

**East Riding Local Plan Review
Options Document – summary of consultation responses
March 2019**

Question 1 - In relation to the housing requirement for the East Riding, which option should be taken forward as part of the Local Plan review?

Option 1 - Use the new standard methodology to identify the local housing need for the East Riding as the basis for a new Local Plan requirement.

Option 2 - As Option 1 but with an uplift to help address affordable housing needs identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment.

Option 3 - Continue the current Local Plan approach which considers the housing requirement across the Hull Housing Market Area, supporting the development and regeneration of the City of Hull, and managing housing growth in the East Riding. This would result in a lower requirement for the East Riding than Option 1 would suggest.

Total number of responses: 191

	Respondents
Option 1	<p>Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant (obo D Fielder) – ref: 10177 Nineteen47 (obo Mr Morris) – ref: 11588 B Cloke – ref: 13516 JWPC Ltd (obo Mrs Brice) – ref:19332 Savillis (obo Mr and Mr Williamson) – ref: 20302 Stephenson and Son (obo JH Dixon & Son LLP, Mr, Mr & Mrs Barnes. The Lane Family Trust) – ref: 20325A, 20325B (respectively) D Hobson – ref: 20595 S Cantwell – ref: 20607</p>
Option 2	<p>Halifax Estates – ref: 10099 Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant (obo Mr Fielder) – ref: 10177 Hutton Cranswick Parish Council – ref:10478 Clubleys (obo The Bray Family, Mr Brosenitz, The Craven Family, The Henley Family, The Hunt Family, Messrs Rook and The Rook Family, Mr Ogram, Murr Family, Pears Family, Sherbourne & Son, Messrs Tinson, Messrs J & R Rook) – ref: 15385A, 15385B, 15385C, 15385D, 15385E, 15385F, 15385G, 15385H, 15385I, 15385J, 15385K (respectively) Bugthorpe and Kirby Underdale Parish Council – ref: 10553 Bridlington Civic Society – ref: 10713 M Teare – ref: 11450 Beswick Parish Council – ref: 13592 Peacock and Smith (obo Gleeson Regeneration – ref: 16655 ELG Town Planning (obo Chablis Associates Ltd, Manor Property Group, Westpark Living Ltd) – ref:19637A, 19637B,</p>

	<p>19637C (respectively) ID Planning (obo Hallam Land Management, Mr and Mrs Wrapson, Keyland Developments Ltd) – ref: 19686, 20401, 20585 (respectively) The Sirius Group (obo FCC Environment) – ref:19989 Quod (obo Beal Homes) – ref:19909A Savillis (obo Mr and Mr Williamson) – ref: 20302 Cushman and Wakefield (obo The University of Hull) – ref: 20235 Barton Willmore (obo Barratt David Wilson Homes, Beal Developments Limited, Central Land Holdings Limited) – ref: 20309A, 20538A, 20538B (respectively) Strathmore Estates (obo Sprey Properties) – ref: 20371 George F White (obo Mr Bayston and Mr Senior) – ref: 20376 RW Elliott and Co – ref: 20472 C Nicholson – ref: 20476 P Davison – ref: 20477 J Holmes – ref: 20489 IB Planning Ltd (obo Mrs Brown) – ref: 20495 Youngs RPS (obo Ei Group plc) – ref: 20505 P Langley – ref: 20508 Rural Housing Enabler – ref: 20589 Barmby Moor Parish Council – ref: 20613</p>
<p>Option 3</p>	<p>Howden Civic Society – ref: 10396 Paul Parish Council – ref: 10785 Pocklington and Wolds Gateway Partnership – ref: 11675 Hull City Council – ref: 11708 Pocklington Town Council – ref: 13492 K Williams – ref: 13631 Hayton and Burnby Parish Council – ref: 15696 Beverley Civic Society – ref: 19579 R Ellison – ref: 19660 A Nicholson – ref: 20378 M Robinson – ref: 20459 Melbourne Parish Council (Cllr Tomalin) – ref: 20475 C Coulter – ref: 20480 C Oliver – ref: 20490 P Webb – ref: 20492</p>

	<p>A McNulty – ref: 20501 M Smith – ref: 20502 A Trimm – ref: 20518 J Windass – ref: 20519 J Green – ref: 20541 Preston Parish Council – ref: 20551 G and K Dunn – ref: 20574 K Courtney – ref: 20578 R and D Jones – ref: 20579 L Parker – ref: 20580 Melbourne Parish Council (Cllr Cooper) – ref: 20581 W J Failey – ref: 20582 Cottingham Parish Council – ref: 20605 Aldbrough Parish Council – ref: 20611</p>
Current requirement	<p>Pegasus Group (obo I space Limited, Duchy Homes, The Foster Family, R. Tinson & Son, Rooke/Potter Family & Sherbourne Family, Pegasus Group, Schultz Family, Mr Simon Goodwin, JC Cooke and Son, S&J Draper, J&S Coates, A&S Crozier and A&J Foster, Mr R Stockbridge and Hogarth Construction Ltd, Evison Farmers and Mr & Mrs Marshall) – ref: 10045A, 10045C, 13538A, 13538B, 13538C, 13538D, 13538E, 13538F, 13538H, 20332A, 20332B, 20332C, 20332D, 20348, 20496 (respectively) Spawforths (obo Mr Hick) – ref: 19511 DLP Planning Unit (obo Williamsfield Developments) – ref: 20516</p>
Supports principle of an uplift for affordable housing (but does not explicitly support figures presented under option 2)	<p>Pegasus Group (obo I space Limited, Duchy Homes, Foster Family, R. Tinson & Son, Rooke/Potter Family & Sherbourne Family, Pegasus Group, Schultz Family, Mr Simon Goodwin, JC Cooke and Son, S&J Draper, J&S Coates, A&S Crozier and A&J Foster, Mr R Stockbridge and Hogarth Construction Ltd, Evison Farmers and Mr & Mrs Marshall) – ref: 10045A,10045C, 13538A, 13538B, 13538C, 13538D, 13538E, 13538F, 13538H, 20332A, 20332B, 20332C, 20332D, 20348, 20496 (respectively) JVH Planning (obo Durdy/Webster) – ref:10126 Michael Glover LLP (obo Great Gutter Lane Collaboration) – ref:11598A DPP UK Ltd (obo Peter Ward Homes, J.G Hatcliffe and Partners and Sunderlandwick Farms) ref: 12151A, 12151B, 12151C (respectively) Clubleys (obo The Bray Family, Mr Brosenitz, The Craven Family, The Henley Family, The Hunt Family, Messrs Rook and the Rook Family, Mr Ogram, Murr Family, Pears Family, Sherbourne & Son, Messrs Tinson, Messrs J & R Rook) – ref: 15385A, 15385B, 15385C, 15385D, 15385E, 15385F, 15385G, 15385H, 15385I, 15385J, 15385K (respectively) Spawforths (obo Mr Hick) – ref: 19511 Indigo Planning (obo Stadium City Developments, Stadium (Vicar Lane) Ltd, Stadium Developments Ltd & Wykeland)</p>

	<p>ref – 19892A, 19892B, 19892C (respectively) Quod (obo Beal Homes) ref – 19909A Barton Willmore (obo Barratt David Wilson Homes) – ref: 20309A Gladman Developments Ltd – ref: 20361</p>
<p>Supports principle of an uplift to reflect growth strategy/economic development</p>	<p>Pegasus Group (obo I space Limited, Duchy Homes, Foster Family, R. Tinson & Son, Rooke/Potter Family & Sherbourne Family, Pegasus Group, Schultz Family, Mr Simon Goodwin, JC Cooke and Son, S&J Draper, J&S Coates, A&S Crozier and A&J Foster, Mr R Stockbridge and Hogarth Construction Ltd, Evison Farmers and Mr & Mrs Marshall) – ref: 10045A,10045C, 13538A, 13538B, 13538C, 13538D, 13538E, 13538F, 13538H, 20332A, 20332B, 20332C, 20332D, 20348, 20496 (respectively) DPP UK Ltd (obo Peter Ward Homes, J.G Hatcliffe and Partners and Sunderlandwick Farms) - ref: 12151A, 12151B, 12151C (respectively) Clubleys (obo The Bray Family, Mr Brosenitz, The Craven Family, The Henley Family, The Hunt Family, Messrs Rook and the Rook Family, Mr Ogram, Murr Family, Pears Family, Sherbourne & Son, Messrs Tinson, Messrs J & R Rook) – ref: 15385A, 15385B, 15385C, 15385D, 15385E, 15385F, 15385G, 15385H, 15385I, 15385J, 15385K (respectively) Peacock and Smith (obo (Gleeson Regeneration) – ref: 16655 Indigo Planning (obo Stadium City Developments, Stadium (Vicar Lane) Ltd, Stadium Developments Ltd & Wykeland) – ref: 19892A, 19892B, 19892C (respectively) Quod (obo Strata and Keepmoat) – ref: 19909C Barton Willmore (obo Barratt David Wilson Homes) – ref: 20309A Gladman Developments Ltd – ref 20361 George F White (obo Mr Bayston and Mr Senior) – ref: 20376 Redrow Homes – ref 20509 DLP Planning Unit (obo Williamsfield Developments) – ref: 20516</p>
<p>Supports principle of an uplift to reflect previous delivery levels</p>	<p>Pegasus Group (obo I space Limited, Duchy Homes, Foster Family, R. Tinson & Son, Rooke/Potter Family & Sherbourne Family, Pegasus Group, Schultz Family, Mr Simon Goodwin, JC Cooke and Son, S&J Draper, J&S Coates, A&S Crozier and A&J Foster, Mr R Stockbridge and Hogarth Construction Ltd, Evison Farmers and Mr & Mrs Marshall) – ref: 10045A,10045C, 13538A, 13538B, 13538C, 13538D, 13538E, 13538F, 13538H, 20332A, 20332B, 20332C, 20332D, 20348, 20496 (respectively) DLP Planning Unit (obo Williamsfield Developments) – ref: 20516</p>

Respondent	Summary of Comments
<p>Pegasus Group (obo I space Limited, Duchy Homes, Foster Family, R. Tinson &</p>	<p>None of the options are appropriate, sufficiently ambitious or justified. All options are below the adopted figure and represent a significant decline in annual housing provision compared with the adopted position. Our analysis is informed by a Housing Need Evidence Appraisal prepared by Pegasus Group.</p>

Son, Rooke/Potter Family & Sherbourne Family, Pegasus Group, Schultz Family, Mr Simon Goodwin, JC Cooke and Son, S&J Draper, J&S Coates, A&S Crozier and A&J Foster, Mr R Stockbridge and Hogarth Construction Ltd, Evison Farmers and Mr & Mrs Marshall) – ref: 10045A, 10045C, 13538A, 13538B, 13538C, 13538D, 13538E, 13538F, 13538H, 20332A, 20332B, 20332C, 20332D, 20348, 20496 (respectively)

The standard methodology initially applied the 2014 based projections. Applying the most recent 2016 based projections means the total number of homes achieved falls significantly short. The Government have suggested the short term, the 2014 based projections should be used.

The cost of housing is problematic for the District which remains a popular place to live. Opportunities for economic growth should be planned to expand opportunities for a younger population to reside in the area. The affordability in the District worsened slightly in 2017. The region as a whole has not become more affordable.

The 2016 based projections suggest that growth in East Riding will be lower than originally thought. It should be noted the household projections are based on short-term past trends of natural change and net migration. The younger population is expected to contract and the number of elderly people is expected to grow. Opportunities for economic growth should be planned to expand opportunities for a younger population to reside in the area.

It is helpful to look at past employment trends as housing need will be driven to a large extent by changes in the labour market. Employment growth 2015-17 was strong with East Riding seeing an employment increase above the levels experienced by York, North Yorkshire and East Riding Local Enterprise Partnership, the region and the national rate of growth. Economic growth forecasts produced by the Regional Econometric Model estimates jobs in the East Riding will increase by 2,600 between 2018 and 2022. This is lower than the job growth estimate for the region and United Kingdom. The target of 2,600 jobs between 2018 and 2022 in the Strategy is modest and unambitious and could be revised to reflect the strong growth seen in recent years. The Strategic Economic Plans for the two Local Enterprise Partnership areas show a high level of employment growth in the region, which doesn't feed through to the Options Document.

The job forecasts in the Economic Strategy represent a baseline position and do not consider the impact of investment in infrastructure and the development of major employment sites. The investment by Siemens in Goole and Capitol Park will create a significant number of new jobs in the East Riding once developed. By not taking these schemes into account there is a real risk the Options Document is underestimating economic growth potential and subsequent housing need in East Riding.

All options are relatively unambitious when considered against the fact that in 13 of the last 17 years there have been more than 1,100 net housing completions in East Riding. Disagree with Option 1 which seeks to set a lower annual housing target than currently adopted. Reducing the housing requirement is counter-productive to support inclusive growth and will affect the provision of new affordable housing.

The projections are self-fulfilling and heavily influenced by recent changes to circumstances. Other factors and aspirations should be considered alongside the household projections to ensure supply is able to meet demand.

A 'policy-on' scenario should have been considered in the Review showing the impact of long term job growth if major employment schemes such as Capitol park Goole are developed. A more sound approach, consistent with the Government's ambitions, would be to retain the annual housing target of at least 1,400 dwellings per annum.

<p>Halifax Estates – ref: 10099</p> <p>Hutton Cranswick Parish Council – ref: 10478</p> <p>Bugthorpe and Kirby Underdale Parish Council – ref: 10553</p> <p>C Nicholson – ref: 20476</p> <p>P Davison – ref: 20477</p> <p>Rural Housing Enabler – ref: 20589</p>	<p>Option 2 is preferred. A more effective policy for providing affordable housing in the East Riding needs to be adopted.</p>
<p>JVH Planning (obo Durdy/Webster) – ref: 10126</p> <p>ELG Town Planning (obo Chablis Associates Ltd, Manor Property Group, Westpark Living Ltd) – ref: 19637A, 19637B, 19637C (respectively)</p> <p>Cushman and Wakefield (obo The University of Hull) – ref: 20235</p> <p>Strathmore Estates (obo Sprey Properties) – ref: 20371</p> <p>George F White (obo Mr Bayston and Mr Senior) – ref: 20376</p>	<p>Option 2 is preferred.</p> <p>This will address local need for market and affordable housing.</p> <p>The shortage of affordable housing is significant and an uplift in overall housing requirement to ensure more affordable housing is delivered would fully accord with the National Planning Policy Framework. It would be unsound to base the requirement solely on the standard methodology, as suggested by Option 1.</p> <p>The consistent under provision of market and affordable housing requires a proactive approach to address the issue.</p> <p>The intention of the methodology is to increase house building. It is therefore essential that the council takes a positive approach and goes beyond the minimum housing requirement.</p> <p>The Council recognises the Government’s commitment to delivering 300,000 new homes per annum will result in a revision to the standard method.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework confirms that plan making should seek opportunities to meet the development needs of the area. Plans should be prepared positively, in a way that is aspirational but deliverable. Options 1 and 3 would fail these tests whereas Option 2 is more consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework. There is however scope to further increase the housing numbers and review corresponding policies in respect of economic development. This would make a more positive contribution meeting the chronic need for affordable housing and increase certainty over delivery.</p> <p>The Local Plan should aim to boost the supply of homes in accordance with the NPPF. The housing requirement should take the full needs of the area into account, including an uplift for affordable housing.</p>

RW Elliott and Co – ref: 20472	
IB Planning Ltd (obo Mrs Brown) – ref: 20495	
Youngs RPS (obo Ei Group plc) – ref: 20505	
Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant (obo Mr Fielder) – ref: 10177	Options 1 and 2 both preferred. Option 1 has the advantage of being straightforward but is unlikely to address all housing needs. Option 2 is superficially attractive and any increased affordable housing requirement must not make sites unviable. Option 3 is likely to result in a significant under provision of housing in other Housing Market Areas and a failure to meet housing need.
Drifffield Town Council – ref: 10228	No option preferred. We are not convinced any of the options will increase the stock of affordable rented housing. The majority of houses for sale and rent in Drifffield do not address the need for affordable housing. The majority of new builds are expensive 4-bedroom dwellings. Local Councils should be informed how many houses in each development are for affordable rent. Option 2 appears to be the only option that pays lip service to the need for more affordable housing.
T C Clarke – ref: 10313	In view of likely developments in housing in central Hull, and 'Brexit' effects, the East Riding contribution to Hull's housing problems are probably nugatory at best and substantially negative at best.
Thwing & Octon Parish Council – ref: 10353	No option preferred. The standard method sets a minimum need figure. It does not produce a housing requirement. 60% of East Riding is rural, characterised against a national average of 20%. None of the options cover the need for rural housing in smaller villages and settlements.
Howden Civic Society – ref: 10396	Option 3 is preferred. Further development requires significant additional infrastructure which cannot readily be provided. Option 2 cannot be pursued as developers are reluctant to build affordable housing. Option 1 might be satisfactory but is dependent on where housing would be built.
Bridlington Civic Society – ref: 10713	Option 2 is preferred. We would like to see a growth in affordable housing in the greater Bridlington area because there is a need for starter-homes and family homes for the younger residents.
Paull Parish Council – ref: 10785	Option 3 is preferred. Concern that the number of houses planned for outweighs the employment opportunities likely to materialise. Support for the delivery of significant numbers of homes in Hull, attracting developers, making the best use of available land, identifying brownfield sites for development, ensuring suitable housing is available.
Directions Planning Consultancy Ltd (obo M Brooks, M Dobson, L Garton,	None of the options are realistic. It is suggested the standard method is an option in its own right however the National Planning Policy Framework is clear it is only the starting point. Option 3 ignores the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework to base the housing need on the standard

<p>Goulden/Sweeting Farmers, JD Goulden) – ref: 11328A, 11328B, 11328C (respectively)</p>	<p>method. Option 3 needs to be underpinned by Option 2 whereby development and growth required to support the city of Hull is identified in addition to the local needs for the East Riding. This would be a forth option.</p>
<p>M Teare – ref: 11450 J Holmes – ref: 20489 P Langley – ref: 20508 Barmby Moor Parish Council – ref: 20613</p>	<p>Option 2 is preferred. Affordable housing in rural areas is rare. Families in villages often get forced apart when children look to move into their own home because affordable housing is located in more developed settlements. Further provision of affordable housing seems to me to be a major issue and should override concerns about the movement between Hull City and East Riding. Hull is a very constrained area and there are much further expansion opportunities in the East Riding. The Councils criteria and policy associated with affordable housing needs should be clear.</p>
<p>Nineteen47 (obo Mr Morris) – ref: 11588</p>	<p>Option 1 is preferred. This needs to be set against the Government’s objective as confirmed within the National Planning Policy Framework of significantly boosting the number of new homes. It will be necessary to monitor the sources of data informing the methodology and update the figure accordingly during the preparation of the Local Plan. Any changes to the methodology will also need to be reflected in future consultations.</p>
<p>Michael Glover LLP (obo Great Gutter Lane Collaboration) – ref: 11598A</p>	<p>Option 2 supports the National Planning Policy Framework objective to significantly boost the supply of homes and is an appropriate starting point. A higher housing requirement is likely to be needed than Option 2 in response to meeting unmet housing needs arising from York.</p>
<p>Pocklington and Wolds Gateway Partnership – ref: 11675 K Williams – ref: 13631 R Ellison – ref: 19660 M Robinson – ref: 20459 Melbourne Parish Council (Cllr Tomalin) – ref: 20475 C Coulter – ref: 20480 C Oliver – ref: 20490</p>	<p>Option 3 is preferred. This would assist the regeneration of the city of Hull and to allow a slower and more manageable pace of development in the East Riding. Should Option 3 not satisfy the Examination of the Plan Option 2 should be chosen as there is a need for small and affordable homes in the East Riding. None of the options meet the affordable housing need. Questions whether the Plan presents options to encourage the development of smaller low cost properties, including by Housing Associations. Development should not be focused in Kingswood. Migration from East Riding to the city should be prevented by providing decent housing in Hull. The needs of the local area need to be consulted upon by those who know the area best. Parish Councils have the knowledge of what is needed in their areas. Local residents should be consulted on future development and their views taken into account. Consult and listen to local parish council.</p>

<p>P Webb – ref: 20492</p> <p>A McNulty – ref: 20501</p> <p>M Smith – ref: 20502</p> <p>J Green – ref: 20541</p> <p>Preston Parish Council – ref: 20551</p> <p>G and K Dunn – ref: 20574</p> <p>Melbourne Parish Council (Cllr Cooper) – ref: 20581</p> <p>Cottingham Parish Council – ref: 20605</p> <p>Aldbrough Parish Council – ref: 20611</p>	
<p>Hull City Council – ref: 11708</p>	<p>General support expressed for Option 3. This option will continue to support the distribution of housing to Hull whilst providing a more realistic requirement for East Riding</p> <p>The housing requirement in the adopted Hull Local Plan is 620 dwellings per annum. This is derived from an evidenced need of 561 dwellings for Hull and an additional 59 dwellings redistributed from the East Riding part of the Housing Market Area.</p> <p>The Planning Practice Guidance notes the Local Housing Need figure is a starting point for establishing the housing requirement. Therefore it is not necessarily appropriate to set an option based on the Local Housing Need figure. The Council expects the housing requirement for the city will ultimately be higher than the Local Housing Need figure. The Council's evidence (Impact of LPEG proposals on housing need), considering the new methodology, suggests a figure of between 519 and 571 dwellings per annum would be appropriate to meet identified needs in the city. The same evidence identified a requirement of 1,145 for East Riding. This offers a well-considered and realistic perspective guiding the most appropriate option to take forward.</p> <p>The Hull Local Plan requirement of 620 allows for approximately 50 dwellings per year to be redistributed to Hull. This would represent a continuation of the current approach in both Local Plans, which considers the housing requirement</p>

	<p>across the Housing Market Area. This would result in a requirement for the East Riding of 1,095 per annum which would represent a more deliverable range and provide for ambitions to deliver affordable housing.</p>
<p>DPP UK Ltd (obo Peter Ward Homes, J.G Hatcliffe and Partners and Sunderlandwick Farms) - ref: 12151A, 12151B, 12151C (respectively)</p>	<p>The options are all derived from the standard method using the 2016 based household projections. This would result in the national minimum annual housing need calculated using the standard method falling significantly. The Government has decided not to change its aspirations for housing growth and disregarded the 2016 based projections.</p> <p>The Office of National Statistics have highlighted the household projections do not take account of how many people may want to form new households but are unable to do so They show what would happen if past trends in household formation continue and not how many houses should be built to meet demand.</p> <p>Assuming the 2014 projections are used in preference by the Government, the requirement under Option 1 becomes 1,000 dwellings per annum, Option 2 becomes 1,300 dwellings per annum and Option 3 becomes 900 dwellings per annum.</p> <p>3,500 jobs were created per annum between 2012 and 2016 but an average of only 800 homes built over the same period. If new jobs created led to migration into the District at a greater rate than historically has happened house prices will inflate and worsen the affordability gap. This cannot be dismissed.</p> <p>There has been a chronic under deliver in affordable housing. We agree the most effective way of delivering affordable housing is as part of wider housing market schemes.</p> <p>Option 1 is inappropriate as it takes no account of economic signals and does not facilitate the provision of affordable housing.</p> <p>Option 3 is unsound as it departs from the standard method without presenting any exceptional circumstances to justify such an approach.</p> <p>Option 2 is recognised as being sound as it will result in the provision of more affordable homes and provides flexibility in relation to maintaining the five year housing land supply.</p>
<p>Pocklington Town Council – ref: 13492</p>	<p>Option 3 is preferred. Pocklington would see more pressure for housing under options 1 or 2.</p>
<p>B Cloke – ref: 13516 D Hobson – ref: 20595 S Cantwell – ref: 20607</p>	<p>Option 1 is preferred.</p> <p>The latest lower figure (706 dwellings) should be used and no further allocations can be justified.</p> <p>Increasing the overall housing requirement to increase the delivery of affordable housing is not sensible. Instead policy should focus on increasing the proportion of new affordable homes delivered through new development. The method of viability assessment should be fixed. The increase in land value resulting from allocating land for development should be limited.</p> <p>Housing demand in Pocklington is strongly linked to York, not Hull. The current strategy is fundamentally inappropriate for determining housing need in and around Pocklington.</p>
<p>A J Duke – ref: 13586</p>	<p>Option 3 is preferred whilst being cognisant of the needs met option 2. There are no employment related drivers causing appreciable demand for affordable housing. A substantial demographic shift towards the elderly should be recognised in areas such as Pocklington. Building houses in areas where there are no employment opportunities will</p>

	<p>generate more vehicle movements. This will be an issue for smaller market towns in terms of traffic impacts. Building houses where people work would reduce this problem. Option 3 would reduce commuter trips from smaller market towns to Hull.</p>
<p>Beswick Parish Council – ref: 13592</p>	<p>Option 2 is preferred. Village communities need to be balanced to include people able to afford only affordable housing. Occupants of affordable housing are likely to be young and have children. Transport to work and provision of primary school places therefore require addressing. Affordable housing is also important for retirees downsizing. Single storey dwellings with sufficient bedrooms to accommodate visiting family and friends should be considered as well as opportunities to promote social interaction.</p>
<p>Clubleys (obo The Bray Family, Mr Brosenitz, The Craven Family, The Henley Family, The Hunt Family, Messrs Rook and the Rook Family, Mr Ogram, Murr Family, Pears Family, Sherbourne & Son, Messrs Tinson, Messrs J & R Rook) – ref: 15385A, 15385B, 15385C, 15385D, 15385E, 15385F, 15385G, 15385H, 15385I, 15385J, 15385K (respectively)</p>	<p>Option 2 is preferred. We are concerned the new standard methodology with an uplift to help address affordable housing needs will not support economic development. Lack of housing supply should not suppress the growth of the economy. Affordability ratios should not be allowed to increase due to restricted housing supply. The current adopted Local Plan is positive and aspirational. Although the requirement has yet to be achieved not maintaining this level of growth in the future would show we lack ambition and are scared of growth and prosperity. It would be disastrous for the Country if the standard methodology resulted in a reduction from the current requirement.</p>
<p>Hayton and Burnby Parish Council – ref: 15696</p>	<p>Option 3 is preferred. A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared. Until there is clear evidence of residents views the Parish Council can only opt for the status quo.</p>
<p>Peacock and Smith (obo Gleeson Regeneration) – ref: 16655</p>	<p>Concerned that all of the options proposed imply a significant reduction in the annual housing requirement which would not accord with the Government’s objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. Household projections are constrained by supply and do not take account of how many people may want to form new households but are unable to do so. Historic under-delivery of housing means there is a case for supporting delivery in excess of the household projections. No reliance should be placed on the 2016 household projections in favour of the 2014 projections. High affordable housing need and the future economic growth strategy should be considered. The evidence submitted for the Local Plan examination shows the employment land housing requirements were significantly higher than the demographic based ones. In light of this, a variant of Option 2 should be considered, drawing on the 2014 based projections but taking account of economic growth. This would produce a figure more aligned to the existing Local Plan requirement and would be more consistent with the objective of increasing the delivery of housing.</p>

City of York Council – ref: 19454	There is the potential for people to move out of Hull and into the vale of York sub area under Option 2. This could significantly increase the demand for commuting into York which is already a powerful economic driver for the region and a destination for many East Riding workers. City of York Council will be pleased to explore this issue with East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
R Wilson – ref: 19487	The Options Document does selectively quotes the National Planning Policy Framework. I was told the national housing need is a justification for this. The East Riding is not rich in jobs and the population is not expanding. The government does not require the building of houses in the East Riding. The council have ignored the government emphasis on protecting open land and revitalising cities. There are more brownfield sites, affordable housing and jobs available in Hull.
Spawforths (obo Mr Hick) – ref: 19511	<p>1,400 dwellings per annum remains the current objectively assessed need and the starting point for the future assessment of housing needs. Supports the use of the standard method accepted by the Local Plan review.</p> <p>Option 1 should be disregarded as it uses 2016 household projections. No reliance should be placed on the 2016 household projections in favour of the 2014 projections.</p> <p>Option 2 should be disregarded. It is not clear how the figure of ‘up to 1,000 dwellings per annum’ has been derived. The uplift for affordable housing, presented under Option 2, is supported however the starting point should be the 2014 projections.</p> <p>Option 3 should be disregarded. The National Planning Policy Framework requires housing needs to be met within the Local Authority area unless there is a Statement of Common Ground with adjoining authorities to meet these needs. There is no evidence of a Statement of Common Ground with Hull.</p> <p>An Option 4 should be considered in line with the adopted requirement. This should comprise the 2014 requirement of 991 households and an additional uplift to meet affordable housing needs. Consideration of whether a further uplift should be applied to align the level of new housing to economic growth in light of the recent inward investment success announced in Goole. The housing market can deliver as much as 1,100 dwellings per year.</p>
Beverley Civic Society – ref: 19579	Option 3 is preferred. It is important the two authorities work together to support the regeneration of the city of Hull.
ID Planning (obo Hallam Land Management, Mr and Mrs Wrapson, Keyland Developments Ltd) – ref: 19686, 20401, 20585 (respectively)	Option 2 is preferred and most closely aligns with the standard methodology for calculating housing need. This option will not have undesirable consequences for Hull. Increasing the requirement figure to support the delivery of affordable housing would enable choice for residents in the Housing Market Area.
Indigo Planning (obo Stadium City Developments, Stadium (Vicar Lane) Ltd, Stadium Developments Ltd &	The Government’s intention is that the standard methodology is used as the starting point for determining housing need unless exceptional circumstances justify an alternative approach. A revised methodology is expected to be published but the implications of the methodology on the housing need for East Riding are not yet known. Irrespective of the starting point for housing need, there is an affordable housing shortfall and an uplift to the housing

Wykeland) – ref:19892A, 19892B, 19892C (respectively)	<p>requirement figure should be applied as a result.</p> <p>Disagree with the assertion that an uplift to the housing needs assessment is not required in light of future employment growth. The vision of the Local Plan is for the East Riding to be economically prosperous. Sufficient housing should be provided to accommodate economic growth. The housing requirement should be above all three scenarios.</p>
Quod (obo Beal Homes, Taylor Megginson Enterprises, Strata and Keepmoat) – ref:19909A, 19909B, 19909C (respectively)	<p>None of the options presented are sound. The Government’s intention is that the standard methodology is used as the starting point for determining housing need unless exceptional circumstances justify an alternative approach.</p> <p>The standard methodology has not yet been confirmed by Government. The base figure of 706 dwellings per annum therefore cannot be relied upon as a starting point for a review of the Plan. To do so would make the Plan unsound.</p> <p>The adopted Local Plan housing target was established based on a joint approach with Hull City Council. To amend this without effective collaboration with the council would not be effective and would make the Plan unsound.</p>
Quod (obo Beal Homes) – ref: 19909A	<p>Affordable housing has been under delivered since the start of the plan period therefore an uplift to address this, as per Option 2, would be appropriate.</p>
Quod (obo Strata and Keepmoat)– ref:19909C	<p>An uplift to address matters such as economic growth aspirations, persistent under-delivery and/or affordability issues, set out in the Planning Practice Guidance, should be considered.</p>
The Sirius Group (obo FCC Environment) – ref:19989	<p>Option 2 is preferred. The housing requirement should be derived from up-to-date evidence documents which are yet to be commissioned. Options 1 and 3 would not meet the affordable housing need for the area. There should be some provision in the Local Plan for the housing requirement to be continually updated.</p>
Home Builders Federation – ref: 20120	<p>The indicative housing figures produced by the standard method using the 2014 and 2016 based household projections (991 and 705 dwellings respectively) are significantly lower than the adopted housing requirement.</p> <p>The Office of National Statistics have highlighted the household projections do not take account of how many people may want to form new households but are unable to do so They show what would happen if past trends in household formation continue and not how many houses should be built to meet demand.</p> <p>The recent Government consultation and the Office of National Statistics have made it clear the 2016 projections are not a justification for lower housing need as they have not been adjusted to take account of where homes have been needed but not available.</p> <p>The council should apply the standard methodology as a minimum starting point and should consider whether it appropriately reflects affordable housing need, those households who may want to form new households and economic growth in the area. The council should also consider what, if anything, has changed in the Plan strategy to justify the difference between the current requirement and standard methodology.</p>
Savillis (obo Mr and Mr Williamson) – ref: 20302	<p>Option 1 and 2 both preferred. Between 2016 and 2018 there was an undersupply of 504 homes. The highest housing figure would be recommended to help achieve a sustained level of housing supply.</p>
Barton Willmore (obo Barratt David Wilson Homes) – ref: 20309A	<p>The standard method is flawed and should not be relied on. The Government has confirmed the methodology will be reviewed.</p> <p>Option 1 is rejected as the lack of uplift, and therefore lower housing target, would further exacerbate the affordable housing need within the District.</p>

	<p>Option 3 is rejected. The adopted Local Plan requirement was artificially reduced with Hull City Council. This would go against the Government's intention to increase housing supply and lead to a reduction in the 2018 based projections, which in turn would lead to a lower requirement in the future.</p> <p>The uplift proposed under Option 2 is supported but basing the uplift on past rates of delivery is questioned as delivery is not a reflection of need. An uplift should also be added to continue to align with job creation and employment growth.</p>
<p>Pegasus Group (obo S Goodwin) – ref: 20332A</p>	<p>All options represent a significant decline in annual housing provision compared with the adopted position. A more sound approach, consistent with the Government's ambitions, would be to retain the annual housing target of at least 1,400 dwellings per annum.</p>
<p>Gladman Developments Ltd – ref: 20361</p>	<p>Option 2 as a starting point is considered the most appropriate. The standard method only defines the minimum housing need and may be adjusted upwards where justified and required.</p> <p>The 2014 based projections should be used as a basis for the calculation. The 2016 projections fail to take into account concealed households and are trend based, reflecting low levels of past housing delivery.</p> <p>The Planning Practice Guidance confirms a number of scenarios where an uplift might be made. The council appear to have rejected the need to uplift the housing requirement in response to economic development. This decision is too hastily reached.</p> <p>The East Riding economy will have benefitted from exceptional economic investments taken place in the city associated with the 2017 city of culture events. Such investments would have not been captured in economic projections informing the Local Plan. A more robust and detailed consideration of this issue is therefore required.</p> <p>An uplift to the housing requirement is supported and would improve affordable housing delivery in the East Riding in line with that provided for in the adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>The rationale of Option 3 is acknowledged but rejected. The current arrangement between Hull and East Riding means investment is directed at Hull to promote the regeneration of the city. The standard method is however based on only demographic needs and should be viewed as a minimum figure.</p> <p>The council does not consider housing need arising from neighbouring authorities. The Vale of York sub area is closely related to the City of York area and this is evidence in the council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment in migratory, economic and commuted terms. The housing needs of York are likely to increase under the standard methodology. Housing needs should be met sustainably. The extent of any arising shortfall of housing need from York will shortly be confirmed through the examination of the York Local Plan.</p> <p>East Riding has far fewer constraints to development than its neighbours and the current housing requirement is higher than any of those presented as options. East Riding is therefore able to deliver a higher level of housing in a sustainable manner. Should the York Local Plan be delayed a review mechanism should be included in the Local Plan, similar to that recently proposed by Oadby and Wigston Council.</p>
<p>A Nicholson – ref: 20378</p>	<p>Option 3 is preferred. Strategic plans for East Riding and Hull support higher levels of housing within the city as the most sustainable location for development. Disagree with the need for employment opportunities and extensive</p>

<p>A Trimm – ref: 20518</p> <p>J Windass – ref: 20519</p> <p>K Courtney – ref: 20578</p> <p>R and D Jones – ref: 20579</p> <p>L Parker – ref: 20580</p> <p>W J Failey – ref: 20582</p>	<p>housing. Support for the delivery of significant numbers of homes in Hull, attracting developers, making the best use of available land, identifying brownfield sites for development, ensuring suitable housing is available.</p>
<p>Highways England – ref: 20434</p>	<p>Highways England will need to understand the likely traffic impact of additional housing growth on the strategic road network. We will work with developers and the local highway authority to ascertain how any severe impact can be mitigated.</p>
<p>Redrow Homes – ref: 20509</p>	<p>Disagree with all options as they are inconsistent with the Government’s ambition to increase the delivery of housing. Reducing the housing target from the adopted requirement is counter-productive to supporting inclusive growth in the District. Strongly support a housing figure in excess of all options.</p> <p>The Council should apply caution in its use of the standard method. The Government has found flaws in the method. The standard method is only the starting point for the housing requirement. Other factors and aspirations, alongside the household projections and standard methodology, are important.</p> <p>The Options Document notes modest economic growth is anticipated over the next years. It does not consider a ‘policy-on’ scenario showing the impact of major employment schemes on long-term job creation. Economic growth potential and subsequent housing need in East Riding is therefore being underestimated.</p>
<p>DLP Planning Unit (obo Williamsfield Developments) – ref: 20516</p>	<p>Option 1 should reflect the 2014 based projections. The 2014 based projections should be used to calculate the housing requirement using the standard method (a minimum number). The last two years of delivery have exceeded 2016 and 2014 projections, representing a return to previous rates of delivery. Greater weight should be given to the 2014 based projections.</p> <p>No reference is made to exceptional circumstances justifying a lower housing requirement. There is no evidence of an agreement for unmet need to be met in another area. Option 3 assumes Hull will continue to provide housing in accordance with their Plan. Without a statement of common ground Option 3 is not viable. There would be no spare capacity in Hull to accommodate any extra demand from East Riding.</p> <p>The Planning Practice Guidance states an uplift can be applied to support growth or where funding is in place to promote a facilitate growth. There are three economic strategies in place in the East Riding. The East Riding Economic Strategy (2018-2022) considers the rate of job growth will be 1,125 per year. The Strategic Economic Plan Update (2016) outlines that in 2014-2016, 21,900 jobs have been created in the Local Enterprise Partnership area. The Humber</p>

	<p>Strategic Economic Plan (2016) identifies that the total jobs in the Humber increased by 20,000 between 2012-2014. All these strategies are planning for employment growth and should be taken into consideration when finalising the housing requirement in the Plan.</p> <p>The Council should re-consult in early 2019 with a range of options that are in accordance with amended planning guidance. None of the options provide a sound basis for plan preparation.</p> <p>Other factors need to be considered beyond affordable housing including past rates of delivery, recent Strategic Housing Market Assessments and economic growth strategies. To fully comply with the guidance the requirement should be 1,400 dwellings per annum. Reducing the planned requirement to 1,000 under Option 2 will reduce the future levels of affordable housing provision by some 30%.</p>
<p>Barton Willmore (obo Beal Developments Limited, Central Land Holdings Limited) – ref: 20538A, 20538B (respectively)</p>	<p>Option 2 is preferred. Since the publication of the Options Document a revised standard method housing need figure would be 957 per annum. This figure forms a more appropriate starting point for determining a housing requirement for the district.</p> <p>An uplift should be applied to the 957 standard method figure. This would facilitate an increased housing land supply to meet a range of housing needs. Given the consistent backlog in housing delivery and the current trajectory of dwelling completions, maintaining the adopted Local Plan housing requirement of 1,400 dwellings per annum would be the most appropriate strategy.</p>
<p>C Scarlett – ref: 20594</p>	<p>The majority of houses for sale and rent in Driffield do not address the need for affordable housing. The majority of new builds are expensive 4-bedroom dwellings. Local Councils should be informed how many houses in each development are for affordable rent. Option 2 appears to be the only option that pays lip service to the need for more affordable housing.</p>

Question 2 - In relation to the future distribution of new development, which option(s) should be taken forward as part of the Local Plan review?

