



Hull Local Plan: 2016 to 2032

East Carr
Masterplan

Supplementary Planning Document
6

Consultation Statement

Background

- 1.1 In preparing Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) the Council is required to follow the procedures laid down in the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulation 2012.
- 1.2 Regulation 12 states that before adoption of an SPD the local planning authority must prepare a statement setting out:
 - the persons that the local authority consulted with when preparing the SPD;
 - a summary of the main issues raised by those persons; and
 - how those issues have been addressed in the SPD.
- 1.3 This Consultation Statement accompanies the Supplementary Planning Document 6. This document provides additional planning guidance on Policies of the Hull Local Plan: 2016 to 2032, which was adopted on the 23rd November 2017.

Consultation

- 2.1 Preparation of the draft SPD involved engagement with other relevant Council departments. The draft SPD has been through the Council's committee regime and elected members have had the opportunity to comment on the draft document.
- 2.2 The draft SPD was made available for public consultation for six weeks between Friday 10th August 2020 and Friday 21th September 2020. A public notice to publicise this event was published in the Hull Daily Mail on 10th August 2020. The consultation was also reported to East Area committee in July 2020, to Planning Committee on 3rd June 2020 and approved by Cabinet Committee on 27th July 2020.
- 2.3 The draft SPD and associated documentation was made available for inspection on the Council's website.
- 2.4 Given that the country was in the midst of the Covid 19 pandemic,

consultation arrangements were amended from those set out in the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. The key difference was that instead of a public meeting, two full day 'appointment only' surgeries were held at venue close to the site on 26th August and 9 September 2020. In total 53 people attended these sessions in individual appointments. Everyone that requested an appointment was invited to attend one and those who were not able to attend either day (or where there were no available slots left) were invited to meet separately. Other means of publicity included a public notice, site notices and hand delivered letters (to 500 addresses).

Consultation responses and main issues

- 3.1 The consultation exercise generated considerable levels of interest in local media and especially from the local community with the majority of the responses received highlighting concerns with the prospect of the site(s) being developed for housing. Full details of the responses received (anonymised in recognition of data protection requirements) are set out in Appendix B.
- 3.2 Comments were received from over 600 individuals / households plus a number of other organisations. In addition, two petitions were received the larger of which comprises just short of 2,500 signatures. The question posed in this petition is set out in Appendix C. The second (smaller) petition included specific comments which are set out in Appendix B.
- 3.3 In summary, the main issues raised relate to: Inappropriate scale and location for new housing; Inadequate consultation (Local Plan and SPD); Access roads not suitable for volume of traffic; Impact on surrounding highway network; Concern about flood risk / impact on drainage system; Loss of open space and related greenspace values; and Inadequacy of existing services and facilities to cope with

increased demand.

Main changes to the SPD

- 4.1 Whilst a number of changes have been made to the SPD in light of representations received, most have not resulted in a change being made. There are two reasons for this:
1. Many of the representations relate to the 'principle' of development. The principle has however already been established in the Local Plan. Consultation on the SPD is to gather views on the design and layout of the proposal and not on such matters as scale and location; and
 2. Many of the representations relate to detailed matters which can only be dealt with at the planning application stage. For example, the impact of traffic movement will only be fully known once a detailed transport assessment is produced. Likewise, in relation to the means of dealing with flood risk, this will only be fully known once a detailed flood risk assessment is produced. Such assessments, and indeed many other technical studies, will need to be produced to the satisfaction of the local planning authority as part of the process of determining a planning application.
- 4.2 Therefore, whilst it is acknowledged that many of the representations received during the consultation exercise are valid planning considerations, they are not of direct relevance to this particular document. It is however important to note that further (and more detailed) consultation will take place as and when a planning application is submitted for the site.
- 4.3 The following changes have however been made to the SPD;
- Text has been added to explain that the SPD will act as a

- 'framework' for future development of the site;
- A direct reference is made to the Local Plan and to the allocated sites;
 - An update is provided in relation to consultation that has been undertaken to this point in drafting the SPD;
 - Further detail is provided regarding flood risk and the need to mitigate and reduce risk;
 - A number of additional references have been added to highlight ecological/environmental values and the need for assessments of such value and necessary mitigation measures which may be required;
 - Greater reference to sustainable methods of construction;
 - Commitment to undertaking a transport assessment prior to a planning application being received.

SEE APPENDIX B FOR FULL LIST OF REPRESENTATIONS

Notes to accompany Appendix B

1. General comments received (and what changes if any are proposed) are set out in the first few pages of the report. These cover many of the more detailed matters subsequently highlighted by individual respondees. Cross reference back to this text is made throughout the rest of the document – this is supplemented with additional text where required i.e. to pick up on different / more detailed matters raised by individual respondees.
2. In many cases responses were received from a household to the original Council consultation and to separate (but related) ward member consultation. This table deals with such matters on a household basis i.e. text to the main consultation exercise is set out and responded to. Text provided to ward member consultation is also set out (unless a direct repeat of the main text) but responses / proposed changes are not repeated – unless additional comments are raised.
3. This table does not set out responses received to the separate EIA screening exercise as this did not form part of the consultation on the SPD. Notwithstanding this, the comments received to that exercise are generally covered in the main consultation exercise.

4. This table does not set out responses made to the separate consultation (by the Environment Agency) on the adjacent flood alleviation scheme. Comments relating to the flood alleviation scheme are however raised by a number of respondees and such matters are picked up where appropriate in the table.
5. In relation to the two petitions received, the main petition referred to above is not set out in the table (as there are no specific comments made – it is simply a list of names/households opposed to the development). The smaller petition included specific comments and as such these have been set out in the table.

Appendix B East Carr Petition

This petition has been signed by Families Neighbours and friend of residents in the Spring Cottage and Howdale Road areas. They all object strongly to the Proposed Green Field Development on East Carr. Objections raised relate to the effects on;

- The Environment, Wildlife and loss of Halls remaining Countryside,
- Severely Increased Traffic and associated Road safety,
- Pollution and noise,
- Existing residents Privacy violation and changes to accustomed life in these areas
- Over stretched local Amenities,

A copy of the petition is available to view on request.

Appendix B - 1st consultation comments and responses

Ref_No	Specific Topic	HCC Response	Action Required
Allocate1	Size / principle of development	The size and location of the development was established in the Local Plan. The Local Plan sets an 'indicative' housing figure of 702 for the site. This is one of just over 50 sites allocated for housing (along with a number of other 'mixed use' sites) which collectively are required to meet the identified housing requirement of 9,920 homes over the plan period to 2032. The SPD does not seek to re-visit such matters (nor indeed is it able to do so). This consultation exercise focusses on the layout and design of the site to ensure that a better standard of development is achieved. The alternative to this would be to rely on the relatively 'strategic' policies in the Local Plan - which would run the risk of a poorer standard of development being delivered on this site.	No change to SPD required.
Allocate2	Focus on brownfield first	The council acknowledges and supports comments received regarding the importance of focussing on brownfield opportunities. In order however to meet the identified need for housing over the plan period (to 2032) it is necessary to look at both brownfield and other greenfield land. Added to that, it is often challenging to bring brownfield land forward and the planning system requires careful consideration of 'deliverability' before land can be allocated. A reliance on brownfield only sites / buildings would not have been sufficient to meet identified needs and such an approach would have resulted in the Local Plan being found unsound. The Local Plan includes a target to deliver at least 60% of all new housing on brownfield sites and over the last 4 years that target has been exceeded	No change to SPD required
Allocate3	What has changed since 1994 decision	The Council previously resisted development on this land and following an initial decision to refuse an application this was tested through an appeal - which upheld the Council's decision. The key difference now is that a new Local Plan has been produced which has established a new housing requirement over the period to 2032. The land was previously not required for housing but it now is. An assessment of the merits of this site alongside many others was undertaken as part of the process of preparing the Local Plan. The inclusion of this land as an allocation in the Local Plan is in its own right a significant issue justifying the Council's approach (as compared to that taken in the early 1990's). The previous appeal position highlighted concerns regarding the likely adverse impact of residents of Danby Close - although there was no technical evidence to say that this road could not be used to access the site. It remains the case that there is likely to be an impact on local residents and the extent to which this is the case will be determined in light of technical assessments required to support a planning application. With regards to East Carr Road, the council did highlight technical constraints. This remains the case i.e. access would involve an upgrade / improvement of this road.	No change to SPD required
Construct1	Construction disruption	It is acknowledged that there will be a level of disturbance associated with any new development. The council can control this to an extent by imposing conditions relating to the construction stage and will encourage developers to sign up to considerate construction agreements.	No change to SPD required
Consult1	Inadequacy of Local Plan consultation	In preparing the Local Plan, the council followed national Planning regulations regarding how and whom to consult with and also complied with local requirements on such matters as set out in the council's Statement of Community Involvement. Objections were received to this site (and these can still be viewed on the council's web site). There is no requirement to consult individual local residents – that level of consultation is reserved for more detailed matters such as at the planning application stage.	No change to SPD required

Consult2	Officers unwilling/unable to answer questions	The council has been clear throughout that this consultation relates to the SPD and not to the principle of development (this already having been established through the Local Plan) nor to a planning application – which as yet has not been received. It is only through consideration of an application (and the various assessments that a developer will be required to provide) that the council will be in a position to answer such detailed questions. And it will be in light of such assessments that the council reaches a decision on whether to approve or refuse the application. Whilst officers (as a consequence of the above) were unable to answer many of the detailed / technical questions posed, they were certainly not unwilling to explain the content and detail of the SPD and the process going forward.	No change to SPD required.
Consult3	Poor consultation (on SPD)	Consultation has been made more difficult than normal as a consequence of the ongoing Covid-19 situation but to suggest that this has been used to push the plan through is completely wrong. The council has complied with national regulations on such matters and the approach agreed in its own Statement of Community Involvement. As a consequence of Covid-19, appointment only sessions have been arranged as opposed to a normal public meeting. All requests for such a meeting have been satisfied including additional ones outside of the pre-arranged two day meetings.	No change to SPD required
Des1	Design	The design principles set out in the SPD are consistent with Local Plan Policy and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Where design approaches are illustrated and where examples and indicative design is shown this is also consistent with Building For Life 12 Principles and the adopted SPD7 Hull Residential Design Guide. To be deemed acceptable future proposals for the site must be consistent with the principles and design guidance contained in the SPD. It is recognised that it may not be possible for future proposals to follow every aspect of the SPD to the letter in particular where the guidance takes the form of concepts and/or indicative design guidance. In this sense it stands to be challenged where an alternative design approach can be fully justified and is found to be acceptable to the Local Planning Authority.	Include new statement recognising that where design guidance takes the form of concepts and/or indicative design guidance alternative design approaches can be proposed for consideration by the Local Planning Authority.
EE1	Environmental impact assessment screening	The purpose of the screening exercise is to establish whether there are environmental matters of such significance that cannot otherwise be dealt with as part of the normal planning process (through the determination of a planning application). The decision here is that such matters can reasonably be dealt with as part of a normal planning application process – this is not to say that there are no environmental issues to be addressed.	No change to SPD required.
EE2	Environmental value	The value of this land (including environmental and ecological values) was considered during the process of preparing the Local Plan. Whilst it was acknowledged that some values did clearly exist, on balance a decision (supported by the Government's Planning Inspector) was made to allocate the land for housing. The SPD provides a framework to ensure environmental value is retained / improved where possible including new open spaces, green corridors, tree planting. The ecological value of the land will be considered further in light of a planning application and where possible existing values will be protected (accepting that much of the land will be lost to development). The SPD refers to the importance of retaining existing natural features and the provision of new open space will seek to capture some of the existing value and create new features. Depending on the specific values identified, the Council will consider the scope to mitigate harm through planning conditions. In this respect, it is useful to note the comments received from Natural England (refer to EC33 below) and Yorkshire Wildlife Trust (refer to EC41 below) and to the proposed amendments made to the SPD in response.	No change to SPD required. But refer to specific changes made in light of comments received from Yorkshire Wildlife Trust and Natural England.

EE4	Pollution	<p>Comments on pollution noted. Whilst acknowledging that growth as established in the Local Plan is required, the council (through a range of planning policies and wider ambitions expressed through it's declaration of a Climate Emergency) will endeavour to minimise levels of pollution. New development will need to comply with Local Plan Policy 47. Whilst the SPD cannot insist on future residents not having a car for example, it can through design requirements increase the likelihood of people using more sustainable forms of transport. Agree to emphasis importance of mitigating the potential for pollution</p>	<p>Add the following text to the end of section 2.3, 'In accordance with guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework and relevant other Local Plan policies, applicants will be required to mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from the new development and to consider carefully lighting strategies to protect local amenity</p>
Flood1	Flooding & drainage matters	<p>Whilst it is acknowledged that there are flood risk issues in the surrounding area (and the proposed Flood Alleviation Scheme to the north of the proposed housing site will impact positively on this) the new development will be designed to ensure that no additional risk will occur. The SPD already confirms that a detailed Flood Risk Assessment will be required as part of any subsequent planning application. Specifically in relation to drainage, the Council will require any new development at East Carr to 'mimic' the existing natural drainage. This means the developer will need to provide evidence of where the site naturally drains to, and at what run-off rate, and then to use this information to assess the storage requirements and discharge points needed. The size of the storage will be based on the more extreme flood event but there will also be a requirement for 'interception storage' which is for the everyday rainfall so the drainage system post development works the same as pre. At present the site is frequently waterlogged as the rain falling onto the field is unable to discharge onto the ground as the soils are heavy clay. Therefore the development will be looking at similar storage volumes but rather than the water just ponding over the field it will have to be routed and contained in sustainable drainage systems such as detention basins, swales, tree pits, permeable paving the volume of which should add up to more than what can presently "sit" on site.</p> <p>The Council recognises that surface water on the site does not discharge into the sewer system to the west but naturally ends up in the Holderness Drain, via East Carr Drain and Sutton Cross Drain. New development will be required to not further exacerbate the drainage situation within the existing housing area.</p>	<p>Various references added to explain the current flooding and drainage situation and requirements going forward to deal with such matters. Add a commitment to not commence housing until completion of adjacent flood alleviation scheme.</p>

LF1	Local services (GPs, dentists)	The SPD acknowledges that local services will be needed as ancillary to new housing. The indicative masterplan is designed around a 'green heart' regarded as a viable location for community and commercial building(s) providing facilities such as a café, crèche, changing rooms and public WCs. The masterplan also indicates the inclusion of retail in the form of a 'local supermarket'. Whilst the SPD strongly encourages these facilities it also acknowledges that commercial elements such as cafes and local shops will be subject to commercial decisions by future developers and operators. By promoting a development with a strong sense of identity and locating community facilities at its heart, the intention is to facilitate the necessary economic conditions to attract and sustain such commercial uses. With regards to services such as GPs, dentists and pre-school child care these are essentially private enterprises and as such are beyond the scope of the SPD. The Council cannot require the provision of such services but must ensure that providers are aware of the scale and location of planned development. Providers of such services were involved in the wider process of preparing the Local Plan and will therefore be aware of planned levels of growth - this is important in allowing such operators to plan to meet growth as part of their ongoing business plan.	No change to SPD required.
LF2	School capacity	The provision of a new school is not feasible on the back of this scale of development (in terms of both numbers of additional pupils and effectiveness). The adequacy of existing schools to accommodate additional numbers of children was assessed as part of the process of preparing the Local Plan and at that time, no issues were highlighted (i.e. growth in pupil numbers could be accommodated) with the exception of required new provision at Kingswood. Clearly with the passage of time such matters change and accordingly this position will be reviewed as and when an application is submitted. It should be noted that the Council envisages this site being built out over a ten year period (i.e. the impact of existing schools will not be sudden). There is scope to seek developer contributions to meet such needs should a particular need be identified.	No change to SPD required.
LF4	Maintenance of open space	Maintenance of open space. This can be achieved either by the council (often taking a contribution from the developer) or through a third party company (often involving ongoing payments from householder).	No change to SPD required.
LF5	Dog rescue centre	The presence of the dog rescue centre is a consideration in relation to residential amenity. However, anyone purchasing a home in proximity to this will be aware of the likely impact. Planning legislation provides protection for existing uses in such cases placing the burden on new occupiers to make sensible choices.	No change to SPD required.
PC1	Home insurance	The ability to obtain (affordable) home insurance will not change as a consequence of the proposed development. For flood related insurance issues, the council would advise residents to visit www.floodre.co.uk .	No change to SPD required.
PC2	Loss of light	The new dwellings are sufficiently distanced from existing properties to ensure there will be no significant loss of light.	No change to SPD required.
PC3	Loss of outlook / privacy	Loss of outlook / privacy / impact on property value. Refer to PC2 and PC4. The SPD provides a framework which helps to ensure that new development does not compromise the amenity of existing housing and particularly in respect of overlooking / privacy issues. New development is laid out in such a manner as to maintain reasonable distances between existing and new development and planting is promoted to assist in retaining / providing effective screening.	No change to SPD required.
PC4	Property value	There is no evidence to suggest that existing property will be de-valued as a result of new development	No change to SPD required.

