To make your comments effective on the HBC Portal or indeed in any emailed or written objection, you must build a strong argument to support your objections or comments.

To help, think about using one or more of the points below around which to frame your arguments.

IMPORTANT TIP. Avoid any emotive or subjective approach to your arguments and objections. For instance, instead of “spoiling the countryside/areas for dog walking etc etc”, talk about preserving “the essential green rural corridor separating Harrogate from the villages of Pannal and Burn Bridge“. Then, where you can, support this with evidence if you can find it. In the case of the proposed developments on the Crimple Valley, consider looking at the District Landscape Character Assessment (District Landscape Character Assessment February 2004 – which is still valid (<https://www.harrogate.gov.uk/site/scripts/google_results.php?q=crimple+valley>). The first bullet point below gives you and idea as to how to start on your objection.

* **Special Landscape Area**. Harrogate District Landscape Character Assessment (Feb 2004) highlights the Mid-Crimple Valley (in which PN19 and PN18 are located) as an essential green "rural corridor" separating Harrogate from the village of Pannal and others. This would be compromised by the proposed development.
* **"Highly sensitive" landscape with "limited or no capacity to accommodate development or mitigate impacts".** This is a direct quote from the Council’s own Sustainability Appraisal Addendum July 2017. Make sure you read this document before objecting (<http://consult.harrogate.gov.uk/portal/pp/sa/sa17?pointId=s1495014076837#section-s1495014076837>.)
* **11th hour additions to local plan**. PN17 is an ill-considered last minute addition to local plan. The HBC Plan has been in formulation for years - why the sudden expansion to PN18 for employment use?
* **The coalescence argument**. Keeping Pannal separate from Harrogate. Negative impact on the local community and conservation area. Maintain green space between Pannal & Harrogate - as specified by 90% of the respondents to community-led plan questionnaire (which you can find here: <http://www.pannalandburnbridge-pc.gov.uk/_UserFiles/Files/Documents/PAN4154_Action%20Plan_A4_LR.pdf>.
* **Traffic**. Traffic gridlock is already common on the A61 going through Pannal and Almsford Bank. 227 houses means about 400 additional cars, plus cars and lorries for the 'employment site'. People driving into Harrogate for work will start to find this commute intolerable making it even harder to attract workers into the area.
* **Tourism and the approach to Harrogate**. The Crimple Valley forms a picturesque backdrop for those entering Harrogate on the main road and rail links into the town. The proposed developments would significantly impact the character and appearance of this landscape, to the detriment of both local residents and the local tourism industry.
* **PN18 & PN19 only specified because the land belongs to HBC**. The land was intended to be maintained as a barrier between village and town.
* **Who benefits?** The plans only benefit the landowners i.e. Harrogate Borough Council and private individuals.
* **Allotments & Park & Stride**. The land in PN19 (now PN20) was set aside for allotments. Park & Stride facilities, (already discussed with HBC) are not shown on their map at all.
* **HBC Policy**. Should Harrogate stop the policy of cramming in houses when a gap appears on their map and start to plan the district’s growth in a proper well thought out manner with more sensitivity? There comes a time when a village becomes full and loses its character and uniqueness. Why does HBC what to destroy villages through continued over development?
* **Negative landscape impacts are identified and mitigation opportunities are limited**. Further negative environmental impacts arise in relation to the historic environment, where likely harm to the significance of a heritage asset is identified, and in relation to impact on local distinctiveness.
* **Slowly permeable, seasonally waterlogged land**. The Environment Agency has devised a Flood Risk Map which indicates that part of the area identified for development is at high risk of flooding already and this would be made worse with the development of the area due to the increase in non-permeable surfaces.
* **Negative impact on local wildlife and biodiversity**. The area is home to a number of different species of wildlife including deer, foxes, heron, owls, kingfishers, and trout. PN19 would destroy natural environment. Ringway footpath through a housing estate!
* **Agricultural land**. Why the NEED for building on a greenfield site as opposed to other sites? Deprives farmers of their living.
* **A large amount of development has already been granted in the local area**. There are already approved plans to build new houses on the Dunlopillo site in Pannal which should more than adequately meet the needs for housing growth in Pannal. Before any further employment or housing development is made, infrastructure must be in place. It isn't even planned.
* **Building 'creep'**. Once building starts on the East side of Leeds Road, it will only be a matter of time before the landowners of the remainder of Crimple Valley get what they wanted: development right along the valley towards the viaduct. Access roads for these new developments coming off Leeds Road can easily be extended further along the Crimple Valley.
* **Housing Economic Development Needs Assessment**. Look for key points in the Harrogate Borough Council Housing Economic Development Needs Assessment (<https://www.harrogate.gov.uk/downloads/file/2714/2017_housing_and_economic_development_needs_assessment>). Projected housing requirements - why is there such a large difference between three projections? How can residents trust projected figures with such a large requirement variance? How accurate are the growth forecast figures used by HBC? Some indicate a reduction in growth, yet HBC have revised housing need figure upwards.