Option 1 - Retain the current Settlement Network, revising it only where significant changes in circumstances are likely to affect the role and function of a settlement.

Option 2 - Amend the Settlement Network to, for example:

- a) Consider a new settlement(s) or a significant extension to an existing settlement, to meet the longer term strategic requirements of the East Riding.
- b) Provide a more flexible approach in designated Villages (Policy S4) to allow for some additional development to support the vitality and viability of the Village.

Total number of responses: 72

	Respondents
Option 1	Jennifer Hubbard (obo Mr D Fielder) – ref: 10177 Howden Civic Society – ref: 10396 Hutton Cranswick Parish Council – ref: 10478 Michael Glover LLP (obo Greater Gutter Lane Collaboration) ref: – 11598 Hull City Council – ref: 11708 DPP (obo Peter Ward Homes, JG Hatcliffe and Partners, Sunderland Wick Farms) – ref: 12151A, 12151B, 12151C (respectively) B Cloke – ref: 13516 I Reid – ref 13592 Hayton and Burnby Parish Council – ref: 15696 ELG Planning (obo Westpark Living Limited) – ref: 19637 R Ellison – ref: 19660 ID Planning (obo Hallam Land Management, Mr and Mrs Wrapson, Keyland Developments Ltd) – ref: 19686, 20401, 20585 (respectively) Barton Willmore (obo Barratt David Wilson Homes, Beal Developments Limited and Central Land Holdings) – ref: 20309, 20538 (respectively) Gladman Developments Ltd – ref: 20361 Strathmore Estates (obo Sprey Properties) – ref: 20371 M Robinson – ref 20459

	<p>Melbourne Parish Council (Cllr Tomalin) – ref: 20475 P Davison – ref: 20477 C Oliver – ref: 20490 A McNulty – ref: 20501 G and K Dunn – ref: 20574 Johnson Mowat Planning Ltd (obo Hull and East Yorkshire Hospitals NHS Trust) – ref: 20588 Barmby Moor Parish Council – ref: 20613</p>
Option 2 - both (a) and (b)	<p>Halifax Estates – ref: 10099 Stephenson and Son (obo The Lane Family Trust, JH Dixon & Son LLP, Miles Farm Camping and Farm Shop) – ref: 10167A, 20325A, 20325B (respectively) Jennifer Hubbard (obo Mr D Fielder) – ref: 10177 Bugthorpe and Kirby Underdale Parish Council – ref: 10553 Michael Glover LLP (obo Greater Gutter Lane Collaboration) – ref: 11598 Doug Jennings (obo Manor House Farm) – ref: 11760 Edwardson Associates (obo R and J Scott) – ref: 12048 Pocklington Town Council – ref: 13492 Beverley Civic Society – ref: 19579 ELG Planning (obo Westpark Living Limited) – ref: 19637 Quod (obo Beal Homes) – ref: 19909 Cushman and Wakefield (obo the University of Hull) – ref: 20235 Savillis (obo Mr AS Williamson and Mr J N Williamson) – ref: 20302 George F White (obo Mr Bayston and Mr Senior) – ref: 20376 ID Planning (obo Mr and Mrs Wrapson) – ref: 20401 C Nicholson – ref: 20476 J Holmes – ref: 20489 P Webb – ref: 20492 IB Planning Ltd (obo Mrs Brown) – ref 20495 M Smith – ref: 20502 J Green – ref: 20541 Cottingham Parish Council – ref: 20605 S Cantwell – ref: 20607 Aldbrough Parish Council – ref: 20611</p>
Option 2 - only (a)	<p>Pegasus Group – ref: 13538F ID Planning (obo Hallam Land Management) – ref: 19686 Sirius Group (obo FCC Environment) – ref: 19889</p>

	Barton Willmore (obo Barratt David Wilson Homes) – ref: 20309
Option 2 - only (b)	<p>Directions Planning Consultancy (obo M Brooks, M Dobson, L Garton, Goulden/Sweeting Farmers and JD Goulden) – ref: 11328</p> <p>Nineteen47 (obo Mr J Morris) – ref: 11588</p> <p>Doug Jennings (obo Manor House Farm) – ref: 11760</p> <p>A J Duke – ref: 13586</p> <p>ELG Planning (obo Chablis Associates Ltd, Manor Property Group) – ref: 19637A, 19637B (respectively)</p> <p>Quod (obo Strata Homes and Keepmoat) – ref: 19909</p> <p>Pegasus Group (obo Mr S Goodwin) – ref: 20332A</p> <p>Josephine Wright (obo Mr Mainwaring) – ref: 20424</p> <p>R W Elliot and Co – ref: 20472</p> <p>C Coulter – ref: 20480</p> <p>North Ferriby Parish Council – ref: 20573</p> <p>ID Planning (obo Keyland Developments Ltd) – ref: 20585</p> <p>Rural Housing Enabler – ref: 20589</p>

Respondent	Summary of Comments
Pegasus Planning (obo Ispace Limited) – ref: 10045A	North Newbald should remain a settlement with an important role and function in the settlement hierarchy. Growth should continue to be identified at village.
Pegasus Planning (obo Duchy Homes) – ref: 10045C	Support for the continued identification of Anlaby as a Major Haltemprice Settlement and a focus for new housing development.
Halifax Estates – ref: 10099 Bugthorpe and Kirby Underdale Parish Council – ref: 10553	Option 2a/b is preferred. There should be a flexible approach to a limited amount of development even in small villages to help sustain the village and the services within it for the long term.
JVH Planning Consultants Ltd (obo Durdy/Webster) – ref: 10126	The four principal towns were the focus for housing development based upon the sustainability of the communities. Goole had the lowest allocation within this group and should take a larger proportion of the growth of the principal towns as part of the Local plan review. The role and function of some of the smaller villages such as Airmyn should be reassessed to ensure that those villages are able to have organic growth to allow those communities to grow and thrive.
Jennifer Hubbard (obo Mr D Fielder) – ref: 10177	Options 1 and 2a/b are preferred. The settlement network remains broadly relevant and should be considered alongside Option 2. A more flexible approach to development in Villages is supported in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

	<p>The Vale of York Housing Market Area is under-provided with higher order settlements compared with other Housing Market Areas despite its proximity to and the influence of York. However Pocklington is far from a dormitory settlement for York. It is sufficiently far away to prosper in its own right with a wide range of services and facilities and a proximate industrial estate.</p> <p>However despite considerable new residential development in recent years, two banks have closed and it would not be prudent to rely on the existing population base to continue to support the current level of services into the future.</p> <p>The land to the north west, north and (part) east of Pocklington is generally flat and featureless such that although continued peripheral built development in most directions will change the position of the interface between the built up area and countryside, it will not change the <i>character</i> or the setting of the town.</p> <p>Pocklington's status should be changed from "Town" to "Principal Town" in the settlement hierarchy. This would have no adverse impact on the council's initiatives (with the City Council) to promote urban regeneration in the Hull area.</p>
<p>Driffield Town Council – ref: 10228</p> <p>C Scarlett – ref: 20594</p>	<p>This is a difficult choice to make for Driffield, where a large part of our local economy is dependent on the people coming in from local villages.</p> <p>Local services have been cut in recent years and there is a concern that the current embargo on development in villages means that there is less investment in the infrastructure and services to those villages, especially in terms of transport and local authority provision for schools and libraries, where there have been significant cuts in recent years.</p> <p>Whilst it seems sensible to develop housing where there are current services, there is a need for more services across the board and to ensure that these are accessible to all. It is impossible to consider housing and services in isolation from each other. Preference for Option 2b where plans are flexible across the board but with additional service provision planned for in conjunction.</p>
<p>Thwing and Octon Parish Council – ref: 10353</p>	<p>The East Riding of Yorkshire has a rural area three times the national average. 101 villages are classed as unsustainable. The revision of the Local Plan is an opportunity to support sustainability in rural settlements and reduce the 101 settlements by significant numbers.</p> <p>Analysis has identified the top five services in rural areas. This does not take into consideration the evolution of services and technology. The document advises only 18% of authorities consider broadband when determining the sustainability of a settlement. Broadband has a substantial impact on rural life, it reduces isolation and opens up access to services.</p> <p>The council need to change how they determine sustainability and take the opportunity to radically change the Plan supporting sustainable and non-sustainable settlements. The impact of not taking more proactive steps to improve the</p>

	<p>sustainability of small rural locations will be a continuation of the deterioration and decline of many rural settlements. Local policy change is needed.</p>
<p>Howden Civic Society – ref: 10396</p>	<p>Option 1 is preferred. New settlements or significant extensions to an existing settlement are options in theory but in practice they would be unlikely to be supportable by the existing road and rail infrastructure without significant investment.</p> <p>Some small additional development in villages, especially of ‘affordable housing’ might add properties where local demand exists and which cannot be met from traditional housing.</p> <p>Option 2a – the most likely place for a significant additional development is the vacant military site at Driffield.</p>
<p>Historic England – ref: 10473</p>	<p>No specific comments relating to the two options. However the council needs to consider how it addresses archaeology. Since the adoption of the Local Plan several allocated sites have come across very important, and in some cases, previously unidentified archaeological remains. Many of these were found to be of national archaeological importance. Dealing with this has added additional costs to developers and has impacted on delivery. Archaeology needs to be considered from the outset in the development strategy. Undertaking such an appraisal and can help remove uncertainty and provide confidence to developers. If there is a need to direct substantial development to settlements with potential importance it might help us learn more about the archaeological landscape of the East Riding. We would welcome an opportunity to meet to explore this matter further.</p>
<p>Bridlington Civic Society – ref: 10713</p>	<p>Those settlements in our Area of Benefit (Bridlington, Flamborough and nine villages in YO15/16) have distinct characters, built on the original agricultural economy. Small scale in-fill in the village envelope, sufficient to provide local housing needs and to ensure the viability of village services are to be welcomed. Large scale development should be discouraged outside the areas already designated for housing where there is sufficient infrastructure to accommodate the needs of extra residents.</p>
<p>Paull Parish Council – ref: 10785</p> <p>A Nicholson – ref: 20478</p> <p>A Trimm – ref: 20518</p> <p>J-Windass – ref: 20519</p> <p>K Coutney – ref: 20578</p> <p>R & D Jones – ref: 20579</p>	<p>A new settlement could come out of 5,000 additional dwellings. This would have a massive impact on transport and social infrastructure in the South West Holderness Area.</p> <p>Each home will be need to be supported by £30,000 to £50,000 worth of infrastructure. Without this, no development can take place. CIL and S106 are ultimately paid out of land values meaning land with residential permission might be worth much less than landowners currently anticipate. This needs to be understood to avoid unrealistic expectations about land value.</p> <p>Constraints in the National Planning Policy Framework should be considered.</p> <p>It is disheartening the revised National Planning Policy Framework allows local authorities to overrule Neighbourhood Plans if not enough homes are delivered elsewhere.</p>

<p>L Parker – ref: 20580</p> <p>W J Failey – ref: 20582</p>	<p>Communities across England are being targeted by land promoters directed towards building unaffordable homes on unsustainable sites, against the wishes of local people.</p> <p>Questions whether the investment for any new settlement is currently available.</p>
<p>Directions Planning Consultancy (obo M Brooks, M Dobson, L Garton, Goulden/Sweeting Farmers and JD Goulden) – ref: 11328</p>	<p>Rejects Option 2a. There is no clear outline as to why a new settlement is required if, as paragraph 3.15 sets out, the overall approach is considered fit for purpose. Question why a new settlement is suggested when the Local Plan is only required to identify sufficient land to meet needs over the plan period. It is not appropriate to meet long term needs beyond the plan period. There is sufficient capacity for further urban extension to meet development needs.</p> <p>Supports Option 2b. Additional development in designated villages would assist with maintaining vitality and viability.</p>
<p>M Teare – ref: 11450</p>	<p>Any action on a settlement should be planned in full consultation with the settlement. The onus is on the council to ensure that this is completed satisfactorily.</p>
<p>Nineteen47 (obo Mr J Morris) – ref: 11588</p>	<p>Option 2b is preferred. Many villages have a good range of services and are well connected to higher tiered settlements. Growth could sustain existing facilities and relieve some of the pressure to allocate land in Principal Towns. Policy S4 is too restrictive and undermines sustainable development opportunities from coming forward. There may be suitable brownfield opportunities within designated villages which negate the need for greenfield development.</p>
<p>Michael Glover LLP (obo Greater Gutter Lane Collaboration) – ref: 11598</p>	<p>Support for all options. Option 1 remains applicable to the Beverley and Central and Bridlington Coastal sub areas – to support the growth of urban areas and realise the benefits of employment, services & facilities and public transport in the Hull Urban Area and town of Bridlington.</p> <p>Option 2a is applicable to the Goole & Humberhead Levels sub area.</p> <p>Option 2b would be applicable to the Driffield & Wolds, Vale of York and Holderness and Southern to support the role of sustainable communities in more rural areas.</p>
<p>Hull City Council – ref: 11708</p>	<p>General support for Option 1. Agree with a settlement hierarchy that retains focus on the ‘Major Haltemprice Settlements’ as a part of the urban area of the Regional City, and therefore as a highly sustainable location to support future housing growth.</p> <p>The sub area approach remains important for understanding the broad character of different parts of the East Riding, but also the key relationships between settlements. The sub area approach of the adopted Local Plan directs 45% of new housing development to the Beverley and Central, and Holderness and Southern Sub areas, Settlements in the Beverley and Central sub area would provide the vast majority of this.</p> <p>Of importance to Hull is how development is managed to support market interventions. It remains important to the overall delivery of the wider city that there continues to be a focus of development in this area and that a detailed</p>

	framework exists that guides decisions on the edge of and in proximity to the city – to ensure its continued growth.
Doug Jennings (obo Manor House Farm) – ref: 11760	Option 2b preferred. More flexibility is required in villages, not just those listed in S4. A flexible approach to the development boundaries around villages will provide much needed housing to support the vitality and viability and villages, and will help small builders, who often find it difficult to secure sites for development.
Edwardson Associates (obo R and J Scott) – ref: 12048	<p>Option 2a/b preferred. Suggest a significant extension to Eastrington village. Our clients land is substantial, well-placed, from constraints and the ownership of one willing landowner. Eastrington can deliver housing that Goole cannot.</p> <p>Support a more flexible approach in villages. There are a number of good appropriate sites on the edge of villages but outside the defined development limits. A more flexible policy approach would allow these sites to come forward and make a positive and sustainable contribution to the five year housing land supply.</p>
Molescroft Parish Council – ref: 12139	<p>The Parish Council has continued to comment for many years about the need to examine the case for a new settlement.</p> <p>Support justifiable local housing need, encouragement of registered social landlords, creation of technology home working and community facilities in smaller villages. A debate to encourage more self-build would be welcome.</p> <p>The recent Timpson Report on Town Centres identifies the need to be more flexible in allowing a wider range of uses to encourage more community activities including residential units, leisure and other related uses to counteract the pressures of online retailing</p> <p>New settlement provision will require a short- and long-term programme of implementation to public transport and in a sustainable location, thus reducing private car usage. It can justifiably be argued that the present system of encouraging the submission of individual random new sites at this stage is counterproductive since it negates the chance of early discussions in regard to a new settlement.</p> <p>Increased awareness of climate change has reinforced the need for a new vision in the preparation of future planning policies. Continuation of present longstanding planning policies will not achieve current expectations or meet housing need or demand in a totally different social and economic era.</p>
BNP Paribas (obo APB) – ref: 12140	Support delivery of housing in Blacktoft to meet local needs and improve the sustainability of villages such as Blacktoft.
DPP (obo Peter Ward Homes, JG Hatcliffe and Partners, Sunderland Wick Farms) – ref: 12151A, 12151B, 12151C (respectively)	<p>Option 1 is supported. The existing Spatial Strategy is based on the sound principle of securing sustainable development, increasing affordability by limiting growth in rural areas whilst ensuring a good geographical spread of development to meet the needs of all areas including rural communities. A great deal of consideration has been taken to this strategy. We agree and consider that the Spatial Strategy and policy S3, in particular, is sound including Goole's position the Network. The policy has only recently be adopted and there is no reason to change tack at this early stage.</p>
Pocklington Town Council –	Option 2a/b preferred. Significant expansion of an existing village would take some of the pressure off settlements with a

ref: 13492	large demand for housing. The current approach has resulted in all allocations being developed and developers now seeking new allocations. Existing allocations should be built out before new ones are added. New estimates need time to 'bed in' and show traffic movement and other additional infrastructure needs.
Pegasus Group (obo The Foster Family) – ref: 13538A	Development should be managed through the Settlement Hierarchy. Leven should remain a settlement with an important role and function and where growth should continue to be identified.
Pegasus Group (obo G E Jibson & Son Ltd) – ref: 13538B	Gilberdyke is a sustainable settlement capable of supporting further residential development.
Pegasus Group (obo Mr J Prince) – ref: 13538C	Cottingham is a sustainable settlement capable of supporting further residential development.
Pegasus Group (obo R. Tinson & Son) – ref: 13538D	Development should be managed through the Settlement Hierarchy. Pocklington should remain a settlement with an important role and function and where growth should continue to be identified.
Pegasus Group (obo The Rooke/Potter Family and Sherbourne Family) – re: 13538E	Development should be managed through the Settlement Hierarchy. Wilberfoss should remain a settlement with an important role and function and where growth should continue to be identified.
Pegasus Group – ref: 13538F	Option 2a preferred. The principle of planning for larger scale development that meets identified needs in a sustainable way is established by the National Planning Policy Framework. Development involving new settlement proposals (i.e. not extensions to existing settlements) must be recognised as strategic policy looking much longer term than current identified need.
Pegasus Group (obo The Schultz Family) – ref: 13538H	Development should be managed through the Settlement Hierarchy. Howden should remain a settlement with an important role and function and where growth should continue to be identified.
A J Duke – ref: 13586	<p>Option 2a/b preferred. Pocklington, and other towns and East Riding, have recently suffered huge increases in housing. The road infrastructure is generally unsuited to even the traffic and many of the residents are totally exhausted by the sheer scale of the inconvenience from large builders trucks and noise generated by building sites.</p> <p>It's clear that some of the most recent housing is unsatisfactory on a number of counts such as small rooms, inadequate off-street parking, unusable garages and variable standards of construction. Many of these houses are not nice places to live and will be difficult to sell.</p> <p>Old infrastructure of existing roads is now under permanent stress due to the high numbers of motor vehicles crossing the market towns. Residents are unhappy about this and they consider that this traffic build-up would have been avoidable had large estates of housing being put elsewhere to create new settlements.</p>

	<p>Consideration of new settlements is by far the best way forward. Proximity to employment opportunities and major travel routes, while managing flood risk are the main factors to take into consideration. Goole and Howden should be investigated. These locations provide the opportunity to build well laid out housing with good travel links, taking pressure off other parts of the East riding road network.</p> <p>Support for a more complicated policy for building affordable homes incentivising Local Authorities to make the large scale developers active in towns like Pocklington build small clusters of affordable homes in nearby villages, probably with a bias towards the unsustainable ones. Done sensitively, it could make life better in these small settlements.</p>
<p>I Reid – ref: 13592</p> <p>C Oliver – ref: 20490</p>	<p>Option 1 is preferred.</p> <p>High value arable land should not be developed and much of the remaining land either is now or will be in the future at risk of flooding.</p> <p>Given that austerity has put greater pressure on local business there is a need for constant review to ensure the development plan reacts as service provision changes.</p>
<p>Johnson Mowat Planning Ltd (obo S&D Imports Worldwide Ltd) – ref: 14053</p>	<p>In relation to the distribution of development for employment use, the existing Settlement Network is not considered to require revision to accommodate employment development in appropriate locations. Goole is identified in the Strategy Document as a location which will ‘develop as a major inter modal hub for trade, logistics and manufacturing’. A substantial scale of employment development as envisaged is appropriate to the status of Goole as a Principal Town. Additional development for employment uses at Goole will support the town’s role as a centre for employment, services and facilities. As an established Principal Town the location is accessible to an existing population and by a variety of transport modes. Continued prioritisation of Goole as a Principal Town will support its economic growth and regeneration. This benefit will be achieved by the allocation of land in strategically beneficial locations which attract investment and occupier businesses.</p>
<p>Clubley (obo The Bray Family, The Craven Family, The Henley Family, The Hunt Family, The Murr Family, The Pears Family) – ref: 15385A, 15385C, 15385D, 15385E, 15385EH, 15385I (respectively)</p>	<p>Support for small areas of development in non-primary villages to benefit the village economy and local services/amenities. This enables villages to see themselves as positive, progressive, forward thinking, aspirational villages opposed to villages that are dying a slow death.</p>
<p>Hayton and Burnby Parish Council – ref: 15696</p>	<p>Option 1 is preferred. It is not clear what a ‘more flexible approach’ in Option 2b would mean.</p>
<p>Peacock and Smith (obo</p>	<p>Stamford Bridge is one of the largest and best located Rural Service Centres and it is therefore important that the</p>

Gleeson Regeneration) – ref: 16655	settlement receives an appropriate quantum of housing growth over the Local Plan Review plan period. It is located on a key transport corridor and is close to York. The development of the two housing allocations will ultimately increase the size and mass of the settlement by some 320 dwellings. The council's Town Centres and Retail Study (2009) confirms Stamford Bridge has one of the larger shopping centres providing a good range of facilities for day to day needs. If the current Network is retained Stamford Bridge should be apportioned the greatest share of housing. Given the size and function of Stamford Bridge consideration should be given to re-defining Stamford Bridge as a Town.
JWPC Limited (obo Mrs Brice) ref: 19332	Settlement boundaries are somewhat out of date. We recommend all site boundaries around smaller settlements are considered for opportunities where small scale developments could come forward.
City of York Council – ref: 19454	Questions whether the council has given consideration to identifying a new settlement it extending an existing settlement to meet housing need on a more sub regional basis, particularly if it is important for meeting long term housing needs.
Indigo Planning (obo Mr A Taylor-Pick) – ref: 19541	Support for continued identification of Driffield as a Principal Town. Major Haltemprice Settlements and Principal Towns are the most appropriate and sustainable locations for extensions. This would be a more appropriate than Option 2(a) as new settlements take a considerable length of time to come forward due to additional infrastructure and services required. This approach would fail to address housing needs in the immediate and short term.
Beverley Civic Society – ref: 19579	Option 2 a/b preferred. This option supports the need to maintain the viability and vitality of 'The Village' by allowing some development to meet local need. Changing methods of working, supporting Internet working from home, and the retention of community facilities should be considered. Any new settlement would need to be have access to good transport facilities, both rail and road, and take account of local employment opportunities.
ELG Planning (obo Chablis Associates Ltd) – ref: 19637A	Option 2b is preferred. The development limits of Welton are drawn unnecessarily tightly. There are opportunities to review the land and promote additional development without comprising the character of the village.
ELG Planning (obo Manor Property Group) – ref: 19637B	Option 2b is preferred. Melton is a village under Policy S4 and lies in a sustainable location. There are opportunities to review the land and promote additional development without comprising the character of the village.
ELG Planning (obo Westpark Living Limited) – ref: 19637C	Option 1 is supported. Support the designation of Elloughton cum Borough as a 'Town' and therefore a sustainable location for development. Option 2 is supported. We would support further housing development in Melton.
ID Planning (obo Hallam Land Management) – ref: 19686	Option 1 is supported. Option 2a is supported in part. There are sufficient sites surrounding settlements in upper tiers of the hierarchy to meet the housing needs for the plan period. Support for significant urban extensions to Beverley given that urban extension sites can utilise existing infrastructure and a wider range of jobs of services are available than would be provided for in a new settlement.
Sirius Group (obo FCC Environment) – ref: 19889	Option 2a preferred. The future distribution of new development should be related to demand and land availability; it is not clear whether the options presented respond to identified demand. This approach would determine the level of

	<p>development required and the capacity to deliver, resulting in an accurate and appropriate development strategy across the plan area.</p> <p>Option 2a would be important in meeting longer term needs for housing. The Humberfield site could support a new settlement to meet longer term strategic requirements. It is situated within the East-West Multi-Modal Transport Corridor to the west of Hessle and to the east of North Ferriby.</p> <p>There is no mention of rural areas and the countryside within the adopted settlement tiers. This is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework. The future distribution of new development should recognise the importance of the rural economy and consider the vitality and economy of rural areas needed for rural communities to boost rural economic growth.</p>
<p>Indigo Planning (obo (Stadium City Developments)– ref: 19892A</p>	<p>Support for the continued identification of Kirk Ella as a Major Haltemprice Settlement and a focus for new housing development.</p>
<p>Indigo Planning (obo Stadium Vicar Lane Developments, Stadium Developments Ltd & Wykeland) – ref: 19892B, 19892C (respectively)</p>	<p>Support for the continued identification of Cottingham as a Major Haltemprice Settlement and a focus for new housing development.</p>
<p>Quod (obo Beal Homes) – ref: 19909A</p>	<p>The current approach (Option 1) reinforces the role and function of existing settlements without consideration of their capacity to accommodate development. The current approach (in combination with Policy S4) restricts development outside development limits without considering where a settlement lies in the Network.</p> <p>Support expressed for Option 2a/b. There are a variety of relevant factors determining the capacity of a settlement to accept additional growth. The benefits associated with development should also be considered. This alternative approach would assist in promoting delivery of allocated sites since development would be distributed across more locations, increasing the number of outlets which can be accommodated by the market.</p> <p>Policy S4 does not acknowledge sites immediately adjacent to settlement limits may be appropriate for open market housing development in certain circumstances, particularly where they adjoin sustainable settlements. Amended policy wording which reflects this would be supported. An example is the policy approach in the submitted Harrogate Local Plan.</p>
<p>Quod (obo Tom Megginson) – ref: 19909B</p>	<p>An alternative approach which is capacity-led would enable the growth of the smaller sustainable settlements in the network, as well as ‘satellites’ to higher order settlements (for example, Kelleythorpe). This alternative approach would assist in promoting delivery of allocated sites since development would be distributed across more locations, increasing</p>

	<p>the number of outlets which can be accommodated by the market.</p> <p>Reconsideration of the Settlement Network in the context of changes that have arisen as a result of development since the Local Plan was adopted is also necessary.</p>
<p>Quod (obo Strata Homes and Keepmoat) – ref: 19909C</p>	<p>Whilst it is logical that the larger settlements are considered the most sustainable locations for further growth, the current approach (Option 1) reinforces the role and function of existing settlements without consideration of their capacity to accommodate development.</p> <p>Option 2a is rejected. The concept of the new settlements is considered in several guidance documents. This guidance demonstrates any new settlement must be of sufficient scale to ensure the delivery of a good level of services, jobs and community facilities to create attractive and sustainable places to live. The minimum critical mass for a new, truly self-sustaining settlement is suggested to be 5,000 new dwellings. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, a new settlement of this scale in addition to the development proposed elsewhere in the East Riding would be unjustified. It is also unclear whether an appropriate location exists to accommodate this scale of development without significant harm.</p> <p>Option 2b is preferred. Policy S4 does not acknowledge sites immediately adjacent to settlement limits may be appropriate for open market housing development in certain circumstances, particularly where they adjoin sustainable settlements. Amended policy wording which reflects this would be supported. An example is the policy approach in the submitted Harrogate Local Plan. This policy adopts a sequential approach that directs development to allocated sites and other sites within settlement limits first where they are available, achievable and deliverable. But it also recognises that there may be circumstances (for example a housing land supply shortfall) where development outside and immediately adjacent settlement boundaries would be appropriate.</p>
<p>Cushman and Wakefield (obo the University of Hull) – ref: 20235</p>	<p>Option 2a/b are preferred. Option 2a and 2b should be taken in combination. Sites around Cottingham are considered suitable for suitable sites for development. A more flexible approach to development in villages can make an important contribution to housing requirements and would support growing and thriving villages. Proposals making efficient use of land or located in sustainable locations should continue to be supported.</p>
<p>Savillis (obo Mr AS Williamson and Mr J N Williamson) – ref: 20302</p>	<p>Option 2a/b preferred. The revised local plan should limit the focus for development on Goole which heavily constrained by flooding. Given that much of East Riding is typified by rural settlements, growth should be encouraged in these areas to ensure that their vitality and viability are retained.</p> <p>Option 2(b) should be pursued in line with the National Planning Policy Framework. Additional development to support the function of Holme on Spalding Moor, and local services, is supported. The National Planning Policy Framework expresses a renewed focus upon rural housing development located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities and support rural services.</p>

	<p>Holme on Spalding Moor is a desirable place to live, given its proximity to economic centres such as York, Selby and Goole. Growth in these areas should be encouraged in order to meet demand and encourage managed growth within these rural communities which otherwise may stagnate.</p> <p>The Vale of York doesn't benefit from a Principle Town or Major Haltemprice Settlement to which growth would otherwise be focussed and therefore growth should be dispersed throughout the rural settlements in the area.</p> <p>Support the continued allocation of sites within smaller settlements such as Holme on Spalding Moor. This approach safeguards the certainty over the delivery of small and intermediate scale sites. This should also be read in the context of the national drive to encourage small and medium sized housebuilder to make a significant contribution to the five year housing land supply. It is clear that smaller settlements are suitable and appropriate locations to deliver smaller sized housing developments which will help to contribute to the significant local housing need across a range of areas rather than concentrating the development opportunities to the few.</p> <p>A viable option would be for Options 2a and 2b to be taken in combination. This would present the opportunity to identify suitable sites to deliver a larger quantum of development than usually allowed in villages.</p> <p>Castle Farm is largely unconstrained and adjacent to the existing settlement limits. The site also falls entirely within the ownership of our client and the landowner remains committed to its development. It offers the opportunity for the council to deliver a development which fulfils the long term needs of the settlement.</p>
Barton Willmore (obo Barratt David Wilson Homes) – ref: 20309A	Option 1 and 2a are preferred. Pocklington. General support for current approach to focusing new development in the most sustainable settlements. Support for well-considered urban extension, enabling new units to be delivered in the next plan period. Clayfields Lane is an appropriate site and there may be scope to provide facilities that would benefit the local community as well as 1,250 units and affordable housing. In addition to the above, Pocklington is one of the largest settlements in the District and has good transport links, including public transport, as well as shops, schools and employment opportunities, both in the town itself and outlying industrial estates.
Pegasus Group (obo Mr S Goodwin) – ref: 20332A	Option 2b is preferred. Skipsea. This would recognise the need for these villages, such as Skipsea, to continue to grow and expand, ensuring their vitality and viability. This approach would comply with paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework
Pegasus Group (obo J C Cooke & Son) – ref: 20332B	Support for the continued identification of Beverley as a Principal Town and a focus for new housing development.
Pegasus Group (obo S&J Draper, J&S Coates, A&S Crozier and A&J Foster) – ref:	Brandesburton should be identified as a Primary Village as a minimum. Given the role and function of the settlement, consideration should be given to promoting the settlement to a Rural Service Centre.