T1	Access (Danby Close/East Carr Road)	The SPD identifies Danby Close and (an improved) East Carr Road as the two likely access points to the new development. The extent to which these roads can accommodate the proposed level of growth will be established through a Transport Assessment which the Council intends to undertake (refer to T2 below) and this will inform consideration of any subsequent planning application. This will establish likely levels of traffic flow arising from the development. The SPD describes these access points as possible / potential routes and other options have been proposed in this exercise. The SPD will be amended to encourage applicants to consider alternative access arrangements as required in light of the outcomes of the transport assessment. At present, Danby Close and East Carr Road remain as the council's preferred routes.	Add the following text to section 4.2, 'The Council will consider the merits of alternative access proposals as part of any planning application, should the transport assessment suggest that this is necessary'.
T2	Wider traffic concerns	It is acknowledged that a development of this scale will have an impact not only on the immediate network of roads (eg. those proposed as access / egress points) but also potentially on the wider highway network. A number of potential 'pinch points' / problematic junctions have been identified by respondees. Likewise, concerns have been raised regarding additional vehicular movements associated with increasing pupil numbers and other trips to shops, places of work or other essential services (GP's doctors etc). Related concerns have also been raised in relation to safety (busy roads, accidents and difficulty experienced by pedestrians trying to cross the road). The Council has committed to undertake a transport assessment to consider the likely effects of this development on the surrounding road network (including the two proposed access points) This assessment will provide a full understanding of the traffic impact of new development and will identify what mitigation measures may be required to overcome such issues. This will provide a context for any future planning application and will sit alongside the guidance set out in the SPD. There may still be a need for a more detailed transport assessment to accompany a planning application (in accordance with the provisions of Local Plan Policy 27.	Add the following text to section 4.2 of the SPD, 'therefore the Council has committed to undertaking a transport impact assessment of the wider area (including the two proposed access points)' and 'The outcome of this assessment will provide a context for any subsequent planning application albeit a further more detailed assessment may still be required to accompany an application'.

All responses on the table below are from local residents unless otherwise stated.

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
EC1	Concerned over the size of the development. Limit the number/style of the development. Move the development to a more suitable location. Height of the properties and close proximity. Style of the houses not in keeping with the area/location. Sutton is an historic village.	See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above The relationship to Sutton village as a consideration in the design and layout of this area is not considered to be significant given the very considerable new development that has occurred in the wider area over a number of years. Likewise, the relationship to the style of housing in the immediate surrounding area is a consideration but not one that is seen as being a determining factor in the proposed style of development set out in the SPD. Existing housing reflects the style and building practices of the time. The proposed new housing will respect the general suburban form of the surrounding area (and this is already highlighted in the document)	No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required
	Flow of traffic to the area – roads/access are unsuitable. Access for emergency services.	See T1 (Traffic access) above	The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required
	Light to properties that will face the new development. Devaluation of my property.	See PC2 (Loss of light) above See PC4 (Property value) above	See above See above

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>Flooding to existing properties in the area. Issues obtaining home insurance and the cost. Change access to the development to another area – consider alternative options.</p> <p>Received via Cllr Craker/Dunston Schools and Education.</p>	<p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above See PC1 (Home insurance) above See T1 (Traffic access) above</p> <p>See LF2 (School capacity) above</p>	<p>See above See above The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required</p> <p>See above</p>
EC2	<p>Environment We have the pleasure of overlooking the first field off East Carr Road and with that comes the hours of watching the various wildlife that goes with it throughout all seasons each year. We wake up and observe Deer grazing just at the back of our fence, Foxes with their cubs playing in the early morning sun.</p> <p>Barn Owls flying around the field hunting for field mice. Sparrow Hawks also hunt on this land. Grass snakes and frogs live in the grass. Pheasants, Partridge & Woodcock ground nest on the fields. Woodpeckers feed on our bird food and the trees around the fields. Numerous songbirds live and nest in the Hawthorn hedges surround the fields and lane. Wildfowl including Shelducks, Malards, Swans, Geese (Pink footed, Greylag and Canadas) & Grey Heron all arrive when the fields are in flood - which I will come on to.</p> <p>This land is one of the last green field spaces within the city boundary and as such should be protected against this proposal.</p> <p>Generations of children have played and exercised on this land and it allows City kids to explore and reap the benefits of a wide countryside space right on their doorstep. Every year children play on the hay bales harvested and this brings back happy memories of when I was a child. Do you as a City councillor really want to take this pleasure away from future generations? It's nice to see the older kids camping out on the fields and most do so responsibly, taking rubbish home with them; Probably out of respect for the land they have grown up using. We have noticed a significant reduction in pollution during this pandemic, not only in this area but as a City. This will be drastically increased due to the traffic needed to build a development of this scale and the future occupiers' cars. This could be in the region of 1000 extra cars. Most families now have at least 2 cars nowadays, so I don't think that is an unreasonable figure to assume.</p> <p>Flood risk Every year the field at the rear of Stornaway Square floods. I have notice this has got worse every year with this winter being without doubt the most concerning. It very nearly entered many of our neighbour's properties. The Golf driving range flooded twice this year</p>	<p>See EE2 (Ecological value) above</p> <p>See EE2 (Ecological value) above</p> <p>See EE2 (Ecological value) above</p> <p>Whilst the proposed development will undoubtedly reduce the amount of open space in the immediate vicinity, there will still be relatively easy access to open / relatively wild areas (including the area being provided as a flood alleviation scheme to the north) and other open spaces will be provided within the new development.</p> <p>See EE4 (Pollution) above</p> <p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p>	<p>A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site</p> <p>A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>See above</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	We sit out on the field on a summers evening and enjoy the near silence. That will be taken once a building site begins for years to come and will continue with the new occupants.	See Construct1 (Construction disruption) above	No change to SPD required
	We exercise our dogs on these fields and they enjoy their freedom to run and play with other dogs whilst we chat with our neighbours and many visitors from surrounding areas. It is quite a community.	See EE2 (Environmental value) above	No change to SPD required.
	Our house value will drop as a result of this proposal. Many Neighbours paid extra for the luxury of not being overlooked and the beautiful outlook.	See PC4 (Property value) above	See above
	Whilst I accept that there is a need for new housing, I firmly believe that brown field developments need to be considered first along with utilizing Town Centre sites and using the Old Docks. A new Victoria Dock development should be done around the Lord Line buildings long before even thinking about using our last Green fields.	See Allocate2 (Focus on brownfield) above	No change to SPD required
	Email		
	Following the recent Public consultation meetings at Saltshouse Tavern, I would like to have my comments recorded for inclusion in the cabinet report.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
	1. Transport & road infrastructure		
	I am extremely disappointed and embarrassed to have Hull City Council highways as my local authorities highways section. Despite numerous questions asked regarding what the council will allow and expect from a potential developer, there was no reassurance or any ideas given, to how the Council expect to overcome the issues that they themselves overturned the last application with in 1994. The traffic situation has increased significantly since then and would drastically increase again should this proposal be allowed.	See Allocate3 (What has changed since 1994) above	No change to SPD required
	A comment on the screening process for this plan stating -there would be be no significant potential environmental impact as a result of this development - How on earth can anyone, let alone a senior council officer, come out with a statement like that? There HAS to be an impact as a result of another 1000+ vehicles using the estate roads. Ridiculous statement and the officer in question should be scrutinised by council and disciplined/dismissed unless he can prove otherwise.	See EE1 above (EIA screening) above. There is no suggestion that there will be no impact. The screening exercise establishes the likely magnitude of impact and as a consequence whether this can be dealt with as part of a panning application or involving an EIA. The views expressed at the consultation event on this matter are entirely appropriate and based on the required process for such matters.	No change to SPD required
	I understand that crossing the proposed development entering via Danby and leaving by East Carr wouldn't be possible except for emergencies. I understand that any new development on this scale requires two access points. By not allowing transversing traffic, this will now require 4 viable routes in, in total. Where are the other 2 going to be?? Why wasn't this stated on the SPD?	See T1 (traffic access) above. This view is incorrect. Despite the fact that through traffic will not be allowed the requirement for a development of this scale is for two access/egress points - this is what is proposed and is what s set out in the SPD.	The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required
	2. Flooding and drainage		
	Again I was disappointed that the council official couldn't again offer any advice and comfort to residents over the issue of flooding of both the rivers, drains and the fields themselves. It appeared that the council officials hadn't even seen the fields in flood as they where surprised by the quantities of water estimated and indeed the worst field affected wasn't identified as the flood plain.	See Flood1 (flooding) above. The Council is well aware of the level and nature of flooding in this area and indeed across the rest of the city. The policy context which underpins the delivery of new development requires full regard to be given to such matters ensuring not only that new areas of housing are protected but also that existing flood risk is not transferred to neighbouring areas. This will be tested as part of the consideration of any future planning application.	See above
	3. Local amenities		
	The SPD incorrectly identified 2 GP surgeries on Howdale Rd which haven't been operating for some 4-5 years now. The nearest is over 2 miles away. Lack of foresight by the planning team hadn't considered this on the SPD and they should have.	The SPD will be updated to reflect that these surgeries are no longer in the area, however it should be noted that the nearest doctor's surgery is just over a mile away, not over two miles away, and there is a dentist a little closer.	SPD will be amended to reflect closed surgeries
	Reassurance on Additional School places couldn't be made by the council planner which again is a massive oversight . All schools in the area are over subscribed and should be addressed at this stage and not left to a developer to fudge around.	See LF2 (School capacity) above	See above
	To Summarise, I feel this SPD has been ill thought out with no concerns for existing residents and has been rushed through under cover of COVID-19. It was also poorly advertised to the local community. Only 550 letters distributed to an estate of 2000-3000 homes is poor. The Environment Agency have sent out 1350 as part of their consultation for North Carr Flood alleviation!!	See Consult3 (SPD consultation process) above	No change to SPD required

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>Lamp post signs were taken down before the 1st meeting and poorly re-fitted once HCC where made aware. Local notice board didn't even have a copy posted.. Flood alleviation works need to be put in place and thoroughly tested to ensure that existing properties AND any potential new developments are protected. The existing road network needs serious attention and upgrading well before any possible consideration to allowing the proposed development being granted permission. How can this possibly be allowed with the current road network? Preston Road redevelopment has been put on hold due to traffic issues and there is an existing network in place So how can East Carr be allowed? More consultation with residents to discuss what will and won't be allowed Must be done to ensure those residents lives will have minimal disruption before during and after any possible development completes.</p>	<p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above See T2 (wider traffic issues) above. The reference to Preston Road and to the traffic concerns related to that development is a useful one to the extent that it demonstrates exactly how hard the Council needs to work when dealing with such proposals to address traffic issues. In that instance, a number of junction improvements have been identified which the developer will need to fund. Without such improvements, the scheme would not have been supported. This level of detail was not known when the site was allocated but has been identified through detailed transport assessments produced to support the application. This is exactly the same process that will be followed for the site at East Carr. Further consultation will be required as part of the planning application process</p>	<p>See above See above No change to SPD required</p>
EC3	<p>We have concerns around flooding risks and traffic access. Traffic congestion. Lack of school places. Doctors surgeries. Loss of the last natural green space in Hull. Can anyone from the council guarantee we will not flood due to these houses being built? Will our home insurance go up from increased risks? Will we still be able to get insurance? Can the council guarantee volumes of traffic will not increase and pollution increase? The roads are not suited to large volumes of traffic. Surely brownfield sites are better for sustainability and lessening the impact of environmental pollution.</p>	<p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above See T1 (Traffic access) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See LF2 (School capacity) above See LF1 (Local Services) above See LF1 (Local Services) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above See PC1 (Home insurance) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See EE4 (Pollution) above See Allocate2 (Focus on brownfield) above</p>	<p>See above The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required See above See above See above See above See above See above See above No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required</p>
EC4	<p>Object strongly to the proposed Green Field Development on East Carr. Objections raised relate to the effects on the Environment, wildlife and loss of Hull's remaining countryside, severely increased traffic and associated road safety, Pollution and Noise, Existing residents privacy violation and changes to accustomed life in these areas. Overstretched local amenities.</p>	<p>See EE1 (EIA screening) above See EE2 (Environmental value) above See EE2 (Ecological value) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required No change to SPD required. A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
		<p>See T1 (Traffic access) above</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>See EE4 (Pollution) above</p> <p>See PC3 (Loss of outlook / privacy) above</p> <p>See LF1 (Local Services) above</p> <p>See LF2 (School capacity) above</p> <p>See LF1 (Local Services) above</p>	<p>The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required</p> <p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p>
EC5	<p>I disagree with the proposed plans for the following reasons,</p> <p>1) I live on Danby Close, I chose to live there as it is a cul-de-sac, its quiet and friendly. We get very little trouble/disturbances due to the fact we are a cul-de-sac. I have a 6 year old boy who is coming to an age where he will want to play out the front. As it is now I could let him, no speeding traffic, no buses all the neighbours know him and would look out for him, there are no strangers as such as mostly the only people that come down Danby live down Danby. This proposal changes all that, everything we bought when we purchased the property, gone. I know this a very selfish view but if you have children yourself you will understand you want them brought up in as nice an environment as possible. This is why we chose to live here and not a main road.</p> <p>2) The fields flood on a regular basis (I believe some of the neighbours have photographs to back this up). Where is this water going to go with 650 houses built on it? They will flood and the surrounding area is more likely to flood. Houses will flood, insurances will go up. I suppose we could all start commuting via Kayak, which brings me nicely onto the next points.</p> <p>3) Increased traffic on the roads. These roads are already busy in fact the whole of East Hull is an absolute nightmare for traffic and not just at rush hour. Most houses have at least 2 cars and I know from the plans each one of these houses is supposed to have 1 parking space and a garage, that's potentially an extra 1300+ cars all coming down Danby, Howdale Road and Dunvegan Road each day, joining the already congested Salthouse Road and Robson Way. I hope no one is in a hurry as they won't be moving very fast. Traffic and Noise pollution will increase, not very environmentally friendly but hey the new houses will have the electric point shame very few people in Hull can afford an electric car!</p> <p>4) I think we can all agree we mainly have vehicles to commute to work, there are a number of work vans down the street including my husbands, they can't use the bus. I'm a working parent I cannot rely on buses (currently the bus takes 40 to 50 minutes to get into town that's with the bus lanes!). I drop my son off at the schools breakfast club at 7.30am and have to be at work for 8am (obviously I am always late due to the extremely bad traffic management in Hull and the fact that numerous roads are closed at the same time!). I cannot be late collecting him from school so have to time my journey to the last minute. A bus is out of the question, they are not reliable and it doesn't matter how many bus lanes you throw at us. They are unreliable due to the fact they stop at every bus stop along the way. Even with the bad traffic commuting in a car is still quicker. I know what you're going to say, why not use your bike. I'm sorry but most bikers are fair weather bikers what happens in the winter? I know we now have more bus lanes to use but I'm sorry I'm not taking any chances with a bus. If a car knocks me off whilst over taking I stand a chance of surviving but a bus? No thanks!</p>	<p>See T1 (traffic access) above. The planning system exists to ensure that required levels of growth are provided in appropriate locations having regard to impact on amenity. The Local Plan has already established the need for growth over the period to 2032 and locations required to meet that need. Planning approval is however still required before any development can occur and it is through the application process that impact on amenity and other detailed matters will be considered.</p> <p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p> <p>See T2 (wider traffic issues) above. The comment regarding electric vehicle charging points is noted but it is important to also note the Government's intention to bringing forward a shift to electric vehicles and the fact that as this date approaches the second hand market and relative affordability of such vehicles will change significantly. This area of land is likely to be built out over a ten year plus period and the houses will be around for many years thereafter.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Council fully appreciates that for many, the use of a car is essential. However, there are opportunities to provide alternative modes of transport and the Council is committed (as part of it's climate change and wider sustainable growth ambitions) to improving such options.</p>	<p>The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>5) I appreciate you there are so many cars on Danby due to the lack of amenities and in the plans they are some on the new estate. What sort of amenities are they planning on building? Unless there is a supermarket people are still going to shop at supermarkets they need to drive to. Putting a couple of small shops on the estate will not have the desired effect. All it will do is encourage groups of youths to hang around the estate. If we need to pop to a local shop we have quite a few in the vicinity, The local garage has a shop, there is one on Dalsetter close near the school, there are a number in Sutton Village and Tweendykes. All of these are in walking distance and are well used by most of the estate.</p> <p>6) Schools, Doctors and Dentists are already oversubscribed with huge waiting lists and parents actually battling it out about school places. Where are all these extra students and patients going to go. How can the existing infrastructure cope with an extra 1300+ people?</p> <p>7) This is one of the last green spaces in this area, its home to various wildlife, birds, bats, various wild flowers and hedgerows . We have even seen a family of deer on these fields on numerous occasions. What will happen to all these?</p>	<p>See LF1 (Local Services) above</p> <p>See LF2 (School capacity) above</p> <p>See EE2 (Environmental value) above</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>
	<p>8) Nature and exercise helps with peoples mental health (Something Hull struggles with) and many people uses this area for these purposes. People work hard and have a lot going on in their lives being able to get back to nature without having to leave the city is fantastic and it's not only used by residents of Danby, Howdale and East Carr. Residents from Bransholme, Sutton Village, Sutton Park and even further reap the benefits of these fields and the surrounding areas.</p> <p>9) The plans suggest that the developers are wanting to create communal community areas which I appreciate, however by building these houses they are ruining our existing community and changing many people's lives and lifestyle. When HCC are already well above their building target I personally feel the Cons most definitely out way the Pros.</p>	<p>See EE2 (environmental value) above</p> <p>See Allocate 1 (size/principle of development) above. Whilst building rates over the last 4 years have been above the requirement established in the Local Plan, the council is required to have sufficient land to meet the requirement over the entire plan period (to 2032)</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC6	<p>Email 1</p> <p>I have a few issues I would like to raise about the planned housing on East Carr and why I am appalled that this is even being considered although I have heard that it's more or less a 'done deal' I am hoping this is not the case.</p> <p>This housing estate will have nothing but a detrimental effect on all who already live around this area as this is a much used natural habitat by a great many people. The space they are allocating to leave for a green space are Loglands Nature Reserve and one field next to the Hornsea track. Here are my issues with this :</p> <p>Many people, myself included, let dogs run free on walks on the present fields with enough space to socially distance which has become a part of life at the present time and for the foreseeable, this would not be possible on the field next to the track as there is not enough space and as there are mopeds, joggers and cycles going up and down the track at all times the dogs would chase them. Also, as a lot walk dogs early mornings to see the wildlife on the fields and to exercise in the peace and quiet, we would have to walk through the new housing estate to get there. Having a small garden as do many on Spring Cottage, my dogs don't have the room to run, so what should I do? Well maybe I should then drive them somewhere else to exercise but I don't have a big enough car so maybe I should buy a van, then I could drive a long distance to exercise them, which then defeats the object of a new estate being built that encourages the home owners to not have a car so as to promote cleaner living but at the same time, everyone else has to use their cars more because they have no green space to use.</p> <p>Then what about Loglands Nature Reserve? We walk down a track to get to it which is in itself a lovely scenic walk but this track is to be made into a major road for the planned housing estate so this will also be destroyed, again, leaving us residents with no enjoyable green space and no home for wildlife.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>Comment noted</p> <p>See EE2 (Environmental value) above</p> <p>Although the current route to the nature reserve will change, the development of this site offers opportunities to improve access.</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>Amend SPD to make reference to maintaining / improving routes to Loglands Nature Reserve.</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	Who are the people this proposed housing is aimed at?	This is a market led development i.e. the housing provided will be available for anyone wishing to live in this area - the type, nature and size of housing will be considered when an application is submitted but this will be informed by policies in the Local Plan which highlight e.g. the need for larger family housing . A proportion of the new housing (as is the case in any new development) will be available as affordable housing.	No change to SPD required.
	Eco friendly people who want a world without cars and to save the Earth by using a cycle instead of a car? Yet they are happy about a wildlife habitat being bulldozed and built over and everyone else having to use their cars to accommodate this?	As with any new development in the City and as part of the wider climate emergency agenda, the Council is keen to promote schemes which are less dependent on cars than has previously been the case	
	First time buyers? That's young couples who will want cars for social outings and work vans.	Comment noted - the proposal is not exclusively focussed on first time buyers and there will be a strong emphasis on family housing.	
	Families? They will have cars to transport children to schools, activities, shopping.	Comment noted - the SPD does not say that people will not have cars. It does however seek to provide design options minimising the need to travel by car.	
	Middle aged couples? Children all grown up and moved out but will make regular visits in their cars with their own children.	Comment noted	
	Older pensioners? Maybe don't want a car but will still have family visiting regularly in their cars, will maybe need ambulances which will have a restricted route to prevent the pollution of traffic.	Comment noted	
	Because of the proposed restricted car access due to 'eco friendly' planning, all these new residents and their visitors will park on the surrounding areas which do not have the capacity for this, making it a dangerous and extra fume filled environment for all the residents of Spring Cottage and Howdale Road. Adding extra to this is the proposed extended bus route spilling noise and fumes round the estate and dangerous traffic levels putting a great many lives at risk.	Any new development will still be required to meet parking standards set out in the Local Plan (eg.2 off street spaces for a 3 bed house).	See above
	Which ever way you look at this, it is not for anyones benefit, these are just excuses to build on green space and nothing what so ever 'eco' about the whole idea.	Comment noted	
	As this is apparently the only green space left to build on in Hull, what do you propose when this is gone? Where will the council plan to build the quota of housing each year when there is no space left to build on? They have to stop somewhere , for once could the council please listen to the residents and put a stop to this planned estate and let us keep our already natural eco friendly zone?	The Council will continue to search out suitable opportunities for housing to meet identified needs. There will always be a focus on brownfield opportunities (including redevelopment land not required for its current use and conversions of buildings) but inevitably there is likely to be a continued need for some green spaces for new housing	No change to SPD required.
	Email 2 I have previously emailed my reasons for my objections to this planned housing estate on the understanding that my email counts as an objection. I have filled and returned any objection forms sent and emailed anyone I can who is involved in this matter.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
	The reason I am emailing again is because I feel so strongly opposed to this scheme as do a great many others but there are some that do not have the capabilities or confidence to do this and after some attending the consultations (of which I attended myself) felt upset, uncomfortable and made to feel belittled which I can quite understand as I would have felt that way myself if it wasn't for the fact I am a strong personality and after politely informing the 3 interviewees (as that was what the whole set up felt like) that I had only 10 min to have my say, I did not want to have that 10 min taken over by each of them telling me things I already knew (that is what I was there objecting about) and taking up my time so as not to give me a chance to speak. This was an appalling way to belittle people and I am disgusted with the way this was carried out. Not one of the 'interview' panel knew of the area or ever been there to see what the problems are. This again appalls me. I did not see one person take notes of what I was saying which leads me to believe they had no interest in my opinion or any others.	It is disingenuous to say that officers in attendance were not aware of local issues or had not visited the site. A note was taken of all comments made - but everyone was encouraged to submit comments in writing. A brief introduction was provided at the start of each session but after that, it was over to the individual to ask questions. The officers in attendance adopted a flexible approach recognising that some people had much to say and others were there more to hear further detail on the proposals.	No change to SPD required.

