

## Harrogate District Local Plan 2014 – 2035 Examination of the New Settlement (Maltkiln) Development Plan Document (DPD)

Schedule of Matters, Issues and Questions for the Examination  
Made on Behalf of Caddick Developments Ltd

### Matter 9 – Delivery and Monitoring

#### Issue 1 – Delivery and Phasing

**Q1. Are the assumptions regarding infrastructure projects, delivery mechanisms and funding sources outlined in the table within Chapter 11 of the DPD still broadly accurate taking into account the latest version of the IDP?**

9.1 The majority of assumptions within the table in Chapter 11 of the DPD are still broadly accurate taking into account the latest version of the IDP however there are a number of infrastructure projects which are included in the IDP but missing from the DPD. These are:

- Community meeting spaces (developer cost of circa £1,074,554).
- Mobility hubs (developer cost of circa £1,500,000).
- District heat network (developer cost of circa £17,783,420).

9.2 Whilst the majority of costs are broadly similar, there are some notable differences between the two documents, as set out below:

- Bus services – DPD cost £1,500,000; IDP cost £3,000,000.
- GP surgery/pharmacy – DPD cost £1,155,000; IDP cost £3,000,000.
- Sports pitches and sports hub – DPD cost £1,900,800; IDP cost £2,500,000 plus an additional off-site contribution of £970,000.

**Q2. What implications, if any, does the latest evidence in the IDP have on the viability of development and the ability to deliver it?**

9.3 Notwithstanding the issues surrounding the Dent and Johnsons land as per our responses to Matter 2, the latest evidence in the IDP does not have a material impact on the ability to deliver the New Settlement, including as our Client proposes it to be modified.

9.4 Our Client has been promoting the Site since the Local Plan, submitted a planning application in 2019, updated this in 2024 and is working up both a detailed Phase 1 application and a planning application to relocate Johnsons nurseries. Throughout all of this time, our Client has engaged cost consultants and worked with the Council to ensure all necessary infrastructure can be delivered in accordance with the IDP.

9.5 Whilst costs have changed, this has not had a material impact on the deliverability of the scheme and subject to the proposed boundary modification, the New Settlement can be delivered.

**Q3. What is the justification for the suggested changes to Chapter 11, including the insertion of new Policy NS38 and its supporting text? Why are they necessary for soundness?**

- 9.6 Our Client does not wish to comment on the soundness of making the modification and have no objections to the insertion of the new policy in principle. There is however concern over the requirements of the policy, which include the submission of an Infrastructure Delivery Strategy, Phasing Strategy, Financial appraisal and *any other documents deemed necessary by the LPA*.
- 9.7 Our Client understands the need to ensure that the infrastructure is delivered, and this policy assists in that, with regards when it should be delivered and that it is viable to do so. We do however object to the reference to any other documents deemed necessary as this is an open ended list and provides complete control to the request to the Council. We do not feel anything else is required other than the three documents listed, however if there are certain documents that are needed, these should be suggested, debated and as necessary included in the policy to give clarity.

**Issue 2 - Monitoring Framework**

**Q1. Will the Council's monitoring and review processes for the DPD be effective in assessing the success or failure of delivery and what alternatives might reasonably be provided if necessary?**

- 9.8 We do not wish to respond to this question in writing however reserve the right to respond verbally depending on other responses received.