterplan A1 now identifies parking at Cattal Station, as well as the shared footway and cycleway throughout the site.</li> </ul>
------------------	--	---	---

	<p>described. Given the scale of the development and the fact that it relies on land across multiple ownerships, this lack of clarity is a serious concern. At no point does the masterplan explain whether the scheme can proceed without the use of statutory land assembly powers, or how delivery risks linked to land control would be managed. For a development of this size, deliverability should be clearly addressed at this stage rather than assumed. As it stands, the proposal appears to rely on an expectation of comprehensive land availability which has not been evidenced, creating uncertainty about whether the settlement can be delivered in the form proposed. The concerns I have raised about the consultation process are reflected in the way the Strategic Green Gap is treated within the draft Masterplan. Previous planning documents described the Green Gap as the minimum necessary to prevent harm and coalescence with neighbouring villages. The draft framework now proposes a reduced gap, while concluding that the resulting impact is only minor. This represents a significant change in position on a fundamental safeguard, yet the reasoning and evidence behind this change are not clearly set out. This lack of transparency makes it difficult to assess whether the reduction is genuinely justified or simply convenient to the development. It also raises concerns about how robust and reliable such safeguards will be over time, particularly once the settlement is established and future pressures emerge. Are we to assume that safeguards are negotiable when they become an annoyance to the project? Where does that leave residents? Given that the Green Gap is presented as a key mitigation measure, the absence of detail about its long-term protection, land use, and resistance to future development undermines confidence that it will function as intended. This directly reinforces concerns that important decisions are being advanced without sufficient clarity or scrutiny. Finally, I note that while Cattal railway station is presented as central to the sustainability of the Maltkiln proposals, there is little clarity around parking provision at the station itself. Cattal already functions as an informal park-and-ride, and without adequate, planned parking, additional demand is likely to be displaced onto surrounding roads and neighbouring settlements. Given the reliance placed on the station within the masterplan, this feels like an unresolved practical issue that warrants clearer consideration at this stage. I appreciate the opportunity to submit these comments and look forward to receiving a response. Thank you for taking the time to consider them.</p>		
12	<p>Having attended the recent "consultation" event at Kirk Hammerton village hall, it was evident to see that this is not a consultation, at least not in a meaningful way. The event lacked detail and information, poorly written boards which were hard to read and a lack of personnel to answer</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Routing the A59 via the roundabout will bring traffic to a crossroads by the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Green infrastructure plan shows the existing and proposed green spaces.</li> </ul>

<p>questions. The patronising manner of the person welcoming people to the event set the tone for the event. Why proper technical drawings are not provided is unclear, the impressions which are not to scale and very hard to see the overlay of different elements do not help people understand the plans. The master plan itself is poorly considered and conceived. There are a number of issues which are clearly not being addressed and whilst I have no doubt the views of local people will continue to be ignored, my comments are as follows: in routing the A59 via a roundabout you are in effect bringing traffic to a crossroads by the village hall in green Hammerton- this is increasing the danger to children in the village and you will be increasing the volume of traffic joining the B6265 opposite a recreational facility. there is no clear detail on how you will prevent rat running through Kirk and Green Hammerton, increasing traffic and risk to residents. The previous plans suggested Kirk Hammerton would become local access only, but this seems lacking in this new plan. how does the 1 car per household policy plan to be enforced? It's quite evident that many households have two or more cars, will you mandate residents of Maltkiln sell a car before they buy a house? your proposed green spaces etc include bridleways, which ultimately end up with you spat out onto the A59. I can only assume the developers or the councillors haven't tried to lead a 500kg scared animal in 60 mph traffic, or they wouldn't be proposing such a route. There is no clear plans for how riders will safely cross the A59, the British horse society have already raised this with you in previous consultations and I'm sure you are aware rider safety was recently discussed in Parliament so you do need to get the right people in the room to advise on this otherwise you are proposing something completely unworkable and therefore useless. The potential increase in traffic in both Kirk and Green Hammerton also puts existing riders at risk. Kirk Hammerton has a large equestrian centre for example, and both villages have some existing bridleways which require road use to access so the increase traffic from this development increases the risk further. the plans do not detail in anyway how the necessary infrastructure will be put in place to make this development workable. The risk is that this will become a housing development in a field. What are the plans for sewage? For building the roundabout? Closing the dangerous Whixley crossroads? Water? Buses etc? Recent water pipe failures in the local area shows just how fragile the ageing pipe work is, adding several thousand houses will cause failure inevitably. Until clear information on this is provided you cannot gain confidence of local people about this being sustainable the planned closure of Parker Lane/Kirk Hammerton Lane, this was not in any previous plans but in effect cuts residents off from being able to walk safely to green Hammerton, and vice versa. Again, I can only assume the</p>	<p>village hall in Green Hammerton.