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>At the end of my consultation after giving very valid reasons on all my objections, the final word from one of the interviewees was “ well, the property developers have got to make their money somewhere “.</p> <p>This is NOT a valid reason to build a housing development on highly valued green space and wildlife habitat and in an area which has no facilities or infrastructure to support yet more housing on an estate that I can guarantee not one of these so called ‘considerate’ property developers would ever live on themselves! They create concrete jungles, take their money and walk away to their nice big house and garden in a lovely spacious and clean area and leave the rest of us to live in the hell they create.</p> <p>As I am sure you can see, I still strongly object.</p> <p>Email 3 (Via councillor Healand)</p> <p>Dear Councillor Healand,</p> <p>I understand you are opposed to the planned housing and trying to assist the local residents in this matter? I for one, greatly appreciate this. I have sent you this copy of an email I have sent to Karl Turner and our local labour Councillors with a few issues I have with this development :</p> <p>[repeat text from e-mail 1 above]</p> <p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>A bad Idea</p>	<p>Reference will have been made to the reality that housebuilders are required to make a profit - otherwise they will not build houses. This is clearly set out in national planning policy. This is not to say however that the local planning authority (informed by local views) does not have a key role to play in influencing the quality and nature of new development</p> <p>Comment noted (refer to previous response)</p> <p>Comment noted</p> <p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC7	<p>We live at Nordale Close and are very distressed to hear about the potential building of over 650 houses on the area to East Carr Road with an entry on Danby Close.</p> <p>Howdale Road is already a very busy road with parking and buses and to increase the volume of traffic to this new site would be dangerous and cause a lot more congestion than there already it.</p> <p>There are already bottlenecks at Sutton Village/Leeds Road/Wawne Road roundabouts, the top of Howdale Road and Dunvegan Road and also going onto Holderness Road at the Diadem roundabout. To add further traffic to this busy area would be downright dangerous and cause massive tailbacks and at all areas.</p> <p>If the new project could have an entrance and exit onto Kestrel Ave and bypass Howdale Road it would be better than adding further bus routes to already busy residential area, were children play out and the elderly walk.</p> <p>We also moved to this area of Hull because we were right on top of lovely fields and walk ways to Hornsea, Great Highfield, etc and that would be taken away from us all.</p> <p>Therefore we would like to add our objections to this site as being particular a bad idea.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>The two proposed access points appear to be the most realistic options available however, the document has been amended to encourage application to submit alternative access proposals should such options be identified. Access from Kestrel Avenue is however unlikely to be achievable given the distance from the site (and accordingly cost) and the fact that it would be taken through existing open areas.</p> <p>See T2 (wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>Comment noted</p> <p>Comment noted</p> <p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>Add text to encourage consideration of alternative access arrangements</p> <p>Consider a new access point to the site from Kestrel Avenue</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC8	<p>I have lived on Spring Cottage Estate since 1981, regarding the proposed planning on this land for 650 houses, people should realise this land has not been cultivated due to the land flooding, during winter months this land remains water even he golf course still floods, it happened last year, the council has put in place flood defences on the green field on Spring Cottage Est and the green field area off Howdale Road. There will be issues of flooding &</p> <p>I can't get house insurance with certain insurance companies due to this issue. Where will the water go, once built on.</p>	<p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p> <p>See PC1 (Home insurance) above</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>See above</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>The next issue will be traffic on East Carr road where due to people parking on one side of the road which they are entitled to do, you have to wait till on coming traffic before having access to travel on to Stornaway Square or Gleneagles housing Estate, if a proposed number of 650 houses are to be built, take in too account say average of 450 vehicles this will become a hazard even with access to Danny lane.</p> <p>There is also the issue of schools, Spring Cottage primary school is full, you cant access Spring Cottage at certain times of the day when the local school opens & closes due to the volume of traffic</p>	<p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>See LF2 (School capacity) above</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>See above</p>
EC9	<p>Hi, my Wife and I live on Princess Royal Park and we are very concerned by what the council is advocating, my first concern is the extra amount of Traffic on Salthouse Road, it is already over used with HGVs, Vans Cyclists, motorists and Motorcyclists already, now you (The Council) wants to add several hundreds more of Vehicles everyday, Stupidity is what I call it, I am a car drive of many years and sometimes I take my life in my hands to get out of Princess Royal Park, enough of traffic, so what a bout the FACT THAT YOU WILL BE BUILDING ON A FLOOD PLAIN. Which doesn't seem to bother you.</p> <p>The excuse of needing more affordable houses is RUBBISH, the ones that are being built on Salthouse Road right now, they are standing empty, do you know why, because they are too expensive these house are certainly not Affordable houseing.I am almost sure that none of the council officers will contemplate buying a house within a flood plain area so why would expect Normal Folk too. These houses wouldn't be, being built for the Illegal Immigrants currently Residing in The Royal Station Hotel would they. Its about time that this council started worrying about the people that actually pay Poll Tax and treat them as good as you do the Benefit Wallahs of Hull.</p>	<p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p> <p>The reason for allocating this land for housing is not to deliver affordable housing it is to meet identified housing need in general (i.e. largely market housing). There is a requirement for affordable housing of 10% on this particular site. The reference to 'illegal immigrants' is incorrect as such people are not eligible for social housing.</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required</p>
EC10	<p>What makes you think this is a good practical idea when we cant get flood insurance for existing homes in the area now! Insurance companies already class this area as a great flood risk!</p> <p>"I don't believe it". See your turning me into Victor Meldrew</p>	<p>See PC1 (Home insurance) above</p> <p>Comment noted</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC11	<p>Email 1 As a local resident living on Howdale Road, close to the site I wish to make you aware that I strongly object to the development in that the proposals will have a serious negative impact to the local area and the standard of living of the current residents. My specific objections are;</p> <p>Increased risk of flooding Traffic generation and congestion Road access</p> <p>Highway safety Increase noise and disturbance Pollution Impact on the environment Impact on wildlife</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above See T1 (Traffic access) above</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See Construct1 (Construction disruption) above See EE4 (Pollution) above See EE2 (Environmental value) above See EE2 (Ecological value) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>See above The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required See above No change to SPD required No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required. A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>Loss of recreational/green space Pressure on local amenities, schools, doctors and dentists, etc.</p> <p>Overlooking and loss of privacy Loss of visual amenity</p> <p>Please would you confirm whether the Local Plan was examined by the Planning Inspectorate back in 2017 when the site was allocated for housing or was the decision made at a local level? I also believe that plans for its inclusion go back a number of years prior to the allocation. If this is correct what were the reasons for the plans non-allocation prior to 2017 and what changed in 2017?</p> <p>Email 2 Via Councillor Healand As a local resident living on Howdale Road, close to the site I wish to make you aware that I strongly object to the development in that the proposals will have a serious negative impact to the local area and the standard of living of the current residents. My specific objections are as follow;</p> <p>Overlooking and loss of privacy Loss of visual amenity Traffic generation and congestion Road access Highway safety Increase noise and disturbance Pollution Impact on the environment Impact on wildlife Loss of recreational/green space Pressure on local amenities, schools, doctors and dentists, etc. Increased risk of flooding</p> <p>I sincerely hope that the you take my objections on board when considering your own stance on the development and that you will make the necessary representations to ensure these proposals do not go ahead</p>	<p>See LF1 (Local Services) above See LF1 (Local Services) above See LF2 (School capacity) above See PC3 (Loss of outlook / privacy) above</p> <p>The Local Plan was examined by a Planning Inspectorate Inspector who considered the proposal to allocate this land for housing and he agreed that this was an appropriate land use. The land was previously allocated as Urban Greenspace. The Council previously defended this position on the basis that at that moment in time it was not required for housing (refer to Allocate 3 (what has changed since the decision in 1994) above</p> <p>Comment noted (refer to response above)</p> <p>See comments in relation to initial response</p>	<p>See above See above See above See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC12	<p>Dunvegan Road and East Carr Road can't take anymore traffic it's a nightmare now trying to drive down East Carr its not wide enough. The fields flood in winter where will all that water go? Onto Spring Cottage. Not enough schools, doctors and shops to cope with 650 new homes, why not use the land on Bransholme on Wawne Road, its stood empty for years now. Leave us some green space so that people can use it as they do now.</p>	<p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above See LF1 (Local Services) above See LF2 (School capacity) above Land at Bransholme is allocated for housing. At present (as is the case at East Carr) no planning application has been submitted for development</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>See above See above See above No change to SPD required.</p>
EC13	<p>I understand from your correspondence the Hull Local Plan was adopted in November 2017 and has been allocated for house development. We have lived in Danby Close since 1985 which is a quiet close of 46 houses. By definition a "Close" is a residential street without access.</p> <p>We objected to the development of this land in 1994 and planning was denied due to environment issues and heavy traffic congestion via Danby Close and East Carr Road, this request was for 350 houses. What has changed, apart from more cars on the highway and global warming both very significant reasons for this planning not to go ahead.</p>	<p>See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above</p> <p>Refer to Allocate 3 (what has changed since the decision in 1994) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>The document states that objections were raised in 2017, whom by? What process was followed? Information was not sent to us regarding this proposal.</p> <p>The population in Hull in 1994 was 308,000 it is now 259,778. Why more housing? Especially on green fields which have shown to be so important for wildlife, mental and physical wellbeing for all ages.</p> <p>Climate change is a global problem more so than in 1994, we are experiencing more rainfall each year, in 2007 Howdale Road, Spring Cottage and surrounding areas experienced flooding. Where the development is proposed these fields hold water, this last year for up to 5 months. House insurance is not offered by all companies due to us already being on a floodplain.</p> <p>Highway safety, traffic generation and pollution will all be impacted on the proposed plan of 650 houses. 650 houses will create as a minimum of 650 cars plus work vehicles, this is a very conservative estimate, add to this daily visitors and the increased vehicles that online shopping has created, daily school runs and a proposed new bus route all via Danby Close, additionally refuse collections and emergency services all being accessed by Danby Close.</p> <p>Spring Cottage school is already oversubscribed. Currently it is a problem to be able to see a GP in our area in a timely fashion.</p>	<p>In preparing the Local Plan, the council followed national Planning regulations regarding how and whom to consult with and also complied with local requirements on such matters as set out in the council's Statement of Community Involvement. Objections were received to this site (and these can still be viewed on the council's web site). There is no requirement to consult individual local residents – that level of consultation is reserved for more detailed matters such as at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The population of Hull in 1994 was lower than it is now. Land is required to meet identified needs. The level of required growth is set out in the Local Plan and this was agreed by the Planning Inspector. Sites were identified and allocated having regard to a range of different factors. A detailed site assessment exercise (which can be viewed at https://hullcc-consult.objective.co.uk/portal/localplan/lpsub_1 under the Local Content section) informed such decisions</p> <p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p> <p>See PC1 (Home insurance) above</p> <p>See T1 (Traffic access) above</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>See LF2 (School capacity) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required</p> <p>No change to SPD required</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p>
EC14 Lovell Developments	Page 6: The document states it should be read as a Design Code. This makes it much more prescriptive than a simple guidance document. Clarity is therefore required - on Design Codes used historically the masterplan and content has been set in stone and had to be followed. How restrictive will this be? This is particularly important when considering the technical requirements for the delivery and how these have been factored into the design features being sought.	The SPD does <u>not</u> state that it should be read as a design code. It does however state that masterplans are often accompanied by design codes and that in relation to certain elements of the document (e.g. design of public spaces) an approach akin to a design code is adopted. The document is however clear in section 2.2 (fourth paragraph) that it not only provides certainty for developers but also flexibility to 'allow plans to evolve as the detailed design of a development is worked through'. This message is emphasised further through new text added to section 1.1	Add text to Section 1.1 clarifying the purpose of the document