20332D	
Pegasus Group (obo Mr R Stockbridge and Hogarth Construction Ltd) – ref: 20348	Development should be managed through the Settlement Hierarchy. Swanland should remain a settlement with an important role and function and where growth should continue to be identified.
Gladman Developments Ltd – ref: 20361	<p>Partial support for Option 1. Agree with position of higher order settlements. However at Primary Village and below the Network is outdated and restricts development at the cost of rural sustainability.</p> <p>The council should have regard to changing patterns of behaviour, technology advances and the need to support remaining services and rural businesses. The current approach, applying proportionate growth on the basis of a static viewpoint of services, does not afford sufficient opportunity for sustainable development within rural areas. Access to the internet might boost the sustainability of the settlement. It provides opportunities for home working and access to a wide range of goods and services meaning rural locations are no longer as isolated as they once were.</p> <p>By the end of the plan period the proportion of electric cars will have increased, changing the way the car is viewed in sustainability terms. Significant weight should be applied to this.</p> <p>Greater weight should be applied to the presence of and the need to support non-agricultural rural enterprise and businesses which make up an increasingly large proportion of the rural economy.</p> <p>Adopting a more flexible approach to development in rural areas will also benefit housing land supply and delivery. A significant problem is reliance on delivery in areas with low demand for housing. This should be addressed through consideration of a different spatial strategy to the one adopted.</p>
George F White (obo Mr Bayston and Mr Senior) – ref: 20376	Option 2a/b preferred. Snaith. The principles of the settlement hierarchy remain sound however there should be some recognising that some of the Rural Service Centres, such as Snaith, have a good level of services and facilities that are able to attract and sustain housing growth. A significant extension should be considered in Snaith to meet the longer term requirements of East Riding.
ID Planning (obo Mr and Mrs Wrapson) – ref: 20401	Support for Options 1 and 2. Option 2 would accord with the National Planning Policy Framework which advises that housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities and that planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive.
Josephine Wright (obo Mr Mainwaring) – ref: 20424	<p>Option 2b is preferred. This approach would allow for more housing in village locations such as Shiptonthorpe and would have a limited impact on the character and appearance of the locality as well as on existing infrastructure. The development limits of Shiptonthorpe have been drawn tightly.</p> <p>Shiptonthorpe lies in a strategic position on the A1079 corridor between Hull and York. There are a number of good</p>

	<p>local services and facilities in the village including. Shiptonthorpe playing fields/play area is located off Station Road/Back Lane.</p> <p>The village is served by good public transport links and has good pedestrian links. It is within reasonable walking distance of the services, facilities, education and employment opportunities in the neighbouring market town of Market Weighton and only five miles away from the employment retail and leisure facilities in the market town of Pocklington.</p>
Highways England – ref: 20434	Highways England will need to understand the traffic impact arising at the Strategic Road Network from new development and whether mitigation is required. Wherever possible new development should be located in sustainable locations with good public transport links in order to minimise traffic impact. Highways England will consider individual development locations based upon their own merits. A cumulative impact assessment of all the sites (both employment and housing) will also need to be undertaken in relation to the Strategic Road Network and this will need to identify how any severe impacts can be mitigated.
Tickton and Routh Parish Council – ref: 20458	Strong support for the re-designation of Tickton as a village rather than a primary village. Any development should be smaller dwellings.
M Robinson – ref: 20459	<p>Consult with and listen to the Parish Council.</p> <p>Aldbrough should be downgraded to a village as there is no bus service, and do not have better facilities than those currently classed in that status (mentions Burton Pidsea, Skipsea, Burstwick as examples).</p>
R W Elliott and Co – ref: 20472	<p>Option 2b is preferred. The lack of building in villages means over time community does suffer. Communities and services will benefit from a small amount of growth in villages and the need for affordable housing, and younger people wanting to move near family.</p> <p>Oppose the criteria used for a settlement to be classed as a “village”. Suggests restrictions on development in the countryside should be loosened, which would encourage more services and facilities. Questions how a village such as Bewholme can ever meet the required number of houses and services. Suggests modern services such as parcel collection points should be considered in the decision as to whether or not a small village can grow.</p>
C Nicholson – ref: 20476	Option 2a and b preferred. The current Plan does not allow for any development in small villages resulting in a very exclusive and ageing population. A few houses in more villages would be preferable.
C Coulter – ref: 20480	Option 2b is preferred. Revisions could be made where additional development would be seen locally to support the vitality and viability of the village.
P Webb – ref: 20492	<p>Option 2a/b preferred. It would be interesting to see whether new, more self-contained development could be accommodate in the region rather than simply extending existing centres. This would be heavily dependent on improved transport links by road and (light) rail being promoted.</p> <p>Allowing villages to expand more rapidly than the rate currently allowed seems sensible assuming there is the demand</p>

	and reliable transport links.
IB Planning Ltd (obo Mrs Brown) – ref: 20495	Option 2a/b preferred. The benefit of using previously developed land in villages and the countryside should be further emphasised and specific sites identified
Pegasus Group (obo Evison Farmers) – ref: 20496A	The pattern of development in the District should be managed to ensure strategic priorities are delivered. Support Woodmansey remaining as a settlement identified to support the delivery of housing. It has good transport links with services to Hull, Beverley, Driffield, Bridlington, Scarborough & Hornsea and a small range of facilities including a primary school, church and public house. Tokenspire Business Park provides employment opportunities for the local area. Woodmansey’s strategic location south of Beverley provides a sustainable opportunity to locate new development. An urban extension in Woodmansey will support the delivery of housing to enhance the settlement.
Pegasus Group (obo Evison Farmers and Mr and Mrs Marshall) – ref: 20496B	The pattern of development in the District should be managed to ensure strategic priorities are delivered. Support Hutton Cranswick remaining as a settlement identified to support the delivery of housing. Despite its rural location Hutton Cranswick offers: connections to the local and wider strategic road network, a train station, frequent public services, Cranswick Industrial estate, Farm Shop, Car Dealership and Garage, Primary School, Post Office, Convenience Store, Doctors Surgery and Public Houses. There is capacity to support further growth without comprising Hutton Cranswick’s overall sustainability. Residential development should be supported.
Young RPS (obo Ei Group plc) ref: 20505	Option 2a/b preferred. Sustainable housing growth is essential to sustain rural villages. Policy S4 is overly restrictive and does not allow for sustainable housing growth when combined with the tightly drawn development limit boundaries of the Local Plan. National Planning Policy has shifted reliance on settlement boundaries. Each site should be considered on its own merits taking into account whether it would result of ‘isolated’ development. Recent case law has clarified that ‘isolated’ should be given its ordinary objective meaning, i.e. far away from other places or buildings; remote To promote sustainable development in rural areas the National Planning Policy Framework recognises that regard should be had to the ability for new development to share and support facilities and services in other nearby settlements.
North Yorkshire County Council – ref: 20506	Any revised settlement network should include a proportionate consideration of the impacts on the wider regional highway network and movements to other centres within neighbouring authorities.
Redrow Homes – ref: 20509	Support for retaining Swanland as a Primary Village. Growth should continue to be identified at Swanland to sustain existing services.
P Crossland – ref: 20528	Any new settlement should be serviced by rail and situated away from the Humber. Outside the Beverley-York line, areas to the north of Bridlington should be examined. Suggest Leconfield/Arram area. Questions what the MOD plan for former runways etc.
Rowley Parish Council – ref: 20565	Rowley Parish Council do not wish for any further development and would like to continue to be a non-selected settlement for Growth.
North Ferriby Parish Council	Option 2b preferred. A flexible approach to smaller village is necessary to ensure services continue to be viable.

– ref: 20573	Disagree with Option 2a. It is too expensive to provide the necessary infrastructure and facilities unless a reasonable number of homes can be provided.
Melbourne Parish Council (Cllr Cooper) – ref: 20581	Melbourne. Is not a large village, has a primary school, small shop and village hall (most villages have a hall). Opposed to any option that means the village would be liable to significant development. Support an option that would lead to organic growth of single houses over a longer period of time.
ID Planning (obo Keyland Developments Ltd) – ref: 20585	Support for Options 1 and 2b. Option 2b would accord with the National Planning Policy Framework which advises that housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities and that planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive.
Johnson Mowat Planning Ltd (obo Hull and East Yorkshire Hospitals NHS Trust) – ref: 20588	Option 1 is preferred. The importance and focus of meeting development needs in the Major Haltemprice Settlements has not changed since the adoption of the Local Plan.
Rural Housing Enabler – ref: 20589	Option 2b preferred. Villages with schools should be considered for housing allocation. This especially applies to those communities where depopulation has occurred. List of 18 such villages is provided (although not an exhaustive list). The call for sites may produce an imbalanced geographical spread of sites for consideration. Should a policy decision be made to consider other villages as well there may be a need to ensure all possible sites in smaller villages are taken into consideration. The Local Plan should therefore reserve the opportunity to re-advertise the call for sites to reflect new policies as they emerge especially if smaller villages are under consideration for allocations.
D Hobson – ref: 20595	<p>Option 1 is preferred.</p> <p>Option 2a would provide leverage for the development of currently unallocated sites, which may be undesirable.</p> <p>Option 2b is unlikely to be consistent with Local Plan and national policies. Expanded provision of facilities at District Centres would need to be linked to increased use from population increase in Villages.</p>
Cottingham Parish Council – ref: 20605	<p>Option 2 a/b preferred. Cottingham will come under enormous pressure for more land to be released. All the major allocated sites have planning permission and there are significant windfall sites coming forward.</p> <p>Cottingham must retain its physical separateness from Hull to its east and Hull and Willerby to its south. Cottingham is cited as a sustainable place to live but where primarily accessibility (and not the wider definition of sustainability) is being used to justify more development that ultimately is resulting in the village being a less sustainable place to live as the quality of life deteriorates.</p> <p>The principal definition of sustainability i.e. to leave a place better for future generations is being ignored. Just building more houses does not constitute sustainability.</p>

	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan was drafted with the proviso of respecting the redrawn settlement development boundaries and protecting those gaps for at least the life time of those plans i.e. until 2030. We are sure that there will be enormous pressure applied by developers and landowners to further erode the eastern and southern separation between Cottingham and Hull and Cottingham and Willerby now that the East Riding has called for sites. To bow to this pressure because of failure to deliver elsewhere in the County we strongly contest would be unreasonable and we would object strongly to this approach being taken.</p> <p>New settlements elsewhere or significant extensions to existing settlements and a more flexible approach to development in villages could provide the same amount of housing and the opportunity for small more characterful developments coming forward; which will also assist small local builders who cannot access the large allocated sites.</p> <p>Whilst Cottingham is close to Hull it is linked to Beverley for leisure and employment and increasing numbers travel west for employment along the A63/M62. The adoption of Option 2 would enable the settlements along the identified East-West Transport Corridor as locations for new employment development to become places to live as well as work. Opportunities at Melton/Welton, Brough/Elloughton, South & North Cave and Howden for instance should be seriously considered. Similarly the emphasis in Hull on the ports and associated employment mean that Hedon and other Holderness settlements should become a focus for new housing development.</p> <p>Local residents concerns regarding inadequate infrastructure, including drainage and road infrastructure, are being ignored. The volume of traffic makes the living environment and quality of life poor. Sustainability as measured by quality of life issues is severely tested. New development in Cottingham would not improve this situation.</p>
S Cantwell – ref: 20607	Option 2a/b preferred. All areas should be reviewed. The situation in some villages has changed such as the loss of bus services. Aldbrough should no longer be classed as a Rural Service Centre.
Aldbrough Parish Council – ref: 20611	Option 2a/2 preferred. Aldbrough is no longer viable as a Rural Service Centre and should be a village. There is no longer a regular bus service to and from Hull so we are unable to support commuters.
Barmby Moor Parish Council – ref: 20613	Option 1 preferred. Residents in this parish feel it is necessary that settlements remain separate and individual and the greenfield sites are not developed.
Ellerker Parish Council – ref: 20614	Ellerker should remain a small rural village offering peace, tranquillity and a strong sense of community. Any future planning policies should be sympathetic to the current nature of this rural village so that its integrity is not unduly compromised by the planning process.

Question 3 - In relation to the Goole and Humberhead Levels area, which option(s) should be taken forward as part of the Local Plan review?

If additional housing allocations are identified as not being appropriate or viable in Goole, due to new evidence on the level of flood risk, which other sustainable parts of the sub area at a low risk of flooding should be considered? Options include extensions to existing settlements or new settlements in the following locations:

1. Snaith;
2. Howden;
3. Pollington; and
4. Eastrington.

Are there any other suitable and accessible locations in the sub area within a low risk flood zone? Please specify and provide supporting evidence to justify.

Total number of responses: 43

	Respondent
Snaith	Gladman Developments Ltd – ref: 20361 George F White (obo Messrs Senior and Bayston) – ref: 20376 C G Coulter – ref 20480 Snaith Parish Council – ref: 20491 [most preferred from public drop in session] P Webb – ref: 20492 Jody Haller – ref: 20522 Joe Haller – ref: 20526
Howden	Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant (obo Mr Fielder) – ref: 10177 Directions Planning Consultancy Ltd (obo Brooks, Dobson, Garton, Goulden/ Sweeting Farmers, JD Goulden) – ref: 11328A, 11328B, 11328C (respectively) Michael Glover (obo Great Gutter Lane, Kirkella, Collaboration) – ref: 11598A Beswick Parish Council – ref: 13592 Gladman Developments Ltd – ref: 20361 P Davison – ref: 20477 C G Coulter – ref 20480 P Webb – ref: 20492
Pollington	C G Coulter – ref 20480 D & L Crosby: ref – 20517

	Ethical Partnership (obo Stobart Group) – ref: 20586
Eastrington	Edwardson Associates (obo R and J Scutt) – ref: 12048 B Cloke – ref: 13516 P Davidson – ref: 20477 C G Coulter – ref 20480 J Holmes – ref: 20489 C Oliver – ref 20490
Other location	JVH Planning (obo Durdy/Webster) – ref: 10126 (Goole and surrounding area) DPP Planning (obo Peter Ward Homes) – ref: 12151A (Goole) K Williams – ref: 13631 (Hull) A J Duke – ref: 13586 (all and/or new settlement) Johnson & Mowat Planning (obo S7D Imports) – ref: 14053 (Goole) C Nicholson – ref: 20476 (spread across East Riding) YoungsRPS (obo Ei Group plc) – ref: 20505 (Airmyn)
No preference stated	Howden Civic Society – ref: 10396 (none) G Walker – ref: 11574 (not Eastrington) Beverley Civic Society – ref: 19579 ID Planning (obo Hallam Land Management) – ref: 19686 Highways England – ref: 20434 Snaith Parish Council - ref: 20491 A McNulty – ref: 20501 North Yorkshire County Council – ref: 20506 N Kelly – ref: 20523 (not Snaith) S Thornton – ref: 20527 (not Snaith)

Respondent	Summary of Comments
C Nicholson – ref: 20476	Preferred Option: None stated. A wider spread of housing across the area would be preferable.
J Holmes – ref: 20489	Preferred Option: Eastrington Has the lowest flood risk of all the options. Would be most logical option.
Beswick Parish Council – ref: 13592	Preferred Option: Howden

	Howden provides services, schools and communication links and, as long as development sites avoid flood hazard zones, these can serve an increase in population.
Snaith Town Council – ref: 20491	<p>Snaith Town Council organised a drop –in session The following are the results of that:</p> <p>Location preference</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eastrington = 3 • Pollington = 7 • Snaith = 19 • Howden = 0 <p>Key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about capacity of schools and infrastructure in general • Parking (insufficient) and traffic concerns • Better transport links required <p>More affordable housing/housing for first-time buyers required</p>
P Webb – ref: 20492	<p>Preferred Option: Howden, or perhaps Snaith.</p> <p>Howden has better rail facilities and this could encourage reduced car usage. Only Snaith and Howden would provide anything much in the way of a ‘historic centre’ for a new larger community and avoid the expansion being simply a featureless estate around a small village centre.</p>
DPP Planning (obo Peter Ward Homes) – ref: 12151A	<p>Preferred Option: Goole</p> <p>Growth should be directed to Goole in line with current policies S3 and S5. We recognise approach to steering development away from flood risk but there is little prospect of flooding in Goole due to the presence of flooding. A common sense approach should be taken. EA supports principle of residential development. Options would prejudice the transformational agenda for Goole set out in the Plan.</p> <p>Little development in Goole has taken place and the options put forward would exacerbate the situation.</p> <p>There is developer interest in the area and our client has demonstrated that it is economic to deliver houses in the town.</p> <p>We also question the sustainability of allocating housing away from Goole. Goole is highly sustainable and attractive to economic investment. Workers need housing close by. Services are available in Goole.</p>
George F White (obo Messrs Senior and Bayston) – ref: 20376	<p>Preferred Option: Snaith</p> <p>Evidence shows large parts of Goole in significant hazard zone. Vitality impacts likely to impact on delivery.</p>

	<p>Snaith has a relatively wide range of services and facilities, and is well positioned in relation to transport.</p> <p>Client's land put forward.</p>
A McNulty – ref: 20501	<p>Preferred Option: No preferences</p> <p>Those with facilities and infrastructure which will support development.</p>
YoungsRPS (obo Ei Group plc) – ref: 20505	<p>Preferred Option: Airmyn.</p> <p>Additional housing allocations can be accommodated on the south side of Airmyn, which is a satellite village to Goole and offers land at a lower risk of flooding.</p>
Gladman Developments Ltd – ref: 20361	<p>Preferred Option: Snaith and Howden</p> <p>Due to the flood zone constraint, further housing in Goole should be minimised on greenfield locations with a focus on brownfield locations.</p> <p>Development should be focussed towards settlements which benefit from the strongest transport connections with Goole, and are already sustainable. Howden and Snaith would best reflect these attributes. Howden and Snaith have stronger transport links than the other two options, and have a strong set-up of services and facilities. Acknowledge Howden is affected to some degree by flood risk constraints.</p>
Michael Glover (obo Great Gutter Lane, Kirkella, Collaboration) – ref: 11598A	<p>Preferred Option: Howden</p> <p>Priority should be given to locations on railway lines and fit in with the transport strategy to widen labour markets. North of Howden should be prioritised, followed by Snaith and Eastington.</p>
North Yorkshire County Council – ref: 20506	<p>Preferred Option: No preference</p> <p>No preference. Would like to ensure that growth proposals would complement North Yorkshire's growth ambitions and the wider strategic opportunities for the M62 corridor.</p> <p>Proposals would need to be capable of providing the necessary infrastructure. Ongoing discussions required.</p>
Directions Planning Consultancy Ltd (obo Brooks, Dobson, Garton) – ref: 11328A	<p>Preferred Option: Howden</p> <p>Support principle of urban extensions to Howden. It is of a suitable size to accept further developments and has existing range of services and facilities, with connection with the M62.</p> <p>Sustainability Appraisal supports development in this settlement.</p>

<p>Directions Planning Consultancy Ltd (obo Goulden/ Sweeting Farmers) – ref: 11328B</p>	<p>Preferred Option: Howden</p> <p>Support principle of urban extensions to Howden. It is of a suitable size to accept further developments and has existing range of services and facilities, with connection with the M62.</p> <p>Sustainability Appraisal supports development in this settlement.</p>
<p>Directions Planning Consultancy Ltd (obo JD Goulden) – ref: 11328C</p>	<p>Preferred Option: Howden</p> <p>Support principle of urban extensions to Howden. It is of a suitable size to accept further developments and has existing range of services and facilities, with connection with the M62.</p> <p>Sustainability Appraisal supports development in this settlement.</p>
<p>Highways England – ref: 20434</p>	<p>Preferred Option: No preference.</p> <p>Would need to understand the impact the likely traffic would have on the SRN from further development at the settlements.</p>
<p>JVH Planning (obo Durdy/Webster) – ref: 10126</p>	<p>Preferred Option: New settlement adjacent to Goole</p> <p>New development adjacent to Goole should not be overlooked or redistributed. Goole is protected in terms of flood risk and represent a more sustainable option than other suggested locations. It is in a strategically important location and benefits from major linkages. Potential to extend existing allocations and mitigation can be achieved on new developments.</p> <p>This remains a more sustainable approach than a redistribution outside the sub area. New settlement unlikely to be a viable option given the huge infrastructure costs and the time lag in housing delivery.</p>
<p>D & L Crosby – ref: 20517</p>	<p>Preferred Option: Pollington/New Settlement</p> <p>Eastrington does not have the infrastructure for new development, particularly the road infrastructure and the lack of services in the village. Village has lost its only shop and there are only 2 rail services a day.</p> <p>If Easttrington is best option due to flood risk, suggests a new settlement to the north-east of Easttrington would be a more suitable route. It would allow access on to 2 main roads and be within walking distance of services/employment in Howden.</p>
<p>K Williams – ref: 13631</p>	<p>Preferred Option: None stated.</p> <p>If Hull is re-generated the demand for houses in the East Riding will go down so need to build in towns and villages.</p>

Edwardson Associates (obo R and J Scutt) – ref: 12048	<p>Preferred Option: Eastrington</p> <p>Recommend significant extension to Eastrington. Has vastly superior credentials to the other settlements and is not a remote settlement, unlike the other options. It is well located to access Goole, Howden, Market Weighton and Beverley. Only limited areas outside of flood risk are available in north of Howden and south of Snaith. Snaith and Howden have more sensitive built environments. Eastrington possesses a more ordinary character and is more capable of accommodating a transformational change. It has a railway station.</p>
J Haller – ref: 20522	<p>Preferred Option: Snaith</p> <p>More houses would allow people to own a home in Snaith. Prices are high so people rent. People say secondary school is overcrowded but students bussed in from Goole and out of Snaith. All shops, bars, cafes and restaurants would benefit.</p>
N Kelly – ref: 20523	<p>Preferred Option: None stated</p> <p>Concerned that development in Snaith is an option, despite two large housing estates recently built and expected 92 house development. Concerned that infrastructure and facilities such as schools, drains and medical services will not be invested in following development. Seems to be little regard about the impact of flooding. Development is approved in areas known for flooding. Snaith is a small town that does not have highway infrastructure to cope with more traffic. A bypass might see a better reception to proposed development. Many better areas with access to motorways. Concerned about the impact on village and community life and turning these places in to one big town.</p>
J Haller – ref: 20526	<p>Preferred Option: Snaith</p> <p>More houses would lower the price of existing houses and therefore be more affordable. An increase in housing will also improve local businesses. Only concern is with the impact on primary and secondary schools.</p>
S Thornton – ref: 20527	<p>Preferred Option: Not stated</p> <p>Objects to development in Snaith. Existing 15 year plan should remain in place. Concerned over the impact on infrastructure as a result of large-scale development, particularly roads and drainage. Flooding is also a significant risk, with banks flooding in recent years. There is not a flood barrier bank. Flood risk areas don't seem to correspond with historical events.</p>
Johnson & Mowat Planning (obo S7D Imports) – ref: 14053	<p>Preferred Option: Goole</p> <p>Goole should be included in the Plan as an attractive location for inward investment, however, should not specify sites.</p>

	The principle of should apply to any suitable employment location in or around Goole.
G Walker – ref: 11574	<p>Preferred Option: Not stated</p> <p>Against development in Easttrington. Housing has increased by 40% over the last 25 years with very little added to infrastructure (sewage and drainage). Sewage is a constant issue due to new housing in the village.</p> <p>Should consult with parish council and locals who know the area. Parish council should be consulted on appropriate locations of allocated sites. There are particular pinch points and black spots.</p>
A J Duke – ref: 13586	<p>Preferred Option: All (and/or New Settlements)</p> <p>Should go for new settlements rather than developing existing settlements. New settlements should have a full range of services and facilities, including provision for business and industry.</p> <p>New settlements should have a provision of high quality housing. Building plots should be a size that reflects quality and have larger rooms.</p> <p>Welwyn Garden City should be used as a template for future developments. Town centres should be airy. Should take inspiration from the best.</p>
Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant (obo Mr Fielder) – ref: 10177	<p>Preferred Option: Howden</p> <p>Support the conclusions of the Sustainability Appraisal in supporting Howden for development. Lower order settlements look to Howden after Goole for services, recreational and other facilities. Opposed to a new settlement at Easttrington as it would compete with Howden.</p> <p>It is considered that Pollington is not an appropriate settlement for development. It is opportunistic and not the result of a rigorous site selection process. It has the potential to compromise future development with Selby Council.</p>
Ethical Partnership (obo Stobart Group) – ref: 20586	<p>Preferred Option: Pollington</p> <p>Scheme submitted called Pollington Park. Includes: proposal for a new junction to the M62, and land for residential and economic development (forecast to deliver 4,000 homes and 12,000 jobs by 2024).</p> <p>Proposal will need national and sub-regional need for new homes.</p> <p>Proposal offers an additional junction that will unlock the proposed development. It will also enable a wider area to be developed and to realise the economic potential of the sub-region.</p> <p>It also responds to the potential of the M62 corridor to generate additional employment through rail and energy related development; and the opportunity to contribute to renewable energy for new and existing communities and businesses.</p> <p>Understanding the relationship between administrative boundaries and commuter habits is crucial for prosperous futures.</p> <p>Unlikely to undermine the soundness of the Selby Local Plan.</p>

	Discussions have taken place between Highways England, ERYC, North Yorkshire Council and Selby District Council.
ID Planning (obo Hallam Land Management) – ref: 19686	<p>Preferred Option: No option preferred</p> <p>In the event that additional housing would not be viable in Goole, extensions to existing settlements in the sub-areas would be supported.</p> <p>New settlements are considered a long-term solution to meet housing need.</p>
Howden Civic Society – ref: 10396	<p>Preferred option: None</p> <p>Howden and Snaith are significantly constrained by their medieval street arrangement. Howden has absorbed 20% increase in housing with no improvement in infrastructure. No space in either town to provide additional retail or employment units, and this will lead to out commuting. The new estates would become dormitory and which will significantly change the nature and character of the town.</p> <p>Major development of housing in Howden was originally approved on the understanding that a sorely-needed relief road would be built. This requirement was subsequently abandoned by the Council. The Council is not willing to force developers to contribute to the essential infrastructure improvements required.</p> <p>Snaith, Howden and Eastington are constrained by their existing road networks and cannot be enlarged without significant detriment to their conservation areas.</p> <p>Pollington is not easily accessible by rail or motorway and may not therefore be a desirable location for significant housing expansion. Goole and Hook appear to have available space, good access by road, rail and river and an expanding employment capacity.</p>
Beverley Civic Society – ref: 19579	<p>Preferred Option: None stated</p> <p>Does not have detailed knowledge of the area. Advise against developments in flood risk areas, especially with the likely effects of climate change.</p>

Question 4 - In relation to Stamford Bridge, which option should be taken forward as part of the Local Plan review?

Option 1 - Support small scale development within the current limits of Stamford Bridge, recognising that larger scale developments (and allocations) are potentially unsuitable due to the current highway constraints.

Option 2 - Investigate the potential for highway improvements, such as a by-pass and/or two-way river crossing, that would be funded through the delivery of a significant number of new homes.

Total number of responses: 49

	Respondent
Option 1	Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning (obo D Fielder) – ref: 10177 M Teare – ref: 11450A DPP (obo Sunderlandwick Farms) – ref: 12151C B Cloke – ref: 13516A Beverley Civic Society – ref: 19579A R Ellison – ref: 19660A ID Planning (obo Mr and Mrs Wrapson) – ref: 20401A A Strangeway – ref: 20465A C Nicholson – ref: 20476A P Davison – ref: 20477A C Oliver – ref: 20490A A McNulty – ref: 20501A Stamford Bridge Parish Council – ref: 20525A G & K Dunn – ref: 20574A
Option 2	Halifax Estates – ref: 10099A Stephenson & Son (obo The Lane Family Trust) – ref: 10167A Bugthorpe and Kirby Underdale Parish Council – ref: 10553 Beswick Parish Council – ref: 13592A Clubleys (obo Sherbourne & Son) – ref: 13720J C Clarke – ref: 19076A/B Stephenson & Son (obo J H Dixon & Son LLP) – ref 20325A Gladman Developments Ltd – ref: 20361 ID Planning (obo Mr and Mrs Wrapson) – ref: 20401A R W Elliott & Co – ref: 20472A

	<p>Melbourne Parish Council (Cllr Tomalin) – ref: 20475 C G Coulter – ref: 20480A J Holmes – ref: 20489A P Webb – ref: 20492A M Smith – ref: 20502A J Green – ref: 20541B D Hobson – ref: 20595A P Thirsk – ref: 20631</p>
--	---

Respondent	Summary of Comments
A Strangeway – ref: 20465A	<p>Have spoken to local residents and believe approximately 75% would prefer Option 1, whilst 12.5% preferred Option 2, and 12.5% chose neither option.</p> <p>As such I will be supporting Option 1, and I expect the Parish Council to support Option 1</p>
A Strangeway – ref: 20465AB	<p>Drop-in session at Pocklington showed that Option 2 was preferred option, despite personal knowledge that Option 1 is the preferred Option in Stamford Bridge.</p> <p>Drop-in session is therefore invalid due to alleged underhanded behaviour, and therefore another session must take place.</p>
Pegasus Group (obo R Tinson & Son) – ref: 13558D	<p>Recognise highway infrastructure constraints at Stamford Bridge, which may affect other locations around the A166.</p> <p>Strategic policies for new infrastructure for transport at the A166 would need to be informed by sustainability appraisal. Significant adverse impacts on these objectives should be avoided and, wherever possible, alternative options (such as Option 1 of Question 4) which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued.</p> <p>If Option 1 selected, consideration will need to be given to ensuring appropriate growth in the wider Vale of York sub area. Additional growth in the Town of Pocklington, which lies off the A1079 and does not impact on the A166, would be an alternative option in this circumstance.</p>
Peacock & Smith (obo Gleeson Regeneration) – ref: 16655A	<p>Do not accept that it is not possible to provide for additional housing allocations in the settlement without significant improvements to highway infrastructure.</p> <p>Submitted a transport appraisal to support proposal south of A166 (for approx. 95 dwellings). Appraisal suggests a modest increase beyond the traffic of the existing David Wilson/Avant Homes developments combined.</p> <p>The bridge incorporates MOVA control which provides a dynamic control through which queuing can be managed in an</p>

	<p>optimal way within the constraints that exist. the modest level of additional trips at the bridge would not be of a scale that could be considered 'severe' in the context of the NPPF.</p> <p>Therefore do not support Option 1. Such an approach would choke off housing supply (and affordable housing) and result in higher house prices for local people. Benefits of new housing outweigh modest additional traffic impact.</p> <p>Do not object to principle of Option 2, but it is complex, time consuming and expensive to achieve. Should not deny homes for Stamford Bridge until a by-pass/new river crossing is provided, as there is an alternative option for providing a certain quantum of development without a severe impact on the highway network.</p>
City of York Council – ref: 19454A	The alternate one-way traffic control on the A166 at Stamford Bridge is a restriction on development growth in the area. Whilst improvements to the A166 to allow two-way traffic at Stamford Bridge could enable development in the area it could also have an adverse impact on the operation of the A64/A166/A1079 junction at Grimston Bar because the removal of the current 'platooning' effect of traffic control at Stamford Bridge, coupled with further development in the area may increase traffic levels. CYC will be pleased to explore this issue with ERC under the Duty to Cooperate.
Michael Glover LLP – ref: 11598A	A more fundamental review of options in the Vale of York sub area is required. Significant investment in highway improvements may also be better targeted elsewhere (one example being the A1079). The high demand, relationship with York and the growth experienced by places such as Pocklington and Market Weighton all support a fresh look at the sub area and not just Stamford Bridge.
North Yorkshire County Council – ref: 20506A	Stamford Bridge is located in close proximity to the boundary with NYCC. The potential impact of either option upon the NYCC area should be considered, and should either support or, as a minimum, not constrain opportunities to enhance east – west connectivity.
Highways England – ref: 20434A	If the approach taken is likely to impact the Strategic Road Network, then Highways England will need to be involved.
Natural England – ref: 20515A	Additional housing allocations may be problematic owing to the light controlled bridge on A166, particularly if a new bridge crossing the Derwent is pursued, as there would be potential issues for use with River Derwent SAC.
Sirius Group (obo FCC Environment Ltd) – ref: 19889A	Rural areas and the countryside should be included in the development strategy for the Local Plan and considered as part of the Review process. Paragraphs 83 and 84 of the revised NPPF concern the vitality and economy of rural areas, and recognise that needs in these areas should be addressed adjacent to or beyond existing settlements. Site submitted at Gallymoor for consideration which provides redevelopment opportunities.
ID Planning (obo Mr and Mrs Wrapson) – ref: 20401A	Support both options. Site submitted adjacent to village. It is considered that this would not have an unacceptable impact on the highway network as it is small scale and is supported by a Transport Note.
Ryedale District Council – ref: 19987A	From a Ryedale District Council perspective, significant levels of new development at Stamford Bridge will increase traffic through a number of our smaller villages and this would be a concern for this authority. On that basis, we seek to continue dialogue based how this consultation progresses so that the wider traffic implications associated with significant

	levels of new housing development are identified and fully understood.
Pocklington and The Wolds Gateway Partnership – ref: 11675A	Further development in Stamford Bridge will impact further on the lanes and byways between Stamford Bridge and Pocklington.
A J Duke – ref: 13586A	The extent of new building in Stamford bridge may have been a mistake. If option 2 were followed I would not like to see the risk of the highway improvements turning out to be inadequate once put to the test. Would it be possible to use the existing road bridge as a one way route and carry traffic in the other direction using a road principally built on the old railway line?
Howden Civic Society – ref: 10396A	The town is gridlocked on many occasions, mostly by traffic passing through the town. To add significant numbers of housing would increase traffic problems. East Riding Council, as evidenced by the Howden decision to drop the requirement for a relief road, does not have a good record of requiring developers to contribute to a relief road, so the traffic problems would only become worse.
Thwing Parish Council – ref: 10353A	Against both options provided. Smaller villages should be proposed for development.
C Clarke – ref: 19076A/B	<p>Support Option 2. Provides cost analysis of bypass and background information on the strategic nature of the A166 (e.g. shortest route from Leeds to Bridlington).</p> <p>Benefits of a bypass include: potentially reducing traffic levels on the A614 and in part the A64; providing better access to a range of ER villages and communities (economy); mitigate impact of proposed new prison at Full Sutton.</p> <p>Provides calculations on time and cost savings resulting from a bypass.</p> <p>Considers that 90% of residents support a bypass. If bypass was provided, developments of all types along the A166 would be feasible.</p> <p>Even small developments within the village will add to the serious traffic problems. Linking a bypass to significant more houses is not within the terms of the existing plan.</p> <p>Challenges the conclusions of Cllr Strangeway.</p>
P Davison – ref: 20477A	Support Option 1. Full Sutton may require the development of a bypass in Stamford Bridge.
C Oliver – ref: 20490A	Support Option 1. Flood risk exceeds the need for further expansion.
A McNulty – ref: 20501A	Support Option 1. Stamford Bridge has seen significant expansion to the East of the village to date, further expansion will be to the detriment of the character of the village infrastructure that supports it.
Stamford Bridge Parish	Supports Option 1. Following a short discussion it was felt by the Councillors that option 1 was the most suitable for

Council – ref: 20525A	Stamford Bridge.
Richard Ellison – ref: 19660A	Supports Option 1. There has been two large scale developments recently and any more building would adversely affect not only traffic flows but the whole infrastructure of the village (e.g. the doctor's surgery). The consultation event and material was not monitored in any way by those Council staff present resulting in widespread abuse (see Cllr Strangeway's blog).
Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning (obo D Fielder) – ref: 10177	Support Option 1. Stamford Bridge is not an appropriate location for further large scale development on townscape, landscape and heritage grounds and also its proximity to York (it is almost entirely a commuter settlement). No opportunity to provide employment opportunities locally. Presence of river mean village cannot be readily expanded to serve the significant development that would be required to fund a new river crossing. Has been previously considered and rejected.
DPP (obo Sunderlandwick Farms) – ref: 12151C	Support Option 1. Stamford Bridge is not the most sustainable of locations with reference to the existing Plan and Settlement Network. It has a limited range of services and facilities and as such it could not support and assimilate the scale of new development which would be necessary to allow for the construction of a new bridge or by pass. Stamford Bridge is heavily constrained (e.g. Important Landscape Areas, historic battlefield). Development of the scale proposed in Option 2 would lead to substantial harm and outweigh the benefits. Other areas such as Pocklington are better.
Beverley Civic Society – ref: 19579A	Support Option 1. Need to take account of the listed bridge structure and the historic battlefield.
R W Elliott & Co – ref: 20472A	Support Option 2. The population growth of York will lead to an increase in traffic being carried through Stamford Bridge. A bypass provides the best long-term solution.
Historic England – ref: 10473A	Preferred Option: No preference. It is a considerable challenge to identify sites around Stamford Bridge that will not impact, to some extent, on the historic environment (e.g. registered battlefield, remains of 'Deventio' Roman town, conservation area). Scheduled monuments and the Registered Battlefield or of the 'highest significance' in planning terms. Substantial harm or loss should be wholly exceptional. No designated heritage assets to east of village but still high probability of nationally important archaeological remains. Consequently, identifying a suitable locations for a new river crossing is going to be a challenge. Even greater challenges come with additional residential development. Historic England need to be involved, with others, as early as possible if Option 2 is explored further.
J Holmes – ref: 20489A	Support Option 2. Inevitable that a new/updated river crossing will be needed as existing bridge is operating beyond design limitations. Current housing developments are increasing traffic and a new crossing should be investigated.