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No clear detail on how rat running through Kirk and Green Hammerton will be prevented.</li> <li>▪ Proposed green spaces, including bridleways, ultimately end up with you spat out onto the A59.</li> <li>▪ No clear plans for how riders will safely cross the A59.</li> <li>▪ Planned closure of Parker Lane/Kirk Hammerton Lane cuts residents off from being able to walk safely to Green Hammerton.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Green Gap still provides a buffer between Green and Kirk Hammerton and Maltkiln.</li> <li>▪ All crossings have been updated as reflected in the illustrative Masterplan A1.</li> <li>▪ The Parker Lane crossing is being downgraded to pedestrian only access, therefore there is no impact.</li> </ul>
--	--	--

	<p>councillors and developers haven't walked down the A59 recently, it's not a pleasant experience, and removing a safe walking route between villages- as well as another vehicle route in is ludicrous. Why this is planned is not clear. the repeated assertion of using compulsory purchases to buy the land for this development is outrageous. Buying land from businesses to force this through is not the answer. The money for said purchase is our money- from the taxes you continue to raise. How and why using public money to line the pockets of developers is in the public interest is not clear. This needs a major rethink. For example, your new roundabout and link road to the B6265 goes through the middle of a working farm! flooding at Cattal. In the last fortnight Cattal has flooded twice closing the road. Climate change is real and here. This will become the norm, including the rising of water levels. How this will be managed with this new development is not clear. Every time Cattal floods someone has to be rescued, requiring the fire brigade, you are potentially increasing this further and with no clear information on how it will be avoided. the merging of villages, it's not clear how you will protect the character and separation of Kirk Hammerton and Green Hammerton from this mega development. The bringing of traffic further down the b6265 means that the impact of the development on Green Hammerton becomes more acute not less. The blurring of boundaries between Maltkiln and the existing villages threatens to ruin the existing character of this area of the vale of York and the lack of provision of clear technical drawings does nothing to dissuade fears about that. I urge you to actually listen to and engage with local people- it will make this development better certainly and help avoid many of the pitfalls that are evident. A failed development will be on the council so actually engaging in a meaningful way would be a vital place to start.</p>		
17	<p>NOTE - submitting for a second time because no confirmation of submittal was received, I was unable to attend the consultation, little notice was given or information made available prior to the session. Having been unable to discuss the now shared materials I have the following comments based on the information I have viewed. I had expected more information to be available; there is no more than the last consultation it appeared to just be a relocation of boundaries. There is no plan to ensure that these villages are not negatively both in the short and the long term. Each time a new plan is released it is positioned closer to the nearby villages and Whixley / Whixley Gate is repeatedly omitted from maps and when shown not labelled indicating that is of no consideration to the planners. Only allocating a single car parking space per property is unrealistic. Having lived in the area for a number of years almost all journeys are by car, it should be planned for each adult in the household to have a parking space.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Development is getting closer and closer to nearby villages.</li> <li>▪ Only allocating a single car parking space per property is unrealistic.</li> <li>▪ Parking at Cattal Station is lacking.</li> <li>▪ No provision for those from Whixley village and Whixley Gate for a safe</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Green Gap was amended during the development of the DPD, and the Masterplan follows this boundary. Therefore, the Green Gap is not encroached by the Maltkiln boundary.</li> <li>▪ Illustrative Masterplan A1 now identifies parking at Cattal Station, as well as the shared footway and</li> </ul>