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>With regards to the flood risk and drainage suggested amendments in red with the original text struck out. Hull asked for 40% climate change in the meeting – SPD mentions 30%. Hull also require a further 10% for urban creep. Page 13 General comment – SUDS should be SuDS in line with current industry practice. Flood risk and drainage Guidance provided in this SPD should be read in conjunction with Hull City Council's Living With Water SPD. It is recommended to divide the site/catchment into two cells: Yorkshire Water main drain systems; and the Environment Agency watercourse system. Surface water management will follow the hierarchical approach for disposal of surface water run-off. Consideration should firstly be given to discharge to soakaway/infiltration system, watercourse and public sewer in that priority order. The existing site drains to Suttoncross Drain and into Holderness Drain (designated as Main Rivers) and it is envisaged that run-off from the development will drain to these watercourses, but at a restricted rate. The restricted rate will be equivalent to the existing greenfield run-off rate as agreed with the Environment Agency and Hull City Council Flood Risk Management. Restricting the run-off to greenfield rates for the development mimics the existing site so as not to increase flood risk downstream. On-site surface water storage will be required and this will provided within the lowest parts of the site, to take advantage of existing natural topography. Surface water storage will also be provided throughout the SuDS and drainage systems across the site. For the purposes of modelling a run off rate of 3.5 litres per/sec applies to the site (greenfield). Overland flows and breach outcomes must be picked up in modelling for the Flood Risk Assessment that accompanies any future planning applications, as will details of the Flood Zone B area. Flood risk from all sources must be considered, including failure of defences and surface water overland flows from extreme storm events. There is a need for a consistent approach to flood management and the phasing of construction and drainage implementation throughout the site if multiple developers are involved. An holistic approach to Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS), both above and below ground, is expected with SUDS incorporated into the design of homes, streets and open space. SUDS are to be designed in line with the new Codes for Adoption so that Yorkshire Water can take on the role of maintaining the system. As such designs should take account of volumes for the 1 in 100 +30% for Climate Change rainfall events.</p> <p>SUDS should be integrated across the whole development wherever reasonably practicable possible i.e. within streets, pocket parks, tree pits, and boundary treatments. This holistic approach to SUDS will help take a proportion of the required storage volume. There is an opportunity to open the culverted drain in the southwest corner of the site. An 8m maintenance easement along all Main River watercourses is required by the Environment Agency, there is an opportunity to design this easement in such a way that provides a perimeter path/green corridor around the site encouraging pedestrian and cycle movements, and linked to surrounding open space and the Trans Pennine Way cycle route. In terms of building design all facility buildings to utilise store and reuse methods whilst it is expected that as a minimum all houses will be installed with water butts, the volume of which is to be agreed with Hull City Council Flood Risk Management Team.</p> <p>Page 16: Highway improvements to be funded - how much, what improvements and what developments will contribute - clarity required for viability purposes.</p> <p>Figure 6: The number of roads shown to the outer perimeter of the development and along green corridors serving plots on only one side is excessive and could be commercially unviable. The route alongside the central hedge should be shown as a pedestrian/cycle rather than vehicle.</p>	<p>Comments noted. No amendment required to SPD as the policy approach to such matters (including through cross reference to the Local Plan and specifically to the Living With Water SPD) ensures that a holistic approach is indeed taken and much of this detail will need to be agreed through discussions between Lead Local Flood Authority and the Environment Agency. Agree to clarify the climate change figure.</p> <p>This will only be known once a planning application is submitted (including details of how many house proposed) and accompanying traffic modelling.</p> <p>Figure 6. is a concept plan no revision is necessary.</p>	<p>Add 'plus 10% for urban creep' after the sentence "As such designs should take account of volumes for the 1 in 100 +30 for Climate Change rainfall events".</p> <p>No change to the SPD required</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>Page 23: Where reasonably practicable and adoption and maintenance protocols will allow, SuDS zones will be incorporated between the footpaths and carriageway and will include features such as street trees in cell systems and rain gardens. Private frontages to the buildings must be a minimum of 2m but this can be extended as appropriate.</p> <p>Page 24: SUD zones on the peripheries of the site - if we are going with PD's rather than single sided streets how does this work - will it be resident's responsibilities. The street section and description (carriageway, 2 footways and cycleway) is a costly solution which may affect viability. There needs to be flexibility to use a range of different arrangements on the site perimeter and against existing hedges. The following should therefore be incorporated: - Where reasonably practicable and adoption and maintenance protocols will allow.....</p> <p>Page 25 SuDS systems within the streets – need to add in somewhere SuDS streets will be incorporated where reasonably practicable, where adoption and maintenance protocols will allow and where access for maintenance can be incorporated. SuDS features on the cross section need to be a depression / shallow swale – not a mound.</p> <p>Page 29: Masterplan shown at present is not commercially deliverable. If taken forward, then the annotation needs to state that it 'shows one possible masterplan for the site' as it does with the bus route. This is the concern of the term Design Code being used. As previously stated the number of 'one sided' roads may threaten viability of the development if prescribed by the SPD.</p>	<p>It is not considered necessary to amend the text as the SPD already provides sufficient flexibility to deal with such matters. The SPD rightly sets out a series of expectations - the deliverability of such matters will need to be tested at the application stage and a developer would need to provide a satisfactory argument to deviate from the spirit of what is set out in the SPD.</p> <p>No change to the SPD is proposed. All SuDS will be subject to adoption and maintenance protocols and this will need to be addressed as part of any future proposals for the site. Street sections shown are described as being 'typical'. There is sufficient flexibility for variance from that shown in the SPD provided an alternative design approach can be fully justified and is found to be acceptable to the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Refer to earlier comment i.e. no need to include flexibility references throughout.</p> <p>The masterplan provides a clear framework for the development of the site. It is not intended that this will be overly prescriptive and alternative proposals which follow the spirit of the policy and / or improve upon this will be supported</p> <p>One sided streets are located to address the edge of the development, and existing features such as the hedgerows. The layout shown is also based on the principles of grids and blocks to create a clearly defined residential layout that is street-focused with buildings fronting onto the public realm, and private spaces at the back. Perimeter blocks make efficient use of space, and ensure properties face onto the public realm. Having development that is side-on or backs onto public spaces should be avoided.</p>	<p>No change to the SPD required</p> <p>No change to the SPD required</p> <p>No change to the SPD required</p> <p>Refer to new text added in 'Purpose of the SPD' section</p> <p>No change to SPD required</p>
	<p>Some junction arrangements may be difficult to implement as shown and do not appear to be in line with technical requirements</p> <p>The pond, trees and hedges around the existing kennels are not shown.</p>	<p>Noted and accepted. These are shown indicatively.</p> <p>Trees and hedges are shown indicatively. Reference to the pond is noted and accepted. Its omission from the indicative drawings is not deliberate, and The Local Planning Authority are open to proposals that retain the pond, especially where this relates to proposals for above ground SuDS</p>	<p>No change to SPD required</p> <p>No change to SPD required</p>
	<p>The use of cycle and pedestrian routes segregated from cars is not clear on the plan The 'heart' also needs to state that other uses can be developed if considered feasible - at the moment the way it reads is that this is a requirement to be developed as part of this site. Who will be responsible for providing and maintaining such facilities as this does not form part of the allocation requirements? Secured by Design factors are also elements which need to be considered alongside the adoption of the roads within the rear courtyards being sought after throughout the development. The way these appear to be proposed would inevitably lead to active frontages to streets but would not have the benefit of the same to the rear where parking is to be provided. Parking would not be within the curtilage of the dwellings and not necessarily directly related to the properties they serve.</p>	<p>At this scale, an indicative plan is not going to show such detail however figure 6. and Chapter 6 both provide further detail of the recommended design approach to the use of cycle and pedestrian routes. The SPD encourages (as opposed to requires) a range of community uses at the 'green heart' of the site as this would contribute positively to the overall sustainability of the new development.</p>	<p>No change to SPD required</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>How will the use of charging points be designed/accommodated for within the development in those rear parking courts? Particularly with lack of surveillance. What is to stop someone else charging their cars on someone else's supply. The consideration of levels is fundamental due to the flood mitigation – would parking courts work? The levels of the roads and parking courts would be set much lower than the dwellings themselves. This would lead to concerns over accessibility and gradients. From a general design perspective, it should be recognised that the provision of courts as drawn would lead to inefficiencies within the layout of circa 15%. This inevitably results in a loss of housing numbers overall on the site. House Type Mix – the masterplan assumes larger semi detached dwellings. This is not reflective of the mix likely to be developed at the site based on revenues.</p> <p>Based on the land quality, peat and piling requirements, garages are not a viable option for development on many areas of the site.</p>	<p>The draft Masterplan delivers an amount of development and density that is considered comfortable for the site having regard to the relative density of the surrounding area and as a means of achieving a high quality environment. Provision of EV charging points is a design challenge any future proposals will have to consider and meet as part of proposed parking strategies and the design of, and interface between public and private spaces. HCC does not consider the requirement in the SPD to provide a variety of parking solutions/design approaches across the development to be prohibitive. There is sufficient flexibility for variance from that shown in the SPD provided an alternative design approach can be fully justified and is found to be acceptable to the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>The SPD does not prescribe the type/mix/size of housing and this will be determined in light of the identified needs as prescribed in Local Plan Policy 5</p> <p>The issue of levels in regards to flood mitigation would be determined at the planning application stage, based on a detailed topographical survey and the evidence and data required for a drainage impact assessment.</p>	<p>No change to the SPD required</p>
	<p>Additional Technical Considerations and Costs on deliverability of the site</p> <p>The scheme needs to be designed around the technical constraints in the first instance particularly to mitigate against the flooding. The following points therefore outline some of those technical considerations that must be accounted for as part of the deliverability and costs for the site: -</p>	<p>Disagree. Flood risk is clearly a significant factor influencing the development of this site (and there are various references throughout the document highlighting this) but there are a wide range of other important factors to be considered in delivering a high quality form of development. And the SPD is set out to highlight all such matters.</p>	<p>No change to the SPD required</p>
	<p>The site lies within a source protection zone (SPZ3) for the Chalk Aquifer. It is therefore likely that the Environment Agency will require additional works with respect to drainage design and measures to mitigate pollution.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change to the SPD required</p>
	<p>Energy Design – Although the principle of this is commended, there are viability and cost concerns. We would suggest that a % of the site should be covered and not demand that this is taken forward on every plot – This adds a potential of £5000.00 per plot for solar panels (This would be £3,500,000 for a development of 700 units)</p>	<p>The SPD references Local Plan Policy 17 and this policy will apply to any future proposal for the site and not merely a % of it. Although reference is made to solar panels (and associated costs) these are not explicitly required through the SPD (or in Policy 17) and there are a range of potential means of delivering energy savings/benefits through design.</p>	