Beswick Parish Council – ref: 13592A	Support Option 2. The existing bridge makes transport to Bridlington and Driffield difficult, and therefore has economic implications. If development is planned to the east there will be a need to develop the bridge.
Halifax Estates – ref: 10099A	Support Option 2. The services of village cannot sustain more development to help pay for a bypass, and therefore another river crossing is considered the best solution.
Bugthorpe and Kirby Underdale Parish Council – ref: 10553	Support Option 2. The services of village cannot sustain more development to help pay for a bypass, and therefore another river crossing is considered the best solution.
P Webb – ref: 20492A	Support Option 2. Could be wider benefits and improved access to Driffield and northern villages if the A166 were to be improved.
Stephenson & Son (obo J H Dixon & Son LLP) – ref 20325A	Support Option 2. The first stage is to investigate options in terms of technical requirements and costs.
M Smith – ref: 20502A	Support Option 2. The current road network is not suitable for any large development in the area.
Gladman Developments Ltd – ref: 20361	Support Option 2. Option 1 is not proactive planning and may result in long term harm to the sustainability of the settlement. Option 2 is more positive but has no likelihood of being delivered due to issues of land availability and funding. A new bridge would bring significant benefits to the settlement. The PPG allows for a higher housing requirement than the Standard Method if this can meet infrastructure needs. More housing in Stamford Bridge will also help with addressing unmet housing needs of York should they arise.
Clubleys (obo Sherbourne & Son) – ref: 13720J	Support Option 2. It is essential for the long term success and prosperity of Stamford Bridge that a solution is found to the traffic problems caused by the single-lane bridge.
Stephenson & Son (obo The Lane Family Trust) – ref: 10167A	Support Option 2. The first stage is to investigate options in terms of technical requirements and costs.
D Hobson – ref: 20595A	Support Option 2. It would address the demand for commuter homes for those working in York. It would reduce the need for development at locations at a greater distance from York.
P Thirsk – ref: 20631	Concerned with the increase in housing of upto 20% at Pocklington and Stamford Bridge, without investing in necessary infrastructure. Concerns over the proposal to develop the prison at Full Sutton, particularly regarding the increase pressure this will have on the road infrastructure and safety concerns. Vehemently opposed to further bridges in Stamford, particularly as this would increase the level of traffic through the

	<p>village. Considered disrespectful to the existing residents of Stamford Bridge.</p> <p>Proposes bypass from Pocklington to A166 (avoiding Stamford Bridge).</p> <p>Also proposes a new bridge to be built between Stamford Bridge and Buttercrambe. Proposes smaller bypasses in Fridaythorpe and Sledmere.</p> <p>Additional road infrastructure will be of benefit to Full Sutton prison, as it will help with recruitment and housing needs,</p> <p>Local residents should have the benefit of a bypass to ease congestion in the village, and protect its bridge.</p> <p>Would prefer if prisons were built in a remote corner of south0esat Yorkshire/Humber. This would lead to development in this area to accommodate prison officers, and greater employment opportunities.</p> <p>Proposes that a mayor of Yorkshire be established to unite these issues.</p>
<p>P Thirsk – ref: 20631</p>	<p>Support Option 2. Need an integrated department for highways or a mayor for Yorkshire. Stamford Bridge is close to the boundaries of four local authorities.</p> <p>Present road bridge in Stamford Bridge was built in 1727 and is the only crossing point on the A166. The bridge was adequate prior to recent development at Stamford Bridge and Pocklington, though summer was always a problem. Would be interested to know its shelf life.</p> <p>Previous proposals for bypass was quashed by traders.</p> <p>20\$ increase in Stamford Bridge homes to reflect need in more popular residential areas. Hard to understand how the councils allowed this without improvements to infrastructure. Plans for prison at Full Sutton will put greater pressure on road infrastructure.</p> <p>Current local plan states no development will happen without improvements. Understand that 4 options put forward. The thought of traffic continually flowing through the village is an insult. Option to create bypass off Buttercrambe Road would redirect some of the traffic but would make A166 much busier. Also totally unacceptable to Gate Hemsley so would have to bypass this. A bypass of this nature would benefit all of Yorkshire and improve Stamford Bridge and Gate Helmsley as places to live.</p> <p>Prison proposal looks unstoppable so should at least have a suitable bypass to ease traffic.</p>

Question 5 - In relation to housing supply and delivery, which option should be taken forward as part of the Local Plan review?

Option 1 - Allocate sufficient land to meet the East Riding's housing needs over the plan period, including an extra level of supply to maintain flexibility.

Option 2 - As Option 1 but in addition, identify specific reserve sites that would be managed and only released where the Council could no longer demonstrate a five-year supply of housing land.

Total number of responses: 88

	Respondent
Option 1	Lockington Parish Council – ref: 10264 Howden Civic Society – ref: 10396 Directions Planning (obo M Brooks, M Dobson & L Garton, Goulden/Sweeting Farmers, J D Goulden) – ref: 11328A, 11328B, 11328C (respectively) Nineteen47 (obo J Morris) – ref: 11588 Michael Glover LLP (obo Great Gutter Lane, Kirkella, Collaboration) – ref: 11598 Hull City Council – ref: 11708 BNP Paribas Real Estate (obo Associated British Ports) – ref: 12140 DPP (obo J G Hatcliffe and Partners) – ref: 12151B B Cloke – ref: 13516 Peacock & Smith (obo Gleeson regeneration) – ref: 16655 ELG Town Planning (obo Chablis Associated Ltd, Manor Property Group, Westpark Living Ltd) – ref: 19637A, 19637B, 19637C (respectively) ID Planning (obo Hallam Land Management) – ref: 19686 Savills (obo Mr & Mrs Williamson) – ref: 20302 Gladman Developments Ltd – ref: 20361 George F. White (obo Mr Bayston and Mr Senior) – ref: 20376 ID Planning (obo Mr and Mrs Wrapson) - ref: 20401 R W Elliott & Co – ref: 20472 Melbourne Parish Council (Cllr Tomalin) – ref: 20475 P Davison – ref: 20477 C Oliver – ref: 20490 Pegasus Group (obo Evison Farmers, Evison Farmers and Mr & Mrs Marshall) – ref: 20496A, 20496B (respectively) A McNulty – ref: 20501 M Smith – ref: 20502

	<p>Barton Willmore (obo Beal Homes, Central Land Holdings) – ref: 20538A, 20538B (respectively) Preston Parish Council – ref: 20551 Rural Housing Enabler – ref: 20589</p>
<p>Option 2</p>	<p>Halifax Estates – ref: 10099 JVH Planning Consultants Ltd (obo Durdy/ Webster) – ref: 10126 Stephenson & Son (obo the Lane Family Trust) – ref: 10167 Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant (obo D Fielder) – ref: 10177 Thwing & Octon Parish Council – ref: 10353 Hutton Cranswick Parish Council – ref: 10478 Bugthorpe and Kirby Underdale Parish Council – ref: 10553 M Teare – ref: 11450 Pocklington and the Wolds Gateway Partnership – ref: 11675 DPP (obo Peter Ward Homes, Sunderlandwick Farms) – ref: 12151A, 12151C (respectively) Pocklington Town Council – ref: 13492 Pegasus Group (obo J&S Coates, A&S Crozier and A&J Foster, the Foster Family, R Tinson & Son, Rooke/Potter Family and Sherbourne Family, Pegasus Group, the Schultz Family, Simon Goodwin, J C Cooke & Son, S&J Draper) – ref: 13538A, 13538D, 13538E, 13538F, 13538H, 20332A, 20332B & C, 20332D (respectively) A J Duke – ref: 13586 Clubleys (obo the Bray Family, TR Craven, the Henley Family, TJ Hunt, J & R Rook, Ogram, the Murr Family, the Pears Family, Sherbourne, Tinson) – ref: 15385A, 15385C, 15385D, 15385E, 15385F, 15385G, 15385H, 15385I, 15385J, 15385K (respectively) Beverley Civic Society – ref: 19579 Sirius Planning (obo FCC Environment) – ref: 19889 Quod (obo Beal Homes, Taylor Megginson Enterprises, Strata and Keepmoat) – ref: 19909A, 19909B, 19909C Cushman & Wakefield (obo the University of Hull) – ref: 20235 Strathmore Estates (obo Spey Properties Ltd) – ref: 20371 M Robinson – ref: 20459 C Nicholson – ref: 20476 C G Coulter – ref: 20480 J Holmes – ref: 20489 P Webb – ref: 20492 IB Planning (obo Gina Brown) – ref: 20495 YoungsRPS (obo Ei Group plc) – ref: 20505 Sutton upon Derwent Parish Council – ref: 20513 J Green – ref: 20541B</p>

	Johnson Mowat (obo Hull and East Yorkshire Hospitals NHS Trust) – ref: 20588 Driffield Parish Council – ref: 20594
--	---

Respondent	Summary of Comments
Pegasus Group (obo Evison Farmers and Mr & Mrs Marshall) – ref: 20496B	Preferred Option: Option 2 Given the emphasis placed on housing delivery by the government and the delivery tests set out in the NPPF, it is considered that Option 2 is taken forward with to maintain maximum flexibility. Housing requirement options are not positive enough to address economic growth potential and subsequent housing need.
Pegasus Group (obo Evison Farmers) – ref: 20496A	Preferred Option: Option 2 Given the emphasis placed on housing delivery by the government and the delivery tests set out in the NPPF, it is considered that Option 2 is taken forward with to maintain maximum flexibility. Housing requirement options are not positive enough to address economic growth potential and subsequent housing need.
Hull City Council – ref: 11708	Preferred Option: Option 1 Preferred option as it is believed oversupply could maintain a developable supply and lead to a higher level of affordable housing. Suggest that Option 2 could be seen as artificially constraining supply. All sites would be subject to a site assessment methodology, and only basis for when it would appear acceptable for sites to be reserved would be where there were clear sequential criteria which suggest some preference for when one site could come forward over another (e.g. flood risk). This approach has been taken at Kingswood, Hull where sequentially less favourable sites are held as later phase sites. Option 2 also brings little certainty to local communities and it is unclear how this approach could work. There is scope for abuse and could be used to manipulate release of reserve sites ahead of non-reserve ones. Need exceptional reasons for reserve sites. Within Hull we over allocated sites by 20% and have seen our housing requirements exceeded in the last 3 years.
Indigo Planning (obo J Healey) – ref: 19892A	Preferred Option: Not stated. Support acknowledgement that council will over-allocate. However, over-allocating should not be used as a mechanism for preventing future development and housing targets should not be ceilings. If reserve sites are identified there would need to be flexibility over when to release. Need to have a policy that allows for regular review (NPPF para 120).

	<p>Agree that new alternative sites are required. Client's site submitted.</p>
<p>Indigo Planning (obo Stadium (Vicar Lane) Ltd) – ref: 19892B</p>	<p>Preferred Option: Not stated.</p> <p>Support acknowledgement that council will over-allocate. However, over-allocating should not be used as a mechanism for preventing future development and housing targets should not be ceilings. If reserve sites are identified there would need to be flexibility over when to release. Need to have a policy that allows for regular review (NPPF para 120). Agree that new alternative sites are required. Client's site submitted.</p>
<p>Indigo Planning (obo Stadium Developments Ltd and Wykeland) – ref: 19892C</p>	<p>Preferred Option: Not stated.</p> <p>Support acknowledgement that council will over-allocate. However, over-allocating should not be used as a mechanism for preventing future development and housing targets should not be ceilings. If reserve sites are identified there would need to be flexibility over when to release. Need to have a policy that allows for regular review (NPPF para 120). Agree that new alternative sites are required. Client's site submitted.</p>
<p>Peacock & Smith (obo Gleeson regeneration) – ref: 16655</p>	<p>Preferred Option: Option 1</p> <p>Support the provision of an extra level of supply relative to the housing requirement in order to maintain flexibility. Suggest that in the light of the poor track record of housing delivery in the District over the past three years, then a 20% buffer of supply would be justified. Further option to consider to bolster housing supply is to make clear that housing requirement is a minimum and allow for windfall schemes outwith defined development limits (provided they are well related to the built up area and other relevant criteria) – see approach by Harrogate Borough Council Do not support Option 2. Housing supply is not something that can be increased easily – may take several years before a site without planning permission is able to deliver new homes. Difficult to achieve transparency in determining which specific reserve supply sites. Disagreements would absorb the time and resources and could be counter productive.</p>
<p>Pegasus Group (obo S Goodwin) – ref: 20332A</p>	<p>Preferred Option: Option 2</p> <p>Efforts should be made to ensure a sufficient number of sites available and deliverable. It is considered Option 2 will maintain maximum flexibility by allocating additional reserve sites. Housing requirement options are not positive enough to address economic growth potential and subsequent housing need.</p>
<p>Pegasus Group (obo J C Cooke & Son) – ref: 20332B</p>	<p>Preferred Option: Option 2</p>

<p>& C</p>	<p>Efforts should be made to ensure a sufficient number of sites available and deliverable. It is considered Option 2 will maintain maximum flexibility by allocating additional reserve sites. Housing requirement options are not positive enough to address economic growth potential and subsequent housing need.</p>
<p>Pegasus Group (obo S&J Draper, J&S Coates, A&S Crozier and A&J Foster) – ref: 20332D</p>	<p>Preferred Option: Option 2</p> <p>Efforts should be made to ensure a sufficient number of sites available and deliverable. It is considered Option 2 will maintain maximum flexibility by allocating additional reserve sites. Housing requirement options are not positive enough to address economic growth potential and subsequent housing need.</p>
<p>York City Council – ref: 19454</p>	<p>Preferred Option: Not stated</p> <p>Reserve allocations could be misinterpreted by the public, therefore controls and communication is needed to avoid misinterpretation.</p>
<p>Gladman Developments Ltd – ref: 20361</p>	<p>Preferred Option: Option 1</p> <p>Recommend allocation of 10-20% of sites in additional to overall housing requirement. The flexibility will ensure that the plan it able to adapt and chance to conditions and circumstances. Reserve sites are effective in areas of constraint but this is not the case for the East Riding. More scope for development to come forward through alternative means. Phasing should only be required where it is fundamental (e.g. for development of specific infrastructure). Need to set an effective policy to deal with windfall schemes (reference proposed Ashford Local Plan 2030) that allows for development adjoining or close to existing built up confines of settlements subject to certain criteria.</p>
<p>Highways England – ref: 20434</p>	<p>Preferred Option: Not stated</p> <p>This issues is a matter for the local planning authority though Highways England would need to understand the likely traffic impact arising at the Strategic Road Network and whether such an impact can be mitigated.</p>
<p>K Williams – ref: 13631</p>	<p>Preferred Option: Hull</p> <p>Enough land has already been allocated. Risk losing the charm of the East Riding. Should stop building any more, and should be reduced if Hull is going to re-generate.</p>
<p>Driffield Town Council – ref: 10228</p>	<p>Preferred Option: Option 2</p> <p>Considered the best option to future proof plans.</p>
<p>D Hobson – ref: 20595</p>	<p>Preferred Option: Opposed to both.</p>

	Hybrid - Could consider allocating only to meet required needs, but with reserve allocations to make up five year shortfall if this occurs (as with Option 2).
Nineteen47 (obo J Morris) – ref: 11588	Preferred Option: Option 1 Council should recognise that there are factors that aren't always apparent at the plan preparation stage – e.g. market conditions, land ownership, local politics, unforeseen technical constraints. A buffer should therefore be added to the projected housing needs.
ELG Town Planning (obo Chablis Associates Ltd) – ref: 19637A	Preferred Option: Option 1 The extra level of supply would maintain flexibility. See no requirement to adopt Option 2, due to the lack of constraints in the area. Option 2 would not be sufficiently flexible or responsive, and may not meet the requirements at the time. If there is a need for further land, then this should be done by way of an early/partial Local Plan review, or granting planning permission for sustainable windfall sites.
ELG Town Planning (obo Manor Property Group) – ref: 19637B	Preferred Option: Option 1 The extra level of supply would maintain flexibility. See no requirement to adopt Option 2, due to the lack of constraints in the area. Option 2 would not be sufficiently flexible or responsive, and may not meet the requirements at the time. If there is a need for further land, then this should be done by way of an early/partial Local Plan review, or granting planning permission for sustainable windfall sites.
ELG Town Planning (obo Westpark Living Ltd) – ref: 19637C	Preferred Option: Option 1 The extra level of supply would maintain flexibility. See no requirement to adopt Option 2, due to the lack of constraints in the area. Option 2 would not be sufficiently flexible or responsive, and may not meet the requirements at the time. If there is a need for further land, then this should be done by way of an early/partial Local Plan review, or granting planning permission for sustainable windfall sites.
BNP Paribas Real Estate (obo Associated British Ports) – ref: 12140	Preferred Option: Option 1 Support ERYC's previous approach taken in the 2016 adopted Local Plan of over-allocating. This would help to ensure local needs are met in the event that allocated sites fail to come forward.

A McNulty – ref: 20501	<p>Preferred Option: Option 1</p> <p>Do not develop on Green Belt.</p>
Michael Glover LLP (obo Great Gutter Lane, Kirkella, Collaboration) – ref: 11598	<p>Preferred Option: Option 1</p> <p>Significant investment is required to promote an allocation and to subsequently gain planning permission and deliver development. Option 1 provides the required level of certainty for a promoter/developer, Option 2 does not. The link to the 5YHLS is too variable, too changeable and too short term in nature to manage and instigate release.</p>
Directions Planning (obo M Brooks, M Dobson & L Garton) – ref: 11328A	<p>Preferred Option: Option 1</p> <p>Support Option 1 which is the approach advocated in the NPPF. If the authority allocates the right sites in the right locations, then there should be no need for a contingency of further sites.</p> <p>Object to Option 2 as it is unlikely to pass the test of soundness provided by the NPPF. References Leeds City Council who attempted to identify Broad Locations within their LP, but was rejected by Pins.</p> <p>Paragraph 67 of the NPPF sets out how policies within the Local Plan should identify a supply of specific deliverable sites of one to five years. The NPPF does not make provision to allocate land over and above this level.</p>
Directions Planning (obo Goulden/Sweeting Farmers) – ref: 11328B	<p>Preferred Option: Option 1</p> <p>Support Option 1 which is the approach advocated in the NPPF. If the authority allocates the right sites in the right locations, then there should be no need for a contingency of further sites.</p> <p>Object to Option 2 as it is unlikely to pass the test of soundness provided by the NPPF. References Leeds City Council who attempted to identify Broad Locations within their LP, but was rejected by Pins.</p> <p>Paragraph 67 of the NPPF sets out how policies within the Local Plan should identify a supply of specific deliverable sites of one to five years. The NPPF does not make provision to allocate land over and above this level.</p>
Directions Planning (obo J D Goulden) – ref: 11328C	<p>Preferred Option: Option 1</p> <p>Support Option 1 which is the approach advocated in the NPPF. If the authority allocates the right sites in the right locations, then there should be no need for a contingency of further sites.</p> <p>Object to Option 2 as it is unlikely to pass the test of soundness provided by the NPPF. References Leeds City Council who attempted to identify Broad Locations within their LP, but was rejected by Pins.</p>

	<p>Paragraph 67 of the NPPF sets out how policies within the Local Plan should identify a supply of specific deliverable sites of one to five years. The NPPF does not make provision to allocate land over and above this level.</p>
Barton Willmore (obo Beal Homes) – ref: 20538A	<p>Preferred Option: Option I</p> <p>The approach of over-allocating places greater likelihood of delivery. The re-assessment of existing sites is an important part of that process.</p> <p>The under-delivery of housing indicates that more sites should be allocated. Concerned reserve sites would create a two-tier system, resulting in delay and complexity that would have a negative impact on completions.</p>
Barton Willmore (obo Central Land Holdings) – ref: 20538B	<p>Preferred Option: Option I</p> <p>The approach of over-allocating places greater likelihood of delivery. The re-assessment of existing sites is an important part of that process.</p> <p>The under-delivery of housing indicates that more sites should be allocated. Concerned reserve sites would create a two-tier system, resulting in delay and complexity that would have a negative impact on completions.</p>
ID Planning (obo Mr and Mrs Wrapson) - ref: 20401	<p>Preferred Option: Option I</p> <p>Will provide a flexible and responsive approach to housing.</p>
Savills (obo Mr & Mrs Williamson) – ref: 20302	<p>Preferred Option: Option I</p> <p>Will maintain flexibility and optimise levels of development. There should be no cap on sustainable development where a range of benefits will be delivered, and should not be used as a mechanism to stifle the development of potential sites.</p>
Rural Housing Enabler – ref: 20589	<p>Preferred Option: Option I</p> <p>Opposition to reserve sites because they could blight land and introduce ‘hope value’ into sites that might be better progressing as Exception Sites for affordable housing. May also provide a springboard for unwarranted and speculative bids to challenge five-year supply especially if the agent or developer is eager to fast-track their particular reserve site.</p>
ID Planning (obo Hallam Land Management) – ref: 19686	<p>Preferred Option: Option I</p> <p>Will provide a flexible and responsive approach to housing delivery and will ensure housing meets will be met.</p>

	<p>Opposed to Option 2 as it would not be sufficiently responsive given the five-year supply is updated annually. By restricting sites, proposals will come from areas of low demand. If there are delivery issues with sites, restricting additional supply will not make those sites deliverable.</p>
<p>Howden Civic Society – ref: 10396</p>	<p>Preferred Option: Option 1</p> <p>Reserve sites would be a blight on the edge of towns and villages. ERYC does not have a good record of complying with its own plan. There is no confidence that reserve sites would remain reserved as suggested.</p>
<p>J Holmes – ref: 20489</p>	<p>Preferred Option: Option 2</p> <p>Due to the unpredictability of future demand, reserve sites are required to maintain flexibility.</p>
<p>Halifax Estates – ref: 10099</p>	<p>Preferred Option: Option 2</p> <p>In the event of a shortage of the five-year housing supply, reserve sites would afford a level of flexibility.</p>
<p>Bugthorpe and Kirby Underdale Parish Council – ref: 10553</p>	<p>Preferred Option: Option 2</p> <p>In the event of a shortage of the five-year housing supply, reserve sites would afford a level of flexibility.</p>
<p>T C Clarke – ref: 10313</p>	<p>Preferred Option: None stated</p> <p>Given that the lifetime of a house is between 60 – 100 years, and that ‘ they are not making any more land’ there doesn’t seem to be much point in allocating land for housing which is not delivered. It just turns into eyesores</p>
<p>Pegasus Group (obo the Foster Family, R Tinson & Son, Rooke/Potter Family and Sherbourne Family, Pegasus Group, the Schultz Family) – ref: 13538A, 13538D, 13538E, 13538F, 13538H (respectively)</p>	<p>Preferred Option: Option 2</p> <p>Considered to be the most suitable option to maintain maximum flexibility in terms of housing delivery.</p> <p>Proposed housing requirement options are not considered sufficient to positively address economic growth and affordable housing.</p>
<p>Johnson Mowat (obo Hull and East Yorkshire Hospitals NHS Trust) – ref: 20588</p>	<p>Preferred Option: Option 2</p> <p>Would welcome an extra supply to maintain flexibility in the delivery of housing needs. Could identify specific reserved sites if the Council could no longer demonstrate a five-year housing supply.</p>

<p>IB Planning (obo G Brown) – ref: 20495</p>	<p>Preferred Option: Option 2</p> <p>Would create certainty and flexibility into the Plan’s housing supply.</p>
<p>DPP (obo Peter Ward Homes, J G Hatcliffe and Partners, Sunderlandwick Farms) – ref: 12151A, 12151B, 12151C (respectively)</p>	<p>Preferred Option: Option 2</p> <p>It is important to demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply and give public confidence in the planning system as a planned system.</p> <p>Delivery is not just about identifying sufficient land it is about identifying a wide spectrum of sites and in particular sites that are attractive to the house building industry. Therefore welcome the review of existing allocations. [Commentary provided on existing Goole allocations and whether they are coming forward for development]. Lack of activity on allocated sites must cast doubt on their deliverability. Other sites in the control of housebuilders should be considered.</p> <p>Land suitable for small and medium sized housebuilders is also required, as well as for builders operating at different ends of the market.</p> <p>Delivery should not be restricted in areas such as Pocklington as development in high demand areas should also be catered for. The approach may mean no development in 20 years.</p> <p>Releasing reserved sites could for part of an action plan.</p>
<p>YoungsRPS (obo Ei Group plc) – ref: 20505</p>	<p>Preferred Option: Option 2</p> <p>Should not be limited to reserve sites. Recommend a criteria based policy that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as detailed by the NPPF, which would take effect in any case.</p>
<p>Quod (obo Beal Homes, Strata and Keepmoat) – ref: 19909A, 19909C (respectively)</p>	<p>Preferred Option: Option 2</p> <p>Option 1 is a do minimum approach. Option 2 provides greater long-term certainty concerning housing supply. It minimises the risk of planning permission being granted on unsuitable sites, due to the lack of shortfall of appropriate sites.</p> <p>It will also provide greater certainty for the local communities in terms of long-term planning for the growth of their area.</p> <p>Should not avoid allocating aspirational but achievable sites that are suitable for development now.</p>
<p>Quod (obo Taylor Megginson</p>	<p>Preferred Option: Option 2</p>

Enterprises) – ref: 19909B	Option 2 would provide ERYC, developers and communities with more certainty about long term proposals to accommodate housing growth. ERYC should not, however, avoid allocating an aspirational but achievable number of sites that are appropriate for immediate development.
Sutton upon Derwent Parish Council – ref: 20513	Preferred Option: Option 2 With strict control.
JVH Planning Consultants Ltd (obo Durdy/ Webster) – ref: 10126	Preferred Option: Option 2 Need to ensure sufficient land is available to meet requirements. Reserve sites may be necessary due to lead in times and is an appropriate response that avoids the uncertainty over land uses.
Sirius Planning (obo FCC Environment) – ref: 19889	Preferred Option: Option 2 Option 2 meets the requirement of the NPPF, paragraph 59, Also favour new settlements as this would meet long-term need for housing beyond the five-year period.
Pocklington Town Council – ref: 13492	Preferred Option: Option 2 Option 2 would suit Pocklington better as a released approach will encourage development across the East Riding rather than in one place first.
Clubleys (obo the Bray Family, TR Craven, the Henley Family, TJ Hunt, J & R Rook, Ogram, the Murr Family, the Pears Family, Sherbourne, Tinson) – ref: 15385A, 15385C, 15385D, 15385E, 15385F, 15385G, 15385H, 15385I, 15385J, 15385K (respectively)	Preferred Option: Option 2 Needs to be plan based to prevent inappropriate sites from being delivered, rather than have the sequentially next best site becoming available.
Cushman & Wakefield (obo the University of Hull) – ref: 20235	Preferred Option: Option 2 Reserve sites should be managed and issued where the Council can no longer demonstrate a five-year housing supply. Would be option most compliant with the NPPF and enable the Council to maintain a deliverable supply of housing land.

<p>A J Duke – ref: 13586</p>	<p>Preferred Option: Option 2</p> <p>Best option for the Council to defend itself from opportunistic and avaricious developers.</p> <p>Purchasing of land could be done in more socially acceptable ways. Propose the use of CPO's to cap the cost of allocated land. Legislation allows the Council to see payments so it should be in a better negotiating position for more social housing and other things such as flood alleviation schemes.</p> <p>Would like to see the Council nurture the capacity of local housebuilders so it is not just the 'big five'.</p> <p>Suggest allocating land away from Pocklington, preferably in good areas between Yapham Road and Barmby Road, or to the east of the Balk. A link road could connect to the A1079.</p>
<p>Pocklington and the Wolds Gateway Partnership – ref: 11675</p>	<p>Preferred Option: Option 2</p> <p>Pocklington currently has 5 major building sites creating disturbance and discomfort. Suggest fewer sites worked at a time, with allocations held in reserve. These could be released when allocated sites have reached approximately 75% capacity.</p>
<p>Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant (obo D Fielder) – ref: 10177</p>	<p>Preferred Option: Option 2</p> <p>Not clear if reserve sites will be upgraded to allocation sites in the Local Plan. Reserve sites could be undeveloped for many years, and be sterilised.</p> <p>Appeal decisions around the country highlights councils' inability to remedy a drop below five year housing supply. Annual updates of supply are not sensitive enough for unlocking reserve sites and often result in unsuitable sites coming forward and being approved. A suitable/workable policy on reserve sites would remedy this.</p>
<p>Thwing & Octon Parish Council – ref: 10353</p>	<p>Preferred Option: Option 2</p> <p>Would like to see the spread of developments across the county, rather than focussed areas.</p>
<p>Beverley Civic Society – ref: 19579</p>	<p>Preferred Option: Option 2</p> <p>Option 2 would appear the best policy at present, given the potential over supply according to the current NPPF calculations. It seems premature to encourage additional proposals, especially in the 'higher value' market areas that are attractive to the large housing builders. This policy reinforces the policy of maintaining the viability of smaller towns and villages.</p>

Driffield Parish Council – ref: 20594	Preferred Option: Option 2 Most sensible approach to future proof plans.
--	---

Question 6 - Are there any other issues that the Council needs to consider as part of a review of employment land and requirements?

Total number of responses: 48

Respondent	Summary of Comments
Stephenson & Son (obo The Lane Family Trust) – ref: 10167	Encourage sustainable development of employment and residential allocations.
Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant (obo D Fielder) – ref: 10177	In relation to new employment allocations, the new ELR must look more than 4 years ahead. This is not an appropriate timescale for informing employment policies or allocations in the next Local Plan. We assume that any ELR review will assess the contribution which SMS businesses, working from home and other small scale businesses make to the District's economy.
Driffield Town Council – ref: 10228 C Scarlett – ref: 20594	In Driffield, where previous large employers have closed and the land has either been left derelict for many years or has become housing. What is ERYC doing to attract employers to areas like Driffield that used to have a strong manufacturing base? Is there any sort of plan as to whether our swathes of derelict sites could be used for employment? Whilst we are aware that the land is currently under the ownership of several individuals and companies, previous ERYC planning preferences for the Driff 9 area of a supermarket development have prevented the development of any sort of on some of these sites as individuals have been pessimistic about their chances of getting individual sites passed. Can we please have some clarity?
Thwing & Octon Parish Council – ref: 10353	Allow building of small developments of say 20 houses in villages that are classed as unsustainable, but wish to grow, and have infill land that can be developed. This would have the benefit of bringing in increased services and allow existing services to grow. A lot of small villages will die without growth. Planning housing settlements only on areas that have shops, transport and supportive network is discriminatory, services such as broadband should also be taken into account.
Howden Civic Society – ref: 10396	The employment 'pull' effect of Leeds should be taken into account.
Bridlington Civic Society – ref: 10713	Bridlington has two industrial/business estates in Bessingby and Carnaby. We are aware that the East Riding and the Regeneration Partnership make positive efforts to encourage and support businesses that start up or to grow. We fully support these efforts, and consider encouraging businesses to locate to these areas has a beneficial effect on all concerned from reduction of heavy traffic in the town centre to co-ordination of travel-to-work.
Paull Parish Council – ref: 10785 Graham Shaw – ref: 16867	Clarifications relating to current Policy S6 requested and in particular that restrictions imposed by the LDO at Hedon Haven should be re-imposed by the Local Plan. Cannot find reference to how the east-west multi-modal transport corridor will come to fruition. Report from seven years ago states the A1033, A63 and M62 cannot cope with expected traffic. Building further industrial estates in Holderness will make the situation worse.

<p>A B Nicholson – ref: 20478</p> <p>A Trimm – ref: 20518</p> <p>J Windass – ref: 20519</p> <p>K Courtney – re: 20578</p> <p>R & D Jones – ref: 20579</p> <p>L Parker – ref: 20580</p> <p>W J Failey – ref: 20582</p>	<p>The requirements of Policy HAV-A should remain as written but with the addition of a buffer/open area between Saltend and Paull in part e.</p>
<p>Pocklington and Wolds Gateway Partnership – ref: 11675</p>	<p>The investment in and creation of employment in the development catchment area is important to provide jobs for the increased population and to reduce the impact on transport infrastructure that commuting creates.</p>
<p>BNP Paribas Real Estate (obo Associated British Ports) – ref: 12140</p>	<p>ABP request that the new Local Plan provides support for the future development of the Port of Goole and Humber International Enterprise Park site</p> <p>Request that the new East Riding Local Plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Allocates the Port of Goole on the Policies Map as “Existing Port Area”, “Operational Port Area” or similar in order to firmly establish the area within which port related development will be supported, both through the implementation of ABP’s Permitted Development Rights and also where planning permission or other consent is required. 2. Includes a policy linked to the allocation which supports future port related development at the Port of Goole, as well as which provides protection from potentially conflicting development (e.g. residential or other sensitive uses) around it, in order to safeguard future operations at the Port. <p>National Policy Statement for Ports (NPSP) is clear in its support for “judgments about when and where new developments might be proposed to be made on the basis of commercial factors by the port industry or port developers operating within a free market environment” (para. 3.3.1).</p> <p>ABP request that the new East Riding Local Plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Allocates the Humber International Enterprise Park site on the new Local Plan Policies Map as a Key Employment site or similar. 2. Includes a policy linked to the allocation that supports the development of the Humber International Enterprise Park site for employment uses.
<p>DPP (obo J G Hatcliffe and Partners) – ref: 12151B</p>	<p>There is always the potential for the Council to reallocate existing employment land as a key employment site or to allocate additional key employment sites. We see no need to protect all employment land and buildings though and</p>

	<p>consider that this is contrary to the NPPF.</p> <p>The employment land review should be used to inform the future employment land allocations.</p> <p>More work is needed on the types of jobs being created, how this relates to the historical situation and who is filling those jobs. It is a matter that cannot simply be dismissed.</p> <p>We agree that it is right to protect key employment sites but there are numerous employment sites and some have not come forward into development. Often the only solution is to allow a non-employment land use/or redevelopment for an alternative land use. In this regard, policy EC1 is considered to be overly restrictive and in particular sub section C, in relation to paragraph 117 of the NPPF.</p>
Pocklington Town Council – ref: 13492	To make some of the market towns more sustainable and discourage commuting extra employment land needs to be allocated next to existing industrial estates. This is particularly important for industrial estates where the existing allocations have been used.
B Cloke – ref: 13516	Drainage – especially inland from Tunstall which is in great risk of breach and would result in flooding, and contamination of fresh water drains with sea water.
Pegasus Group (obo the Foster Family) – ref: 13538A	<p>It is our view that East Riding should be aiming for higher long-term growth in employment. Job numbers in the District have been on a strong upward trajectory over the last three years, having surpassed regional and national growth levels. However, the</p> <p>Options Document notes that growth over the next few years is expected to be relatively modest. This view is based on analysis undertaken to inform the 2018-22 East Riding Economic Strategy. What it does not acknowledge is that the Strategy only looks at baseline forecasts. A "policy-on" scenario should also have been considered, showing what the impact on long-term job creation could be if major schemes such as Capitol Park Goole are developed. By not taking this issue into account, there is a real risk that the Options Document is underestimating the economic growth potential and subsequent housing need in East Riding.</p>
Pegasus Group – ref: 13538F	<p>East Riding has seen relatively strong employment growth in recent years. Employment grew between 2015 and 2017 by 4,000 jobs at a faster rate (1.5% per annum) than Yorkshire & the Humber and the UK. The employment growth figure of 2,600 for 2018-22, presented in the East Riding Economic Strategy, therefore seems unambitious.</p> <p>Significantly, a “policy-on” scenario should also have been considered, showing what the impact on long-term jobs growth could be if major employment schemes, infrastructure investment programmes etc. come forward</p> <p>It is noted that a new Employment Land Review will be prepared as part of the Plan Review and we reserve the right to comment further on this evidence base in due course.</p>
A J Duke – ref: 13586	Are there opportunities to create park and ride schemes to move commuters in buses along our trunk roads.
Johnson Mowat Planning Ltd (obo S&D Imports (Woldwide) Ltd) – ref: 14053	The key principles for consideration of future employment land requirements should be: Strategically accessible location, Proximity and accessibility to centres of population, Site characteristics to meet modern occupier requirements, Proximity to services/amenities. In terms of a forthcoming Employment Land Review, this needs to consider the following factors: The recent take-up and commitments at allocated employment land in Goole (i.e.