	<p>Trains are infrequent and buses even more so. The whole development is based around the train station at Cattal, currently the lack of parking has effectively reduced the road past the station to single lane with cars abandoned by the side of the road. Parking at the station appears to be something that again has no clear plan. There is no planned provision for those from Whixley village and Whixley Gate for a safe walkway crossing the A59 to the station. The plan appears to show no direct road access from Whixley to Cattal. Anytime there is any roadwork or accident on the A59 there are no alternative routes capable of handling a high level of traffic, this would be further exacerbated should the road through Cattal be flooded. Again, given that substantial works would be required on the A59 what plans are there to ensure that those living locally are minimally affected - lessons need to be learnt as we had months of gridlocked traffic during the most recent builds in Green Hammerton. There is no plan for what would happen should all of the land not be made available and are there any guarantees that green routes / pathways, medical centres etc. will actually be delivered.</p>	<p>walkway crossing the A59 to the station.</p>	<p>cycleway throughout the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All crossings have been updated as reflected in the illustrative Masterplan A1.</li> </ul>
20	<p>I support and endorse the submissions made by both Green Hammerton Parish Council and the joint Parish councils, as though the same were set out here in full. I am supportive of the overall development but have misgivings as to the quality being maintained. The draft masterplan does not assuage those misgivings. It does not address, with sufficient certainty and entrenchment, the preservation of the green gap; the rerouting of the A6265, the closure and subsequent use of the to be redundant part of A6265, and measures to inhibit rat running through Green Hammerton.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Masterplan does not address the preservation of the green gap, the rerouting of the A6265, the closure and subsequent use of the to be redundant part of the A6265, and measures to inhibit rat running through Green Hammerton.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Green Gap was amended during the development of the DPD, and the Masterplan follows this boundary. Therefore, the Green Gap is not encroached by the Maltkiln boundary.</li> </ul>
24	<p>Re-run this as a genuinely collaborative process with clear stages, not a short comment window. Publish an engagement plan that sets out what is open to change, how local input will shape revisions, and how you will report back on what you accepted/rejected and why. Make the Framework testable and honest about what is fixed now. &gt;If future applications must be consistent with the Framework, then spell out plainly what decisions are being made at Framework stage (the parameters, safeguards, minimum standards, triggers) and what is genuinely deferred. Don't push the hard choices into later design codes while claiming certainty now. Bring beyond the boundary impacts and connections into the Masterplan, not as an afterthought. Include a clear plan for external walking/cycling links and safeguarded corridors beyond the site boundary, plus a proper section on off-site impacts and enabling infrastructure (including wastewater/sewage</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The masterplan stage must openly test reasonable alternative, publish the evidence used, and explain why the preferred option is chosen so residents can see that long-term outcomes, not short-term pressures, are driving the plan.</li> <li>Basic quality control – proofread and correct</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Masterplan has been developed with stakeholders, the community, the Council and the developer. The final version is based on evidence and has considered alternatives for each section.</li> <li>The document is being reviewed.</li> </ul>

	<p>and strategic utilities). Residents need to understand what is happening to neighbouring communities and networks, not just what is drawn inside the red line. Lock down the Strategic Green Gap with unambiguous safeguards. If any crossings or connections are proposed, define exactly what they are for, what is prohibited, and how infrastructure first, development later creep will be prevented. If necessary, introduce stronger standalone protection so residents can trust the line will hold. Evidence and alternatives must be part of collaboration especially where choices look driven by short-term developer exigencies. Key structural decisions (for example, the location and quantum of employment land and the traffic consequences) should not be treated as faits accomplis shaped by the promoters' commercial constraints. The Masterplan stage must openly test reasonable alternatives, publish the evidence used, and explain why the preferred option is chosen so residents can see that long-term outcomes, not short-term pressures, are driving the plan. Basic quality control: proofread and correct errors. This includes repeated drafting mistakes and, frankly, repeatedly spelling the settlement's name as Maltkin. If the basics aren't checked, it undermines confidence that the bigger claims are being handled with the necessary care.</p>	<p>errors, including repeated drafting and spelling mistakes.</p>	
<p><b>25</b></p>	<p>Coalition of Local Councils Response to North Yorkshire Council on the Draft Maltkiln Masterplan Framework (January 2026) Executive summary the draft Masterplan Framework is presented as a document that future planning applications must follow, yet it reads more like a persuasive vision than a robust, testable framework. Too much of what matters is deferred to later documents (design codes, parameters, future strategies), while the Framework already embeds major choices (movement structure, character areas, land-use distribution and implied density patterns). This creates a trust and clarity problem: residents are told key issues are later, but the direction of travel is already set. A second headline issue is process. Despite repeated references to collaboration, there has been no meaningful collaboration with the local community. The public has been asked to respond to a near-complete document within a short period following a drop-in event. Requests for a modest extension were refused on the grounds of maintaining momentum. That is consultation-on-a-draft, not collaboration in shaping the Framework. If the Council wishes the Framework to carry real weight and provide certainty, it should be re-issued alongside: a published governance/decision framework; a clear definition of what detailed means at this stage (what is fixed vs flexible); a staged engagement framework showing how local community input will shape iterations before applications are fixed; and a clear statement on timing/phasing and land control, and how impacts on neighbouring</p>		