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>Clarification of EV point required – Mode 2 is standard 3 pin socket with charging cable provided by the car manufacturer which is the preference. However if Mode 3 is required this is a fit for purpose charging point on a dedicated service at £555/per plot. If as the SPD suggests 2 charging points per home adds an additional £1110 per plot coupled with the examination of whether additional substations and electricity infrastructure would be required to facilitate the increased electricity demand. CIL – This area of Hull commands a CIL charge of £60/m2 which is a significant cost when developing the site. NDSS house types and Building Regulations Increase (Part M 4). This will incur additional build cost required for the same revenue as standard types. This results in no additional revenue to cover those additional build costs. Based on the Flood Risk work undertaken, Flood Alleviation measures to dwellings which may be required: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood resistant external doors and any window openings that extend to the worst areas of flooding (if considered acceptable). • Raise DPC above FFL. Engineering bricks to be used below DPC – subject to foundation design. • Ensure any sanitary and waste fittings or internal gullies are above FFL. Otherwise, fit nonreturn valves on private drainage, but it should be noted that these can be a maintenance liability. • Utility and duct entries to be above FFL or fully sealed. • Electrical sockets to be a minimum of 300mm above FFL and circuits are to drop down from the ceiling rather than coming up from the ground floor. • Foundation designs, concrete blocks, floors, membranes and other related construction details will be subject to any detailed design requirements but should be in accordance with “Improving the Flood Performance of New Buildings, Flood Resilient Construction”, issued May 2007 by the Department for Communities and Local Government. <p>Ground Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 75% of the site will require surcharging due to the Peat • 20m piled foundations will be required due to the Peat • Site slopes 0-2m <p>Drainage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SPD suggests SUDS are a viable flood risk solution, however it should be noted that following the undertaking of a ground investigation, engineers have advised that soakaways will not provide means of surface water disposal for the site, consequently there will be a need for surface water balancing. • From the work being undertaken from a Flood Risk perspective, subject to EA & HCC Approval) along with further studies carried, it is recommended that flood mitigation be primarily set by establishing minimum floor levels. The suggested minimum floor level is 100mm above the maximum flood level depicted by mapping in the SFRA. The varied increases required across the site are as follows: circa 25% of the site up by 300mm circa 20% up 600mm, circa 50% up by between 600 to 900mm. This would ideally be 600mm plus 300 flood resilience measures • Rising Main required • FW and SW pumping stations will be required • Oversized drainage will be required 	<p>In terms of the specification for home chargers as set out under the current Government grant programme for home chargers. https://olevgrant.com/electric-car-charging-points-for-home/ . The rate of charge only needs to be 7kW nothing more.</p> <p>HCC is asking for a single EV point installed and operational and the ducting only to install a second point. Therefore, what is required to meet the SPD requirement is a single operational EV point that is OLEV approved and installed by an OLEV approved installer. The Distribution Board in the home needs to be EV compliant so that the two EV points can be used at the same time without presenting a fire risk in the home. There have been examples nationally where house fires have been started by EV owners plugging in two vehicles to the existing house 3 pin socket system.</p> <p>In terms of a second point, the requirement is just to provide the trunking so this could be a second trunk parallel to the one installed for the live point or an oversized single trunk. The trunking for the second point needs to exit next to the first live point and be capped for later retrofit.</p> <p>Acknowledge that national policy on such matters is likely to change and in due course may be picked up through amended building regulations and/or planning policy. The above however reflects the current position.</p> <p>Comment on development viability noted. The SPD however sets out the range of likely policy costs and it will be for the developer to consider how best to meet these aims.</p> <p>Comments noted but feel this level of detail is for a planning application and the required Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Comments noted but feel this level of detail is for a planning application and the required Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Comments noted but feel this level of detail is for a planning application and the required Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Comments noted but feel this level of detail is for a planning application and the required Drainage Impact Assessment.</p>	<p>Requirements on EV charging points will be made more explicit in the SPD.</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>The design is imperative not only in hitting a high quality but more importantly realising the delivery of the scheme. As demonstrated above, technical considerations should be the first consideration. Fundamentally the issue therefore is whether or not the site can “afford” all that is being sought within the draft SPD. The technical abnormalities are significant on this scheme due to the ground and drainage requirements, coupled with CIL, NDSS (including Part M building regs) and the affordable housing in addition to the EV points and energy design requirements. It should be noted that the average selling prices in the area from Oct 2017 – Sept 20 are at £169.69/ft2 which is considerably low to substantiate the high abnormal costs associated with this site.</p>	<p>Disagree. In the first instance the site needs to be designed to meet the planning policy framework that is: Hull Local Plan and all relevant Supplementary Planning Documents.</p> <p>As previously stated all content within this SPD is given with the best intention of assisting developers and their design teams. To be deemed acceptable future proposals for the site must be consistent with the principles and design guidance contained in this document. It is recognised that it may not be possible for future proposals to follow every aspect of the SPD to the letter in particular where the guidance takes the form of concepts and/or indicative design guidance. Alternative design approaches must be justified and found to be acceptable to the Local Planning Authority. During the pre-application and planning application stages when more detail is available on the level, nature and type of development proposed and associated costs, it will be possible to consider (where a convincing case is put forward) variations to the masterplan - and these will then be taken into account in reaching a decision on whether or not to support the application.</p>	<p>No change to the SPD required</p>
<p>EC15</p>	<p>I very strongly object to the proposal for the building of the above houses and I object on the following grounds. I originally moved into Danby Close in April 1980 and spent 6 years before moving to Stonegate, so I have lived in the area for 40 years.</p> <p>I also remember back in the 1990s that the council turned down planning permission mostly the same reasons as I give below .</p> <p>These houses are to be built on a flood plain. Remember 2007 when this area looked more like a large lake and hundreds of homes were flooded. How can you consider a development in such an area? Which is contrary to the councils own Strategic policies regarding flooding and drainage. Which idiot Labour Councillors agreed to this idea of developing this green field flood site? It does not make any sense especially as I stated it contravenes the council's own policies.</p> <p>This is still classed as a high-risk zone and the surrounding houses and land would not be able to cope with the additional drainage needed to cope with the new development. It can not cope now and is frequently under water. Why not build on brownfield site which I thought was council policy.</p> <p>In addition, the transport system, roads and infrastructure will not be able to cope with the additional cars and vans. 650 homes will equate to over 1000 more vehicles. The road entries are Dandy Close and East Carr Lane which with parked cars are far too narrow to allow further access to the site. This area is already overworked with the current traffic as the current main road Salthouse and Robson Way are often just standing traffic. We need a bypass not more houses. Traffic and environmental issues and concerns have got worse ever since I moved into the area back in 1980.</p> <p>Where are the new children going to be educated? There are no new schools in this area and in fact Lambwath school was closed and now new housing is currently being built on it. What about insurance premiums for our homes with the additional threat of flooding increasing with this development.</p> <p>Finally, the environmental impact on the wildlife we have left in this area would be drastic to say the least. This field should be left alone and no housing to be constructed.</p> <p>Response to Councillor Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet A bad idea. Very bad it's a flood plain as well.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>Comment noted</p> <p>Development in this area does not contravene local planning policy. The council will however need to be satisfied that any planning application adequately addresses the risk of flooding (reference to Local Plan Policies 38-40)</p> <p>See Allocate2 (Focus on brownfield) above</p> <p>See T1 (Traffic access) above</p> <p>See LF2 (School capacity) above</p> <p>See PC1 (Home insurance) above</p> <p>See EE2 (Ecological value) above</p> <p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required</p> <p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required</p> <p>The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	It is ridiculous to even think about building 650 houses on that flood plain. Also the roads in this area are far too congested as it is. Another 1,000 cars which it will be stupid. We need a ring road from Bilton round Sutton, Bransholme and Kingswood rather than more houses, to ease pressure on Saltshouse Road and Robson Way.	Proposal for ring road from Bilton round Sutton, Bransholme and Kingswood – there is no strategic justification for this proposal and no source of funding available.	No change to SPD required
EC16	<p>I request the Hull City Council to oppose the above development because: the area is a flood plane, it will only make potential flooding more possible. the area around Howdale Road, Dunvegan Road, Saltshouse Road even more congested than it is now. Traffic around Howdale Road is often quite bad, with the bus service having difficulty getting pasted cars parked on the road. Danby Close is not suitable to take all the extra through traffic the developments will cause. It is totally unfair on the residence of Danby Close.</p> <p>at present we have difficulty in getting doctors appointments etc, with an additional 650 households local GP services will not be able to cope. the local school Spring Cottage is already over subscribed, so will additional an school be built etc? They are many other areas in Hull (brown field) sites that could be used for this development. Why destroy this lovely green field site. Listen to the people who voted you in, to represent our views. Response to Councillor Craker/Dunston leaflet The area is a flood plain and should not be built on. The road infrastructure around Danby Close, Howdale Road etc is inadequate now, this development would cause major issues. Local schools and services would struggle to cope with such a development. Therefore I request that you represent my view of not supporting the development.</p>	<p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>See T1 (Traffic access) above</p> <p>See LF1 (Local Services) above See LF2 (School capacity) above See Allocate2 (Focus on brownfield) above</p> <p>Comment noted Comment noted See responses provided above</p>	<p>See above See above</p> <p>The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required</p> <p>No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required.</p>
EC17	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed development of East Carr Fields and the proposed build of 650 houses. This area often floods quite heavily, also the impact on the Environment and Wildlife as well as local amenities, recreational use of this land but above all the detriment to the local families ie extra traffic and pollution.</p> <p>I live off Howdale Road and the traffic to get onto Saltshouse Road is often impossible so how this can be improved with an extra 1000 more cars and buses is a loss to me. I urge you to stop this housing development as there are also several new developments already in progress all along Saltshouse Road which will also add to the over stretched area. I hope this e-mail will help you to reconsider this development. Response to Councillor Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet A bad idea</p>	<p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p> <p>See EE2 (Environmental value) above See EE2 (Ecological value) above</p> <p>See LF1 (Local Services) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>The required transport assessment will take into account traffic from other new and proposed developments in the area.</p> <p>Comment noted</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required. A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site See above See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC18	I think its a bad idea , The traffic is going to be horrendous for people in the area, And not only that it's a floodplain , Haven't we learnt the lesson from 2007. Not only that this could have an effect on the price of houses in the area .	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>They are local schools and the safety of our children should be of the utmost importance. On a last note Hope Common sense prevails and keep our country side for a place to enjoy</p>	<p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above See PC4 (Property value) above See LF2 (School capacity) above Comment noted</p>	<p>See above See above See above No change to SPD required.</p>
EC19	<p>1. Bad idea 2. Enough houses around this area 3. Will cause far too much traffic</p>	<p>Comment noted The Local Plan identified the need for around 10,000 new homes over the plan period to 2032. This figure was thoroughly tested and found to be sound by the Planning Inspector appointed to examine the Local Plan. All sites allocated in the Local Plan (including the two sites at East Carr) are required to meet this overall requirement See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required. See above</p>
EC20	<p>1. We strongly object to this planning application. There is no doubting the local residents can only perceive this 'Spatial Masterplan' negatively. It will be catastrophic for Danby Close and will have a serious impact on the neighbourhood, particularly in terms of traffic. What about provision for school places etc etc? Such a large development on a high risk flood area is folly!</p> <p>However, <u>the overriding concern</u> is that the main and possibly only access point, is via Danby Close – not ideal as part of the proposed major bus route, both in and out of the new housing site or the construction of the building site entrance. This will cause serious detriment; it will blight the lives of residents who will become trapped, unable to get off their drives with all the traffic and double yellows. What about access for Emergency vehicles at all times? A solution could be to bulldoze some if not all of the houses in Danby Close. Is this to become part of the plan?</p> <p>The report is correct in saying that the development threatens congestion and bottlenecks.... And there will be a 'significant increase of vehicles within the vicinity' (p16). The talk of providing ways of avoiding the need to drive within this wetland oasis is daft. The report is fanciful 'pie in the sky', full of flowery jargon and contradiction. To build up to 860 houses (based on 40 homes per hectare) and expect folk to ride bikes and trikes or go off on a ramble rather than drive around is a load of nonsense! As there are no plans to build a school, children will have to be driven to schools outside of the area as the nearest one is already over subscribed!</p>	<p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>See LF2 (School capacity) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above Danby Close is one of two access routes to the proposed site. There is no intention to clear any properties to gain access to the site.</p> <p>The SPD rightly seeks to make provision for movement other than by private car but still makes provision for car based travel / parking. The impact of such movement will be assessed when a planning application is submitted and a decision taken at that point as to whether or not this equates to an acceptable or otherwise situation. The SPD refers to an indicative housing figure of 689 (not 860)</p>	<p>See above See above See above No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>The proposed cul-de-sacs, internal courtyard settings look so overcrowded and unappealing (Figs 9/10, P19). All the SUDS and water butts in the world will not overcome the flood risk which will be ever present in this 'island on a sea of green space' (p21). Also the case for 'one-sided' streets says it all in the quest to cram in as much housing as possible. Such thinking does not result in a 'high quality residential development'. The Council will be taking a massive and irresponsible risk to build on land which is not suitable for residential development. Good luck to anyone who tries to get Home Insurance to cover Flooding! The Planning Document is an affront to the residents of Danby/East Carr catchment area.</p>	<p>See Des1 (Design) above</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority, Hull City Council will use the SPD as a framework and/or blueprint when working with developers to provide guidance and in assessing the acceptability of their proposals. Design principles in the SPD will not change. A revision to the SPD will include a new statement recognising that where design guidance takes the form of concepts and/or indicative design guidance alternative design approaches can be proposed for consideration by the Local Planning Authority. The Council will work proactively with developers / designers to ensure positive planning outcomes for this site and will use the SPD as a broad framework for doing so. Whilst there is considerable detail set out in the document which will assist in this ambition, an overly prescriptive approach is not</p>
	<p>Suggested Changes (Please set out any change(s) you feel are necessary to improve the SPD. Assurance these houses will not cause flooding to the existing residential streets. The Council should underwrite any additional insurance costs. Proper attention to road traffic management has been overlooked. Assurance that more than the one access to the residential site other than Danby Close will be provided. Preferably Danby Close to be kept as a cul-de-sac. An alternative main access road must be identified, perhaps by allocating the spare land off Howdale currently used by dog walkers.</p>	<p>In accordance with both national and local policy on flooding, the Council will need to be satisfied that new development is not placed at risk of flooding nor that the risk of flooding is transferred to adjacent areas. The Council will not underwrite the risk of floods but can advise on affordable home insurance (but does not accept that new development will increase the likelihood of flooding in any event). The SPD refers to two preferred access points off Danby Close and East Carr Road. A full transport assessment will be required to support a planning application.</p>	
	<p>Response to Councillor Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet A bad idea. This will create a nightmare situation for residents with the swell of traffic including buses and parking restrictions. The land in question is not fit for housing because of flooding. We have already been refused home insurance because of flood risk!</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>
	<p>Response to Councillor Craker/Dunstan leaflet [Repeat of original objection]</p>		