	Siemens, Croda), The quantum area of employment land allocation remaining in Goole, The anticipated requirement for employment land over the forthcoming plan period, The full range of employment uses i.e. industrial and storage/distribution, and the sub-sectors within these, The accommodation of businesses which require large external areas relative to building floorspace i.e. for external storage or vehicle related uses, accessibility of particular sites, accessibility of particular sites to services and amenities, and objective for economic growth and regeneration of Goole, which is driven by business investment and job creation.
City of York Council – ref: 19454	There’s potential change of economic focus arising from the proposed merger of the Leeds City Region and North Yorkshire and York Local Enterprise Partnerships and the exclusion of ERC form this merged LEP
Beverley Civic Society – ref: 19579	Clearly the authority needs to monitor the employment market closely and to build the results of the EDS into the ELR, and encourage the home/work balance to avoid the need for excessive travel to work.
ELG Town Planning (obo Westpark Living Ltd) – ref: 19637C	The role that land previously in employment use, but now vacant or derelict, might play in meeting future employment land requirements needs to be considered. In line with guidance in NPPF the Council must not seek to retain such sites in employment use where such development would be unviable and therefore unrealistic, especially where alternative higher value uses such as housing would make better and more efficient use of the land available.
R Ellison – ref: 19660	Views of local residents. Environmental considerations
Sirius Planning (obo FCC Environment) – ref: 19889	Support the preparation of a new Employment Land Review to inform the Local Plan Review. The Council should reassess all undeveloped allocated sites to determine whether they are likely to be developed by the end of the revised plan period. If a site is no longer considered to be deliverable, it should be de-allocated and replaced by an alternative allocation. The Local Plan Review should consider the vitality and economy of rural areas needed for rural communities to boost rural economic growth.
Quod (obo Taylor Megginson Enterprises) – ref: 19909	The Economic Development Strategy which aims to develop a pipeline of employment sites for growth ensuring a lack of available development sites or land is not a constraint ERYC have not yet produced an updated Employment Land Review to quantify the specific pipeline required to meet this aspirational approach. It is crucial that strategic policies set out an overall strategy for delivering an appropriate scale of industrial development, in the right locations. There has been strong take up of some sites allocated for industrial development in the ERLP, an example being at land at Kelleythorpe Industrial Estate, which is now fully committed. Megginson are able to provide evidence of further demand for employment floorspace/land in this part of the East Riding and would support a review of employment land requirements via the LPR to this end.
Stephenson & Son (obo J H Dixon & Son LLP) – ref: 20325A	Encourage sustainable development of employment and residential allocations.
Stephenson & Son (obo K, C, and J Barnes, Mile Farm	

Camping and Farm Shop) – ref: 20325B	
Pegasus Group (obo J C Cooke & Son) – ref: 20332	<p>Employment in East Riding has been on a positive trajectory since 1998. Growth over the period 2015-17 was particularly strong (growing by 1.5% - 4,000 jobs), with East Riding seeing an employment increase above the levels experienced by York, North Yorkshire and East Riding LEP, the region and the national rate of growth.</p> <p>The Economic Strategy referenced in the East Riding Local Plan Review Options Document highlights economic growth forecasts produced by the Regional Econometric Model (REM). The REM gives very modest forecasts for employment growth.</p> <p>It should be noted that the REM only gives a baseline jobs growth target for East Riding. The Strategy should consider what the impact of "policy-on" growth would be.</p> <p>Both LEP Strategic Economic They show a high level of ambition for employment growth in Yorkshire & the Humber, which doesn't feed through to the Local Plan Review Options Document. This is especially relevant when considered against the context of the modest jobs growth forecast in the East Riding Economic Strategy.</p>
Highways England – ref: 20434	The Employment Land Review should be sent to Highways England once completed. It is not in a position to comment on how the ELR is undertaken. However, a cumulative impact assessment of all the sites will need to be undertaken in relation to the Strategic Road Network and how any impacts can be mitigated.
M Robinson – ref: 20459	Refers to (paragraph?) 3.42 of the Options Consultation. This relates to the new Town Centres, Retail and Leisure Study.
Melbourne Parish Council (Cllr Tomalin) – ref: 20475	To ensure sufficient infrastructure and facilities before the development of housing.
P Davison – ref: 20477	Re- assessment of traffic impact of entire employment land.
C G Coulter - ref: 20480	Retention of flexibility to meet future, as yet unrealised, needs for employment opportunities!
IB Planning (obo G Brown) – ref: 20495	As part of the Employment Land Review it is important to consider previously developed land. Westwinds Farm, Swanland, should be considered.
A McNulty – ref: 20501	Do not develop on greenbelt.
M Smith – ref: 20502	The impact on the local road network, i believe this is not being done at present.
P Langley – ref: 20508	Use of brown field land rather than green where possible. Also open space for recreation, sufficient public transport, and local services including shops, bank/ PO, doctor, school etc.
G & K Dunn – ref: 20574	The Council need to consider the justification of a second bridge or bypass in Stamford Bridge. We consider this has not been established, and the damage caused to the local environment would be immense.
Cottingham Parish Council – ref: 20605	Appropriate industrial sites need to be allocated. There would be scope for a small industrial development in Cottingham in the North Moor area as long as sufficient infrastructure improvements were made, particularly to the

	road network.
S Cantwell – ref: 20607	Costs should be fair for local businesses so they can compete with online competitors.
Aldbrough Parish Council – ref: 20611	Aldbrough is a place where the majority of people travel to work and without a public transport link. The designated areas for building over the last few years and that are currently in the planning stage are not appropriate for sustaining the village.
Barmby Moor Parish Council – ref: 20613	We already have employment land allocated. On the Industrial Estate in Barmby Moor, there should be a preference for light industry.

Question 7 - Are there any issues that the Council needs to consider as part of a review of retail/leisure floorspace and requirements?

Total number of responses: 28

Respondent	Summary of Comments
Driffield Town Council – ref: 10228 C Scarlett – ref: 20594	Recent studies by ERYC have shown that Driffield is a popular destination for visitors mainly for shopping and the market. Whilst the town council is taking all steps to build the market, there is little we can do to ensure the empty shops in the town are filled. What can be done by ERYC to publicise the popularity of Driffield with shoppers and help ensure that retailers consider us as a viable location? Is it possible to include this in the planning?
T C Clarke – ref: 10313	There seems likely to be a lot of land currently occupied by large retail sheds becoming available for other purposes within the next 10 – 25 years. The question of transportation to and from retail and leisure facilities needs to be better planned than it has been.
Thwing and Octon Parish Council – ref: 10353	Where larger developments are planned, such as in Stamford Bridge extra retail and leisure space should be an essential part of the development plan.
Howden Civic Society – ref: 10396	Some towns e.g. Howden, Snaith and Eastrington cannot expand their retail space. Goole's retail core is dead but would benefit from a complete redesign and rebuild. If Goole is to expand by virtue of its employment increases and new housing, the retail and leisure infrastructure would need to be radically overhauled.
Bridlington Civic Society – ref: 10713	Through the Town Improvement Forum, with other like-minded voluntary groups and the Regeneration Team, we aim to create an attractive environment that will encourage new retail and leisure businesses, encourage landlords to bring upper floors back into residential use. Maintenance of the physical environment is essential to continue to attract residents and visitors alike and help expand the seasonal nature of local businesses. We await the Retail and Leisure Study with interest.
Paull Parish Council – ref: 10785 A B Nicholson – ref: 20478 W J Failey – ref: 20582	National planning policy seeks to direct retail development and other high trip generating uses to town centres as a priority. This is at odds with a reduction in Co2 emissions from cars, buses and trains. Transport and logistics particularly in Holderness is not suitable to support this and would require considerable investment in these services. The loss of major facilities in many major towns such as Post Offices needs to be looked at. It is demand that dictates need and in the South many villages have utilised a Public House spare room as a Post Office. Should look at change of use to make this type of thing easier in the East Riding.
Pocklington and the Wolds Gateway Partnership – ref: 11675	Pocklington's swimming pool is inadequate for the increased population and inadequate in terms of its size. There is no diving area. Swimming is recognised as the best all round exercise for all ages and abilities as it has little risk of injuring the individual. Pocklington does not have an all weather 3G pitch but has the population to support one. There is a willing host, prepared to manage the site, within Pocklington. Currently the winter sports clubs have no facilities to train on the very wet parts of winter when the natural pitches are waterlogged.

Hull City Council – ref: 11708	<p>The Council notes that further evidence has been commissioned to inform future floorspace required for town centre uses such as retail and leisure needs, and that a new Town Centres Retail and Leisure Study will provide recommendations for potential policy revisions in order to support the vitality and viability of centres. It is therefore difficult to comment in detail in the absence of this. The Council support a hierarchy of centres in which Hull City Centre acts as the focus for the wider city region with Centres in the East Riding sitting below this.</p> <p>Most recent evidence prepared for the Hull Local Plan and the Public Inquiry regarding development of retail floorspace at Kingswood has highlighted the reducing need for floorspace and fragility of retail and leisure development schemes within the city centre. This trend is continuing. The Council would not therefore be expecting significant retail / leisure allocations to be made within sequentially less preferable locations that could impact on Hull City Centre. In reality the Council would be surprised if any major retail allocations were designated within the Beverley and Central sub area and would be likely to object to their inclusion.</p>
DPP (obo J G Hatcliffe and Partners) – ref: 12151	<p>We have completed the stakeholder feedback forms to the Town Centres, Retail and Leisure Study, and this is submitted separately.</p>
Pocklington Town Council – ref: 13492	<p>The changes in shopping habits as more retail goes on line. Town centre uses should be restricted to commercial uses first before residential is considered. This can include office use which means that people are still working in our town centres.</p>
B Cloke – ref: 13516	<p>Transport – for villages, caravan parks, and estates into towns such as Withernsea.</p>
A J Duke – ref: 13586	<p>Business rates have to be brought down substantially if our town centres are to become viable.</p> <p>Also, as an example that I think is not unusual, the retail centre in Pocklington is changing rapidly: bars, coffee shops and restaurants are replacing what has been here.</p> <p>Since the last of the cooperative supermarket, the West End of Pocklington retail centre has low footfall and shops that close tend to stay closed for a long time. Planning at the County level should be sympathetic to improving the viability of this part of Pocklington's retail area.</p> <p>Pocklington has inadequate provision of supermarkets. A site for a new large supermarket with plenty of car parking should be investigated. This could be located adjacent to possible new housing close to the A1079 on the east of the balk or there might be room near the Hodsow Lane roundabout. This area could be valuable and be served by a shuttle service to and from the town centre.</p>
Beverley and District Civic Society – ref: 19579	<p>Town centre retail provision is important to maintain town and village vitality. Although on-line spending is on the increase, town centres provide a community function in providing a space for both retail and leisure interaction. Proposals for out-of-town retail development should be resisted; garden centres notwithstanding.</p>
Sirius Planning (obo FCC Environment) – ref: 19889	<p>It is noted that the retailing sector are fast changing environments, therefore given the lifespan of the Local Plan Review, 2039/40, it is considered that some flexibility in relation to retail and leisure floorspace should be provided within the wording of the draft policies to accommodate any variation requirements within East Riding. Policies should be drafted to take into account that new settlements will need to be self sustaining and therefore will require elements of retail and leisure within them.</p>

<p>Pegasus Group (obo J C Cooke & Son) – ref: 20332B</p>	<p>Land southwest of Mount Pleasant Farm, Beverly Road, Bishop Burton provides scope for a mixture of uses within the site to support services required currently and for additional community requirements generated from the development proposals itself.</p> <p>NPPF provides significant support for economic growth whether this is within existing settlements or in the countryside. Requested that the Local Plan Review is reflective of the NPPF in this regard and recognises that sites which are beyond settlements provide a key role in economic growth of Districts and the rural economy. There is a requirement for specific forms of leisure and retail development to be located outside of existing settlements. Planning Policy should therefore be flexible to reflect National Planning Policy and allow development where there is a demonstrated need.</p>
<p>Highways England – ref: 20434</p>	<p>Highways England would generally prefer developments to be located within sustainable locations with good access to public transport links to reduce the number of those accessing these sites by car. Highways England will need to understand the traffic impact arising at the Strategic Road Network from any developments included within the Plan both individually and cumulatively.</p>
<p>M Robinson – ref: 20459</p> <p>Melbourne Parish Council (Cllr Tomalin) – ref: 20475</p>	<p>No other issues to consider.</p>
<p>P Davison – ref: 20477</p>	<p>Impact of out of town retail centres offering free parking. Council to consider parking charge strategy.</p>
<p>P Webb – ref: 20492</p>	<p>Given the uncertainties of the retail sector the plan should encourage re-use of redundant retail spaces and try to limit new building except where there is a clear current need.</p>
<p>A McNulty – ref: 20501</p>	<p>Do not develop on green belt</p>
<p>P Langley – ref: 20508</p>	<p>Services need to be uprated and capable of handling the increased population.</p>
<p>D Hobson – ref: 20595</p>	<p>The new Town Centres Retail and Leisure study should not restrict classification of retail types to only:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "Convenience Shopping ("everyday essential items, including food, drinks, newspapers/magazines and confectionary") and 2. "Comparison Shopping" ("items not obtained on a frequent basis including clothing footwear, household and recreational goods"). <p>These categories do not reflect the wider variety of retail types that exist and which need to be recognised as necessary for the vitality of Town Centres. These include, amongst others, small specialist shops, including food shops such as green grocers, butchers, bakers; hardware; chemists; newsagents; stationary; fancy goods; clothing.</p> <p>The study should consider the needs of different parts of towns taking into account distances between shops and housing, especially where there are older and less mobile residents.</p> <p>The study should re-evaluate the distance that residents are prepared to walk, before they opt for car use. This</p>

	<p>evaluation should refer to evidence collected about actual communities. Evidence obtained from businesses in Pocklington suggests that a distance of more than 0.75 km is a deterrent, which leads to longer journeys out of town to destinations where parking is easier.</p> <p>The benefits for town centre vitality of providing retail and other town centre uses along links between supermarkets and other attractions (e.g. Burnby Hall Gardens) should be considered. The benefits for town centre vitality of permitting and encouraging town centre uses along these routes should be evaluated.</p> <p>The means by which Primary and Secondary Shopping frontages are designated should be more precisely define. Existing Primary Shopping Areas should be reassessed.</p>
S Cantwell – ref: 20607	That Towns retain a good mixture of shops and facilities and do not become overwhelmed by cafes etc
Barmby Moor Parish Council – ref: 20613	We already have employment land allocated. On the Industrial Estate in Barmby Moor, there should be a preference for light industry.

Question 8 - In relations to town centres, which option should be taken forward as part of the Local Plan review?

Option 1 - Do not identify Local Centres.

Option 2 - Identify Local Centres.

Total number of responses: 37

	Respondent
Option 1	Paull Parish Council – ref: 10785 M Teare – ref: 11450 B Cloke – ref: 13516 Melbourne Parish Council (Cllr Tomalin) – ref: 20475 C Nicholson – ref: 20476 P Davison – ref: 20477 A B Nicholson – ref: 20478 W J Failey – ref: 20582
Option 2	Halifax Estates – ref: 10099 Lockington Parish Council – ref: 10264 Bugthorpe and Kirby Underdale Parish Council – ref: 10553 Pocklington and the Wolds Gateway Partnership – ref: 11675 Pocklington Town Council – ref: 13492 Beswick Parish Council – ref: 13592 K Williams – ref: 13631 Clubleys (obo J Brosenitz) – ref: 15385 Sirius Planning (obo FCC Environment Ltd) – ref: 19889 C G Coulter – ref: 20480 J Holmes – ref: 20489 C Oliver – ref: 20490 A McNulty – ref: 20501 M Smith – ref: 20502 P Langley – ref: 20508 J Green – ref: 20541B S Cantwell – ref: 20607 Aldbrough Parish Council – ref: 20611

	Barmby Moor Parish Council – ref: 20613
--	---

Respondent	Summary of Comments
Halifax Estates – ref: 10099 Bugthorpe and Kirby Underdale Parish Council – ref: 10553	Prefers option 2. This policy would ensure a more balanced system of assessment of services provided in settlements throughout the East Riding.
T C Clarke – ref: 10313	To prosper, Anlaby needs to be identified as a local centre. Anlaby Common is a muddle which ought to be sorted (combine with Anlaby Park?)
Bridlington Civic Society – ref: 10713	We consider it important that the Local Plan support local centres in the selected villages, to ensure their long term viability, provide a quality of life to residents through the viability of all the services and to prevent them from becoming dormitory satellites to larger towns.
Paull Parish Council – ref: 10785 A B Nicholson – ref: 20478 W J Failey – ref: 20582	Option 1 Preferred Creating a system of hierarchy within Towns is not a good idea as this only goes to fuel the existing problems. Without infrastructure this is not a well thought out solution. Hedon is a complete nightmare to park in. If Towns are to be identified as local centres, then the criteria cannot just be about size. Hedon is the central focus already for most of South West Holderness. In the SA document you mentioned that this would ensure that the role of these local centres is supported and not undermined by new developments proposed in neighbouring locations. I feel that this would cause more problems for the neighbouring parish councils. The local centres as they exist today do everything they can to involve themselves in new developments in their ward. This is undemocratic, and they should have no or little say on developments proposed for neighbouring locations. They have the same right as Consultees or Objectors as everyone else. The Power should be given to the Parish Council to do what is best for their Constituents.
DPP (obo J.G. Hatcliffe and Partners) – ref: 12151	The term 'larger villages' does not appear in Policy S3, but we have assumed that it means both Rural Services Centres and Primary Villages. Given the central rural village centres can play in community life we feel that it is important that the services and facilities in the larger villages are protected by a policy in the Local Plan Review as envisaged in section 8.0 of the NPPF. Given that such centres can be loose knit it is not always possible to identify a boundary and therefore we suggest that a star would be appropriate.
A J Duke – ref: 13586	I support moves that keep small villages with a variety of services in a viable condition, but it's all a question of balance, what would be the penalty for doing this? Supporting these places should help support a sense of community, and the existence of the services should mean that at least some trips to other places need not be made.
Beverley Civic Society – ref: 19579	It is important to retain the viability of small communities. Any policy that has a negative effect should be resisted. However economic factors may lead to a need for some concentration of facilities, but access for all types of residents

	needs to be taken into account, eg public transport for the young and the elderly.
Sirius Planning (obo FCC Environment Ltd) – ref: 19889	FCC support Option 2 to identify local centres, however consider that this should be strengthened to also identify rural centres. The Local Plan Review should consider the vitality and economy of rural areas needed for rural communities to boost rural economic growth. Consideration should be given to whether there are any isolated communities which would benefit from additional growth to provide economies of scale for new infrastructure and service provision. The Local Plan Review should note that new settlements will require their own local centres.
Pegasus Group (obo J C Cooke & Son) – ref: 20332	The Local Plan Review could include and identify Local Centres as part of the plan, however any planning policy should ensure the Local Centres are considered as part of wider hierarchy. The Local Plan Review should be flexible enough to allow development outside of the centres when certain criteria have been met. This would be reflective of the approach in the NPPF.
Highways England – ref: 20434	Highways England will need to understand the traffic impact on the SRN from any town centre uses included within the Plan and whether any associated mitigation is likely to be required for the Strategic Road Network.
M Robinson – ref: 20459	Aldbrough can no longer be classed as a service centre due to the loss of most of our facilities i.e. withdrawal of bus service by EY Motor services. Decline in Agricultural jobs. The lack of job opportunities, the only jobs locally are at the Gas Caverns and Bio Mass plant, these are specialist jobs and most already taken. The lack of off street parking. The Amount of Traffic speeding through the village and parking on road junctions. ERYC are not willing to do anything about this situation. No safe place to cross the main road (Hornsea Rd) which splits the village.
Barton Willmore (obo Beal Developments Limited) – ref: 20538A Barton Willmore (obo Central Land Holdings Limited) – ref: 20538B	The designation of local centres provides a useful framework for land use planning. It can add a useful context for policy making and decision taking, linking proposed developments with neighbourhoods and their amenities.
D Hobson – ref: 20595	For reasons of sustainability the Local Plan should aim to provide main facilities, which need to be accessed on a frequent basis, close to housing. New housing away from such facilities should be viewed as NOT SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT, unless useable and convenient means of travel to access the facilities is available.

Question 9 - Are there any issues that the Council should consider when providing guidance on the mix of new housing development?

Total number of responses: 68

Respondent	Summary of Comments
<p>Pegasus Group (obo Living by Ispace Limited, Duchy Homes Ltd, Foster Family, R Tinson & Son c/o Clubleys, Schultz Family, S Goodwin, J C Cooke & Son, S&J Draper, J&S Coates, A&S Crozier and A&J Foster, R Stockbridge and Hogarth (Construction) Ltd, Evison Farmers, Evison Farmers and Mr & Mrs Marshall) – ref: 10045A, 10045C, 13538A, 13583D, 13538H, 20332A, 20332B, 20332D, 20348A, 20496A, 20496B (respectively)</p> <p>Redrow Homes Ltd – ref: 20509</p>	<p>Noted that council is collating housing mix requirement evidence. Reserve the right to comment further if and when a policy is drafted.</p>
<p>Halifax Estates - ref: 10099</p> <p>Bugthorpe and Kirby Underdale Parish Council – ref: 10553</p>	<p>Stringent conditions on developers to ensure that housing mix caters for needs of the market and not the maximisation of profits.</p>
<p>Stephenson & Son (obo Lane Family Trust, J H Dixon & Son LLP, Mile Farm Camping and Farm Shop) – ref: 10167A, 20325A, 20325B (respectively)</p>	<p>Mix of house types on larger sites.</p>

Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant (obo D Fielder) – ref: 10177	‘One size fits all’ housing mix policy approach is not appropriate for rural East Riding settlements of differing characters. Policy should be flexible to allow for varying housing mix and density in different settlements.
Driffield Town Council – ref: 10228 C Scarlett – ref: 20594	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Driffield - majority new builds expensive, three/four detached homes (median price £323,000). Lack of two/three bedroom affordable homes (17 of 88 homes for sale less than £150,000). • Two bedroom affordable homes required. Affordable housing need in Driffield not currently addressed. • Inform Town/Parish Councils of affordable housing mix for each development. • Don’t determine housing mix by market forces – introduce stronger policy/Council build homes itself.
T C Clarke – ref: 10313	The deficiencies of the SHMAs are at last becoming apparent. The concept seems to require revisiting/revising/abandoning.
Thwing and Octon Parish Council – ref: 10353	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listen to residents and parish councils in regards to mix needed. • Affordable housing, social housing, housing for older people, and accommodation for rural workers should be considered.
Hutton Cranswick Parish Council – ref: 10478	Smaller properties required on shared ownership/rental basis for first time buyers and older people.
Bridlington and District Civic Society – ref: 10713	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordable housing required in Bridlington – need for starter homes and family homes for younger people. • Smaller, cheaper houses sold as second-homes/converted to holiday lets reducing affordable housing availability. • Support the delivery of smaller dwellings and reduction of four/five bed dwellings.
Paull Parish Council – ref: 10785	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing for young professionals – retain workforce and attract businesses. • Clear policies to identify housing mix requirements between Hull and East Riding. • Affordable homes required – work with housing associations and meet actual housing needs based on robust evidence. • Promote new build schemes to under-occupiers (those living in homes that exceed their needs) e.g. older people, to release larger family homes. • Promote affordable housing schemes e.g. help to buy and shared ownership.
J Abraham – ref: 11407 North Ferriby Parish Council – ref: 20573	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocations near to facilities to be explicit in providing older people housing where need is identified. • Older people housing required to avoid unsustainable demand on social/residential care and to free up larger family homes reducing need to build new three-five bedroom houses. • Currently existing housing stock not becoming available in sufficient quantity so families no choice but to buy large new houses.
Michael Glover LLP (obo Great Gutter Lane Kirkella Collaboration) – ref: 11598	Important consideration that house building is market driven and markets can change quickly, developers must have confidence in investing land, construction cost and sales. Flexible policy approach required as rigidity will stifle investment.

Pocklington and the Wolds Gateway Partnership – ref: 11675	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good mix of housing types and sizes required. Include smaller dwellings such as flats, and two-three bedroom bungalows and houses. • Affordable homes for first time buyers.
Hull City Council – ref: 11708	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current policy encourages higher proportion of three+ bedroom houses. However, high proportion of affordable housing should not be more than two bedrooms. • Need to balance range of house types to meet identified needs and market demands. Supports approach to specifying percentage ranges for house sizes by number of bedrooms.
DPP (obo Peter Ward Homes, J.G. Hatcliffe and Partners, Sunderlandwick Farms) – ref: 12151A, 12151B, 12151C (respectively)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy to require percentage of dwelling types would be difficult to achieve sensibly and would not create a balanced mix that integrates into existing communities or produce well designed schemes. • Existing Local Plan policy (H1) is sound and should remain unchanged. • Any housing mix policy should be flexible unlike rigid requirements in the current SHMA. • Not all older people require bungalows, market housing provides sufficient accommodation for the elderly (smaller houses, flats).
Pocklington Town Council – ref: 13492	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two bed starter homes (semi-detached or terraced) required and less four/five bed detached properties. • Flexible housing design that can adapt for the less mobile.
A J Duke – ref: 13586	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current lack of variety in new housing, cramped, small gardens with inadequate parking (Pocklington example). Attractive frontages, houses stood back from roads and two-three parking spaces per house required. • Community led housing to be increased across East Riding to provide small sites of affordable/low cost homes in villages. Local housing for local people of great value.
I Reid – ref: 13592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordable housing required to buy/rent as starter homes and bungalows for older people downsizing (sufficient bedrooms for visitors). • House extensions reducing number of small (two/three bedroom), affordable homes available in villages. Socio-economic class of villages subsequently rising, reducing diversity and availability of affordable homes for local people. • Provision of well-designed terraced housing (serried ranks of Victorian housing unacceptable and unnecessary). Not to be confined to affordable housing, especially in larger settlements. • Consider modular, factory built housing that caters for changing families and demand through addition and removal of compartments.
K Williams – ref: 13631	Smaller, affordable homes required. Molescroft developments consist of overpriced, large houses.
Beverley and District Civic Society – ref: 19579	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Smaller units required (two/three bedroom) for first time buyers and older people. • Affordable housing required. • UK lowest floor space standards in Europe, should be increased to improve healthy living.
ID Planning (obo Hallam Land	Housing mix should be encouraged. Policy should not be prescriptive as size of site and housing need of area will

Management) – ref: 19686	determine suitable mix.
Indigo Planning (obo J Healey c/o Stadium City Developments, Stadium (Vicar Lane) Ltd, Stadium Developments Ltd and Wykeland) – ref: 19892A, 19892B, 19892C (respectively)	Identified local housing needs in the SHMA not being met. Suggests additional sites are required that can deliver a mix of housing, including smaller properties, to offer wider choice and competition in the market. A specific housing mix requirement policy would be onerous, a flexible policy approach should be incorporated so each site can be determined on its own merits.
Tickton and Routh Parish Council – ref: 20458	Smaller houses required.
M Robinson – ref: 20459	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two bed, terraced housing built in Aldbrough with inadequate parking and open/play space. Larger detached and semi-detached bungalows required for older people to downsize. This will release three and four bedroom family homes required by local young families. • Mix of house types required across East Riding, not just in certain affluent areas. • Developers not contributing to the Parish for local facilities (e.g. s106).
R Ellison – ref: 19660	Ensure a higher percentage of affordable housing.
Sirius Planning (obo FCC Environment) – ref: 19889	Consider need for sheltered/care home accommodation for older people as highlighted in SHMA (2016) pages 127 and 189 and in line with paragraph 20 of the NPPG. 20594
Home Builders Federation – ref: 20120	Overly prescriptive policy could compromise/stall housing delivery. Flexible policy approach required that; recognises need and demand varies in different areas and on different sites, ensures a scheme is viable and provides an appropriate mix of house types, sizes and tenures.
Barton Willmore (obo Barratt David Wilson Homes (Yorkshire East)) – ref: 20309	Noted that lack of two-three bed homes being delivered since Local Plan was adopted. However, housing mix policy must continue to acknowledge market forces and viability will dictate suitable housing mix and this should not be removed from any future policy.
Gladman Developments Ltd – ref: 20361	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flexible housing mix policy requirements – site specific/locality issues that may affect viability. • SHMA not to be taken at face value – likely only considers needs of future residents (unless existing issues with variation of housing stock). • Housing needs evidence to be kept up to date. SHMA to be updated as part of Local Plan review. • Consider market demand (house prices and sales rates). Failure to consider market signals could result in worsening affordability and harming effectiveness of Local Plan.
Melbourne Parish Council (Cllr Tomalin) – ref: 20475	Establish the correct level of low cost housing requirements.
C Nicholson – ref: 20476	Affordable housing required in smaller villages.

<p>A B Nicholson – ref: 20478</p> <p>A Trimm – ref: 20518</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordable homes required – work with housing associations and meet actual housing needs based on robust evidence. • Promote new build schemes to under-occupiers (those living in homes that exceed their needs) e.g. older people, to release larger family homes. • Provide student accommodation to release pressure on potential family homes. • Ensure suitable housing mix in housing estate regeneration projects. • Promote affordable housing schemes e.g. help to buy and shared ownership.
<p>C G Coulter – ref: 20480</p>	<p>Identify percentage ranges for house sizes to increase proportion of two and three bed properties for older people and first time buyers – homes suited to the needs of the East Riding.</p>
<p>C Oliver - 20490</p>	<p>Mix of house types required – two and three bed properties, bungalows and affordable housing. Affordable housing for local people so they can stay in the places they grew up. Smaller properties for older people to downsize, releasing larger properties onto the market.</p>
<p>P Webb – ref: 20492</p>	<p>Smaller homes required for first time buyers and older people downsizing.</p>
<p>A McNulty – ref: 20501</p>	<p>Comments irrelevant to Q9 and summarised under Q18.</p>
<p>D and L Crosby – ref: 20517</p>	<p>Provide a range of housing for the community in particular the growing elderly population.</p>
<p>Barton Willmore (obo Central Land Holdings Limited) – ref: 20538B</p>	<p>Flexible policy approach required – sites to be determined on a case-by-case basis on their own merits and market considerations at the time.</p> <p>Policy requiring percentage ranges of various house sizes/types would be overly prescriptive and hinder delivery and completion numbers (including affordable housing).</p>
<p>J Green – ref: 20541</p>	<p>Smaller two/three bedroom properties and bungalows required.</p>
<p>Preston Parish Council – ref: 20551</p>	<p>Adequate parking provision for all new developments – minimum of two spaces, and three-four spaces for larger four-five bedroom properties.</p>
<p>Howden Town Council – ref: 20568</p>	<p>Concern poor quality of housing is being delivered - to be addressed and enforced.</p>
<p>Melbourne Parish Council (Cllr Cooper) – ref: 20581</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stringent conditions to ensure only appropriate housing mix provided. • Smaller two-three bedroom houses required.
<p>ID Planning (obo Keyland Developments Ltd) – ref: 20585</p>	<p>A mix of housing types should be encouraged, including bungalows for older people. However, the Council should be careful not to affect the viability of developments through stringent percentage targets.</p>
<p>Johnson Mowat (obo Hull and East Yorkshire Hospitals NHS Trust) – ref: 20588</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supportive of a non-prescriptive, flexible housing mix policy to allow for local variances. • Viability and the cumulative effects of other policy requirements to be considered when establishing housing mix requirements. • Welcome Council’s proposal new housing schemes must reflect on market demand and issues of viability.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage ranges need to be based on evidence of need and demand.
S Cantwell - 20607	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Take into account views of Parish Councils • Mix of sizes required - 4+ bedroom houses and bungalows needed, too many small 1-2 beds.
Aldbrough Parish Council – ref: 20611	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ask Parish Council what is needed. Direct link to residents. • Larger properties required for young families, smaller properties (bungalows) required for older people downsizing (will free up family homes). • Blanket 'one size fits all' approach not suitable. Listen to local people not central Government.
Barmby Moor Parish Council – ref: 20613	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordable homes required. • 2 and 3 bedroom houses and bungalows required. • Sensibly sized rooms, gardens, green spaces and play areas.

Question 10 - In relation to housing standards, which option(s) should be taken forward as part of the Local Plan review?

Option 1 - Do not introduce specific standards for new housing and rely on existing design policies in the Local Plan and NPPF.

Option 2 - Seek to introduce the Government's technical standards and the Building for Life approach to design as a requirement of new housing development to meet the specific needs of the East Riding?