	<p>communities will be managed during interim phases. Detailed comments and required changes. The DPD requires an allocation-wide masterplan that provides the basis for subsequent planning applications and detailed design work. The Framework is being positioned as the controlling reference point parameters) for later applications, yet repeatedly postpones decisive matters (density, deliverability dependencies, drainage detail, enforceable standards) to later stages. If later proposals must be consistent with this Framework, the Framework must contain sufficient parameters and evidence to make that consistency auditable. Add a schedule titled Framework-stage commitments and evidence what is fixed now (parameters, minima, safeguards, triggers) and what is not; the minimum drawings/metrics that prove key claims; what must be delivered before occupations (phase triggers); and how compliance will be assessed at application stage. Collaboration, governance and engagement: claimed but not evidenced. The DPD requires the masterplan to be produced in conjunction with the Council and the local community, alongside other stakeholders. The public-facing process describes promoter/Council workshops leading to the Framework, followed by a short comment period. This may be collaboration between institutional parties, but it is not collaboration with the local community. Refusal of a modest extension requested by councils/residents (to preserve momentum) reinforces this perception. Required changes (three documents that must accompany any re-issue): Governance / decision framework: who decides what, when; how disagreements are resolved; how commitments are secured, monitored and reported. Engagement framework: what is genuinely open to change; staged engagement points; how feedback is assessed; how changes are reported back (audit trail). Community involvement mechanism: an explicit statement of how community involvement will occur in practice and through what representative structures (including clarity on the role that will be required of the Community Liaison Group). Meaning of detailed and parameters Policy context: masterplan that fixes essential settlement structure and requirements, not just aspirations.</p>		
<p><b>29</b></p>	<p>Very disappointed with the standard of the Caddick event, less detailed than previously and the feedback from those giving the feedback was poor. Having been involved in the original consultation it was like stepping back as if none of that had happened. The standard of information was poor, and responses was poor showed a distinct lack of knowledge of what had gone on before, it appears to be a hurried tick box exercise. It was disappointing to see that the development now does not appear to centre on the station, the lack of parking and transport hub in that area, sport hub and other things that will be constructed to the west later if at all. The development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Development does not appear to centre on the station the lack of parking and transport hub in that area, sport hub and other things that will be constructed to the west later if at all.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Illustrative Masterplan A1 now identifies parking at Cattal Station, as well as the shared footway and cycleway throughout the site.</li> <li>▪ The Green Gap was amended during the</li> </ul>

	<p>was supposed to self-sufficient, but the sewage works that was not in any of the other plans now appears off the development. The boundary of the development which was previously below the ridge (Doodle Hill) has now been extended further to the east into the funnel neck of the rivers and flood plains. There are missed messages here, we are talking only about Maltkiln and not how these fits into the existing environment. Roads that suddenly end on the edge of Green Hammerton (Harrogate Road) at the village hall that will compound the present problems on that road. The sports field at Green Hammerton is too small and is already over developed and not able to accommodate the residents of Green Hammerton now will have to accommodate Maltkiln residents. There still appears to be a lot of transport issues which have not been addressed, relief road for Cattal, Whixley junction, the movement of the proposed roundabout closer to Green Hammerton reducing the green gap. (Green Belt). The closing of existing access to the A59, B6265 junction, which could have been made left turn only onto A59 and right turn only off the A59. This closure makes a piece of dead land for anti-social behaviour. The more access that can be provided on and off the A59 north and south will reduce the opportunities for rat runs. What is the policy for the green gap can part of it be used as an extension playing field or allotments for Green Hammerton? A59 being dual carriageway to west of Maltkiln, which had been shown before? Lack of Maltkiln resident vehicle parking (single parking spaces) which has been highlighted since day one, vehicles will be required due to the lack of available facilities. The driver for this appears to be make the housing denser to get more houses in. Lack of education facilities which are required for the mass of houses which are built here and the surrounding areas, residents will move in with ready-made families, surely the education authorities should be pushing for the education establishments to be built. Concerns what these houses will put on the existing drainage and water infrastructure, we already having numerous failures. Pedestrian cycle routes from Green Hammerton alongside a major road and still having to cross the A59, no underpasses or a pedestrian bridge. It appears now to be just a housing development without it being the flag ship development, which was promised, it left me with more questions than answers and being bitterly disappointed in the whole process which I had been happy to engage in, resulting in a complete lack of trust towards both Caddick and North Yorkshire Council.