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
EC21	<p>How will this new building development of 650 new homes fit with the Council's new incentive scheme of providing better amenities for cyclists whilst adding a potential 1,300 extra vehicles onto the already congested and poorly maintained roads around this area and the City as a whole.</p> <p>How will the already busy Howdale Road, Dunvegan Road and Saltshouse Road cope with the additional traffic, noise and pollution which will be created during and for years afterwards should this development be allowed to proceed?</p> <p>The above mentioned Howdale Road and Dunvegan Road are both bus routes and even now are blighted by on-street parking, not only restricted to cars but commercial vehicles belonging to residents, obstructing the free flow of traffic.</p> <p>The roads around this area are continually busy and used as a "rat-run" by people cutting through from Saltshouse Road and in to Bransholme (via Kestrel Avenue) and vice versa, thus avoiding the roundabout at the junction of Leads Road, Wawne Road and Robson Way.</p> <p>Also, the eastern side of Howdale Road is already heavily congested and exiting onto Saltshouse Road can be extremely difficult especially at peak times, although many requests for a roundabout have been refused.</p> <p>In addition to the increased traffic levels and noise, what will the impact on the environment? Will this development increase the risk of flooding to the surrounding properties and how will this risk be mitigated?</p> <p>The Howdale Road and Spring Cottage estates have very little infrastructure and amenities in place to support the current population let alone any further developments, regardless of size.</p> <p>Also, has a study been undertaken to establish how this development will impact on the wildlife, flora and fauna currently in situ there and the impact on their habitat?</p> <p>Why are the Council intent on the destruction of one of the City's last remaining greenfield sites when brownfield sites are available and should be the preferential option?</p> <p>Suggested Changes</p> <p>The utilisation and development of brownfield sites should always be considered in the first instance and given priority over any greenfield site and especially over the last remaining greenfield site left on the outskirts of the City.</p> <p>Undertake extensive research, studies and surveys to identify:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> the potential risk of flooding to the surrounding area and properties the impact to the environment and wildlife, flora and fauna the increase in traffic levels, noise and pollution to the area 	<p>Prioritising cycling in the city does not reduce the need for new housing and whilst great attention can be given to the layout and design to increase the likelihood of residents choosing to cycle, inevitably levels of vehicular movement will also increase.</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>See EE2 (Environmental value) above</p> <p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p> <p>See LF1 (Local Services) above</p> <p>See EE2 (environmental value) above</p> <p>See Allocate2 (Focus on brownfield) above</p> <p>See Allocate2 (focus on brownfield first) above. The proposed site is a relatively small part of a much wider area of greenfield land within the city's eastern boundary.</p> <p>See Flood 1 above</p> <p>See EE2 (Environment value) above</p> <p>See EE4 (pollution) and T2 (wider traffic concerns) above</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required</p> <p>No change to SPD required</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC22	<p>I am opposed to the above development for the following primary reasons i)The drainage of the Spring Cottage area couldn't cope in 2007, so where would the drainage of the proposed site be directed to ? ii Should a repeat of 2007 occur the whole East Carr area could be cut off.iii Can't see how Danby Close could accommodate such an Increase in traffic.iv The increase in traffic would have a severe detrimental effect on the approaching roads.v The 'Planning Personel' should, at several times during the course of a day, drive down Danby Close, Dunvegan Road, and Howdale Road, then consider the implications of the additional, possible, 1000 resident's vehicles.vi A more considerate access approach would be from the direction of Saltshouse Road.vii Canterbury Drive and it's offshoots already gets traffic intended for Danby Close. How would that be prevented ?</p> <p><i>Letter received via Liberal Democrats</i></p> <p><i>Response to Councillor Craker/Dunstan leaflet</i></p>	<p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>See above</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	I Disapprove of the development because we have a view of the fields and silence, this would be significantly reduced, also more traffic on Howdale Road	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC23	<p>The vast majority of people would have objected to the East Carr Masterplan Document SPD in 2017 had we been informed about it being included in the Hull Local Plan for future housing. East Carr is subject to flooding and the proposed access roads to the site are not wide enough for the amount of vehicles that the development will generate. Access from Howdale Road onto Robson Way at present is busy especially at peak times. Buses also struggle to negotiate Dunvegan Road due to parked cars. The people who will live on East Carr Development will need to have cars to go to work, Doctors, shopping, leisure, take children to school etc. There is very few amenities at present in the area and the bus takes 45 minutes to Town. Hull City Council is supposed to be a green council so why is it proposing to allow a development on one of the few green fields left in Hull. The council should be developing brown field sites in and near the City Centre like the Rank Mill area next to Drypool Bridge which was demolished and just left. It makes sense to develop areas in and close to the city centre to cut down on pollution caused by cars coming in from the suburbs for work, shopping and entertainment.</p> <p><i>Response to Councillor Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet</i> A bad idea. The fields are low lying and subject to Flooding, the additional traffic will cause more pollution, traffic problems especially for buses that already struggle to get through Dunvegan Road</p> <p><i>Response to Councillor Craker/Dunstan leaflet</i> The development should not get approval, the fields where it is proposed to build the houses is subject to flooding from Holderness Drain and heavy rain. Only recently the Gold Range near East Carr Lane was flooded. Also the extra traffic on narrow residential streets will make traffic problems worse. Buses already have problems getting down Dunvegan Road due to parked cars. It would be better to develop brownfield sites espe in the City Centre than on farm land.</p>	<p>See Consult1 (Local Plan consultation process) above</p> <p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See LF1 (Local Services) above See LF1 (Local Services) above See Allocate2 (Focus on brownfield) above There is considerable new development planned for and coming forward in and around the city centre. The Rank Mill area is allocated for housing.</p> <p>Comment noted - refer to responses provided above.</p> <p>Comment noted - refer to responses provided above.</p>	<p>No change to SPD required</p> <p>See above See above See above See above No change to SPD required</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC24	<p>Email 1</p> <p>We are opposed to the housing plan for the following reasons</p> <p>1. Danby Close is a quiet cul de sac with the majority of the residents over 50 years old many have lived on the close for many years. Building 650 houses and using the close as it's main access and bus route would impact heavily on the local residents. The average UK home has 1.3 car's, this means an extra 850 are likely to use the close everyday as opposed to approximately 70 in use by the current residents.</p> <p>2. The proposed bus route appears to loop around the new development via Danby Close. Howdale Road is currently serviced by 4 per hour during the daytime. This would mean there would be 16 bus movements per hour leaving and entering Danby Close.</p> <p>3. The fields to the rear of Danby flood regularly. Building on this land would surely make this situation worse. Even now, finding relatively cheap house insurance can be difficult.</p> <p>4. House values are likely to drop and make them difficult to sell in the short term while building work is going on, and with 650 homes proposed this is likely to several years to complete.</p>	<p>T1 (access - Danby Close and East Carr Road). There are two proposed access points to the site and as such Danby Close will not have to deal with all vehicular movement. Transport modelling will be required to predict actual levels of vehicular movement and any mitigation required.</p> <p>The SPD encourages the site to be accessed by public transport as a means of reducing dependence on private vehicles. The level of bus services likely to access this site is unknown and will depend largely on commercial decisions.</p> <p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p> <p>See PC4 (Property value) above</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>5. There will be disruption and noise while building work is going on with mud and dirt being walked into our homes. If the project is done in stages and added to in the future this could go on for many years.</p> <p>6. Is there anything to stop East Riding Council adding to the development by building a bridge across the Holderness Drain and building their own development, again adding to traffic numbers.</p> <p>7. There is no provision for a Drs Surgery or school, the local primary school is already oversubscribed.</p> <p>8. Suttoncross drain and foliage to the rear of Danby Close makes the rear of the properties relatively secure. It is proposed to make this into a footpath and in our view compromising security.</p> <p>Email 2 Via Councillor Healand [repeats comments above] Also sent Councillor Healand photos</p>	<p>See Construct1 (Construction disruption) above</p> <p>There are no plans to develop land to the east of the city and it is unlikely that East Riding Council would see such a location as an attractive one to the extent that it would not meet locally identified needs.</p> <p>See LF1 (Local Services) above</p> <p>See LF2 (School capacity) above</p> <p>The SPD proposes Sutton Cross Drain i.e. retaining it as a barrier (and making a positive impact on the threat of flooding). Reference is also made to the importance of retaining existing natural features</p> <p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>Add new text to require protection and enhancement of existing landscaping around perimeter of site particularly on western boundary with exiting housing.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC25	<p>Harking back to the presentation to the Government appointed planning officer, the question everyone is asking is this, if we the residents of Danby Close, East Carr Lane, Stornaway square, Canterbury Close, Ramsgate Close and Howdale Road who,s properties overlook this site and would be the ones most affected, had never been informed by the Council and were unaware of the proposal to build these new houses just who were the people who objected, how many of them were there, and how did they find out about it.</p> <p>We have also a question regarding the Councils own objections to a developer requesting to build far fewer homes on this land dated August 1994 at that time the Council stated that permission was refused on the following grounds,</p> <p>The site is not in the City plan, the site is identified as urban green space of conservation interest.</p> <p>Use of Danby Close and East Carr Road to access the development would be detrimental to the residential amenities of residents of these roads.</p> <p>The use of East Carr Road is unacceptable in highway design terms as an access to the site because it is of inadequate standard for the level of traffic envisaged and does not meet the Highway Authority standards.</p> <p>Fast forward 26 years with a huge increase in vehicle ownership to where the Council themselves now want to develop the site, and notwithstanding what they said then,, the planning Inspector receives the following unopposed assurances from the Council I quote from his report, "Whilst the proposal would result in a significant number of vehicles using Danby Close, which at present is a short quiet cul de sac, The Council advises that the road has been designed to accommodate additional traffic and that the local highway network can cope with the additional use"</p>	<p>See Consult1 (Local Plan consultation process) above</p> <p>The previous position indicated that there would be an adverse impact on residents living on Danby Close and on the basis that the council at that time did not rely on this land to meet identified housing needs, saw no reason to accept this. In relation to Danby Close – there was no suggestion that access wasn't possible on a technical basis. With regards to East Carr Road, the council did highlight technical constraints. This remains the case i.e. access would involve an upgrade / improvement of this road. In addition, the position regarding need for housing land is now very different.</p> <p>See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above</p> <p>See T1 (Traffic access) above</p> <p>The SPD acknowledged that improvements to East Carr Road would be required and that even then, this could only be used to access a relatively small part of the site. Danby Close is designed to the same standard as Howdale Road and is capable of being used as a bus route, The level of vehicular movement will be assessed through a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>Refer to comments provided above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required</p> <p>No change to SPD required</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>See above</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>So without a penny being spent in the intervening 26 years on either of the two formally highly unsuitable and totally unacceptable access points under 1994 car ownership and traffic conditions, they suddenly become super highways especially designed and future proofed to carry the one thousand extra vehicles and four thousand extra vehicle movements per day that the 700 new homes will generate with ease, when it suits the Council, oh and the urban green space of conservation interest doesn't matter anymore either.</p> <p>Danby Close was designed around 1976 and completed in 1980 no way can the planning dept of 1976 claim that they envisaged and planned for Danby Close to be designed to take the traffic from 700 new homes they planned to build commencing in 2022 completing in 2032 (56 years later) a road which would then have to continue serve the new houses for a further 80 or 100 years until possibly 2132, with the year on year growth in vehicle ownership that would be some foresight.</p> <p>It would appear that the man from the Ministry wasn't told the whole truth by the Council regarding the unsuitability of the access points, it's also true that had the residents been made aware of the proposals as they are now, he would have received hundreds of objections as you are now experiencing, so he wasn't made aware of the fact that local residents had not been informed or consulted and had been were blissfully unaware of the proposal and therefore highly unlikely to submit objections.</p> <p>Our main annoyance and anger has been caused by the cavalier attitude of the Council in refusing to engage with residents who will be affected and inconvenienced in many different ways by this development at an early stage and we are convinced that had we had the opportunity to voice our objections before the planning Inspector was invited to pass the plans that he would have come to a different conclusion on traffic and access reasons alone.</p> <p>I won't go too deeply into the flood risk of this marshy site next to the regularly overtopping Holderness drain or the derisory idea that a few suds, a fancy name for leaving a strip of grass to soak away the excess standing water will cure the flood risk, it doesn't drain because. It's a marsh</p> <p>it's a marsh because it doesn't drain, and we who see these fields heavily flooded for months at a time don't understand why the Council can't grasp that simple but undeniable fact.</p> <p>So in essence we are angry at not being consulted at the early stage and will continue to fight have our objections heard and to to stop this development which everyone but the Council regards as madness.</p>	<p>Refer to comments provided above</p> <p>It is not uncommon for a housing development to be constructed with roads leading to open land - as is the case here - in recognition that at some point in the future, such land may be required for development.</p> <p>See Consult1 (Local Plan consultation process) above</p> <p>Refer to previous comment</p> <p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p> <p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p> <p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required</p> <p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC26	<p>I was very upset to read in the Hull Daily Mail the 'proposed' development of 650 houses – now 702!</p> <p>The Local Plan that was adopted in November 2017 was <u>NOT</u> publicised. I have spoken to residents backing onto the proposed development fields and they had NO notification.</p> <p>I heard about a consultation meeting that had been held 4 days BEFORE a letter had been posted to a resident of Higham Close! It seems this 'development' is a 'done-deal' (plenty of council tax from 702 houses!).</p> <p>The East Carr fields are still boggy in the height of summer. Apparently there is a natural spring. The access through Danby Close for over 1000 vehicles seems ludicrous and even more so from East Carr Road track. The impact on all surrounding roads will be gridlock. Has a survey of traffic been done at rush hour, term time on Howdale Road, Dunvegan Road, Saltshouse Road and the impact to Westerngailes Way? Robson Way? Leads Road? Wawne Road?</p>	<p>The land is allocated for 762 houses in the Local Plan. Based on the layout proposed in the SPD this has been reduced to 689.</p> <p>See Consult1 (Local Plan consultation process) above</p> <p>The letter (delivered 4 days before the end of the local Plan consultation period) was delivered by a ward member. This was in addition to other consultation undertaken by the council (in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement)</p> <p>A transport assessment will be required to accompany any planning application and this will establish likely levels of vehicular movement and any mitigation measures required to address any problems arising.</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required</p> <p>See above</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>The infrastructure is NOT in place to accommodate such a grand scale of development. <u>The drains from Danby Close and Inlgeby Close built by Wimpey are only to take the capacity of these houses.</u> I have been advised by the original development construction of 'Chestnut Farm'. Spring Cottage Primary School is already over-subscribed. Will existing families with children at the school have to go to appeal to keep siblings together? The wildlife (deer, grass snakes, hedgehogs, swallows, woodpeckers, bats and owls) are all under threat and been pushed out further. We need our greenspaces – this year has proved how much they help the wellbeing of local residents. I understand we need sustainable growth, but surely there is enough 'brown' sites to be redeveloped rather than our precious open spaces being taken advantage of. This development should be STOPPED and never again be an issued up for discussion.</p> <p>2. 700 + houses to be built on a flood zone! The environmental impact will be huge. The amount of traffic will have a knock on effect from Danby Close, East Carr Rd through Howdale Rd, Saltshouse Rd (this backs up to Western Gales from the roundabout at Holderness Rd already), Robson Way, Wawne Rd.</p> <p>Spring Cotttage Primary school is on the opposite side of the road to the proposed houses. Dunvegan Road and Howdale Rd are already dangerous for pupils at peak times. <i>Response to Councillor Craker/Dunstan leaflet</i> I am opposed to the planning due to the additional amount of traffic and congestion on surrounding roads.</p>	<p>The SPD makes specific reference to the policy context regarding flooding and drainage and detailed assessments will be required to support any planning application</p> <p>See LF2 (School capacity) above See LF1 (Local Services) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above See EE2 (Environmental value) above See T1 (Traffic access) above</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>Comment noted</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>See above See above See above No change to SPD required. The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC27	<p>I object to the homes being built in the field due to the extra flood risks to existing homes. The traffic assessment has not been carried out. And due to the 3 council representative at my meeting at Saltshouse Tavern there inabilities to answer straight forward questions with straight forward answers. The main answer given was It will be left to the developers to sort out. It also appears nature is just pushed to one side no one really cares any more all the council want is the revenue from this build. I object strongly and will continue to fight this development.</p>	<p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p> <p>The City Council has produced a strategic flood risk assessment for the entire city and as part of the proses of selecting sites for inclusion in the Local Plan has undertaken more detailed assessment work. However, it is for an applicant (as part of a planning application) to prepare a detailed flood risk assessment. Should this highlight particular issues, then the Council will need to determine the extent to which such issues would potentially lead to a reason for refusal or if they could be overcome – ensuring the safety of those who would be living in the new housing and those living nearby. This is a completely normal approach to take in such matters.</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See Consult2 (Officer responses to questions) above See EE2 (Ecological value) above</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>See above No change to SPD required. A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>Letter sent to Councillor Healand (enclosing letter to Karl Turner MP) Good morning. My name is xxxxxxx and live at xxxxxxxx Hull. On the 26th August 2020 I stood outside Salts house Tavern with this board and with a petition to Save East Carr. (Photo of board in email)</p> <p>I did have an allotted time of 1600 hrs which I did have to request twice before I got a reply.</p> <p>This email is in two sections and is a summary of the day and I have tried to condense it down. So please bear with me and read to the end. The board started to attract attention from the local residents living in that area and these are some of the comments made. What's this all about then ? I don't know anything about this. I didn't get a letter. Don't be daft they can't build on them fields. These roads are bad enough as it is. Where's the extra school places. I can't get an appointment at the doctors now. I don't have internet. Why has this been done during shut down ? Why are you going to the meeting why can't we go in ? There was a lot more comments Karl but the main question was Is Karl Turner here can we talk to him, why isn't he here he should be fighting for us. I did inform them that as I was aware that you was against this development and this raised a few eye brows to put it politely. When the doors opened at 1100 hours the majority of the people came to us at the board. They felt sick, nervous and felt intimidated about facing people of authority and one gentleman felt as though he was thick and not of a clever understanding that they would not listen to him. One elderly couple (in there eighties) where near to tears and walking away as all this was doing ,was bringing up memories of there house flooding and asking why this had come up again when it had been rejected twice before. He wished that Karl Turner was here to talk on his behalf. Why have MP and have to do this on our own it's scary. This gentleman has voted Labour all his life and feels let down. The proposed plans up on the windows provoked more questions and no one was available to even try and explain them to the members of public. After the ten minute slot was up majority of the people came to see us and here are just a few of the comments made Those houses are as good as built. That was a complete waste of time. That was a farce.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>Anyone requesting an appointment was told they would be notified and offered a meeting 48 hours in advance of the session - this was to allow the Council to effectively manage the event in light of covid. Everyone that requested a session was offered one.</p> <p>The description given to people attending the drop-in session i.e. 'they felt sick, nervous and intimidated' is not recognised. Whilst clearly some were emotional, others were robust in their views and keen to get answers. The fact that some answers were not forthcoming reflects the nature of the exercise i.e. consultation on a design SPD. <u>Not</u> the principle of the development nor a detailed planning application. Irrespective of how senior/experienced an officer at each session was, it simply was not possible to answer many of the issues raised. This will remain the case until such time as a planning application is submitted - at that time we will know how many houses are proposed and the manner in which drainage and flooding matters are to be dealt with. The Council at that stage will require detailed technical studies to assess the impact on residential amenity, highways, natural environment etc...