Total number of responses: 75

	Respondent
Option 1	Directions Planning Consultancy Ltd (obo M Brooks, M Dobson and L Garton, Goulden/Sweeting Farmers, J D Goulden) – ref: 11328A, 11328B, 11328C (respectively) Michael Glover LLP (obo Great Gutter Lane Kirkella Collaboration) – ref: 11598 DPP (obo Peter Ward Homes, J.G. Hatcliffe and Partners) – ref: 12151A, 12151B (respectively) ELG Town Planning (obo Chablis Associates Ltd, Manor Property Group, Westpark Living Ltd) – ref: 19637A, 19637B, 19637C (respectively) ID Planning (obo Hallam Land Management) – ref: 19686 Sirius Planning (obo FCC Environment) – ref: 19889 Home Builders Federation – ref: 20120 Cushman and Wakefield (obo University of Hull) – ref: 20235 Barton Willmore (obo Barratt David Wilson Homes (Yorkshire East), Beal Homes and Central Land Holdings Limited) – ref: 20309, 20538A, 20538B (respectively) Gladman Developments Ltd – ref: 20361 R W Elliott and Co – ref: 20472 C Nicholson – ref: 20476 J Holmes – ref: 20489 A McNulty – 20501 Johnson Mowat (obo Hull and East Yorkshire Hospitals NHS Trust) – ref: 20588 D Hobson – ref: 20595
Option 2	Halifax Estates - ref: 10099 Stephenson & Son (obo 'Lane Family Trust', 'J H Dixon & Son LLP' and 'Mile Farm Camping and Farm Shop') – ref: 10167A, 20325A and 20325B (respectively) Lockington Parish Council (Cllr Clarke) – ref: 10264 T C Clarke – ref: 10313 Howden Civic Society – ref: 10396

	<p>Bugthorpe and Kirby Underdale Parish Council – ref: 10553 Bridlington and District Civic Society – ref: 10713 J Abraham – ref: 11407 M Teare – ref: 11450 Pocklington and the Wolds Gateway Partnership – ref: 11675 Hull City Council – ref: 11708 Pocklington Town Council – ref: 13492 B Cloke – ref: 13516 A J Duke – ref: 13586 I Reid – ref: 13592 K Williams – ref: 13631 Beverley and District Civic Society – ref: 19579 Melbourne Parish Council (Cllr Tomalin) – ref: 20475 P Davison – ref: 20477 C G Coulter – ref: 20480 C Oliver – ref: 20490 P Webb – ref: 20492 M Smith – ref: 20502 P Langley – ref: 20508 D and L Crosby – ref: 20517 J Green – ref: 20541 North Ferriby Parish Council – ref: 20573 Melbourne Parish Council (Cllr Cooper) – ref: 20581 Rural Housing Enabler – ref: 20589 Cottingham Parish Council – ref: 20605 S Cantwell – 20607</p>
--	--

Respondent	Summary of Comments
<p>Directions Planning Consultancy Ltd (obo M Brooks, M Dobson and L Garton, Goulden/Sweeting Farmers, J D Goulden) – ref: 11328A, 11328B, 11328C</p>	<p>Option 1 preferred:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compliant with NPPF – no need to increase requirements and development cost. • Building for Life is good practice and should already be incorporated into decision making process. Existing policies in Local Plan should intend to promote same principles. • Object Option 2 – increases development cost without long term benefits as incorporated adaptations at build

(respectively)	stage can be removed. Internal spaces can be adapted without planning permission. Building regulations require wheelchair accessibility and adaptations, no need for duplication in policy.
Michael Glover LLP (obo Great Gutter Lane Kirkella Collaboration) – ref: 11598	Option 1 preferred: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good design and energy efficient important considerations. However, delivery of houses (i.e. viability) is crucial consideration. • House building market driven, developers must have confidence in land investment, construction cost and sales. Flexible policy approach required as rigidity will stifle investment.
DPP (obo Peter Ward Homes, J.G. Hatcliffe and Partners) – ref: 12151A and 12151B (respectively)	Option 1 preferred: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NPPG states evidence required to determine need for and justify accessibility or space standard policies - Council currently has no evidence. • People live longer and want to remain in own homes – catered for through building regulations (no evidence to suggest this is not achieved through building regulations). • Approximately 25% of existing housing stock bungalows. • Need for extra care facilities (can be provided on larger sites) rather than accessible homes. • Internal space standards vary between house builders – ‘one fits all’ policy could adversely affect range and choice of properties available. • Introduction of national internal space standards could; impact on meeting demand for starter homes and discount for sale homes by increasing sale cost, adversely affect flagship Government policy, increase building costs, affect viability in certain locations and reduce number of affordable units delivered. Overall, adversely affect delivery of affordable homes that are needed. • Building for Life further obstacle for achieving planning permission – unnecessary duplication of Design and Access Statements and current Local Plan policies.
ELG Town Planning (obo Chablis Associates Ltd, Manor Property Group, Westpark Living Ltd) – ref: 19637A, 19637B and 19637C (respectively)	Option 1 preferred: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council do not yet have evidence to support space, accessibility or adaptability standards for new housing. • More appropriately addressed via building regulations.
Sirius Planning (obo FCC Environment) – ref: 19889	Option 1 preferred: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High proportion of elderly residents in East Riding with specific accessibility needs. • Range of homes should be provided to encourage downsizing and the release of larger family homes. • Not necessary to introduce a Building for Life design requirement.
Home Builders Federation – ref: 20120	Option 1 preferred: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local needs can be met without optional housing standards policy.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Optional housing standards can negatively impact viability, affordability and choice for customers. • Consider implications on viability and deliverability of market and affordable housing. • PPG sets out type of evidence required – Council requires robust justifiable evidence to introduce any optional housing standard policy and PPG criteria must be applied. • Support provision of homes to suit needs of older people and disabled people. However, local assessment evidencing need in the East Riding required. If housing standard policy is adopted a suitable transition period should be included. • PPG sets out other policy requirements including; consideration of site specific factors (e.g. flooding and topography) and that policies for wheelchair access homes should only be applied to dwellings where LPA is responsible for allocating/nominating a person to live there.
Cushman and Wakefield (obo University of Hull) – ref: 20235	<p>Option 1 preferred:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site specific standards too prescriptive and can affect viability and delivery. • Acknowledged standards ensure appropriate level of amenity for future development but meeting standards not always feasible e.g. conversions of existing buildings. • Existing design policies and supplementary guidance is sufficient in providing appropriate standards for new development.
Barton Willmore (obo Barratt David Wilson Homes (Yorkshire East)) – ref: 20309	<p>Option 1 preferred:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robust evidence required to justify increase in minimum space standards and demonstrate it is financially viable. • Question whether there is sufficient justification or evidence to introduce such policy at present. • Client only major housebuilder committed to applying 12 principles of BFL to all developments therefore sufficient scope in existing policy to secure high quality design.
Gladman Developments Ltd – ref: 20361	<p>Option 1 preferred:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In compliance with PPG, robust and justifiable evidence would be needed to introduce housing standards under Option 2. • Optional building standard can impact development cost, implication on viability should be tested through Local Plan Viability Assessment.
Johnson Mowat (obo Hull and East Yorkshire Hospitals NHS Trust) – ref: 20588	<p>Option 1 preferred:</p> <p>Concerns of impact on viability if Government’s technical standards introduced. Local needs can be met without optional housing standards.</p>
D Hobson – ref: 20595	<p>Option 1 preferred:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reject Option 2 • Additional costs for all new homes to allow future adaptation will reduce number of available affordable homes. • Government to decide acceptable standards – room size and parking provision to be improved.
Halifax Estates - ref: 10099	<p>Option 2 preferred:</p>

Bugthorpe and Kirby Underdale Parish Council – ref: 10553	Introduction of technical standards desirable but inevitably this will increase housing costs.
Howden Civic Society – ref: 10396	Option 2 preferred: Developers will not provide extra standards unless forced to. Has the Council the stomach for forcing developers to do anything?
Bridlington and District Civic Society – ref: 10713	Option 2 preferred: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BFL will provide independent, long term residency and increase standard of house builds across UK. • UK has some of the smallest, inflexible housing in Europe due to land pressures and need for profit. • All new builds to incorporate solar panels to reduce reliance on fossil fuels.
J Abraham – ref: 11407 North Ferriby Parish Council – ref: 20573	Option 2 preferred: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Older people housing required - near to facilities, to avoid unsustainable demand on social/residential care and to free up larger family homes reducing need to build new three-five bedroom houses. • Currently existing housing stock not becoming available in sufficient quantity so families no choice but to buy large new houses.
Pocklington and the Wolds Gateway Partnership – ref: 11675	Option 2 preferred: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All houses to accommodate the infirm whether residents or visitors. • Adaptable house designs for future modifications.
Hull City Council – ref: 11708	Option 2 preferred: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subject to viability the East Riding should push to achieve high standards in design of housing. • Hull City Council have adopted national space standards that vary across market value zones and adopted a policy requiring development to be designed to Building for Life principles (including provision of accessible, adaptable and wheelchair user dwellings).
Pocklington Town Council – ref: 13492	Option 2 preferred: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing will be more flexible and adaptable to East riding demographic. • Single storey dwelling for older people. • Bedrooms currently too small for single beds. • Sufficient parking per dwelling – garages to be used for cars not house extensions.
A J Duke – ref: 13586	Option 2 preferred: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developers not building suitable houses in Pocklington – small bedrooms and no garages to accommodate even a small car. • BFL will pay back over time.
I Reid – ref: 13592	Option 2 preferred:

	All housing (affordable or otherwise) to be futuristic. Includes energy efficiency, local/domestic energy generation, flood proofing (in all areas due to uncertainty of run-off and intense rainfall associated with climate change) and high-quality design.
Beverley and District Civic Society – ref: 19579	Option 2 preferred: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accessible/adaptable homes - independent living for older/less mobile people. • Zero energy efficient homes - tackle climate change crisis and meet higher sustainability and environmental standards. Design features including insulation, glazing and green energy generation. • Facilities for interaction e.g. safe zones with no car access, play areas, community facilities and pedestrian travel to schools. • Consider Government’s ‘Building Better, Building Beautiful’ Commission to improve design quality and community engagement in planning development and give more consideration to local character.
Melbourne Parish Council (Cllr Tomalin) – ref: 20475	Option 2 preferred: Requirement to include state-of-the-art energy control saving technology.
C G Coulter – ref: 20480	Option 2 preferred: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BFL will allow extended occupation into old age. • High quality construction to last in future.
P Webb – ref: 20492	Option 2 preferred: Given demographics, sensible to provide development suitable for adaptation in future.
P Langley – ref: 20508	Option 2 preferred: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New housing should meet needs of older people.
Rural Housing Enabler – ref: 20589	Option 2 preferred: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be a clear commitment to meeting Government’s technical standards as long as evidence is provided to demonstrate viability.
S Cantwell - 20607	Option 2 preferred: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All new homes should be accessible to all. • Rooms to be decent, functional size. Bedrooms should be able to fit a bed as a minimum.
Pegasus Group (obo Living by Ispace Limited, Duchy Homes Ltd, Foster Family, R Tinson & Son c/o Clubleys, Rooke/Potter and Sherbourne Families c/o Clubleys, S Goodwin, J C Cooke & Son, S&J Draper, J&S Coates, A&S	No preferred option stated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted the Council are considering introducing housing standards. • In compliance with NPPG, the Council need robust and justifiable evidence to introduce housing standards under Option 2 taking account of need, viability and transitional timing.

<p>Crozier and A&J Foster, R Stockbridge and Hogarth (Construction) Ltd, Evison Farmers, Evison Farmers and Mr & Mrs Marshall) – ref: 10045A, 10045C, 13538A, 13583D, 13538E, 20332A, 20332B, 20332D 20348A, 20496A, 20496B (respectively)</p> <p>Redrow Homes Ltd – ref: 20509</p>	
<p>Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant (obo D Fielder) – ref: 10177</p>	<p>No preferred option stated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National space standards fluctuated over years – 1 bed accommodation required by LPAs, RPs and those in housing need but can be difficult to let/sell in fluctuating market. • Building for Life (BFL) style housing more expensive than non-BFL housing – reasonable to require proportion of BFL housing on sites larger than 10 dwellings. • Increase percentage of BFL housing on larger sites at each subsequent Local Plan review. • Sites of 10 or fewer dwellings are usually built by SME ‘local’ builders to a semi-bespoke specification who can modify standards to meet disability/age related needs of customers.
<p>Driffield Town Council – ref: 10228</p> <p>C Scarlett – ref: 20594</p>	<p>No preferred Option stated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong evidence of need required to enforce Building for Life Standard as minimum (not just age demographic as being challenged in court by House Builders Associations). • Enforce wheelchair accessible standards for new homes and facilities – wheelchair users comprise around 2% of population and cannot currently access basic facilities in majority of houses. • Driffield - lack of accessible market and social housing for visitors and residents (nearly 40% don’t meet ‘visitable’ standards and no houses for sale meet need of wheelchair users) e.g. steps into bungalows and level entrance WCs too small for wheelchairs. • Disabled people include all ages - the elderly, working age and younger (not just older people). • UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities houses need to allow disabled parents to take full part in family life (virtually no houses allow this currently).
<p>Thwing and Octon Parish Council – ref: 10353</p>	<p>No preferred option stated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renewable energy technology as standard for all new housing.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximum insulation to allow changes in building regulations. • Adequate parking spaces and roadside parking. • Design in-keeping with local area. • Adequate sized rooms to adapt to lifestyle changes. • Heating systems take account of climate change and running costs. • Green spaces on large developments.
<p>Quod (obo Beal Homes, Strata Homes and Keepmoat) – ref: 19909A, 19909C (respectively)</p>	<p>No preferred option stated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence there is an identified need for accessible and/or adaptable housing or justifiable need for an internal space standard in line with NPPF (2018) paragraph 127(f) and Footnote 46. • Unless evidence produced policy would be unjustified and unsound. • Do not curtail delivery through overly prescriptive policies.
<p>Barmby Moor Parish Council – ref: 20613</p>	<p>No preferred Option stated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need more information on the Building For Life Approach.

Question 11 - In relation to the housing requirement for the East Riding, which option should be taken forward as part of the Local Plan review?

Option 1 - Do not allocate or introduce a specific policy for self- and custom-build. Instead, allow the market to bring forward appropriate windfall sites using the existing policy framework for residential development.

Option 2 - Allocate specific sites, and/or introduce a specific policy, to provide for self-/custom-build housing in areas of greatest need.

Option 3 - Establish that a certain proportion of a larger allocated site should be made available for self-/custom-build housing.

Total number of responses: 62

	Respondents
Option 1	Halifax Estates - ref: 10099 JVH Planning Consultants Ltd (obo Mmes Durdy/Webster) – ref: 10126 Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant (obo D Fielder) – ref: 10177 Lockington Parish Council (Cllr Clarke) – ref: 10264 Howden Civic Society – ref: 10396 Bugthorpe and Kirby Underdale Parish Council – ref: 10553 M Teare – ref: 11450 Michael Glover LLP (obo Great Gutter Lane Kirkella Collaboration) – ref: 11598 Pocklington and the Wolds Gateway Partnership – ref: 11675 DPP (obo Peter Ward Homes, J.G. Hatcliffe and Partners, Sunderlandwick Farms) – ref: 12151A, 12151B and 12151C (respectively) B Cloke – ref: 13516 I Reid – ref: 13592 K Williams – ref: 13631 ELG Town Planning (obo Chablis Associates Ltd) – ref: 19637A Sirius Planning (obo FCC Environment) – ref: 19889 Indigo Planning (obo J Healey c/o Stadium City Developments, Stadium (Vicar Lane) Ltd, Stadium Developments Ltd and Wykeland) – ref: 19892A, 19892B, 19892C (respectively) Barton Willmore (obo Barratt David Wilson Homes (Yorkshire East), Beal Homes, Central Land Holdings Limited) – ref: 20309, 20538A, 20538B (respectively) Stephenson & Son (obo J H Dixon & Son LLP and Mile Farm Camping and Farm Shop) – ref 20325A and 20325B Gladman Developments Ltd – ref: 20361

	<p>George F White (obo Mr Bayston and Mr Senior) – ref: 20376 R W Elliott and Co – ref: 20472 Melbourne Parish Council (Cllr Tomalin) – ref: 20475 C Oliver - 20490 M Smith – ref: 20502 Redrow Homes Ltd – ref: 20509 Johnson Mowat (obo Hull and East Yorkshire Hospitals NHS Trust) – ref: 20588</p>
Option 2	<p>Stephenson & Son (obo Lane Family Trust) – ref: 10167A Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant (obo D Fielder) – ref: 10177 Michael Glover LLP (obo Great Gutter Lane Kirkella Collaboration) – ref: 11598 A J Duke – ref: 13586 Beverley and District Civic Society – ref: 19579 ELG Town Planning (obo Chablis Associates Ltd) – ref: 19637A C G Coulter – ref: 20480 J Holmes – ref: 20489 P Webb – ref: 20492 YoungsRPS (obo Ei Group Plc) – ref: 20505 J Green – ref: 20541 Rural Housing Enabler – ref: 20589 Cottingham Parish Council – ref: 20605 S Cantwell – 20607 Aldbrough Parish Council – ref: 20611 Barmby Moor Parish Council – ref: 20613</p>
Option 3	<p>T C Clarke – ref: 10313 A J Duke – ref: 13586 Beverley and District Civic Society – ref: 19579 M Robinson – ref: 20459 P Davison – ref: 20477 C G Coulter – ref: 20480 P Webb – ref: 20492 A McNulty – 20501 Rural Housing Enabler – ref: 20589 D Hobson – ref: 20595 Cottingham Parish Council – ref: 20605</p>

Respondent	Summary of Comments
<p>Halifax Estates - ref: 10099</p> <p>Bugthorpe and Kirby Underdale Parish Council – ref: 10553</p>	<p>Option 1 preferred:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should not allocate self-build sites as there may not be demand. • Flexible approach should be adopted to bring forward high quality self-build houses.
<p>JVH Planning Consultants Ltd (obo Mmes Durdy/Webster) – ref: 10126</p>	<p>Option 1 preferred: Plan should be sufficiently flexible to allow for sites to come forward to meet need for self-build.</p>
<p>Howden Civic Society – ref: 10396</p>	<p>Option 1 preferred:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concept of people wanting to design and build their own home is at odds with the Council dictating where/how these should be built. • Option 3 could result in undeveloped sections of sites as no-one has chosen to self-build there. • Use existing policy framework.
<p>DPP (obo Peter Ward Homes, J.G. Hatcliffe and Partners, Sunderlandwick Farms) – ref: 12151A, 12151B, 12151C (respectively)</p>	<p>Option 1 preferred:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-build register small number (22). • Agree with paragraph 3.52 of Options Document. • SHLAA (position at 1 April 2017) shows considerable number of windfall sites permitted and built each year – ample opportunity for self/custom build housing in East Riding.
<p>Sirius Planning (obo FCC Environment) – ref: 19889</p>	<p>Option 1 preferred:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Viability of self-build development varies depending on nature of site. Specific policy/allocations therefore not necessary. • Decisions to be made on case-by-case basis. • Housing policy should state that delivery of housing through windfall sites will be supported in line with Paragraph 68 of the NPPF.
<p>Indigo Planning (obo J Healey c/o Stadium City Developments, Stadium (Vicar Lane) Ltd, Stadium Developments Ltd and Wykeland) – ref: 19892A, 19892B, 19892C (respectively)</p>	<p>Support Option 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wide choice of housing required to meet needs of population. • 22 on self-build register not significant enough to trigger need for Option 3. • Option 3 would further reduce amount of market housing delivered on sites in addition to affordable housing requirements. Could impact viability and deliverability.

Gladman Developments Ltd – ref: 20361	<p>Option 1 preferred:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-build register evidence of need is light touch and lacks robustness - 22 residents on register indicates low level of interest. • Provision of self-build on large strategic sites is not suitable or effective means of addressing demand. Unclear how it would work taking account of complex delivery, infrastructure requirements, phasing, health and safety and security issues. • Unlikely residents on self-build register interested in plots on larger sites. Smaller, quieter locations preferred. • Register is basic and does not include preference for location/type of site. Unknown where self-builders wish to build/live. Significant issue for Council when considering self-build locations.
Barton Willmore (obo Barratt David Wilson Homes (Yorkshire East)) – ref: 20309	<p>Option 1 preferred:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 22 self-build plots identified on register can be provided by windfall sites. • Option 3 opposed – private parties on developer sites would cause delivery and cashflow issues. Unclear how Section 106 and CIL contributions could be calculated and who is responsible for paying these. Uncertainty who is responsible for discharging planning conditions. • Question Council’s evidence of demand for self-build plots within major housing developments.
Johnson Mowat (obo Hull and East Yorkshire Hospitals NHS Trust) – ref: 20588	<p>Option 1 preferred:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of evidence Self Build Register suggests sites are required within larger housing sites. • Oppose policy requiring self/custom build proportion on larger allocations – would prevent comprehensive development. • If design consistency requirements were imposed on larger sites this would be unattractive to self/custom builders. • Would cause construction management complications, increased risk/liabilities and reduced efficiency.
M Robinson – ref: 20459	<p>Option 3 preferred:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listen to Parish council they know what is required.
D Hobson – ref: 20595	<p>Option 3 preferred:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Downside to Option 3 it will reduce number of affordable homes that can be subsidised by new housing developments.
Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant (obo D Fielder) – ref: 10177	<p>Options 1 and 2 preferred:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Combine Options 1 and 2 – allocate specific self-build sites in areas of greatest need combined with policy to encourage self-build on windfall or wider allocated sites. • Small allocations for self-build (less than 10 dwellings) to avoid protracted construction periods and impact on neighbours.
ELG Town Planning (obo Chablis Associates Ltd) – ref:	<p>Support Options 1 or 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 3 not practicable.

19637A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual site allocations suitable although Council should not hold onto unrealistic development expectation on such sites in absence of demand as this could prejudice wider housing objectives. • Allocate small sites for housing with self/custom build as an option available.
A J Duke – ref: 13586	<p>Options 2 and 3 preferred:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1 not so good – current approach means self-build opportunities are near non-existent. • Options 2 and 3 worth trying – trial this approach for a period of time in a particular region before developing policy further. • If other evidence favours an option then this should have more investment.
Beverley and District Civic Society – ref: 19579	<p>Options 2 and 3 preferred:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote self-build opportunities. • Encourage community-led housing. • Encourage sustainable modular building systems with energy efficient construction.
P Webb – ref: 20492	<p>Options 2 and 3 preferred: Self-build and cooperative building more likely if policies encourage creation of sites rather than relying on windfall.</p>
Rural Housing Enabler – ref: 20589	<p>Options 2 and 3 preferred: Consider affordable self-build through subsidised/low value land on rural exception sites – similar to successful policies progressed in East Lindsey and Shropshire.</p>
Pegasus Group (obo Duchy Homes Ltd, J C Cooke & Son, S&J Draper, J&S Coates, A&S Crozier and A&J Foster, Evison Farmers, Evison Farmers and Mr & Mrs Marshall) – ref: 10045C, 20332B, 20332D, 20496A, 20496B (respectively)	<p>Oppose Option 3 – approach not practicable and will potentially stifle quick and comprehensive delivery of sustainable sites.</p>
Thwing and Octon Parish Council – ref: 10353	<p>No preferred Option stated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considers all Options impractical. • Appropriate self-build sites small in size – consider small rural village locations. • Advancing technology that is changing rural England should be considered.
Home Builders Federation – ref: 20120	<p>No preferred Option stated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HBF members will be able to assist custom build sector therefore do not oppose idea of increasing self/custom build for potential contribution to housing supply. • Oppose Option 3 – does not boost housing supply, simply changes delivery mechanism from one form to

	<p>another.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engage with landowners and work with self/custom build developers to maximise opportunities.
C Scarlett – ref: 20594	<p>No preferred Option stated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believes original idea was to increase social housing by allowing tenants to input design of their homes. Specific provision of self-build is inappropriate use of Local Plan. Allocating affordable land to increase social and community-led housing is positive approach. Positive if people can input design of social housing so house is adapted to their specific needs.
Directions Planning Ltd (obo M Brooks, M Dobson and L Garton, Goulden/Sweeting Farmers, J D Goulden) – ref: 11328A, 11328B, 11328C (respectively)	<p>Object to Option 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Main issue with self-build is pace of construction reliant on purchaser – no controls over how long it will take (some may fail). Construction of neighbourhoods will vary and could cause inconvenience to neighbours, friction and poor living environment. Important main developer retains control of construction.
City of York Council – ref: 19454	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments on Question 11. Paragraph 3.52 – City of York Council has policy to promote self and custom build housing (in submitted Local Plan, not yet adopted). Includes requirement for sites 5ha and above to provide at least 5% of plots for sale to self-builders or small/custom house builders subject to identification of appropriate demand.

Question 12 - In relation to affordable housing, which option(s) should be taken forward as part of the Local Plan review?

Option 1 - Continue to use the criteria-based exceptions policy to support appropriate proposals for affordable housing as and when they come forward.

Option 2 - As with Option 1 but also allocate specific sites for the delivery of affordable housing which could be cross-subsidised through a proportion of market housing.

Total number of responses: 76

	Respondents
Option 1	Lockington Parish Council – ref: 10264 T C Clarke – ref: 10313 Michael Glover LLP (obo Great Gutter Lane Kirkella Collaboration) – ref: 11598 DPP (obo Peter Ward Homes) – ref: 12151A B Cloke – ref: 13516 K Williams – ref: 13631 ID Planning (obo Hallam Land Management Ltd and Mr and Mrs Wrapson) – ref: 19686 and 20401 M Robinson – ref: 20459 R W Elliott & Co – ref: 20472 J Holmes – ref: 20489 C Oliver – ref: 20490 M Smith – ref: 20502 Cottingham Parish Council – ref: 20605 Barmby Moor Parish Council – ref: 20613 A McNulty – ref: 20501 D and L Crosby – ref: 20517
Option 2	Pegasus Group (obo Living by Ispace Limited, Duchy Homes Ltd, Foster Family, R Tinson & Son c/o Clubleys, Rooke/Potter and Sherbourne families c/o Clubleys, Schultz Family, S Goodwin, J C Cooke & Son, S&J Draper, J&S Coates, A&S Crozier and A&J Foster, R Stockbridge, Hogarth (Construction) Ltd, Evison Farmers, Evison Farmers and Mr & Mrs Marshall) – ref: 10045A, 10045C, 13538A, 13583D, 13538E, 13538H, 20332A, 20332B, 20332D 20348A, 20496A, 20496B (respectively) Halifax Estates – ref: 10099 Stephenson & Son (obo The Lane Family Trust, J H Dixon & Son LLP) – ref: 10167A, 20325A (respectively) Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant (obo D Fielder) – ref: 10177 Driffield Town Council – ref: 10228

	<p>Howden Civic Society – ref: 10396</p> <p>Bugthorpe and Kirby Underdale Parish Council – ref: 10553</p> <p>Directions Planning Consultancy Ltd (obo M Brooks, M Dobson and L Garton, Goulden/Sweeting Farmers and J D Goulden) – ref: 11328A, 11328B and 11328C (respectively)</p> <p>M Teare – ref: 11450</p> <p>Pocklington and the Wolds Gateway Partnership – ref: 11675</p> <p>Pocklington Town Council – ref: 13492</p> <p>A J Duke – ref: 13586</p> <p>Beswick Parish Council – ref: 13592</p> <p>Beverley and District Civic Society – ref: 19579</p> <p>R Ellison – ref: 19660</p> <p>Sirius Planning (obo FCC Environment Ltd) – ref: 19889</p> <p>Melbourne Parish Council (Cllr Tomalin and Cllr Cooper) – ref: 20475 and 20581 (respectively)</p> <p>P Davison – ref: 20477</p> <p>C G Coulter – ref: 20480</p> <p>P Webb – ref: 20492</p> <p>IB Planning Limited (obo G Brown) – ref: 20495</p> <p>YoungsRPS (obo Ei Group plc) – ref: 20505</p> <p>P Langley – ref: 20508</p> <p>J Green – ref: 20541</p> <p>Johnson Mowat Ltd (obo Hull and East Yorkshire Hospitals NHS Trust) – ref: 20588</p> <p>Rural Housing Enabler – ref: 20589</p> <p>C Scarlett – ref: 20594</p> <p>D Hobson – ref: 20595</p> <p>S Cantwell – ref: 20607</p> <p>Aldbrough Parish Council – ref: 20611</p>
--	--

Respondent	Summary of Comments
Michael Glover LLP (obo Great Gutter Lane Kirkella Collaboration) – ref: 11598	<p>Option 1 preferred:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Market comfortable with current approach and changes must be thought through. • Affordable housing contributions have caused difficulty for smaller house builders, particularly in areas where registered providers are inactive.
DPP (obo Peter Ward Homes) – ref: 12151A	Option 1 preferred:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing exceptions policy works – land can gain permission as an exception to normal planning policies. Landowners understand residential land value is lower as it's not allocated. Option 2 could sterilise suitable housing sites – while sites will be determined suitable for housing, affordable housing will not generate a good return so landowners will be unlikely to sell up therefore retaining the current land use (usually farmland).
K Williams – ref: 13631	<p>Option 1 preferred:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do developers ever build affordable houses? Affordable homes required. Molescroft, Beverley developments consist of overpriced, large houses – 4 bed houses more than £500,000.
ID Planning (obo Hallam Land Management Ltd) – ref: 19686	<p>Option 1 preferred:</p> <p>Option 2 would require support from willing landowners. Only viable if landowners willing to put sites forward for affordable housing.</p>
ID Planning (obo Mr and Mrs Wrapson) – ref: 20401	<p>Option 1 preferred:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option 2 would require support of landowners to bring sites forward. Opposed to Option 2 as it would not encourage a housing mix, but encourage concentrated areas of affordable housing.
M Robinson – ref: 20459	<p>Option 1 preferred:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordable housing no use if there are no local employment opportunities or public transport facilities. No bus service in Aldbrough – high costs of travelling to employment areas by car outweigh cheaper housing. Increased car travel contributing to air pollution.
D and L Crosby – ref: 20517	<p>Option 1 preferred:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avoid large social housing sites – integrate with market housing. Developers should not be able to provide commuted sums for off-site affordable housing.
Pegasus Group (obo Living by Ispace Limited, Duchy Homes Ltd, Foster Family, R Tinson & Son c/o Clubleys, Rooke/Potter and Sherbourne families c/o Clubleys, Schultz Family, S Goodwin, J C Cooke & Son, S&J Draper, J&S Coates, A&S Crozier and A&J Foster, R Stockbridge, Hogarth (Construction) Ltd, Evison Farmers, Evison	<p>Option 2 preferred:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidenced need for affordable housing in East Riding – address this by adopting more ambitious housing requirement. Option 2 supported where evidence suggests need will not be met through market-led schemes alone.

Farmers and Mr & Mrs Marshall) – ref: 10045A, 10045C, 13538A, 13583D, 13538E, 13538H, 20332A, 20332B, 20332D, 20348A, 20496A, 20496B (respectively)	
Halifax Estates – ref: 10099 Bugthorpe and Kirby Underdale Parish Council – ref: 10553	Option 2 preferred: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More dynamic approach required to deliver affordable housing. • Assist developers to ensure affordable housing is viable.
Drifffield Town Council – ref: 10228 C Scarlett – ref: 20594	Option 2 preferred: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current policy criteria not working – necessary to adopt Option 2 and force builders to meet obligations. • Sites should have pedestrian/cycle/wheelchair access to settlement centres.
Howden Civic Society – ref: 10396	Option 2 preferred: Most realistic chance of success.
Directions Planning Consultancy Ltd (obo M Brooks, M Dobson and L Garton, Goulden/Sweeting Farmers and J D Goulden) – ref: 11328A, 11328B and 11328C (respectively)	Option 2 preferred: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council’s Housing Strategy (2017) states existing affordable housing target not been achieved to date – alternative approach therefore required. • Option 2 most likely to result in affordable housing delivery – landowners often unwilling to sell for affordable housing as lower value. Registered providers only willing to buy units at equivalent build cost therefore no profit in land purchase. Market houses will provide sufficient margins to allow landowners to sell.
M Teare – ref: 11450	Option 2 preferred: Interested to see outcome of the Together Housing project in Hutton Cranswick providing shared ownership, rental and market housing.
Pocklington Town Council – ref: 13492	Option 2 preferred: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will ensure affordable houses for rent delivered across East Riding (not just new development sites). • Important families can afford to stay in their local area as public transport links poor across East Riding.
A J Duke – ref: 13586	Option 2 preferred: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1 – not so good.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option 2 – affordable homes where needed will strengthen communities. It's good the needs of lower income people are being considered.
Beswick Parish Council – ref: 13592	<p>Option 2 preferred:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developers avoid mixing luxury and affordable housing – use appeals procedure to reduce contribution. Allowing developers to pay for/subsidise the building of affordable housing may increase delivery – even though it encourages geographical social division.
Beverley and District Civic Society – ref: 19579	<p>Option 2 preferred:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paragraph 3.54 of the Options Document sums up the dilemma. Current policy fails to meet need, Option 1 inappropriate. Option 2 – include market housing to avoid concentration of affordable housing and social issues associated. <p>Encourage Social Housing Association/Council led housing developments to increase delivery.</p>
Sirius Planning (obo FCC Environment Ltd) – ref: 19889	<p>Option 2 preferred:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thresholds and proportions adopted in Local Plan are out of date and need revisiting, given paragraph 2.10 of Options Document. Support paragraph 3.54 of Options Document – update Affordable Housing Viability Assessment (2010). Support paragraph 3.56 of Options Document – include element of market housing to support scheme viability in line with paragraph 77 of the NPPF. Support Option 2 – allocations should only take place where viability can be demonstrated. <p>Consider non-allocated exception site policies should allow market housing to enable affordable housing development.</p>
Melbourne Parish Council (Cllr Tomalin and Cllr Cooper) – ref: 20475 and 20581 (respectively)	<p>Option 2 preferred:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The term 'affordable' needs more precise definition. On the basis this makes it easier for developers to provide affordable housing.
C G Coulter – ref: 20480	<p>Option 2 preferred:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Priority – increase proportion of affordable housing with Government support to offset affordability concerns of the developers. Number of completed affordable homes has fallen below Local Plan requirement and the need and demand for such housing is increasing.
P Webb – ref: 20492	<p>Option 2 preferred:</p> <p>Avoid large areas of affordable housing but ensure supply meets demand – will encourage young families and low income workers to stay in/come to the area.</p>
IB Planning Limited (obo G Brown) – ref: 20495	<p>Option 2 preferred:</p> <p>Options Document (paragraph 3.54) states need for affordable housing is acute. Option 2 would provide more</p>

	flexibility in site identification and delivery.
YoungsRPS (obo Ei Group plc) – ref: 20505	Option 2 preferred: Viable solution to affordable housing shortfall – take positive approach and uplift market housing supply to offset the affordable requirement on-site and by developer contributions.
P Langley – ref: 20508	Option 2 preferred: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More affordable housing needed. • Stringent conditions to ensure developers deliver affordable housing requirement.
Johnson Mowat Ltd (obo Hull and East Yorkshire Hospitals NHS Trust) – ref: 20588	Option 2 preferred: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledge need to increase delivery of affordable housing through financially viable approach. • Option 2 could work in increasing delivery.
Rural Housing Enabler – ref: 20589	Option 2 preferred: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support Option 2 but do not believe it should be cross subsidised by market housing. • Homes England funding available where mixed tenure not required or where affordable housing does not require cross subsidy. • Definition of ‘proportion’ required – developers may be inclined to seek high proportion market housing.
D Hobson – ref: 20595	Option 2 preferred: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reject Option 1. • Additional provision should require developers seeking to make payment in lieu of affordable housing to identify and facilitate the delivery of affordable homes on identified sites. • Affordable housing calculations fails to take into account land value increase which accrues when development is permitted. Cost of compliance/community benefit attached to approval should be deducted from land value in calculations.
S Cantwell – ref: 20607	Option 2 preferred: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developers should provide affordable houses on all sites and not via commuted sums. • Affordable should be in perpetuity, not just for first purchaser.
Aldbrough Parish Council – ref: 20611	Option 2 preferred: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs for Aldbrough not being met – too many starter homes whereas other locations unable to get them. • Developers incorrectly advised about needs of the village by planning agents/officers. • Complete review with input from Town/Parish Councils required.
Thwing and Octon Parish Council – ref: 10353	No preferred Option stated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Options do not cover all requirements. • Need for affordable housing in rural areas/villages to support workforce of rural industries, agriculture and tourism.

Bridlington and District Civic Society – ref: 10713	<p>No preferred Option stated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whichever Option is selected, avoid large grouping of affordable housing – integrate into general mix of housing. • Past grouping of affordable housing in Bridlington attracted unfavourable publicity for residents.
Hull City Council – ref: 11708	<p>No preferred Option stated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognises challenge of meeting affordable housing needs and supports proactive approach in providing adequate land (suggests Option 2). • Viability and housing need evidence required to inform future approach.
ELG Town Planning (obo Chablis Associates Ltd, Manor Property Group and Westpark Living Ltd) – ref: 19637A, 19637B, 19637C (respectively)	<p>No preferred Option stated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flexible approach required to meet affordable housing needs. • Make use of off-site contributions where on-site provision is unsuitable e.g. small sites, dedicated self/custom build sites.
Indigo Planning (obo J Healey c/o Stadium City Developments, Stadium (Vicar Lane) Ltd and Stadium Developments Ltd and Wykland) – ref: 19892A, 19892B, 19892C (respectively)	<p>No preferred Option stated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flexible policy so contribution of affordable housing can be determined on site by site basis (consider economic viability, site and market conditions). Do not place onerous requirements on development schemes. • Policy should allow off-site provision of affordable housing or financial contribution in lieu of on-site provision in line with paragraph 62 of NPPF. • Allocate more sustainable, short term deliverable housing sites (exceed need) to increase market competition and increase potential of sites being able to deliver affordable housing.
Home Builders Federation – ref: 20120	<p>No preferred Option stated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support need to address affordable housing requirements by amending policy to reflect broadened definition of affordable housing. • Affordable housing delivery unlikely through market-led schemes alone.
Barton Willmore (obo Barratt and David Wilson Homes (Yorkshire East)) – ref: 20309	<p>No preferred Option stated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shortfall described in paragraph 3.54 of Options Document not representative – Council failed to deliver annual housing requirement since Local Plan adoption, one of main reasons affecting delivery of affordable housing. • Questions the need to alter affordable housing thresholds adopted in 2016 – unlikely market has changed dramatically that increasing thresholds now would be viable.
Gladman Developments Ltd – ref: 20361	<p>No preferred Option stated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledge need to update policy - implementation of NPPF affordable housing definition will increase

	<p>affordable housing provision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reassess affordable housing viability adopting most up to date market information (land value and build costs). • Support a variation in affordable housing requirement across the East Riding to reflect diversity of housing market – ensure viability and aid delivery. • Allocate specific sites that are brought forward using financial contributions gained from other planning applications. • Spread specific sites across East Riding to ensure gained contributions are spent and delivered locally to benefit local communities. • Ensure sites are deliverable and have landowner agreements. • Allow market provision to enhance prospect of delivery (suggests Option 2). • Localised policy reflecting paragraph 71 of NPPF (need to secure and support delivery of first time buyer homes) should be included.
Highways England – ref: 20434	<p>No preferred Option stated: Highways England will need to understand the traffic impacts generated by any affordable housing development on the strategic road network to determine relevant mitigation.</p>
Howden Town Council – ref: 20568	<p>No preferred Option stated: Consider use of affordable housing in Howden – does not always meet local needs such as first time buyers and those wanting bungalows.</p>

Question 13 - Are there any other policy approaches the Council should take to increase the delivery of affordable housing through the Local Plan?