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Boundary of the development has now been extended further to the east into the funnel neck of the rivers and flood plains.</li> <li>▪ The sports field at Green Hammerton is too small and is already over developed and not able to accommodate the residents of Green Hammerton now will have to accommodate Maltkiln residents.</li> <li>▪ Appears to be a lot of transport issues that have not been addressed: relief road for Cattal, Whixley junction, the movement of the proposed roundabout closer to Green Hammerton reducing the green gap, the closing of existing access to the A59.</li> <li>▪ Lack of education facilities which are required for the mass of houses which are built here and the surrounding areas.</li> <li>▪ Pedestrian cycle routes from Green Hammerton alongside a major road and still having to cross the A59, no underpasses or a pedestrian bridge.</li> </ul>	<p>development of the DPD, and the Masterplan follows this boundary. Therefore, the Green Gap is not encroached by the Maltkiln boundary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There is a 7.5 ha sports hub designated in Maltkiln as shown on the Illustrative Masterplan A1, as well as open space including additional play areas.</li> <li>▪ Both primary and secondary education is included in the Illustrative Masterplan A1 to support the residents.</li> <li>▪ All crossings have been updated as reflected in the illustrative Masterplan A1.</li> </ul>
<p><b>31</b></p>	<p>Cattal Station: We live in the village of Great Ouseburn and regularly use Cattal Station to access York and Leeds. We have to drive to the station as there is no frequent bus service and the roads to get to Cattal are not safe</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Roads to get to Cattal are not safe to cycle/walk on. Does not seem to be a plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There is a shared footpath and cycleway</li> </ul>

	<p>to cycle/walk on. There does not seem to be a plan to provide the necessary parking/drop-off point for the use of Cattal station as a park and ride. Given that Maltkiln is fundamentally centred around Cattal station, this should be a priority within the plans. Cattal station must remain easily accessible, attractive, and viable for non-residents, including adequate car parking.</p>	<p>to provide the necessary parking/drop-off point for the use of the station as a park and ride. This should be a priority.</p>	<p>providing pedestrian access to Cattal Station.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Illustrative Masterplan A1 now also identifies parking at Cattal Station.</li> </ul>
<p><b>32</b></p>	<p>1. Insufficient Level of Detail. The consultation materials lack the level of detail that would reasonably be expected at this stage of the development process. As presented, the consultation does not provide sufficient information to enable residents to meaningfully understand or scrutinise the proposals. This creates the perception that the exercise is being undertaken primarily as a procedural requirement rather than as a genuine opportunity for informed public engagement. 2. Poor Communication and Limited Access to Information. Communication in advance of the consultation event on 15 January was inadequate. Many residents were unable to access the consultation documents beforehand, preventing them from preparing informed questions or comments. On the day of the event, the venue was extremely crowded, making it difficult to view the display boards properly or spend sufficient time reviewing and understanding the information. These factors significantly reduced the effectiveness and value of the consultation. 3. Lack of Clear Identification of Representatives. At the consultation event, representatives from both the developer (Caddick) and North Yorkshire Council were not clearly identifiable. Caddick representatives did not display name badges or role descriptions, and not all NYCC representatives were wearing lanyards. This made it difficult for attendees to identify appropriate individuals to discuss specific issues or proposals, giving the impression that representatives were not adequately prepared for transparent public engagement. 4. Inability to Obtain Clear or Consistent Answers. Attendees frequently reported being redirected between NYCC and Caddick representatives, with neither able to provide clear or definitive answers to questions. This lack of clarity and accountability was frustrating and undermined confidence in both the consultation process and the robustness of the proposals. Comments on the Draft Maltkiln Masterplan Framework 5. Focus Limited to the Redline Boundary The framework focuses solely on the Maltkiln site within the redline boundary and does not adequately consider impacts beyond this area. There is insufficient assessment of how the development will affect neighbouring communities, particularly Kirk Hammerton and Green Hammerton. At present, the potential impacts and required mitigation measures for these settlements are neither clearly understood nor</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ One parking space per dwelling is unrealistic.