</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>They talked all the way through my ten minutes. I felt uncomfortable and that they didn't really listen or care about my comments. They couldn't answer basic questions. They just kept saying the council did this right. The highways person seemed oblivious to the traffic already. The most frightening answer that everyone was given was the sloping shoulder bit is... IT will be up to the developer who builds the houses to prove and sort out the problems and make sure that all is well. Again Karl your name came up, people who have voted for you ,where disappointed that you did not turn up or even kept them fully informed and they want your help. It's difficult getting the message out because one lady commented that she didn't do internet stuff and a letter in the post is the only way she gets information. Informed that the Council had done the minimum requirements for passing on information ie putting leaflets through some doors but not all doors and that they had also put it on line in Hull daily Mail and even on lamppost. With a typical Yorkshire glint in her eye she said " next time they want my council tax put it on a lamp post and see if I pay it. Again Karl you have a lot of disappointed voters. I won't go into details of my ten minutes as most of the comments made came out of my meeting as well. I can understand how people feel going into that situation as they couldn't answer most of the questions asked. They had a set profile that they just pushed out at you and yes it's up to the developers to sort these problems out. Who is running Hull is it the council or is it the developers. Karl the next meeting is on the 9th September between 1100 and 1900. I will be there with my board and with a brilliant wonderful bunch of friends and concerned residents. They are putting in a lot of time and money to save east Carr and I think it would be beneficial for you to connect back with your constituents ,a lot of residents are losing faith. This e mail is not intended to be hostile or intimidating but it's the general feeling of the people who voted labour in in this area. Any other advice or help on the 9 th would be welcome from anyone who can assist the local people will be welcome Response to Councillor Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet A bad idea. This appears to be pushing through by Hull City Council during the shut down period. This is prime green belt land with lots of wild life. Why isn't land that is council owned not being built on first.</p> <p>Response to via Councillor Craker/Dunstan I have sent an email to Councillor Craker and Dunstan. Mr Craker address is wrong and email sent back. This development is being slipped through during Covid 19. Not everyone is online you need to send plans and full information about this development, I could understand building houses on fields but there is so much other land that has not been developed: i.e. Preston Road, Ings Estate. The field is prime green land, it has a diverse wildlife that will be pushed further at. During covid 19 the fields have been a lifeline for visitors and walkers from the surrounding area. I strongly object to houses being build on this beautiful spot. You know once you build on one field the development will spread like a concrete cancer until it meets up with Kingswood. Please observe Labours environmental policy and keep green areas free from greedy business development.</p>	<p>Comment noted The timing of the consultation had nothing to do with the pandemic. The Council has an ongoing programme of work relating to the production of SPDs - to provide guidance on policies established in the Local Plan. The importance of this work is to ensure that such guidance is available in advance of a planning application being submitted. If an application is received in advance of the SPD being finalised then it will have to be considered in light of relevant policies in the Local Plan. The SPD will add a valuable additional layer of detail that should result in a better planning outcome for the area.</p> <p>Comment noted The Preston Road site is allocated for housing and an application for this land has just been approved subject to conditions. The Local Plan establishes a need for housing over the period to 2032 and the East Carr site is one of many others that will contribute to meeting this need. Further consultation will be required to support a future planning application.</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
EC28	<p>I feel that this development would cause detrimental effects to the whole area around Howdale Road and Spring Cottage area,not only to the families that live there but the wildlife around the area, also the reduction in areas to walk. The main issues that need to be addressed I feel are:</p>		
	<p>Lack of road infrastructure into and out of the new housing development.</p>	<p>See T1 (Traffic access) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD is required.</p>
	<p>That the population of the new area will initially be 1300-2000 people using the inadequate routes to access and leave the area.</p>	<p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p>	<p>See above</p>
	<p>A huge increase in traffic not only domestic but buses and delivery vehicles. Increased drivers means possibly 1000 cars and as the population of the said area will be larger than this then this means more cars and other vehicles. Having to exit from only TWO roads.</p>		
	<p>Are there to be any houses demolished? If so where and how many.</p>	<p>There is no intention to clear any properties to gain access to the site.</p>	<p>No change to SPD required</p>
	<p>The amount of congestion that will be caused not only on Spring Cottage and Howdale Road but having an impact on the surrounding area. Saltshouse Road, Robson Way,Wawne road, Leeds Road and many other areas.</p>	<p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p>	<p>See above</p>
	<p>Many children live with their families and they will be in danger due to the dramatic increase in traffic.</p>		
	<p>Traffic using Howdale Road, Dunvegan Road, Robson way and surrounding area speed especially the bend on Howdale Road where Danby Close is causing a potential increase in car and pedestrian injuries.</p>		
	<p>A new school will likely have to be built as the current Spring Cottage primary school is already oversubscribed.</p>	<p>See LF2 (School capacity) above</p>	<p>See above</p>
	<p>There will be an unacceptable amount of disruption to the area if the building goes ahead with all the different construction vehicles, workers,deliveries.</p>	<p>See Construct1 (Construction disruption) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required</p>
	<p>The unbelievable dissemination to the local wildlife which is hugely diverse In this area.</p>	<p>See EE2 (Ecological value) above</p>	<p>A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site</p>
	<p>There is a huge possibility that the amount of houses built will increase as more and more planning permission is given turning this development into a huge area with totally insufficient facilities and roads to access the said area.</p>	<p>No other land is allocated for development in this area and given that Holderness Drain marks the eastern boundary of the City, the investment in a flood alleviation scheme to the north and the golf course to the south, it is unlikely that this position will change.</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>
	<p>The filth, dirt and damage to the roads whilst the construction is being done will be endless.</p>	<p>See Construct1 above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required</p>
	<p>These fields where the new development will be floods at all times of the year even though there will be a drainage system it is quite possible to be insufficient.</p>	<p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p>	<p>See above</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>With more people more car parking facilities will be required a house with 4 adults may have 4 cars so not enough space at their home to park due to off street parking only. Where will they park?</p>	<p>See Des1 (Design) above</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority, Hull City Council will use the SPD as a framework and/or blueprint when working with developers to provide guidance and in assessing the acceptability of their proposals. Design principles in the SPD will not change. A revision to the SPD will include a new statement recognising that where design guidance takes the form of concepts and/or indicative design guidance alternative design approaches can be proposed for consideration by the Local Planning Authority. The Council will work proactively with developers / designers to ensure positive planning outcomes for this site and will use the SPD as a broad framework for doing so. Whilst there is considerable detail set out in the document which will assist in this ambition, an overly prescriptive approach is not</p> <p>See above</p>
	<p>An increase in buses going onto the new development again increasing congestion,pollution, traffic gridlock.</p>	<p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required</p>
	<p>What about other areas Ings/ Bellfield Avenue area. Houses were demolished here and most of the land has not been built on and this area has scope for more access. Area's on Bransholme where houses have been demolished leaving large areas of undeveloped land not used with excellent road infrastructure shops and schools these areas should be utilised to their full extent. Also the Preston Road/ Marfleet Lane area again where houses have been demolished and has infrastructure is in place.</p>	<p>The Ings/Bellfield Avenue area is currently being built on.</p> <p>See Allocate2 (Focus on brownfield) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required</p>
	<p>Response to Councillor Healand/ A Furley leaflet</p> <p>My family received your recent update on the Danby Close/East Carr road development, to which we all find is a horrendous and hugely detrimental for the whole area.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>
	<p>I was recently talking to friends one who lives on Western Gailles Way and the other in Sutton. They were not aware of the new plans to build 650 houses and were seriously concerned that they had not received information on the possible new development, or given the chance to express their concerns as living anywhere around the area of the development is going to effect everyone who lives there.</p>	<p>The Council complied with normal practice in relation to consulting on such matters (refer to Statement of Community Involvement). It is simply not realistic (in terms of cost and officer time) to send letters to everyone who <i>may</i> be interested. As it is, a 500 letter drop was a significant exercise.</p>	<p>No change to SPD required</p>
	<p>I did not know if it was possible to make people in these areas aware of the possible development so they are also given the opportunity to give their opinions. I'm sure all people objecting to the new planned housing would like to see as many people as possible giving their opinion on the proposed plans.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>I would like to say thank you for your updates and information via post as it keeps people updated and keeps the momentum of their objections going.</p> <p>I hope that it is possible to inform other areas as I feel it will help in the battle to stop this new development as they must have a right to know as well. I do not think people realise how big the area they are to build on is and I'm sure it won't stop there either. Before we know, it will be expanded and turn into a new Kingswood.</p> <p><i>Response to Councillor Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet</i></p> <p>A bad idea.</p> <p><i>Response to Councillor Craker/Dunstan leaflet.</i></p> <p>Why do you want this have you seen the parked traffic down Danby and East Carr only one car can get by. The congestion will be unbelievable. The dirt traffic from construction traffic. The flooding of that area in unbelievable. What about wildlife, exercise some beautiful green land. Only 2 roads in and out, buses, probable shops so more traffic. Increase in crime. Why isn't unused land being built on. Saltshouse/Bellfield Avenue houses were demolished. Preson Road, Bransholme and 2 roads in and out only is an horrendous idea you have not thought about this properly.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>Refer to comments provided above.</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC29	<p>My concerns are the traffic, I bought a house down a quiet close, opening it up will mean all the traffic to the estate will be passing my house, buses, deliveries, everything. So in theory it will no longer be a close for us. Hardly fair when there are other options available.</p> <p>The roads out of Danby Close and the surrounding area are very busy at peak times as it is, are you confident they will be able to take all this extra traffic, I am not, I sit in the traffic jams. What's going to be done to stop this bigger impact on us?</p> <p>The field is constantly we, has surface water on, will we be at higher risk of flooding, I am thinking yes. Will our insurance rise, again I expect so.</p> <p>Also concerns about compulsory purchases, as everything I asked in my 10min meeting the reply was "its down to the developer", surely the developer will decide this, not what I was told, no compulsory purchases, can you guarantee this?</p>	<p>Applicants will be encouraged to consider alternative access options but at present, Danby Close and East Carr Road remain the most likely options available.</p> <p>See T1 (Traffic access) above</p> <p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p> <p>See PC1 (Home insurance) above</p> <p>The council does not consider that compulsory purchase is an issue with regards to this proposal i.e. there is no need for it</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC30	<p>I am writing this letter in appose to the housing development planned for Danby close fields, with my house been 7 Danby I strongly oppose to the development and using Danby close as the main access road to the development. building houses on those fields will have lasting affects to danby close and surrounding areas with huge amounts of traffic making it dangerous for residents and children were many feel safe when playng with friends in the street and around the area. flooding been another worry as those fields hold huge amounts of water.</p>	<p>See T1 (Traffic access) above</p> <p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>See above</p>
EC31	<p>Please could we add our objections to the East Carr development. We were particularly annoyed at the tone of the letter received from Hull CC on the 10th August. This letter states that the East Carr site was allocated for housing development in November 2017 and that "at that time objections were raised and considered by a Planning Inspector". We have lived here since 1982 and have not been notified of this development until this year. We have also spoken to numerous people in the local area and none of them have received notifications. Our question is who was notified and how could people have their say about something they were not aware of? It strikes us as a very underhand way of handling such an important plan which will have a negative effect on local people. The letter is very much presenting the development as a fait accompli which will definitely go ahead and it is only how it is to be built that is up for discussion.</p>	<p>It is a fact that the principle of development is established in the Local Plan. The purpose of the SPD is to ensure that when a proposal is submitted (a planning application) that the Council can push for a better quality of development than otherwise may be achieved. The merits of that application will be considered (and there will be further consultation at that stage) before the local planning authority reaches a decision.</p>	<p>No change to SPD required</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>Hull CC state it is the last greenfield site they can build on within the Hull boundary. Is this really something to be proud of? The reason it is the last site is because it has been considered in the past and found to be unsuitable because of flooding and traffic in the local area. Surely it is important to preserve this site for future generations. There is little in the way of amenities in the local area and this greenfield site is our amenity used by many people for dog walking, exercise and enjoying nature. We have seen deer, little egrets, owls, geese, kestrels, bats, bees and all kinds of butterflies. Once it's gone, it's gone!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The development is being "sold" on the point of traffic free streets. How is this going to be possible when people are going to need a car to access amenities. · The nearest doctor's surgery is on Wawne road – a good 25-minute walk away. Few people will walk this far. · walk carrying shopping. · Spring cottage primary school has been over-subscribed for many years meaning that residents will need a car to get their children to school. · The local pharmacy is extremely busy already meaning very long waits to collect medication. · The local supermarket is very small stocking only essentials with no fresh meat and few vegetables. A car will be needed to avoid a long Under normal circumstances the local bus is extremely busy at times – try using one with a pushchair or wheelchair. You often have to wait for another bus because there is no room. · The local roads are struggling to cope with the volume of traffic now. Getting out of Howdale Road onto Saltshouse Road and/or Robson Way can involve a lengthy wait. The mini roundabout at the end of Robson Way/Leads Road often has long tailbacks, as does Saltshouse Road onto Holderness Road roundabout. · Dunvegan Road and East Carr Road have cars & vans parked on both sides meaning taking the bus is like a slalom ride and riding a bike is taking your life in your hands. · Danby Close is to be used for an entrance/exit for the bus service (because East Carr Road is totally unsuitable) which is very unfair to the people living there. No doubt they will go round with the yellow paint but most of the residents have short driveways so where are they supposed to park especially when so many people are now expected to bring home their work's vans. · The fields they are intending to build on flood every winter and often resemble duck ponds. We ourselves witnessed flooding in all the surrounding area in 2007 and to a lesser degree more recently. Can they really be sure that extra housing will not worsen this situation for us and them? Water has to go somewhere! <p>Please, please reconsider this terrible plan Response to Councillor Craker/Dunstan</p> <p>Im not happy about it at all. It's a lovely greenspace with lots of birds, animals and butterflies and its been great to walk around there especially during lockdown also. It will increase traffic, East Carr and Dunvegan Road already busy enough. One local primary school which is normally full, no doctors surgeries, few local shops – all reasons why traffic will be increased. Dog kennels – I have no objection to this but the dogs do bark a lot at times – how long before new residents complain about this. 8 and 11 bus services already very busy at times (normally). Increased flood risk. Green environments are good for mental health.</p>	<p>It is not correct that this is the last greenfield site in the city (indeed this site is a relatively small part of a much wider area to the east of the city) but it is a site which has been allocated for housing. Building on brownfield sites will always be a priority for the Council (in accordance with national policy) but it is not possible to rely purely on such land to meet identified needs. This will not be a traffic free development (and the SPD does not claim that this is the intention) but the design of the site can lead to less reliance on the car. Car free streets can make a significant difference to the quality of the environment including providing safe play spaces and contributing positively to managing flood risk.</p> <p>See LF1 (Local Services) above</p> <p>See LF1 (Local Services) above See LF2 (School capacity) above</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>See T1 (Traffic access) above</p> <p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p> <p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>No change to the SPD is required.</p> <p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC32	<p>I am writing to you to OBJECT to the proposed East Carr Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the following reasons; <u>Traffic and Transport</u></p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>Adding 650+ houses within the area will add more volume of traffic to the road infrastructure that has already been deemed not fit for additional housing development within the area and will also cause traffic problems in and around the Howdale Road and Robson Way area pinch points. The pinch points being the roundabouts at Saltshouse Road and Dunvegan Road, Leads Road, Robson Way and Howdale Road, also the T junction at Saltshouse Road and Howdale Road. Traffic surveys should be taken and available to the public prior to any further planning applications. If this has already been completed recently and available, I would like a copy of survey and report sent to me. Also as we have seen since the houses have been built on the old Princess Royal hospital site, the volume of traffic on Saltshouse Road at peak times has significantly increased and is causing tailbacks the full length of Saltshouse Road and Robson Way. There is also a regular backlog of traffic spanning the full length of Leads Road at peak times, which joins Robson Way. This proposed development will only add to the problem. There will be excess traffic in the form of construction and contractor's vehicles from the start of the development. Where will these park and what plans will be in place to eliminate any impact on the local residents? Danby Close is not fit for traffic access for 650+ houses let alone a bus route down it. The last planning permission was rejected due to the infrastructure not fit for purpose, what has changed with the roads and infrastructure since the last planning application was last rejected?</p>	<p>A transport assessment will be required as part of the planning application process (and the SPD already confirms that this is the case) and this will be in the public domain. This will take into account recently constructed housing in the area. Construction traffic - a construction management plan will be required as part of any planning application. See allocate 3 (what has changed since 1994 decision) above. Not clear where the reference to road infrastructure not being deemed fit for additional housing comes from (other than a reference at the last appeal decision about East Carr Road - this is acknowledged in the SPD with improvements required)</p>	<p>See above</p>
	<p>No safe pedestrian crossings are in place whatsoever around Howdale Road, Dunvegan Road, Robson Way and Saltshouse Road for school children and parents walking to and from school. With the new plans 650+ houses introduce more children crossings roads and more cars on the road, thus becoming a safety hazard and significantly increases the risk of an accident! Average Cars per household is 1.2 meaning an extra 780 cars in and around the community, which will be using the existing not fit for purpose infrastructure.</p>	<p>The impact of the development in relation to traffic flows and safety concerns will be assessed as part of the transport assessment accompanying any planning application.</p>	
	<p><u>Negative Impact on the Local Community</u> The introduction of 650+ houses means potentially there could be 1,560 people introduced into the community, this is the equivalent to bringing a village like Skirlaugh into this area. The dearth of local amenities will mean they will be stretched beyond their limits. The last doctor's surgery has now gone and converted to a family home and Lambwath Primary School has been knocked down and now a housing development is being built in its place. The local school (Spring Cottage) is currently oversubscribed and with the proposed planning of 650+ more houses, where will these be schooled? Traffic issues again at school pick up and drop off times. Average children per household is 0.7 meaning potentially an additional 455 children will need a school to go to. The next nearest Primary Schools are a car journey away again adding to the traffic issues again at school pick up and drop off times and have an adverse effect on the noise and air pollution. Dog fouling is a big problem in the streets around Howdale Road, Many people use the green space to walk their dogs which if built upon will force them to use the streets instead and potentially make this problem even worse. What plans are in place to deal with this given that the issue is not being dealt with effectively already?</p>	<p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p>	<p>See above</p>
		<p>See LF1 (Local Services) above See LF2 (School capacity) above The new development and associated flood alleviation scheme will still allow for dog walking and associated litter bins can be provided.</p>	<p>See above See above No change to SPD required.</p>
	<p><u>Poor Concept Design</u></p>		