Total number of responses: 46

Respondent	Summary of Comments
<p>Pegasus Group (obo Living by Ispace Limited, Duchy Homes Ltd, Foster Family, R Tinson & Son c/o Clubleys, Rooke/Potter and Sherbourne Families c/o Clubleys, Schultz Family, S Goodwin, J C Cooke & Son, S&J Draper, J&S Coates, A&S Crozier and A&j Foster, R Stockbridge, Hogarth (Construction) Ltd, Evison Farmers, Evison Farmers and Mr & Mrs Marshall) – ref: 10045A, 10045C, 13538A, 13583D, 13538E, 13538H, 20332A, 20332B, 20332D 20348A, 20496A, 20496B (respectively)</p> <p>M Teare – ref: 11450</p> <p>Beverley and District Civic Society – ref: 19579</p> <p>ELG Town Planning (obo Chablis Associates Ltd, Manor Property Group and Westpark Living Ltd) – ref:</p>	<p>Same response to Question 12 – see summary of comments above.</p>

19637A, 19637B and 19637C (respectively) Highways England – ref: 20434	
Halifax Estates – ref: 10099 Bugthorpe and Kirby Underdale Parish Council – ref: 10553	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopt flexible policy approach for provision affordable housing (to buy, part buy or rent). • Work with larger land estates to provide for rented affordable housing in small villages where housing supply is limited.
Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant (obo D Fielder) - ref: 10177	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce reliance on Registered Providers' regime – it is expensive, inefficient and fails to maximise delivery and minimise cost of affordable housing. • Discounted market housing for sale more acceptable for developers than rented accommodation. Usually preferred by communities outside of major settlements.
Driffield Town Council – ref: 10228 C Scarlett – ref: 20594	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stringent conditions to ensure developers have to deliver affordable housing obligations. • Council should borrow to build own affordable rented housing.
Thwing and Octon Parish Council – ref: 10353	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NPPF requires sustainable transport policies in rural areas. • Public transport links get residents to other settlements but not rural places of work. Rural house prices too high for those working in the countryside, they travel from more affordable locations. • Support affordable homes close to employment and provide adequate transport systems – reduce emissions from reverse commuters.
Michael Glover LLP (obo Great Gutter Lane Kirkella Collaboration) – ref: 11598	Range of approach in place already such as exception policies. Difficult to think of further appropriate measures.
Pocklington and the Wolds Gateway Partnership – ref: 11675	Good mix of housing required to provide sense of community. Good example is Orchard Gardens, Pocklington (YO42 2EX) – residents age from new born to elderly and good mix of skills set.
DPP (obo Peter Ward Homes) – ref: 12151A	As per Q1 comments – allocate housing land above requirement of standard method to provide more affordable homes.
A J Duke – ref: 13586	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Old fashioned council housing met needs well. • Few flaws such as passing house onto family members. • Principle was good – allowed local Government to help local people.
Sirius Planning (obo FCC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximise available brownfield land, within and outside of development limits in line with paragraph 117 of the

Environment) – ref: 19889	<p>NPPF.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider importance of affordable rural housing in line with paragraph 77 of the NPPF.
M Robinson – ref: 20459	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider transport and employment opportunities in the local area.
P Davison – ref: 20477	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government allowing Councils to build - must look for opportunities for more social housing.
C G Coulter – ref: 20480	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priority – increase proportion of affordable housing with Government support to offset affordability concerns of the developers. • Number of completed affordable homes has fallen below Local Plan requirement and the need and demand for such housing is increasing.
P Webb - 20492	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can the council allocate resources to liaise with and encourage Housing Associations to develop social housing?
YoungsRPS (obo Ei Group plc) – ref: 20505	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy S4 overly restrictive, tight development limits don't allow for sustainable housing growth. • NPPF – shift away from development limits and consider sites on own merits. • Amend policy to be more flexible, allow additional development to support villages. • Amend development limits to identify further housing allocations.
P Langley – ref: 20508	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council consider buying land, building affordable/accessible housing and sell at market value. • Utilise redundant council buildings and sites.
Redrow Homes – ref: 20509	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordability ratios changed little over past decade, housing ladder out of reach for many. Maintaining high build rates will help address shortfall of supply.
D and L Crosby – ref: 20517	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure burden of other contributions does not make providing affordable housing prohibitive.
Barton Willmore (obo Beal Developments Ltd and Central Land Holdings) – ref: 20538A and 20538B (respectively)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase delivery of market housing on larger sites to increase provision of affordable housing. • Allocate more sustainable, deliverable sites.
Melbourne Parish Council (Cllr Cooper) – ref: 20581	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear, transparent definition needed – affordable has different meaning to different people. • Affordable homes should be integrated within housing developments – not on the fringe in marginal or less desirable aspects.
Rural Housing Enabler – ref: 20589	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider entry-level exception sites (NPPF 2018) to complement rural exception sites. • Clear commitment to promoting community led housing – particularly community land trusts and cohousing schemes. • Allow free of charge pre-application enquiries for all affordable housing schemes. • Ask landowners of rejected sites if they would be considered for affordable housing – subject to size, need and deliverability. • Consider another call for sites.

D Hobson – ref: 20595	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developers seeking to make payment in lieu of affordable housing provision should identify and facilitate delivery of affordable homes required on specific sites in the Local Plan.
Cottingham Parish Council – ref: 20605	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social housing required – local authority build them.
S Cantwell – ref: 20607	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ask local communities what their needs are.
Aldbrough Parish Council – ref: 20611	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct initial communication between Town/Parish Council and planning officers.
Barmby Moor Parish Council – ref: 20613	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support principle of affordable housing, not enough knowledge to make recommendations.

Question 14 - Do you agree we should update the Local Plan to reflect the recommendations of the new gypsy and traveller Accommodation Assessment and de-allocate sites BRID-H outside of Bridlington and COT-L outside of Cottingham?

Total number of responses: 23

Respondent	Summary of Comments
Halifax Estates - ref: 10099	Yes - agree
Bugthorpe and Kirby Underdale Parish Council – ref: 10553	
M Teare – ref: 11450	
Pocklington Town Council – ref: 13492	
B Cloke – ref: 13516	
K Williams – ref: 13631	
P Webb – ref: 20492	
A McNulty – ref: 20501	
P Langley – ref: 20508	
Cottingham Parish Council – ref: 20605	
S Cantwell – ref: 20607	
Aldbrough Parish Council – ref: 20611	

Barmby Moor Parish Council – ref: 20613	
Bridlington and District Civic Society – ref: 10713	Retain BRID-H – more secure with CCTV, hopefully stop fly tipping and blaming it on residents of the site.
Bridlington Town Council – ref: 11581	Anomaly in paragraph 3.58 of Options Document – mentions location of two existing sites in East Riding, but then states need is likely to be met by three existing sites in East Riding.
Hull City Council – ref: 11708	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the approach to meeting needs of Gypsy and Travellers. • Hull Local Plan identifies numbers for new sites, supported by updated Travellers Need Assessment (2017).
Skidby Parish Council – ref: 14139	Yes – support deallocation, have been opposed to extension for 5 years. Landscaping/screening promised in 2010 expansion not provided. Proposed extension in area of high landscape value.
City of York Council – ref: 19454	No comment on Question 14. Paragraph 3.58 – in contrast, submitted City of York Local Plan sets out requirements for meeting needs of G&T households that do and do not meet the revised planning definition.
M Robinson – ref: 20459	No - disagree
Melbourne Parish Council (Cllr Tomalin) – ref: 20475	
M Smith – ref: 20502	
C G Coulter – ref: 20480	Yes, agree the Local Plan should provide for gypsy and traveller accommodation.
C Oliver – ref: 20490	No – do not deallocate. Uncertainty how ‘need’ was calculated. Travellers may not have been reached by consultation/enquiries.

Question 15 - Which option should be taken forward in relation to wind energy development (based on evidence from the Wind Energy Sensitivity Study) as part of the Local Plan review?

Option 1 - Identify only the “Area of search for onshore wind energy developments” as being potentially suitable.

Option 2 - Identify the “Area of potential constraint for onshore wind energy developments” and “Area of Search for wind energy development” as being potentially suitable.

Option 3 - Identify all of the East Riding identified as being potentially suitable, using a criteria-based policy to determine the suitability of wind energy developments on a case by case basis.

Total number of responses: 50

	Individual responses
Option 1	Historic England – ref: 10473 Bugthorpe and Kirby Underdale Parish Council – ref: 10553 Bridlington Civic Society – ref: 10713 Paull Parish Council – ref: 10785 J Abraham – ref: 11407 Pocklington and the Wolds Gateway Partnership – ref: 11675 Pocklington Town Council – ref: 13492 B Cloke – ref: 13516 A B Nicholson – ref: 20478 M Smith – ref: 20502 Lichfields (obo Bourne Leisure Ltd) – ref: 20512 Natural England – ref: 20515 Preston Parish Council – ref: 20551 W Failey – ref: 20582
Option 2	Stephenson & Son (obo Lane Family Trust, J H Dixon & Son LLP, Mile Farm Camping & Farm Shop) – ref: 10167, 20325A, 20325B (respectively) A J Duke – ref: 13586 I Reid – ref: 13592 R W Elliott & Co – ref: 20472 C Nicholson – ref: 20476 C Coulter – ref: 20480

	<p>J Holmes – ref: 20489 P Webb – ref: 20492 A McNulty – ref: 20501 J Green – ref: 20541 North Ferriby Parish Council – ref: 20573</p>
Option 3	<p>Driffield Town Council – ref: 10228 T C Clarke – ref: 10313 Howden Civic Society – ref: 10396 M Teare – ref: 11450 K Williams – ref: 13631 Sirius Planning (obo FCC Environment Ltd) – ref: 19889 M Robinson – ref: 20459 Melbourne Parish Council (Cllr Tomalin) – ref: 20475 P Davison – ref: 20477 C Oliver – ref: 20490 IB Planning Ltd (obo G Brown) – ref: 20495 P Langley – ref: 20508 C Scarlett – ref: 20594 D Hobson – ref: 20595</p>

Respondent	Summary of Comments
Lichfields (obo Bourne Leisure Ltd) – ref: 20512	Bourne Leisure agree with option 1. The potential impact on the rural landscape and tourism development should be considered in identifying suitable areas for onshore wind. The tourist economy relies on these sensitive rural landscapes. The tourist economy would be hindered should wind development be located within the sensitive areas.
Natural England – ref: 20515	Following on from NPPF changes we need to be mindful of Areas of Search and functionally linked land for SPA birds and can work with you on this.
Historic England – ref: 10473	<p>Option 1</p> <p>Because of its topography and landscape character, wind turbine developments have the potential to cause considerable harm to elements which contribute to the significance of designated heritage assets at considerable distances from the asset themselves. This has been amply demonstrated by the windfarm at Lissett Airfield which, despite being over 5.6km from Burton Agnes Hall, clearly has had a significant adverse impact upon both setting and people’s experience of this Grade I Listed building.</p> <p>For that reason option 1 is supported together with a robust Criteria-based policy setting out the detailed</p>

	considerations which would need to be taken into account in determining the acceptability of any future proposals of this nature.
Preston Parish Council – ref: 20551	Within the local areas we feel wind farms have reached capacity and would not wish to see further sitings.
Pocklington and the Wolds Gateway Partnership – ref: 11675	Option 1 Offshore wind development is preferable to onshore development as the maximum benefit from the wind is available. It also provides a larger number of employment opportunities with transferable skills to and from the maritime industry as a whole. The offshore wind industry is already developing manufacturing and servicing facilities in the Humber Ports region which is competent in this area.
J Abraham – ref: 11407 North Ferriby Parish Council – ref: 20573	Prefer option 2 as a minimum. The area of search as defined is too narrow and would result in saturation of onshore wind to the detriment of local residents. Appropriate criteria for the approval of specific site proposals need to be developed to avoid developers taking the plan as carte blanche for the erection of turbines in areas of potential search.
J Holmes – ref: 20489	Focusing on a single small area will limit the effectiveness and scale of onshore wind development.
P Webb – ref: 20492	Option 2 seems to provide more options for finding sites without leading to resources being spent to evaluate sites that are very likely to be rejected.
Melbourne Parish Council (Cllr Cooper) – ref: 20581	Not sure on this. Vital bird flyways and migratory routes need to be avoided due to potential impact. Not sure if the Area of Search is too close to the Humber/Aire/Calder corridor? Comments from nature organisations will be appropriate.
Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant (obo D Field) – ref: 10177	Identify Areas of Significant Constraint and Areas of Search – remain silent on the rest of the District where, one assumes, the evidence base for both provision and constraint is less robust and leaving it to prospective developers to make their case. Alternatively, include a criteria based policy for the remaining area.
Thwing & Octon Parish Council – ref: 10353	Wind energy development should not be discussed or considered in isolation to other renewable energy resources or outside of a comprehensive plan addressing climate change now and in the longer term.
Bridlington Civic Society – ref: 10713	Option 1 - This Society has a policy to support small scale, individual schemes erected to provide energy for agricultural units and business premises which have low impact on landscape and require little Infrastructure. The Area of Search should be concentrated along the Humber Estuary, close to the industries that will benefit from the development and which will need less costly infrastructure to back the projects.
I Reid – ref: 13592	Option 2 Zonation is a preferable means of providing opportunities for on-shore wind and solar power generation. Blanket opposition has been ignored and the County is littered with wind farms. Need to understand the criteria used for the zonation and, if appropriate, assess whether the criteria are well-founded or flawed. So, for instance, the “Area of potential constraint” may be too loosely defined and, therefore, too extensive; in this case, the criteria look as if they require redefining or adding to. Similarly, the “Area of significant constraint” appears too extensive within the Vale of

	York and, therefore, again, the criteria look as if they require redefining or adding to.
A J Duke – ref: 13586	Prefer option 2 Wind energy equipment is only getting larger and more intrusive. It should be kept well away from both existing towns and potential town locations.
P Langley – ref: 20508 K Williams – ref: 13631	Option 3 Sustainable energy is of paramount importance. All areas should be considered case by case. Onshore wind is probably now the cheapest source, is very quick to install and can be uninstalled at a later date just as rapidly. It should be given priority in the planning process at least until our reliance on coal and gas have diminished significantly. This includes replacing oil based fuels for transport and the availability of a LOT more electric vehicle charging points.
Sirius Planning (obo FCC Environment Ltd) – ref: 19889	Option 3 - Wind energy is subject to various site specific constraints and therefore to only allocate just an area of East Riding for wind energy would significantly constrain this type of development unnecessarily.
Ryedale District Council – ref: 19987	Both ERYC and RDC share the area of land nationally defined as the Yorkshire Wolds (NCA27), Ryedale support the approach to safeguard the Yorkshire Wold's Areas of High Landscape Value. Both Council's landscape evidence recognise the sensitivities of the area to structures of a tall, vertical nature, and the Landscape Characterisation undertaken in 2011 by North Yorkshire County Council, has ensured that despite being in different administrations, the landscape character unity was identified. We note, and support, the work of ERYC in their identification of areas of wind energy suitability, and we will look to undertake a similar exercise in the review of the Ryedale Plan. As such we see no conflict of approach between the two authorities in this aspect of the Local Plan Review. We would welcome further engagement as the work on the ER Plan's review moves forward as a result of this issues and options consultation, and in terms of our own Local Plan Review in due course.
Hull City Council – ref: 11708	No preference – support an area based approach to development of wind energy. This should include a criteria based policy. Specific opportunities should be identified through local plan allocations or designation of areas. Sites should not be precluded where opportunities arise that could meet the criteria. Hull City Council support the Yorkshire Energy Park for specific allocation to support low carbon energy development.
York City Council – ref:19454	No preferred option - The Council look forward to exploring the potential impact of onshore wind development in those areas that abut the City of York eastern boundary under the Duty to Cooperate. Any onshore wind development in this area could potentially have detrimental impact on York's natural environment and heritage assets.
North Yorkshire County Council – ref: 20506	No preferred option- Cross boundary impacts should be considered when identifying potential suitable locations for onshore wind. This includes impact on local communities, the natural and historic environment.
Pegasus Planning – ref: 13538F	No preference. The Council is invited to consider footnote 49 of the NPPF (2018) and the repowering of existing wind farms/turbines and issue further consultation on this basis.
Highways England – ref: 20434	No preferred option – Highways England should be consulted on any renewable energy developments that may have impact on the strategic road network.

Question 16 - In relation to other types of renewable and low carbon energy development (non-wind), which option should be taken forward as part of the Local Plan review?

Option 1 - Consider identifying suitable areas for other types of renewable and low carbon energy development in the Plan?

Option 2 - Identify all of the East Riding identified as being potentially suitable, using a criteria-based policy to determine the suitability of renewable and low carbon energy developments on a case by case basis.

Total number of responses: 40

	Respondent
Option 1	Halifax Estates – ref: 10099 Bugthorpe & Kirby Underdale Parish Council – ref: 10553 Bridlington and District Civic Society – ref: 10713 Paull Parish Council – ref: 10785 I Reid – ref: 13592 R W Elliott & Co – ref: 20472 P Davison – ref: 20477 A B Nicholson – ref: 20478 P Webb – ref: 20492 A McNulty – ref: 20501 M Smith – ref: 20502 Lichfields (obo Bourne Leisure Ltd) – ref: 20512 W J Failey – ref: 20582
Option 2	Pegasus Group (obo JMB Solar Projects Ltd) – ref: 10045B Stephenson & Son (obo Lane Family Trust, J H Dixon & Son LLP, Mile Farm Camping and Farm Shop) – ref: 10167B, 20325A, 20325B Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant (obo D Fielder) – ref: 10177 Driffield Town Council – ref: 10228 J Abraham – ref: 11407 M Teare – ref: 11450 Pocklington & Wolds Gateway Partnership – ref: 11675

	<p>B Cloke – ref: 13516 K Williams – ref: 13631 Sirius Group (obo FCC Environment Ltd) – ref: 19889 M Robinson – ref: 20459 Melbourne Parish Council (Cllr Tomalin) – ref: 20475 C Nicholson – ref: 20476 C G Coulter – ref: 20480 C Oliver – ref: 20490 P Langley – ref: 20508 J Green – ref: 20541 North Ferriby Parish Council – ref: 20573 C Scarett – ref: 20594</p>
--	--

Respondent	Summary of Comments
Lichfields (obo Bourne Leisure Ltd) – ref: 20512	Bourne Leisure agree with option I. The potential impact on the rural landscape and tourism development should be considered in identifying suitable areas. The tourist economy relies on these rural landscapes. Particular consideration should be given to the tourist's perception of energy developments within landscapes.
Halifax Estates – ref: 10099 Bugthorpe & Kirby Underdale Parish Council – ref: 10553	Option I Low carbon energy developments must be considered on a case by case basis. Developments of high visual impact would not be suitable on the Yorkshire Wolds. Wave and tide technologies may be appropriate along the coastline.
Paull Parish Council – ref: 10785 A B Nicholson – ref: 20478 W J Failey – ref: 20582	Prefer option I with the consideration of; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Department of Energy and Climate Change's methodology for assessing the capacity for renewable energy developments. • The increased scale of new renewable energy developments (large scale solar and wind farms) • Local Landscape Character Assessment (local topography is an important factor as development can harm both flat and hilly landscapes). • Historic assets and their setting relative to their importance. • Cumulative impacts • Local amenity and open space.

	<p>Once suitable sites for renewable energy have been identified in a local or neighbourhood plan, planning applications for such developments should not be approved unless the proposed development site is in a designated area.</p> <p>The need for renewable or low carbon energy does not automatically override environmental protections.</p>
I Reid – ref: 13592	<p>Prefer option 1</p> <p>Pasture land could be made available for solar and wind development. Some hazard zones should be avoided (sea cliff retreat areas).</p> <p>Flood zones may not be a limiting factor depending on the vulnerability of the type of renewable energy.</p> <p>Zones should be delimited for the planting of biofuels and planted in areas where there are added benefits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved landscape amenity. • Reduction in flood hazard. • Reduction in surface wind speed. • Economic use of land that can not sustain food crops.
A McNulty – ref: 20501	<p>Prefer option 1</p> <p>Biomass is not sustainable. Issues include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Material is imported and is of inconsistent quality resulting in expensive maintenance and serving costs. • Poor security of supply. <p>Consideration should be given to hydroelectric schemes to make use of our significant tidal range and extensive river network.</p>
Bridlington and District Civic Society – ref: 10713	<p>Prefer option 1</p> <p>Sites should still be considered on a case by case basis through a criteria based policy, however, high landscape value areas (Yorkshire Wolds & Flamborough Head should be excluded except for small scale renewable energy developments.</p>
P Webb – ref: 20492	<p>Prefer option 1</p> <p>Avoid needless contention and enquiries.</p> <p>Solar development could be linked to set-aside policies for unproductive agricultural land.</p>
P Langley – ref: 20508	<p>Prefer option 2</p> <p>Solar energy is capable of supplying much of our energy needs.</p> <p>Solar panels along south facing field boundaries and on residential roof space should be encouraged.</p>

	The national grid needs to be capable of dealing with the distributed power generation, which may require planning priority to power infrastructure.
Sirius Planning (obo FCC Environment Ltd) – ref: 19889	Prefer option 2 Renewable energy is subject to various site-specific constraints and therefore to only allocate just an area of East Riding for renewable energy would significantly constrain renewable energy developments unnecessarily. Grid constraint is also a significant factor for renewable energy developments, with development only being viable when they are in close proximity to an available local grid connection.
Pocklington & Wolds Gateway Partnership – ref: 11675	Prefer option 2 New homes should include solar roof tiles and electric vehicle charging points.
Pegasus Group (obo JMB Solar Projects Ltd) – ref: 10045B	Prefer option 2. Land at Scurf Dyke is considered appropriate for renewable energy development with the implementation of either option 1 or 2.
J Abraham – ref: 11407 North Ferriby Parish Council – ref: 20573	Prefer option 2. Renewable energy developments should be located near the source of energy and considered on a case by case basis. This will allow for the assessment of cumulative effect and residential amenity.
Drifffield Town Council – ref: 10228 C Scarlett – ref: 20594	Prefer option 2 providing nuclear and fracking are not classed as low-carbon.
Melbourne Parish Council (Cllr Cooper) – ref: 20581	Options are not clear. What is low carbon energy development? If shale gas is identified as low carbon then any option that gives this energy source any preference would not get my vote.
A J Duke – ref: 13586	No preferred option - Strongly against fracking until there is lots of production in the South East of the UK
City of York Council – ref: 19454	No preferred option - The Council look forward to exploring the potential impact of onshore wind development in those areas that abut the City of York eastern boundary under the Duty to Cooperate. Any onshore wind development in this area could potentially have detrimental impact on York's natural environment and heritage assets.
Highways England – ref: 20434	No preferred option – Highways England should be consulted on any renewable energy developments that may have impact on the strategic road network.

Question 17 - Which option should be taken forward as part of the Local Plan review?

Option 1 - Continue to consider the impact of proposals on health and wellbeing using existing policies, such as ENVI (Design) and C3 (Open space).

Option 2 - Introduce a specific policy to ensure that development decisions consider the impact of proposals on health and wellbeing.

Total number of responses: 55

	Respondent
Option 1	Stephenson & Son (obo The Lane Family, J H Dixon & Son LLP, Mr & Mrs Barnes) – ref: 10167, 20325A, 20325B (respectively) Bridlington Civic Society – ref: 10713 Paull Parish Council – ref: 10785 M Teare – ref: 11450 Pocklington and Wolds Gateway Partnership – ref: 11675 Pocklington Town Council – ref: 13492 Sirius Planning (obo FCC Planning) – ref: 19889 P Davison – ref: 20477 A B Nicholson – ref: 20478 J Holmes – ref: 20489 A McNulty – ref: 20501 A Trimm – ref: 20518 J Windass – ref: 20519 Barton Willmore (obo Beal Homes) – ref: 20538B K Courtney – ref: 20578 R & D Jones – ref: 20579 L Parker – ref: 20580 W J Failey – ref: 20582 D Hobson- ref: 20595
Option 2	Halifax Estates – ref: 10099 Jennifer Hubbard Town Planning Consultant (obo D Fielder) – 10177A Driffield Town Council – ref: 10228 Thwing & Octon Parish Council – ref: 10353 Howden Civic Society – 10396

	<p>Bugthorpe and Kirby Underdale Parish Council – ref: 10553 J Abraham – ref: 11407 Pocklington and Wolds Gateway Partnership – ref: 11675 DPP (obo JG Hatcliffe and Partners) – ref: 12151B & C B Cloke – ref 13516 A J Duke – ref: 13586 I Reid – ref: 13592 K Williams – ref: 13631 Canal & River Trust- ref: 20205 M Robinson – ref: 20459 C Nicholson –ref: 20476 C Coulter –ref: 20480 C Oliver – ref: 20490 P Webb – ref: 20492 M Smith – ref: 20502 P Langley – ref: 20508 J Green – ref: 20541 Preston Parish Council - ref: 20551 North Ferriby Parish Council - ref: 20573 Melbourne Parish Council (Cllr Cooper) – ref: 20581 Cottingham Parish Council –ref: 20605 S Cantwell – ref: 20607 Aldbrough Parish Council – ref: 20611</p>
--	---

Respondent	Summary of Comments
Pocklington and Wolds Gateway Partnership – ref: 11675	<p>Use both option 1 and 2 The significant level of development in Pocklington has caused distress for local residents evidenced by anger shown at public meetings. The day to day management of the delivery of development needs to be better managed to reduce its impact on local residents.</p>
Howden Civic Society – ref: 10396	<p>Option 2 is essential. The pattern of development has a marked effect on health and well-being. The design and layout of development sites are critical to the way people enjoy living, feel secure and healthy. Regimented rows of houses offer little quality of life or encourage neighbourliness. This quality of life is more important than merely building high numbers of houses in order to provide a satisfying living</p>

	environment for future decades. Whatever is built in the time-frame of this plan will still be standing at the end of the century so decisions about layout and design of developments are critical and cannot be left to the short term whims of property developers alone.
Thwing & Octon Parish Council – ref: 10353	Option 2 When discussing the sustainability of rural areas, one of the points to consider is ‘social capital’. These community links and informal support networks are vital to maintaining support when state services are withdrawn. Rural residents on average are 14% more trusting of people in their neighbourhood, more willing to help their neighbours, feel safer, and feel a sense of belonging, than their urban counterparts.
Canal & River Trust - ref: 20205	Option 2 Existing policies ENVI and C3 do not directly target the impact of development upon health and wellbeing, as they are relatively broad policies, and do not provide a precise guide to the decision maker about how development could be designed to promote health and wellbeing. Whilst we welcome the existing wording of policy ENV5 ‘Strengthening Green Infrastructure’, the existing wording in part B, with regards to enhancing the functionality and connectivity of the corridor, is relatively broad, and does not provide definitive guidance to the decision maker. A new policy should provide additional text to give a clear steer as to how development can be designed to promote health and wellbeing. This could include measures to promote access to the strategic green and blue infrastructure, to ensure that development promotes the surveillance of key pedestrian and cyclist routes, and to ensure that proposals incorporate improvements to the strategic green infrastructure, where necessary, to accommodate the additional population brought by that development. The Trust have recently undertaken research on the contribution our network makes to wellbeing. We believe that our network can promote healthy lifestyles through providing routes for walking and cycling, and can also provide spaces for people to relax, which could improve their self-reported wellbeing. Our 2017 Community Survey (produced by Kantar TNS) identified that 90% of our visitors undertook physical activity, and that waterway users have a higher life satisfaction figure (81%) than non-users (71%). These are two examples of how use of our network could help prevent ill-health through improving the measures identified within the boroughs Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2016-19.
I Reid – ref: 13592	Option 2 Positive action policies are preferable in ensuring developers build in facilities (open space, play parks, walking routes, both new and existing PROWs) to proposed developments.
DPP (obo JG Hatcliffe and Partners) – ref: 12151B & C	Option 2 There is a need for a policy which deals with community assets in line with NPPF Para 92.
P Langley – ref: 20508	Option 2

	Open space, amenity and clean air considerations must be included with all major planning decisions.
J Green – ref: 20541	Option 2 More emphasis on the options for walking and cycling. Developers should ensure that the routes and paths connect to the services and facilities in the settlement (rather than providing a path across the front of their development that goes nowhere).
Driffield Town Council – ref: 10228 C Scarlett – ref: 20594	Option 2 it is necessary to further consider the health and wellbeing of our local population over and above the current local plan – especially the developments in the new strategic plan for health and wellbeing that are designed to improve the potential for independence of older and disabled people.
Melbourne Parish Council (Cllr Cooper) – ref: 20581	Option 2 An important aspect of housing development, particularly as shale gas exploration is deemed to be harmful to health.
A J Duke – ref: 13586	Option 2 ERYC should increase the scope and sophistication of environmental decisions it makes,
Cottingham Parish Council – ref: 20605	Option 2 A policy should include air quality/pollution levels and connectivity
Aldbrough Parish Council – ref: 20611	Option 2 Significant pressure on local health services to deal with increase in population. Caravan /holiday lodge residents are not considered due to their living status. Police, Doctors and hospitals need to be consulted to determine whether they can cope with the level of development proposed. There a significant parking issues in Aldborough - 1.5 car spaces per house is ridiculous.

Question 18 - Are there any other policies that should be amended through the Local Plan Review? Are there any new policies that need to be included in the plan?

Total number of responses: 99

Respondent	Summary of Comments
M Robinson – ref: 20459	Has requested that Aldbrough be downgraded in the LP to a “village”, as there is no bus service, and do not have better facilities than those currently classed in that status (mentions Burton Pidsea, Skipsea, Burstwick as examples).
R W Elliott & Co – ref: 20472	Oppose the criteria used for a settlement to be classed as a “village”. Suggests restrictions on development in the countryside should be loosened, which would encourage more services and facilities.
A B Nicholson – ref: 20478	Policy C3 Open Space (as detailed in Q17) HVA-A to reflect actual LDO area to avoid confusion Policy A1 to reflect Open Space (C) Policy S6 Employment Land
C G Coulter – ref: 20480	No new policies are required.
National Grid – ref: 20488	No comments. However, wish to be informed of any future consultations.
Selby District Council – ref: 20387	
Doncaster Council – ref: 20520	
Nineteen47 - ref: 11588	Have requested that a site to the south-east of Thorngumbald be considered for allocated land. Wishes to remain part of any future consultations.
IB Planning Ltd – ref: 20495	LP should state presumption in favour of development (Policy S4), particularly in the countryside. The LP should include more encouragement for the redevelopment of brownfield sites.
Gallagher Planning – ref: 20422	Requested that a site to the south-west of Foggathorpe be considered for allocated land. The settlement classification should be elevated to be classed as a “village”. As Foggathorpe does not have a development limit, it restricts appropriate development in the settlement as it is, by definition, part of the ‘Countryside’.
Hull City Council – ref: 11708	Policy ENV4 seeks a net gain in biodiversity. Recommends a specific policy on health and well-being that would give greater weight to these issues, rather than referencing a proxy policy.

BNP Paribas – ref: 12140	<p>Support the amendment of S5 Policy through the proposed identification of draft housing requirement and allocations for Hedon.</p> <p>Hull Road and Blacktoft Lane sites should be allocated for housing.</p>
Willerby Community Action Group – ref: 20593	<p>Opposed to allocated site AWK-C (Bellfield Farm), for a variety of concerns, including the adverse impact any development could have in terms of roads, traffic congestion, schooling, drainage, flooding, and general infrastructure.</p> <p>Believes that alternative sites in Willerby are more suitable and appropriate for development.</p> <p>Seek to preserve the integrity of the farm, which has historical significance within the parish.</p>
YoungsRPS – ref: 20505	<p>Considers Policy S4 to be overly restrictive. Should be amended to provide greater flexibility, vitality and viability of villages.</p> <p>Notes that the NPPF has shifted its focus away from a reliance on settlement boundaries, and sites should be considered on their own merits.</p>
Bridlington Civic Society – ref: 10713	<p>Proposes development management teams for each sub-area of Bridlington.</p> <p>A holistic view could be beneficial to the development of Bridlington in terms of strategy, timing and cost.</p>
North Yorkshire County Council – ref: 20506	<p>Advises that the ERLP (refers to Minerals and Waste Joint Plan) should have consideration to neighbouring plans when considering allocations.</p>
Highways England – ref: 20434	<p>It is not Highway England's role to determine what policies LA's should amend.</p>
Lichfields – ref: 20512	<p>Clients, Bourne Leisure, support current policies (S4 and EC2). Wish to reserve right for to comment on tourism related policies until further notice.</p>
Quod – ref: 19909	<p>Consider whether Key Open Areas is fully justified.</p> <p>Policy S4 is considered to restrict development. Development beyond the boundaries of settlements should be considered appropriate when necessary.</p>
Natural England – ref: 20515	<p>Would welcome an opportunity to be engaged in the review process early on, to provide advice on objectives in the Plan, including ecological networks, green infrastructure and net gain.</p>
K Williams – ref: 13631	<p>Against the development of Longcroft Playing Fields. Land is public and therefore should not be developed.</p> <p>Against the recent eviction of scouts and cadets without compensation or a new appropriate site.</p>
A Trimm – ref: 20518	<p>Policy C3 Open Space (wish to include Paull as part of maintaining open spaces between neighbouring settlements at Hedon, Hull and Salt End).</p> <p>HVA-A to reflect actual LDO area to avoid confusion</p>

	<p>Policy A1 to reflect Open Space (C) Policy S6 Employment Land (see A.B. Nicholson, above)</p>
Sirius Planning (obo FCC Environment Ltd) – ref: 19889	<p>Recommends that policy EC2 should be amended for clarification purposes to include holiday lodges in 2 (b).</p>
J Windass – ref: 20519	<p>Policy C3 Open Space (wish to include Paull as part of maintaining open spaces between neighbouring settlements at Hedon, Hull and Salt End). HVA-A to reflect actual LDO area to avoid confusion Policy A1 to reflect Open Space (C) Policy S6 Employment Land (See Audrey Trim, above)</p>
Edwardson Associates – ref: 12048	<p>Would welcome a policy whereby development limits were less stringent. This is particularly the case for sustainable villages which are constrained by the “Countryside” definition.</p>
Doug Jennings Planning Services – ref: 11760	<p>Policy S4 requires amending to reflect NPPF para 79c. in relation to conversion of rural buildings to residential use. Policy is too restrictive in its present form, which is not reflected by the NPPF.</p>
D Cross – ref: 20530	<p>Objects to the allocated site at Bellfield Farm (AWK-C)</p> <p>States that this would destroy the livelihood of the farmer and his family, and add congestion to Great Gutter Lane.</p> <p>Highlights the historic significance of the site.</p>
K Rudderforth – ref: 20531	<p>Objects to allocated site, AWK-C, Bellfield Farm.</p> <p>Details concerns, including: overstressing the community on services such as doctor’s surgery, schools and traffic congestion.</p> <p>Also opposed to the destruction of Bellfield Farm as a valuable sustainable farm.</p>
L Garden – ref: 20532	<p>Objects to allocated site, AWK-C, Bellfield Farm.</p> <p>Is concerned that the community will be slowly eroded as a consequence of development at this site. The local schools and nursery will be lost of an important educational asset.</p> <p>Also concerned with the traffic congestion that will be caused as a consequence of development at the site.</p>
R & E Acey – ref: 20533	<p>Objects to allocated site, AWK-C, Bellfield Farm.</p> <p>Opposes development at this site as it is an important asset to Willerby. Development will erode the green spaces</p>

	of Willerby, and increase traffic congestion at Willerby Roundabout.
J McCaffrey – ref: 20534	<p>Objects to allocated site, AWK-C, Bellfield Farm.</p> <p>Expresses that Council have shown lack of respect to residents following West Hill development.</p> <p>Further development would increase air pollution and flood risk.</p> <p>Developers provide nothing to the local community.</p>
I Lyle – ref: 19637	Policies C1 and C2 do not provide specificity to educational facilities.
S McCaffrey – ref: 20535	<p>Objects to allocated site, AWK-C, Bellfield Farm.</p> <p>Development on this site will increase the traffic congestion and pollution in Willerby.</p> <p>Infrastructure needs have not been met as a result of recent development.</p>
S Collins – ref: 20536	<p>Opposed to allocated site AWK-C (Bellfield Farm), for a variety of concerns, including the adverse impact any development could have in terms of roads, traffic congestion, schooling, drainage, flooding, and general infrastructure.</p> <p>Believes that alternative sites in Willerby are more suitable and appropriate for development.</p> <p>Seek to preserve the integrity of the farm, which has historical significance</p>
S & S Thorpe – ref: 20537	<p>Objects to allocated site, AWK-C, Bellfield Farm.</p> <p>The development would have an adverse impact in terms of the increasing pressure on the three main roundabouts of Willerby at Willerby Square, Great Gutter Lane and the A164.</p>
G & T Burton - ref: 20539	<p>Objects to allocated site, AWK-C, Bellfield Farm.</p> <p>No further comments.</p>
A & D Akroyd – ref: 12688	<p>Objects to allocated site, AWK-C, Bellfield Farm.</p> <p>Concerned with the increase in traffic that this would cause.</p>
A Newlove – ref: 20542	<p>Objects to allocated site, AWK-C, Bellfield Farm.</p> <p>Opposes further development due to the adverse impact on vehicular traffic.</p>

J & E Brown – ref: 15674	<p>Objects to allocated site, AWK-C, Bellfield Farm.</p> <p>Oppose any future developments due to the impact these would have on traffic in the vicinity.</p>
C Sutcliffe – ref: 20543	<p>Objects to allocated site, AWK-C, Bellfield Farm.</p> <p>Oppose development in Willerby due to the negative impact this would have on road traffic.</p>
C Mirfin – ref: 20544	<p>Objects to allocated site, AWK-C, Bellfield Farm.</p> <p>Oppose the destruction of the rural countryside.</p>
C Cranleigh – ref: 20545	<p>Objects to allocated site, AWK-C, Bellfield Farm.</p> <p>The road infrastructure cannot cope with an increase in vehicular traffic.</p>
J Garden – ref: 20546	<p>Supports the letter submitted by the WCAG</p>
J Swales – ref: 20547	<p>Objects to allocated site, AWK-C, Bellfield Farm.</p> <p>The quality of life for nearby residents will be diminished.</p>
J Thurston – ref: 20549	<p>Supports the letter provided by WCAG</p>
M Edwards – ref: 20550	<p>Objects to allocated site, AWK-C, Bellfield Farm.</p> <p>Opposed to further development in Willerby due to the adverse impact on vehicular traffic.</p> <p>Lack of development would also incentivise further development in Hull.</p>
Preston Parish Council – ref: 20551	<p>Against large scale developments. Highlights lack of road infrastructure and long-term solutions.</p>
Scarborough Council – ref: 10527	<p>No comment to make. Wishes to be kept informed of any further developments.</p>
R Watson – ref: 20552	<p>Objects to allocated site, AWK-C, Bellfield Farm.</p> <p>Fully supports the objection submitted by WCAG.</p>
D White – ref: 20553	<p>Objects to allocated site, AWK-C, Bellfield Farm.</p> <p>Supports the objection submitted by WCAG.</p>
B Lee – ref: 20554	<p>Objects to allocated site, AWK-C, Bellfield Farm.</p>

	Supports the objection submitted by WCAG.
Fangfoss Parish Council – ref: 20555	<p>Questions if PC's will be consulted on site allocations.</p> <p>Questions why some PC's such as High Catton, Skirpenbeck, Spittal and Warter have not been consulted.</p>
D Hemingway – ref: 20405	<p>Objects to allocated site, AWK-C, Bellfield Farm.</p> <p>Well Lane is impassable during peak times, as well as problems on Beverley Road, Main Street and the A164 junction.</p> <p>Road infrastructure has not been considered as part of the developments.</p> <p>Concerns over pollution caused by more vehicles in the area. Other concerns over the impact on medical facilities and schools.</p> <p>Concerns about the flood risk in the area should the development be approved.</p> <p>More suitable locations for development.</p>
Mr and Mrs Mirfin – ref: 20556	<p>Objects to allocated site, AWK-C, Bellfield Farm.</p> <p>Supports the objection submitted by WCAG.</p> <p>Contends that the road infrastructure cannot cope with additional housing.</p> <p>The services in the village are not substantial enough to provide for additional residents, especially Doctor services.</p> <p>Risk of exacerbating sewage issues.</p>
G Walker – ref: 11574	Believes Parish Council's should have the final say when it concerns site allocation. Suggests road upgrades.
I Carmichael – ref: 20559	<p>Supports the objection submitted by WCAG.</p> <p>Opposes and requests justification and reasoning for the urbanisation of Anlaby and Willerby.</p> <p>Developments adversely affect the quality of life for existing residents.</p>
J Wilson – ref: 20560	Objects to allocated site, AWK-C, Bellfield Farm.