</li> <li>▪ Previous documentation stated that the originally defined Green Gap represented the minimum necessary to prevent coalescence and harm. The latest assessment significantly reduces this gap while concluding that the impact is now only minor.</li> <li>▪ No clear plan to provide adequate parking to support Cattal Station as a park and ride facility. As Maltkiln is fundamentally centred around Cattal station, appropriate parking provision should be a core element of the masterplan.</li> <li>▪ Closure of Parker Lane would have a severe and unacceptable impact on residents of Kirk Hammerton and Green Hammerton. The lane provides essential connectivity between the villages and serves as a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Green Gap was amended during the development of the DPD, and the Masterplan follows this boundary. Therefore, the Green Gap is not encroached by the Maltkiln boundary.</li> <li>▪ The parking strategy will outline the amount of parking in the outline planning application. This level of detail is not included in the masterplan.</li> <li>▪ Parker Lane is to be retained as a pedestrian route.</li> </ul>

<p>adequately addressed. 6. One Parking Space per Dwelling Policy The proposed policy of one parking space per dwelling is unrealistic. Given the location and limited early provision of public transport, it is highly likely that most households will own at least two vehicles. Bus services, if provided, are unlikely to be viable until much later phases of development. Presenting the development as sustainable while relying on a parking strategy that does not reflect realistic travel behaviour raises serious concerns about its practicality and credibility. Presentation of the Development as a Single Deliverable Scheme. The development was presented as a comprehensive and unified scheme, despite it being acknowledged that not all land required for delivery is currently available. NYCC was unable or unwilling to comment on the implications should some land not be acquired. This presents a misleading impression of deliverability. No alternative scenarios or mitigation measures were discussed in the event that only part of the scheme is delivered, which is a likely outcome. Green Gap Assessment and Confidence in NYCC Policy Previous documentation stated that the originally defined Green Gap represented the minimum necessary to prevent coalescence and harm. The latest assessment significantly reduces this gap while concluding that the impact is now only minor. This reversal of a fundamental requirement previously emphasised by the Planning Inspector raises serious concerns about policy consistency and trust in NYCC's decision-making. Furthermore, insufficient detail has been provided regarding the nature of development proposed adjacent to the revised Green Gap, including land use and housing types. Without this information, it is not possible to make an informed assessment, rendering the consultation inadequate. Given the vulnerability of the Green Gap to future development, the land should be robustly protected ideally through woodland planting or a designation that makes future development significantly more difficult if NYCC is genuinely committed to its role as a strategic green buffer. 9. Cattal Railway Station and Parking Provision There is no clear plan to provide adequate parking to support Cattal station as a park-and-ride facility. In practice, Cattal station already functions as an informal park-and-ride for York and Harrogate, with parking spilling onto surrounding roads and causing congestion. As Maltkiln is fundamentally centred around Cattal station, appropriate parking provision should be a core element of the masterplan. Failure to address this will displace parking pressures to Hammerton station, where on-street parking issues already exist. 10. Traffic Management and Use of Through-Routes The proposals do not clearly explain how traffic from Maltkiln will be prevented from using Kirk Hammerton as a through-route. Gilsthwaite Lane is described as a quiet lane, but there is no explanation of how this designation would function in practice. In addition, there appears to be limited consideration of</p>	<p>key active travel route to shops, services, schools, healthcare, and recreational facilities.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>the impact of frequent flooding at Cattal Bridge, which regularly closes the southbound route from the settlement. There is significant concern among residents that Parker Lane may be closed to vehicles and pedestrians in the future. While not explicitly shown on the plans, documentation refers to the potential closure of nearby level crossings as a result of increased rail crossings within the Maltkiln development. This can reasonably be interpreted as referring to Parker Lane. Closure of Parker Lane would have a severe and unacceptable impact on residents of Kirk Hammerton and Green Hammerton. The lane provides essential connectivity between the villages and serves as a key active travel route to shops, services, schools, healthcare, and recreational facilities. It is also a vital access route during emergencies, particularly when alternative roads are closed due to flooding or accidents on the A59. It would be unacceptable for this right of way to be compromised as part of negotiations that primarily benefit developers or Network Rail.</p> <p>12. Drainage, Sewers, and Wastewater Treatment The proposed development will require a new sewer and wastewater treatment works, which is likely to have a significant impact on Kirk Hammerton. However, no detailed plans or impact assessments have been provided. The existing wastewater treatment works is insufficient to accommodate an additional 3,000-4,000 households and associated commercial development. A new or significantly expanded facility will be required, yet there is no assessment of its visual, environmental, or operational impact on Kirk Hammerton or its conservation area. Large treatment works typically bring increased HGV movements, odour, vermin, insects, noise, and light pollution, none of which have been adequately considered. In addition, proposals indicate that sewer network upgrades may run along Gilsthwaite Lane and through the centre of Kirk Hammerton via Chapel Street. These roads are narrow and poorly suited to major infrastructure works, and the disruption would cause substantial harm to residents and the village environment. Finally, there was no clarity at the consultation regarding phasing. It remains unclear whether the existing sewer network and wastewater treatment works have sufficient capacity to support any further development prior to the delivery of new infrastructure.</p>		
<p><b>49</b></p>	<p>The plan doesn't show any crossing locations on the A59. While the detail may follow, we think it's important that key locations are indicated on the MP for residents of Whixley like me that's Station Road but there is also a key crossing location to Green Hammerton. Plus, Skatemoor Lane is well used by cyclists. Parking at Cattal Station must be resolved, plus if the road from A59 to Cattal Station is pedestrianised where will rail users coming from other villages park, they will probably use Whixley Gate? Careful consideration is needed re all users of Cattal Station especially in the early</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No crossing locations on the A59.</li> <li>▪ One parking space per home is unrealistic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All crossings have been updated as reflected in the illustrative Masterplan A1.</li> <li>▪ The parking strategy will outline the amount of parking in the outline</li> </ul>

	<p>stages of the development. Parking (or lack of it) is already a problem. What about sewage? Our local sewers are already causing problems – the one from Whixley to Green Hammerton collapsed last year causing major problems and two years ago the sewer collapsed just below Green Hammerton. What provisions will be made? How will the Council ensure the village centre is delivered in a first phase and that it will actually include anything useful to contain trips on site and provide existing population with improved local facilities. Also how does the CPO impact the delivery of the Village Centre? Can the development proceed, in a way which will ensure an exemplar development, before the uncertainty of the CPO land is resolved? How will the Council prevent the developer building the easy win homes in the NW corner and then walking away once thing get to the difficult land south of the railway and on the CPO land? Are they really going to restrict parking provision to one space per home? This is unrealistic. How will you prevent rat running and speeding through the villages? Especially Whixley, Clockhill Field Lane is already used by many as a short cut from the A59 across to the Boroughbridge Road. The phasing information indicates the sports facilities would be one of the last things to be provided. When will the Council approve a phasing plan and can the sports facilities be provided sooner – these would genuinely be something which would benefit the local communities.</p>		<p>planning application. This level of detail is not included in the masterplan.</p>
<p><b>57</b></p>	<p>I am cautiously optimistic regarding the development and would welcome improved infrastructure in the local area (particularly improved pedestrian routes between the various communities and improvements to Cattal station). It would be good to see more detailed timelines of when and how construction will begin. I think a lot of people, (myself included) are naturally sceptical that improvements in local infrastructure will be constructed alongside homes and not just put off and ultimately never implemented. My home is roughly in the centre of the planned development area (at the junction of Gilsthwaite Lane and Stephenson's Lane). From the plans it looks like road access to our properties will be from 'quiet lanes', could this be defined please? Could access by delivery services/trades be affected? Elsewhere in the masterplan it is mentioned that all homes will have EV charging - is there any possibility of funding being made available for homes within the development border to upgrade alongside the new build homes? I appreciate the masterplan includes open space around my home - hopefully this will remain intact in the final development.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Could 'quiet lanes' be defined please.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Quiet Lane definition has been added.</li> </ul>
<p><b>119</b></p>	<p>The current plans look to bring Maltkiln much closer to Green Hammerton. This risks existing villages totally losing their character and being absorbed</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Current plans show Maltkiln much closer to Green</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Green Gap was amended during the</li> </ul>

	<p>into the bigger town, including areas that have been designated conservation areas. Plans should respect existing villages identities and leave green space between settlements.</p>	<p>Hammerton, risking existing villages totally losing their character and being absorbed into the bigger town.</p>	<p>development of the DPD, and the Masterplan follows this boundary. Therefore, the Green Gap is not encroached by the Maltkiln boundary</p>
--	---	---	--