	<p>Supports the objection submitted by WCAG.</p> <p>The additional development adjacent to a school could cause significant concerns.</p>
J & S Mawer – ref: 20561	<p>Objects to allocated site, AWK-C, Bellfield Farm.</p> <p>Supports the objection submitted by WCAG.</p> <p>Any development approved on this site would lead to the inevitable closure of the local cricket club, due to the expense of paying for damage to the new dwellings.</p>
K Clarkson – ref: 20562	<p>Objects to allocated site, AWK-C, Bellfield Farm.</p> <p>Would adversely impact vehicular traffic in and around the area.</p> <p>Would increase pressure on local schools.</p>
R Chamberlain – ref: 20563	<p>Objects to allocated site, AWK-C, Bellfield Farm.</p> <p>Opposes the loss of a largely green area and the loss of a productive farm.</p> <p>Opposes the urbanisation of Willerby</p> <p>Untenable increase in vehicular traffic in the village.</p> <p>Overcrowding in local school</p>
R Spence – ref: 20564	<p>Objects to allocated site, AWK-C, Bellfield Farm.</p> <p>Supports the objection submitted by WCAG.</p> <p>Serious concerns about the impact on vehicular traffic that would be exacerbated by further development.</p>
S Wainwright – ref: 20566	<p>Objects to allocated site, AWK-C, Bellfield Farm.</p> <p>Concerns over congestion, overcrowding in schools, pollution, flood risk and the environment as a result of any development at the site.</p>
A Welsh – ref: 20567	<p>Objects to allocated site, AWK-C, Bellfield Farm.</p> <p>Concerns over an increase in traffic in the area.</p> <p>Infrastructure is not in place to cope with further developments.</p>

	<p>Loss of open space benefits to the local residents could have an adverse impact on health and well-being.</p> <p>Development could exacerbate existing issues with children traveling to work.</p>
Howden Town Council – ref: 20568	Would like several issues to be considered in the LP, relating to infrastructure, facilities and housing in and around Howden.
M Hunter – ref: 20570	<p>Objects to allocated site, AWK-C, Bellfield Farm.</p> <p>Opposes development due to the high levels of traffic congestion in the village.</p>
D Levy – ref: 20571	<p>Objects to allocated site, AWK-C, Bellfield Farm.</p> <p>Supports the objection submitted by WCAG.</p> <p>Road infrastructure is unable to cope with additional development.</p>
F Oliver – ref: 20572	<p>Proposes the need for infrastructure to be put in place, before sites are allocated.</p> <p>Insist on a mix of developments when approving a site.</p> <p>Use brownfield sites with ‘walk to work’ appeal.</p> <p>Support public transport and green ideas.</p>
R Williamson – ref: 20575	<p>Objects to allocated site, AWK-C, Bellfield Farm.</p> <p>Supports the objection submitted by WCAG.</p> <p>Serious concerns over the ability for local services to provide for the village, such as schools, doctors and leisure facilities.</p>
Driffield Town Council – ref: 10228	Suggests holistic overview to include all services when considering the Local Plan.
A Strangeway – ref: 20465	Suggests undertaking new drop-in sessions due to alleged discrepancies at the previous session held in Pocklington.
Ryedale District Council – ref: 19987	Would like to be updated on matters concerning the role of Stamford Bridge, and the landscape character appraisal impact in relation to on-shore wind energy.
K Courtney – ref: 20578	Policy C3 Open Space (wish to include Paull as part of maintaining open spaces between neighbouring settlements at Hedon, Hull and Salt End).

	<p>HVA-A to reflect actual LDO area to avoid confusion Policy A1 to reflect Open Space (C) Policy S6 Employment Land</p>
R & D Jones – ref: 20579	<p>Policy C3 Open Space (wish to include Paull as part of maintaining open spaces between neighbouring settlements at Hedon, Hull and Salt End). HVA-A to reflect actual LDO area to avoid confusion Policy A1 to reflect Open Space (C) Policy S6 Employment Land</p>
L Parker – ref: 20580	<p>Policy C3 Open Space (wish to include Paull as part of maintaining open spaces between neighbouring settlements at Hedon, Hull and Salt End). HVA-A to reflect actual LDO area to avoid confusion Policy A1 to reflect Open Space (C) Policy S6 Employment Land</p>
Melbourne Parish Council (Cllr Cooper) – ref: 20581	<p>Suggests setting a target of growth in each settlement of 5% per annum to result in more manageable growth.</p> <p>Suggests the next consultation exercise should be carried out over a longer period.</p>
W J Failey – ref: 20582	<p>Policy C3 Open Space (wish to include Paull as part of maintaining open spaces between neighbouring settlements at Hedon, Hull and Salt End). HVA-A to reflect actual LDO area to avoid confusion Policy A1 to reflect Open Space (C) Policy S6 Employment Land</p>
A J Duke – ref: 13586	<p>Suggests the use of CPO's to cap the value of land.</p> <p>Would like the authority to seriously consider measures to limit the amount payable for land used in large-scale developments.</p> <p>The current system is unfair and negative.</p>
A Brett – ref: 19588	<p>Objects to allocated site, AWK-C, Bellfield Farm.</p> <p>Supports the objection submitted by WCAG.</p> <p>Opposes further development chiefly due to the traffic congestion that would be worsened by any further housing.</p>
Paull Parish Council – ref: 10785	<p>Policy C3 Open (wish to include Paull as part of maintaining open spaces between neighbouring settlements at Hedon, Hull and Salt End).</p>

	<p>HVA-A to reflect the actual LDO area to avoid confusion. Policy AI to reflect Open Space Section C Policy S6 Employment Land</p>
Howden Civic Society – ref: 10396	<p>ERYC doesn't comply with plans and policies. Preparation and review of the Local Plan is merely a paper exercise.</p>
G Shaw – ref: 106867	<p>Policy C3 Open Space (wish to include Paull as part of maintaining open spaces between neighbouring settlements at Hedon, Hull and Salt End). HVA-A to reflect the actual LDO area to avoid confusion. Policy AI to reflect Open Space Section C Policy S6 Employment Land</p>
J Greenwood – ref: 20590	<p>Objects to allocated site, AWK-C, Bellfield Farm.</p> <p>Supports the objection submitted by WCAG.</p> <p>In particular, great concerns over the potential traffic issues that would be a result of any proposed development on this site.</p>
Thwing Parish Council – ref: 10353	<p>Urges long-term rural planning in villages. Consider the objectives for the next few decades, as opposed.</p>
L Clark – ref: 20591	<p>Objects to allocated site, AWK-C, Bellfield Farm.</p> <p>Supports the objection submitted by WCAG.</p> <p>Also expresses concerns regarding the capacity of local schools and doctors' services. Concerns as well over the impact on the road infrastructure at traffic congestion.</p>
T Norris – ref: 20592	<p>Objects to allocated site, AWK-C, Bellfield Farm.</p> <p>Supports the objection submitted by WCAG.</p> <p>Particular attention should be paid to traffic congestion at peak times in the area, notably at the A164 roundabout, and drainage issues on Great Gutter Lane/ Viking Close.</p>
J R Gardham – ref: 20504	<p>Objects to allocated site, AWK-C, Bellfield Farm.</p> <p>Supports the objection submitted by WCAG.</p> <p>Organisation formed in response to the proposed site at Bellfield Farm (AWK-C).</p>

	<p>In particular, issues concerning congestion that would be a result of any development at the site, and the pressure that this will have an impact on in terms of the A164 roundabout and Willerby Square.</p> <p>Concerned that the local cricket club would have an uncertain future if development was to proceed.</p> <p>Bellfield Farm provides the local community with services and facilities of an educational and historical nature, and the loss of this farm would have an adverse impact on the quality of life of the local community.</p>
Beverley Civic Society – ref: 19579	Encourages inter-departmental consultation within the ERYC when reviewing the LP. Notes that the impact from development on schools in particular is a poignant issue.
C Scarlett – ref: 20594	Suggests holistic overview to include all services when considering the Local Plan.
D Hobson – ref: 20595	<p>The following policies are in direct conflict with one another:</p> <p>Policy S2 with S4 – by supporting new housing in areas where there are no facilities.</p> <p>Policy S2 supports S7, EC1 and EC3 by increasing potential use of town centres from out-of-town settlements.</p> <p>Policy EC4 fails to fully support policies S7-S8, EC1-EC4 and A6, because it does not recognise that journeys out of town are multi-functional, so do not address requirements of S8.</p> <p>A lack of parking is meaning resident are traveling further afield to remote places that are providing a more comfortable commute and parking facilities. This drives business out of town centres, as well as increasing unsustainable journeying. Adequate parking is essential to maintaining sustainable towns and locations.</p> <p>Suggest new retail and leisure facilities should not be able to exclude public parking on their premises.</p> <p>New residential developments should mandate additional vehicular parking.</p>
R Jones – ref: 20579	Infilling of Paull would ruin the character of the village, as an industrial-scale development would overwhelm it.
Mr L Parker – ref: 20580	Would like to see the re-instating of Paull in the LP as part of the section maintaining Key Open Areas (A1, Sec. C, part 2, v).
W J Failey – ref: 20582	
Hedon Town Council – ref: 20486	Parish Council members feel that development in Hedon should be prohibited, based on the recent flood risk review from the Environmental Agency.

	<p>Feel strongly that the green spaces between Hedon and Hull should be maintained.</p> <p>Expressed concerns regarding the proposals at Yorkshire Energy Park and Humber International Enterprise Park, and the impact these could have on the local infrastructure.</p> <p>Strong objection against any potential ABP land to be leased to the chemical park owners for chemical park activities.</p>
J Offord – ref: 20548	<p>Objects to allocated site, AWK-C, Bellfield Farm.</p> <p>Supports the objection submitted by WCAG.</p> <p>Derelict industrial and manufacturing sites should be considered as an option for affordable housing.</p>
P Graham – ref: 20485	<p>Objects to the allocated site AWK-C at Bellfield Farm, Willerby.</p> <p>Notes that transport is a key issue, and that the surrounding artery roads adjacent to this site are beyond capacity for prolonged periods at peak times during the day.</p> <p>Others issues to consider include flood risk – two natural springs within the boundary of the site which were not previously considered when allocating the site.</p> <p>Bellfield Farm is the last working farm in the parish of Willerby. Is of educational importance to local schools.</p> <p>Bellfield Farm s a heritage asset with strong historical links. The only working farm in the parish which is also graded as a high quality farm.</p> <p>Biodiversity – barns and other buildings on the site provide valuable habitats for many important species, including bats and birds. Suggests full wildlife survey be carried out when considering this site for allocation.</p> <p>School expansion would not be able to take place due to the consideration that would need to be taken to the road infrastructure and the increase in vehicles, which is not sufficient or up to the necessary standard.</p>
M Hemingway – ref: 20484	<p>Objects to the allocated site, AWK-C, at Bellfield Farm.</p> <p>There is a disregard to road safety, particularly at peak times on Well Lane. This is putting children at risk.</p> <p>Willerby is presently over-developed, whilst the traffic infrastructure in the village is at breaking point. This will be</p>

	<p>further congested by the addition of further housing,</p> <p>Concerned further development would increase the risk of flooding.</p> <p>Bellfield Farm is the focal point for the community. Has important educational benefit to local children,</p> <p>Council cannot support a scheme for a development under 250 houses, as this would mean that the local infrastructure would not be improved.</p>
H Williams – ref: 20483	<p>Objects to allocated site, AWK-C, Bellfield Farm.</p> <p>Details concerns, including: overstressing the community on services such as doctor’s surgery, schools and traffic congestion.</p> <p>Also opposes to the destruction of Bellfield Farm as a valuable sustainable farm.</p> <p>The farm is a valuable teaching resource for local schools, and any further development would remove this.</p>
S Sanderson – ref: 10478	<p>Smaller properties to be made available for shared ownership and rental, for first-time buyers and retirement market.</p> <p>Attention to infrastructure needs and in particular provision of adequate utilities, adequacy of water and supply disposal.</p>
A McNulty – ref: 20501	<p>Do not develop on green belt land. Density of developments should be considered. Impact on surrounding infrastructure such as roads road safety, congestion, loss of amenity should be considered.</p>

Question 19 - Do the Local Plan's vision, place statement and objectives need to be revised? If yes, how?

Total number of responses: 24

Respondent	Summary of Comments
M Robinson – ref: 20459	Suggests Aldbrough be downgraded to a village, as there is no bus service, and does not have better services than nearby villages such as Sproatley, Burton Pidsea or Burstwick.
C Nicholson – ref: 20476	Stop building in large villages and towns. Suggests spreading housing developments to villages.
B Cloke – ref: 13156	No revisions required.
C G Coulter – ref: 20480	
DPP – ref: 12151	If strategies for settlements such as Stamford Bridge are proposed, then the LP will have to adapt its strategy to reflect this change.
YoungsRPS – ref: 20505	Suggests the Place Statement for Goole should be amended to include Airmyn as a satellite village that can provide sustainable housing.
JVH Planning Consultants Ltd – ref: 10126	The current strategy will need to be revised based on the changing nature of housing requirements.
Sirius Planning (obo FCC Environment Ltd) – ref: 19889	<p>Argues that the M62-A63 corridor exclusively relate to employment areas, but consider other forms of development. The plan should also provide for rural development in accordance with para 84 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Supports objectives 6, 8 and 11, where the Local Plan aims to ensure a deliverable supply of housing, to significantly increase the provision of affordable housing, and to the encourage the efficient use of land.</p> <p>Objective 9 is unclear as to whether it includes brownfield land in rural areas.</p>
Johnson Mowat Planning Ltd – ref: 14053	<p>Suggests it is essential that the Local Plan focuses on economic prosperity and growth.</p> <p>Aruges the protection of the A63/M62 corridor should be retained.</p> <p>Objective 5 should include emphasis on optimal use of existing infrastructure</p> <p>Objective 12 should be retained.</p>
Driffield Town Council – ref: 10228	Driffield place statement requires amendment. Suggests Parish Council deals with task.
Paull Parish Council – ref:	Argue that growth of population does not increase the prosperity of the regions existing population. Increases

<p>I0785</p> <p>A B Nicholson – ref: 20478</p> <p>A Trimm – ref: 20518</p> <p>J Windass – ref: 20519</p> <p>K Courtney – ref: 20578</p> <p>R & D Jones – ref: 20579</p> <p>L Parker – ref: 20580</p> <p>W J Failey – ref: 20582</p>	<p>pressure on local infrastructure. Suggests investment in infrastructure before further development.</p>
<p>A J Duke – ref: 13586</p>	<p>Suggests reference to Northern Powerhouse and HS3. Believes this would help provide an answer to its objectives to increase growth.</p>
<p>G Hicks – ref: 11675</p>	<p>Suggests review after assessment of current developments.</p>
<p>Johnson Mowat - ref: 20588</p>	<p>Important the vision retains focus on economic prosperity and growth. Important that developments can create open spaces and facilitate new pedestrian activity.</p>
<p>Thwing Parish Council – ref: 10353</p>	<p>Suggests revision is necessary to be proactive in shaping sustainable communities. Suggests that this process can be carried out by the Parish Councils.</p>
<p>C Scarlett – ref: 20594</p>	<p>Driffield place statement requires amendment. Suggests Parish Council deals with task.</p>
<p>D Hobson – ref: 20595</p>	<p>Suggests the present vision does not protect Pocklington’s market town centre. The loss of shops to housing and the introduction of low quality services has degraded the town centre.</p> <p>Describes issues concerning footfall, and lack of parking provisions in the town centre, as well as the approval of poor quality retail units.</p>

Question 20 - Do you have any comments on the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report that accompanies this document?

Total number of responses: 19

Respondent	Summary of Comments
Paull Parish Council – ref: 10785	Argues that the document is designed to be too complex and deliberately misleading. Over-50's should be taken into consideration who may have no internet access or service.
A B Nicholson – ref: 20478	Questionnaire is weighted towards predetermined conclusion.
A Trimm – ref: 20518	<p>Suggests when allocating sites, the Council should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seek to protect and promote local heritage. • Promote extensive use of air quality monitors. • Use of full traffic surveys. • Thorough understanding of why people do not shop in Hedon or Hull. • Investigate where people work, focus employment land for those companies. • Conduct wildlife and environmental study.
J Windass – ref: 20519	
K Courtney – ref: 20578	
R and D Jones – ref: 20579	
L Parker – ref: 20580	
W J Failey – ref: 20582	
C G Coulter – ref: 20480	The consultation process is flawed, as it is difficult to reach the public for a full response.
Historic England – ref: 10473	Broadly concur with evaluation. Suggests that Conservation and HAP be closely involved thorough the preparation of the SA.
C Oliver – ref: 20490	Argues that sustainable links and road infrastructure are insufficient in rural areas. Tickton has reduced bus service and lost its pubs – does not require village status.
Peacock and Smith – ref: 16665	Reserve the right to comment.
Highways England – ref: 20434	Suggests that dependent on the options presented, Highways England will assess the associated impact on the SRN in due course.
Natural England – ref: 20515	Approves Objective 10. Should ensure there is a net gain in terms of biodiversity. Ensure sustainable use of natural resources. Protected species should be included.
Sirius Planning (obo FCC Environment Ltd) – ref: 19889	On the DSAM – Sirius object to Q1, which states that only sites adjacent to a settlement would be considered appropriate.

	<p>The LP should consider the vitality and economy of rural areas to boost rural growth, as per NPPF paragraph 84.</p> <p>The DSAM should consider new settlements will be of a scale to produce their own services and infrastructure, therefore should not be scored against.</p>
J Green – ref. 20541	Suggests more emphasis be given to protecting high quality farmland. Non-designated heritage assets should be protected.
P Miall – ref:13104	<p>Objects to the site allocated at AWK-C (Bellfield Farm, Well Lane).</p> <p>The local school is at full capacity. Could mean an end to the cricket club. Would increase speeding traffic in the area. Should be more appropriate sites.</p>
Melbourne Parish Council (Cllr Cooper) – ref: 20581	Not read appraisal. Suggest all developments be sustainable to include solar, water capture and individual wind turbines.
Johnson Mowat – ref: 20588	Questions the validity of 19 Objectives.

General comments submitted and not related to a specific question in the Options Document

Consultation point: paragraphs 3.66-3.69 (Allocations)

Total number of responses: 8

Respondent	Summary of Comments
<p>BNP Paribas Real Estate (obo Associated British Ports) – ref: 12140</p>	<p>Port of Goole</p> <p>Port of Goole is the UK’s most inland port, with an important transport network to the M62, M1 and A1, as well as a dedicated rail freight terminal. As the dock has developed, it has enhanced the connectivity to the town and wider region, promoting economic competitiveness.</p> <p>Request that the Local Plan allocates the Port of Goole on the Policies Map as an “Existing Port Area” or “Operational Port Area” to establish that development will be supported in that area. This will ensure that the ERLP is in line with the NPPF and the NSPS.</p>
	<p>Humber International Enterprise Park</p> <p>Request to allocate HIEP as a Key Employment site.</p> <p>Site 1 benefits from Enterprise Zone status, whilst the renewal of the 2013 LDO is presently being considered.</p> <p>The hybrid application to construct a new estate between Hull Road and Paull Road, and the outline for 446,400m² is presently under consideration.</p> <p>By including the site in the Local Plan, it will ensure the Authority is in line with the NPPF, notably in terms of its economic objectives to build a sustainable economy supporting innovation and productivity, and paragraphs 8, 15, 80, 81 and 82.</p>
	<p>Hull Road, Hedon</p> <p>This site was not allocated in the 2016 Local Plan due to concerns over surface water drainage in the area.</p> <p>Requested that the Hull Road site is allocated for residential development to meet housing needs in a sustainable location. Considered to be in a location within close proximity of existing services and facilities, whilst the area would provide residential developments to accommodate for the expected increase in additional employment</p>

	<p>opportunities in the area.</p> <p>Blacktoft Lane, Blacktoft</p> <p>Requested that the Blacktoft site is allocated for residential development to meet local housing needs.</p>
<p>Indigo Planning (obo J Healey c/o Stadium City Developments) – ref: 19892A</p>	<p>West Ella Grange Farm, Kirk Ella (Residential)</p> <p>The site is outside the development limits but adjacent to the settlement boundary and is not in an important landscape area.</p> <p>Client is flexible regarding the boundaries, and would welcome further correspondence for a preferable solution.</p> <p>There are a range of local services and facilities within close proximity to the north and east side of the site, including schools, Spire, shops and East Riding Hospital.</p> <p>The site is deliverable in accordance with paragraph 47 of the NPPF. It is achievable now with a realistic delivery on site within 5 years.</p>
<p>Indigo Planning (obo Stadium (Vicar Lane) Ltd) – ref: 19892B</p>	<p>Land at New Village Road, Cottingham (Residential)</p> <p>Is a deliverable site that is able to come forward in the short-term. Previous interest in site and owners are willing to develop the site.</p> <p>The site lies nearby services and facilities, including the train station, schools, dentists and GP surgery.</p> <p>The area lies within designated flood zone 1, although a small portion of the site lies within flood zone 3. Site is identified as Open Area, however development would not merge any settlements, and would ensure Cottingham retained its character.</p>
<p>Gladman Developments Ltd – ref: 20361</p>	<p>Land at Roman Road, Stamford Bridge 20361 (Residential)</p> <p>The site is considered to be in a sustainable location. Stamford Bridge is identified as a Rural Service Centre. The settlement has been considered an acceptable location for development in the past.</p> <p>The settlement features a good range of services including a Supermarket, Post Office, Pub, Doctors Surgery,</p>

Pharmacy, Dentist and a Library. The Site is accessibility to these services, sharing similar location sustainability and accessibly credentials as committed sites located immediately to the west and south.

The proximity and connectivity of Stamford Bridge to York, means that it represents one of the most obvious and suitable locations at which to meet any unmet housing need which might arise from the City over the plan period. Additional homes allocated to Stamford Bridge in response to this need would also help address infrastructure capacity issues as identified by the Council within the consultation document.

Gladman can confirm the availability of the Site for housing, and its deliverability during the plan period. The previous application illustrates the willingness of Gladman to promote and secure the residential development of this Site.

Land at Back Lane, Holme on Spalding Moor

Gladman consider that the Site to be sustainably located. Holme-on-Spalding-Moor is identified as a Rural Service Centre within the adopted Strategy Document (the fourth tier of the settlement hierarchy). Holme-on-Spalding-Moor features a good range of serves and facilities. This includes a primary school, convenience store, post office, pub, doctor's surgery, pharmacy, village hall and playing fields. The nearest secondary school is accessible via the 902-bus service in nearby Market Weighton. Holme-on-Spalding-Moor is therefore considered sustainable and is a suitable location for new development.

Gladman consider that the allocation, and ultimately development, of this Site would result in the following significant benefits, including the delivery of 175 dwellings and contribution to the five-year housing supply, delivery of a broad mix of housing, delivery of affordable housing, areas of new open space, provision of up to 128 full-time jobs during the development phase.

(Residential)

Land at The Balk, Pocklington (Residential)

Gladman consider that the Site is situated in a sustainable location. Pocklington is identified as a Town within the adopted Strategy Document (the third tier of the settlement hierarchy) and forms the largest and most sustainable settlement located within the York Sub Area of East Riding.

Pocklington therefore holds an important function within the sub-area and is the primary location at which to concentrate growth to meet the identified housing and economic needs of the subarea.

Pocklington town centre functions strongly and features a good range of daily essential services as well as higher

	<p>order facilities. The settlement includes x2 Supermarkets, numerous shops, a Post Office, Pub, Banks, Doctors Surgery, Pharmacy, School provision, Dentist and a Library. There are also sports and recreational facilities available, and a large employment site is located to the south of the town.</p> <p>Gladman consider that the benefits of the development of this Site for housing are significant, and weigh in favour of the allocation of the Site in the Local Plan.</p>
	<p>Land west of Sykes Close, Swanland (Residential)</p> <p>Swanland is identified as a Primary Village in the adopted Local Plan. Some growth is therefore expected at Swanland over the plan period with provision made for 165 dwellings through the adopted Local Plan. Gladman consider that Swanland provides a sustainable location for development. Swanland features a primary school, convenience store, post office, pub, pharmacy, and recreational facilities. Swanland is closely related to Hull with hourly services departing the village to Hull every hour. Sources of employment are also available in nearby North Ferriby, Hessle, and Brough.</p> <p>Gladman consider that there are many associated benefits of the development of this Site for housing. This includes (see overleaf):</p> <p>Up to 150 dwellings, assisting with the delivery of the housing requirement and maintenance of a five-year land supply;</p> <p>Delivery of a broad mix of housing of varying types, sizes and tenures which is responsive to need and demand; policy compliant affordable housing provision responsive to a significant shortfall of supply, sustainable location close to public transport links, minimising the need to travel by car, areas of new open space for the benefit of new and existing residents.</p>
Highways England – ref: 20434	Suggests proposal to reassess all undeveloped allocated sites.
Natural England – ref: 20515	Would be helpful to look at potential allocation sites, including the Humber International Enterprise Park.
Preston Parish Council – ref: 20551	Feel that wind farms have reached full capacity in the local area.
Johnson Mowat (obo Hull and East Yorkshire Hospital Trust) – ref: 20588	<p>Land South of Castle Road, Cottingham (residential)</p> <p>Disagree with reassessing sites up until plan period of 2029. Argue they should be removed as allocated altogether.</p> <p>The Trust’s land holding south of Castle Road, Cottingham would form a logical extension to Cottingham. It is located in a sustainable location and its development will accord with the Settlement Strategy of East Riding and assist in meeting the housing needs of the Council with delivery achievable within the revised plan period.</p>

	There are no technical constraints to the delivery of the site, and importantly the site does not lie within a high-risk flood zone, it falls completely within flood zone I, unlike a number of other potential sites in Cottingham which are located in high-risk flood zones.
--	--

Consultation point: paragraphs 3.70-3.74 (Call for sites)

Total number of responses: 11

Respondent	Summary of Comments
Indigo Planning (obo Stadium Developments Ltd and Wykeland) – ref: 19892C	<p>Inglemire Lane, Cottingham (residential)</p> <p>Whilst there has not been any developer in the interest in the site to date, the owner of the site is willing to bring the site forward for residential development in the short term.</p> <p>Developing the site off Inglemire Lane would enable the settlement to grow without encroaching into the countryside and would not result in the settlement boundary moving any closer to neighbouring Hull than it already does. In short, the site forms a logical extension to the settlement of Cottingham.</p> <p>It offers a range of services and facilities, including a bank, Hallgate Primary School, a dentist, GP surgery, two pharmacies, bakery, cafes, pubs and a green grocer. Cottingham Railway Station is accessible from the site and provides easy access to Hull, Sheffield, Doncaster and Scarborough. There are also a number of bus stops located within easy access of the site.</p>
Pegasus Group (obo S Goodwin) – ref: 20332A	<p>Land at Green Turtle Cottage, Skipsea (residential)</p> <p>The plan provides an indication of how the layout of the development could be formed to maintain the appearance of the village, to complement its character and respect the open countryside. It also facilitates access throughout the site which includes a pedestrian access direct to Bridlington Road and into the centre of the village. In total the proposal would provide 9 residential dwellings all of which are bungalows.</p> <p>NPPF paragraph 68 highlights that small and medium sites, such as land at Green Turtle Cottage, make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirements of an area and can be built-out relatively quickly. The site is likely to be attractive to the market and is of a scale to be suitable for a range of developers.</p>
Pegasus Group (obo A Cooke) – ref: 20332B	<p>Land at Mount Pleasant Farm, Molescroft (residential)</p> <p>There are distinct opportunities presented by a development of this scale which can deliver and contribute a</p>

	<p>significant level of housing and other uses to the District.</p> <p>This site presents a realistic opportunity for a sustainable urban extension to Beverley that would preserve the character of the settlement and the nearby countryside whilst delivering much needed housing, employment and community uses.</p>
Pegasus Group (obo A Cooke) – ref: 20332C	<p>Land on the edge of Beverley (mixed-use commercial)</p> <p>This site represents a distinct opportunity to provide a mixed-use development on the edge of Beverley, but which is within walking distance of Beverley racecourse. It is considered that a development accommodating commercial, leisure or tourism uses could be accommodated on the site which would serve both the local community and tourists to the local area.</p> <p>The landowner is willing to submit additional technical information in support of site promotion to demonstrate that the site is a suitable location for residential allocation as may be required.</p>
Pegasus Group (obo S&J Draper, J&S Coates, A&S Crozier and A&J Foster) – ref: 20332D	<p>Land at Starcarr Lane, Brandesburton (residential)</p> <p>NPPF Paragraph 118 (c & d) highlights that planning policies and decisions should give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land and promote and support the development of under-utilised land and buildings.</p> <p>This site would contribute to these objectives by making use of existing brownfield land. Existing business on the site would be located to nearby employment sites and allocations as is necessary.</p>
Pegasus (obo the Rooke/Potter Family and Sherbourne Family) – ref: 13538E	<p>Main Street/Mill Lane, Wilberfoss (residential)</p> <p>The site bounds the western development limit of Wilberfoss. It is in part of the settlement that is not at risk from flood therefore represents, sequentially, the more appropriate place for Wilberfoss' growth outside Flood Zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>The Masterplan shows the whole of the landownership available for development and how this can be delivered comprehensively (for in the region of 150-160 dwellings), but it is capable of being brought forward in smaller portion(s) as may be required by the Plan Review.</p>
Pegasus Group (obo the Foster Family) – ref: 13538A	<p>Land West of Spruce Road, Leven</p> <p>The site bounds the eastern development limit of Leven. It is the only part of the settlement that is not at risk from flood therefore represents, sequentially, the most appropriate place for Leven's growth outside Flood Zones</p>

	2 and 3. The site is under the single ownership of family members. It is immediately available for development and is being actively promoted by the landowning family.
Pegasus (obo R Tinson & Son) – ref: 13538D	Sherbutt Fields Farm, Pocklington The Masterplan shows how the site can be delivered comprehensively (for in the region of 370 dwellings), and also identifies a spatial development strategy for strategic landscape planting on land north of Pocklington within the same landownership. A strategic landscape approach for the north Pocklington could enhance the settlement edge, increase biodiversity, and improve opportunities for better access to the countryside.
Highways England – ref: 20434	Highways England are committed to assessing the future impact of allocated sites.
M Stubbs – ref: 20254	Believes that Pocklington has reached optimal capacity, in housing and parked vehicles. Recommends new settlements. Concerned over the impact developments would have on local road infrastructure.
The Coal Authority – ref: 20209	No sites to put forward.

Consultation Point: Draft Site Assessment Methodology

Total number of responses: 8

Respondent	Summary of Comments
City of York Council - ref: 19454	Lack of clarity in respect of the criteria used for justifying a site that merits consideration. Q6. & Q.7 Queries the assumption that ‘walking/cycling distances of up to 800m’ are regarded as ‘easy walks’. Suggest rephrasing wording.
North Yorkshire County Council – ref: 20506	Support the methodology in considering the accessibility of potential sites to existing bus and rail services.
Quod (obo Beal Homes, Strata Homes and Keepmoat) – ref: 19909A, 19909C (respectively)	DSAM is not a suitable method on which to judge the suitability of sites for allocation. Prior to using the DSAM to assess individual sites the Council should first: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Confirm the scale of housing need that they are required to plan for and ii. How they propose to distribute this amongst individual settlements.
Highways England – ref: 20434	Generally supportive of the DSAM Q6) & 7) A cumulative impact assessment of all the sites (employment, housing and retail) will also need to be undertaken in relation to the SRN and how any severe impacts can be mitigated.

	<p>25) If mitigation highway measures are likely required as part of a development, these should be included as part of the site assessments as they may affect viability.</p> <p>26) Highways England would prefer to see new sites located in the vicinity of railway stations, in order to minimise the traffic impact on the SRN.</p> <p>31) It will be necessary for development to demonstrate that any necessary mitigation is deliverable both physically and financially, otherwise this has the potential to delay or prevent the development coming forward.</p> <p>The development traffic arising from the potential sites at the SRN and an assessment of how these impact on the safety and capacity of the SRN will need to be provided to Highways England.</p>
<p>Barton Willmore (obo Beal Developments Ltd, Central Land Holdings Ltd) – ref: 20538A,20538B (respectively)</p>	<p>Concerns that sites could be dismissed too early.</p> <p>Q28. Housing uses should be awarded merit in Town Centres in line with NPPF Para 85f.</p> <p>Q30. Residential schemes accord with the affordable housing policy should be merited more than a neutral score.</p> <p>Supportive of Stage 3.</p>
<p>A J Duke – ref: 13586</p>	<p>Sound evidence-based methodology.</p>
<p>Michael Glover LLP – ref: 11598</p>	<p>Disagree with significant weight being placed in terms of delivery, on the questionable benefits on an ‘option’ on any site put forward.</p>
<p>Environment Agency – ref: 19996</p>	<p>Q17 Suggested factual amendments wording to supporting text to clarify the purpose of source protection zones.</p> <p>Q19 Satisfied with content.</p>