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>The layout of the houses proposed was used on Sutton Park in the 70's (front gardens facing each other) and doesn't work. The streets have parked cars left right and centre. Hardly anyone parks their car in the garage anymore. The developer says they want to create a traffic free environment around the new plans but put a bus route right through the new development. This is a contradiction. Why not promote people to walk to the current bus stops that are already in place and regularly used on Howdale Road? The Council haven't put a bus route through the Western Gales Way development and those residents have just as far to walk to the nearest bus stop. Also the local council are pushing for people to use cycles in the area and no consideration has been made for improving the local area outside of the proposed development, this would have to be implemented in the surrounding area for the proposal to work. The public walkway proposed along the back of the existing houses gardens, significantly reduces the security of the houses currently there. This will allow opportunists an escape route right along the estate from one end to the other. How is this supposed to be policed in the event that the crime rate increases in the area? Currently along the back of the garden fences it is over grown and creates a natural barrier and deterrent. There is already an antisocial issue in the area with motorbikes illegally using the Trans Pennine Trail. The proposed pathways connecting the development to the trail, offers even more access and opportunity for this to continue. The current sewer system is already under sized and over populated for the area. How do the plans manage to ensure no more undue demand is put onto the current sewer systems? Same with the drinking water supplies, residents at the end of the lines already suffer with low water pressure. How will this be managed to ensure the new development has no impact on current household's water pressure?</p>	<p>See Des1 (Design) above. There are some excellent examples of car free streets that have been built in the city in recent years (e.g. on the former Riley allotment site off Springbank West) where not only has the quality of the local environment been improved but there are also significant flood risk benefits. There is no suggestion that this will be a traffic free development and it is not a contradiction that there is a desire to encourage public transport provision. Reducing dependency on private vehicles and encouraging use of public transport go hand in hand. The Council is promoting wider cycle infrastructure improvements and will continue to encourage this form of movement. There are however real opportunities to incorporate such infrastructure in new development (as opposed to often more costly 'retrofitting) and this is exactly what is proposed for this development. It is proposed to retain landscaping at the edge of the site which will contribute to maintaining privacy and assisting with security of existing properties. Capacity of drainage in the existing housing area is acknowledged but the new development will not impact on this - and this will be a requirement of the scheme which will be confirmed through required drainage assessments.</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority, Hull City Council will use the SPD as a framework and/or blueprint when working with developers to provide guidance and in assessing the acceptability of their proposals. Design principles in the SPD will not change. A revision to the SPD will include a new statement recognising that where design guidance takes the form of concepts and/or indicative design guidance alternative design approaches can be proposed for consideration by the Local Planning Authority. The Council will work proactively with developers / designers to ensure positive planning outcomes for this site and will use the SPD as a broad framework for doing so. Whilst there is considerable detail set out in the document which will assist in this ambition, an overly prescriptive approach is not</p>
	<p><u>Negative Impact on the Local Wildlife and Ecology</u> A great deal of nature in the area will be adversely affected. Currently on the fields to be built on deer, foxes, voles, newts, rabbits, owls, hedgehogs, bats and a variety of birds are regularly seen (I live overlooking the fields and have seen all of these in recent weeks). These will be pushed out from their regular homes and habitats.</p>	<p>See EE2 (Ecological value) above</p>	<p>#N/A</p> <p>A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>I'm unsure what type of bats are roosting behind us in the fields but they are out every evening at dusk. I'm sure these are legally protected. The adjacent field is earmarked as a nature reserve area, however the building work alongside this will contradict what this is hoping to achieve. What mitigations will be in place to ensure no impact on the current wildlife aspects in the area during both construction and going forward? The proposed site is a high risk flood plain and was completely flooded in 2007 along with much of the existing property in the area. I witness the fields becoming lakes during heavy rainfall on an annual basis. I appreciate that new builders have to create storage for worst case flooding but this doesn't help where the water runs to from Sutton Village down to the fields to be built on. The proposed plans for the flood alleviation works hasn't even started but the council are looking to approve the building of houses in the area before the flood alleviation work has started. Have the latest flood alleviation plans taken into account the proposed housing development? What are the plans for the flood alleviation scheme planned at the rear of Ramsgate close? Not only will the construction activities have a significant effect on the wildlife there is also a high risk for the construction activities to contaminate the surrounding watercourses. What plans will be put in place to ensure no environmental impact on the watercourse?</p>	<p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above. Amendments to the SPD confirm</p>	<p>See above</p>
	<p><u>Negative Impacts On Local People's Health and Wellbeing</u></p>	<p>Any such risk identified would be conditioned as part of a planning approval.</p>	<p>No change to SPD required</p>
	<p>The introduction of 650+ houses means that potentially there could be 1,560 people introduced into the community, this is the equivalent to bringing a village similar in size to Skirlaugh, into this area. This will result in an increase in Noise, Air and Light Pollution.</p>	<p>See EE4 (Pollution) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>
	<p>Noise Pollution – Noise can cause annoyance and fatigue, interfere with communication and sleep, reduce efficiency and damage hearing. There are guidelines to noise levels for undisturbed sleep, and a daytime level for outdoor sound levels to prevent people from becoming “moderately annoyed”. Physiological effects of exposure to noise include constriction of blood vessels, tightening of muscles, increased heart rate and blood pressure and changes in stomach and abdomen movement. The effects of exposure to noise are personal as hearing sensitivity varies. There is an increasing body of research linking prolonged exposure to transport noise to health impacts. A major impact of noise is sleep disturbance and disrupted sleep has been linked to effects on cardiac health. A number of reports have made direct links between transport noise and cardiac health. There are links between children's concentration too. How does the developer plan to ensure no impact to the area and the people currently living here, both during and following construction? If the houses are to be built and people living in them and we are then being exposed to the increased traffic and construction noise?</p>	<p>Any development of this scale would have to be accompanied by a Noise Assessment and Environmental Health would be consulted on such matters. Any development is likely to have some effect but in decision making the LPA need to take account of the acoustic environment and in doing so consider: whether or not a significant adverse effect is occurring or likely to occur; whether or not an adverse effect is occurring or likely to occur; and whether or not a good standard of amenity can be achieved. On most approvals these matters are often controlled by conditions such as Construction Management Plans, which control hours of construction, deliveries and dust etc.</p>	<p>No change to SPD required</p>
	<p>Air Pollution – Poor air quality is the largest environmental risk to public health in the UK, as long-term exposure to air pollution can cause chronic conditions such as cardiovascular and respiratory diseases as well as lung cancer, leading to reduced life expectancy. Air pollution is the main cause of heart disease, stroke, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, lung cancer, and acute respiratory infections in children. The introduction of the proposed plans will increase the air pollution in the area and reduce the air quality. The local council in the area already have numerous outstanding actions from the Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) report. How do the council plan to meet these targets when introducing more emissions on a green space and also protect people in and around the Sutton area? This proposal contradicts the government driven Healthy Air initiative https://www.healthyair.org.uk/ . Putting a bus route through the area only adds to the air pollution and people will continue to use cars as a mode of transport regardless of government intentions.</p> <p>(Link to Healthy Air website included in response)</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority will need to establish (through an Air Quality Assessment) the 'baseline' local air quality, including what would happen to air quality in the absence of the development; whether the proposed development could significantly change air quality during the construction and operational phases (and the consequences of this for public health and biodiversity); and whether occupiers or users of the development could experience poor living conditions or health due to poor air quality.</p>	<p>No change to SPD required</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>Light pollution is proven to have an effect on people's mental health and causes sleep issues. Plants and animals depend on the Earth's daily cycle of light and dark rhythm to govern life-sustaining behaviours such as reproduction, nourishment, sleep and protection from predators. With 650+ houses planned all with internal and external lighting, street lighting, cars and bus lights at all hours, how can the developers, the council and the environmental agency ensure no impact on the surrounding wildlife and people living in the area.</p>	<p>On any submission the issue of light pollution would be considered and if necessary controlled through conditions (on any approval). As with other emissions, comments from bodies such as Environmental Health and also any neighbour response would be taken into account.</p>	
	<p>The proposals for this site in 1994 were for less than half of the houses proposed currently and were rejected due to inadequate standards of access routes onto the site and it being detrimental to the residential amenities. Given that since this time, traffic in the area has increased, GP surgeries have closed down, the local primary school is oversubscribed and we have experienced a severe flood in the area, I would like to ask what you deem has changed in favour of the plans? The plans for the flood elevation scheme haven't even begun and already the developers are pushing for more housing development in the area.</p>	<p>See Allocate2 (Focus on brownfield) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required</p>
		<p>The previous position indicated that there would be an adverse impact on residents living on Danby Close and on the basis that the council at that time did not rely on this land to meet identified housing needs, saw no reason to accept this. In relation to Danby Close – there was no suggestion that access wasn't possible on a technical basis. With regards to east Carr Road, the council did highlight technical constraints. This remains the case i.e. access would involve an upgrade / improvement of this road. In addition, the position regarding need for housing land is now very different.</p>	
		<p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See LF1 (Local Services) above See LF2 (School capacity) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above Comment noted</p>	<p>See above See above See above See above No change to SPD required.</p>
	<p>I have lived in and around Sutton most of my life, 30+ years and I think Sutton is a safe place to live, low crime rates, low anti-social behaviour issues and has a community feel about it. The area is a desirable one and introducing 650+ homes would not be in keeping with the Sutton area character and community feel. I have seen this with other large housing developments that have had a vast expansion to an area and how there is no real community feel as of yet, as this takes a long time to establish. Around Hull I think there is enough land and regeneration areas that should be built on and progressed before the developers consider building on what is now very limited countryside within the Hull boundary, the proposed fields at the back of Danby Close being the remaining East Hull parcel of green space.</p>		
	<p>This is the last large scale natural and untouched green belt land in the area and I would strongly recommend the preservation of it for the residents and future generations instead of it being developed for more housing.</p>	<p>Hull does not have a green belt</p>	<p>No change to SPD required</p>
	<p>In recent years this site has been accepted into the Hull Masterplan without any consultation to local residents. Had we been consulted on the proposed plans, residents would have been able to give their views at that time and the process been much more efficient, saving even more objections at this time. I would like to ask who accepted this proposed development site? And were they aware that no prior consultation had taken place with local residents, contravening government housing development policies?</p>	<p>See Consult1 (Local Plan consultation process) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>Overall, I believe the proposed East Carr development will cause harm and have a significant impact on the local wildlife, and people currently living in the Sutton area, cause havoc with the areas transport infrastructure, create a safety hazard to children in the area, create even more of a strain on local amenities and ruin the character of the Sutton area. I strongly object to the proposal and believe the proposal should be refused by the Council along with all other relevant local and national Planning Authorities.</p> <p>Due to the current COVID-19 pandemic the decision to close the Wilson Centre (on Alfred Gelder Street in Hull), means the plans from 1994 cannot be reviewed publicly at this time. The council's online planning portal only dates back to the 1st January 1995. As part of the consultation process, surely we should be given access to all relevant information.</p>	<p>See EE2 (Ecological value) above</p> <p>See Consult3 (SPD consultation process) above</p>	<p>A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site</p> <p>No change to SPD required</p>
EC33 Natural England	<p>While we welcome this opportunity to give our views, the topic this Supplementary Planning Document covers is unlikely to have major effects on the natural environment, but may nonetheless have some effects. We therefore do not wish to provide specific comments, but advise you to consider the following issues:</p> <p>Green Infrastructure – This SPD could consider making provision for Green Infrastructure (GI) within development. This should be in line with any GI strategy covering your area. The National Planning Policy Framework states that local planning authorities should ‘take a strategic approach to maintaining and enhancing networks of habitats and green Infrastructure’. The Planning Practice Guidance on Green Infrastructure provides more detail on this. Urban green space provides multi-functional benefits. It contributes to coherent and resilient ecological networks, allowing species to move around within, and between, towns and the countryside with even small patches of habitat benefitting movement. Urban GI is also recognised as one of the most effective tools available to us in managing environmental risks such as flooding and heat waves. Greener neighbourhoods and improved access to nature can also improve public health and quality of life and reduce environmental inequalities.</p> <p>There may be significant opportunities to retrofit green infrastructure in urban environments. These can be realised through:-green roof systems and roof gardens, green walls to provide insulation or shading and cooling, new tree planting or altering the management of land (e.g. management of verges to enhance biodiversity). You could also consider issues relating to the protection of natural resources, including air quality, ground and surface water and soils within urban design plans. Further information on GI is included within the Town and Country Planning Association’s “Design Guide for Sustainable Communities” and their more recent “Good Practice Guidance for Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity”.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>Comment noted. Agree to add further reference to green infrastructure including opportunities to multi-functional benefits of such infrastructure.</p> <p>Comment noted - refer to previous response</p>	<p>Add following text in ecology section, 'including for example the creation of new hedgerows and other appropriate green infrastructure' and 'Green infrastructure, such as the creation of SuDS, rain gardens, swales and reed beds should be multifunctional so that as well as achieving targets for drainage and flood risk, features may also provide benefits for people, such as through the use of rain gardens for grey water, and for wildlife by creating new high-quality habitat' to the flood risk and drainage section.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>Biodiversity enhancement – This SPD could consider incorporating features which are beneficial to wildlife within development, in line with paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework. You may wish to consider providing guidance on, for example, the level of bat roost or bird box provision within the built structure, or other measures to enhance biodiversity in the urban environment. An example of good practice includes the Exeter Residential Design Guide SPD, which advises (amongst other matters) a ratio of one nest/roost box per residential unit.</p> <p>Landscape enhancement – The SPD may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment; use natural resources more sustainably; and bring benefits for the local community, for example through green infrastructure provision and access to and contact with nature. Landscape characterisation and townscape assessments, and associated sensitivity and capacity assessments provide tools for planners and developers to consider how new development might make a positive contribution to the character and functions of the landscape through sensitive siting and good design and avoid unacceptable impacts. For example, it may be appropriate to seek that, where viable, trees should be of a species capable of growth to exceed building height and managed so to do, and where mature trees are retained on site, provision is made for succession planting so that new trees will be well established by the time mature trees die.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Further guidance will be provided to applicant in light of outcome of required ecological assessments.</p> <p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>
	<p>Other design considerations – The NPPF includes a number of design principles which could be considered, including the impacts of lighting on landscape and biodiversity (para 180).</p>	<p>This has already been addressed to an extent insofar as the site has already been allocated for housing. However it is considered to useful to include further reference to</p>	<p>Add the following text to the end of section 2.3, 'In accordance with guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework and relevant other Local Plan policies, applicants will be required to mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from the new development and to consider carefully lighting strategies to protect local amenity'. No change to SPD required</p>
	<p>Strategic Environmental Assessment/Habitats Regulations Assessment – A SPD requires a Strategic Environmental Assessment only in exceptional circumstances as set out in the Planning Practice Guidance. While SPDs are unlikely to give rise to likely significant effects on European Sites, they should be considered as a plan under the Habitats Regulations in the same way as any other plan or project. If your SPD requires a Strategic Environmental Assessment or Habitats Regulation Assessment, you are required to consult us at certain stages as set out in the Planning Practice Guidance. Should the plan be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment, then, please consult Natural England again.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
EC34	<p>I am writing as a Spring Cottage resident to object to the proposed housing development on East Carr Greenland. I have lived on Stornaway Square, Spring Cottage for 23 years. The proposed 650 plus housing development will massively impact on the already severe traffic congestion on Spring Cottage, Howdale and surrounding area. The area will not cope and become an overwhelming highway nightmare with the huge increase of additional traffic such as new residents having one or two vehicles per household, visitors, delivery and service vehicles driving through to the proposed two entrances East Carr Road and Danby Close causing detrimental impact on the whole area, environment and current residents safety. There are over 130 houses on Stornaway Square and Pentland Close who have one or two vehicles per household that have to use East Carr Road to access our street which is next to the golf range/kennels access. East Carr Road is a narrow road with a blind bend with resident street parking. East Carr Road residents and visitors, staff and visitors going to the kennels and golf range, service and work vehicles, some Gleneagles residents use this road. East Carr Road is not a possible option to accommodate the enormous increase of traffic to a safe highway standard for cars and pedestrians to use at the same time, pedestrians and vehicle users would constantly be in danger of the inadequate access. I drive around my area which apprehension as it is and do not want anymore traffic. The traffic is extremely busy at weekends causing severe traffic congestion in the area. Spring Cottage and Howdale does not have the capacity to safely accommodate the anticipated traffic generated by the proposed development. This would lead to unacceptable levels of traffic, resulting in increased congestion and road safety risks. Currently there is a highe housing development being built off Middlesex Road/Bellfield Road. I have noticed at least two new road accesses that will join onto Saltshouse Road from this development not far from Dunvegan Road, this will cause additional traffic congestion in my area. Currently there is a 23 house development being built at the old Sutton Place Unit on Saltshouse Road.</p> <p>The road access is between Dunvegan Road and Howdale Road. This will cause additional traffic congestion in my area. Opposite Stornaway Square there is land which used to be the Gleneagles Centre where there is going to be a proposal of an additional 25 houses as stated in the Hull Local Plan, this will cause additional traffic congestion in my area. At the top of Dunvegan Road the Old White House School is being transformed into a school again on a larger scale to accommodate over 50 children. There will be an increase of vehicles including staff, parents, school buses dropping off and picking up the children, delivery service vehicles such as food and resources which will cause additional traffic congestion as where the school is located which will halt traffic due to close location to the Dunvegan roundabout, I know this will happen as I would be stuck in traffic when the White House School was in operation years ago. My experience travelling from my home to work on Anlaby Road each day having to leave at 7.45 travelling via Saltshouse Road, Holderness Road or Leads Road to hopefully arrive before 9.00am – leaving any later I would be late for work. Travelling home via the same routes is constant congestion. New residents will want and have to drive cars. Not everyone works local and getting a bus or cycling is not an option due to personal circumstances, not being practical on distance, weather conditions, what people do for their work, where they work, shift patterns and family responsibilities and much more. The areas infrastructure cannot take more traffic, more traffic pollution, more noise pollution and years of construction traffic on narrow congested roads.</p>	<p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>See T1 (Traffic access) above</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>More destroying green fields with wildlife, the green fields (Sea of Green) are enjoyed by the community for personal activities and enjoyment and will be lost forever with brick and concrete. Every year the fields hold so much water and this time from end of 2019 into 2020 the fields were like huge lakes. The Council have proposed a development and not looked at the serious consequences putting Spring Cottage and Howdale resident's lives at risk, I repeat again this will be an overwhelming highway nightmare.</p>	See EE2 (Ecological value) above	<p>A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site</p> <p>See above</p>
	<p>Suggested Changes –</p>	See Flood1 (Flooding) above	See above
	<p>Privacy I live on Stornaway Square and my back garden backs onto the greenfield. I have trees and bushes at the bottom of my border and would like all the trees and bushes and undergrowth to remain running along the field with additional trees and bushes to screen for my privacy and for the wildlife.</p>	See PC3 (Loss of outlook / privacy) above	See above
	<p>Noise Pollution – I do not want a road, cycle path and pedestrian path near my back garden. It will have to be set far back from my boundary. I am used to a tranquil quiet environment when I am in my back garden. The noise pollution will impact on my way of life. I have enough traffic noise at the front of my house and do not want to hear it from both sides.</p>	<p>The SPD seeks to retain such features and to add where appropriate. Due consideration will be given to space around homes, noise and disturbance in the design and layout of any subsequent development. An easement will be required around the perimeter of the site.</p>	No change to the SPD required.
	<p>Light Pollution – A road, cycle path and pedestrian path will need street lighting to illuminate it. This is why the road, cycle path and pedestrian path needs to be further back also. If any street lighting illuminates in my back garden this will be an intrusion into my privacy as I am used to complete darkness and do not want my house and back garden illuminating.</p>	Will be considered and if necessary controlled through conditions (on any approval). As with other emissions, comments from bodies such as Environmental Health and also any neighbour response would be taken into account.	No change to SPD required.
	<p>Cultivated Drains – I have grave concerns of the Sutton Cross Drain at the back of my property to be cultivated, causing flooding to my property due to blockages.</p>	Culverting of the drain is not proposed.	No change to SPD required.
	<p>Benches – Benches should not be located in the development this will cause youths to gather and cause nuisance antisocial behaviour and damage the benches.</p>	Disagree with the statement. The provision of resting places (benches) is an important part of facilitating sustainable modes of travel i.e. walking and associated active and healthy lifestyles. Young people ('youths') have as much right to walk around and sit and rest as any other member of the community. Resting places will need to be compatible with wheelchairs and scooters.	No change to SPD required.
	<p>Road Blocks – Road blocks will be needed to stop speeding around the development by residents and non-residents using the roads.</p>	A range of measures are included in the SPD (such as street design) to discourage unnecessary movement by car and to ensure that speeding is not an issue. Hull City council Highways will assess any future planning applications from many perspectives including road safety and speed restrictions.	See above
	<p>Car Parking – Residents need to be restricted where they park their vehicles as some residents will have work vehicles and even caravans. If they have plenty of parking on the front/side and at the rear of the property they should not be allowed to park on the main roads around the development. Parking at the rear of their property will look tidier.</p>	Important to manage car parking in the new development with this in mind parking has to be designed carefully and using a range of parking solutions appropriate to site context and types of housing proposed.	See above
	<p><i>Response to Councillor Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet</i></p>		
	<p>A bad idea</p>		
	<p><i>Response to Councillor Craker/Dunstan leaflet</i></p>		
	<p>I strongly object to any housing development on East Carr Greenland.</p>	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>Traffic Generation/Highway Safety – very concerned about the current increase of traffic on East Carr Road and the surrounding area approaching it. East Carr Road is a narrow road with a blind bend with street parking causing constant congestion as it is, with an increase in traffic it would not only be irresponsible, inconvenient but extremely dangerous and putting current residents safety at risk. The single narrow entrance/lane towards the kennels cannot cater for the amount of traffic proposed this would be irresponsible and extremely dangerous putting lives at risk not only for drivers but for pedestrians walking down the lane. Danby Close is a quiet road that the residents are used to therefore this should not be turned into a main road as the increased noise pollution and volume of traffic expected will impact the residents safety. Spring Cottage and howdale will not cope with the enormous increase of traffic of the additional thousand plus vehicles expected this will be overwhelming and putting too much pressure on the environment and community.</p> <p>Traffic Pollution – The additional thousand plus resident vehicles, visitors vehicles, delivery vehicles, service vehicles will undoubtedly increase pollution to the local environment.</p> <p>Noise Pollution – Compared to the tranquil environment there is now I have grave concerns that having a road next to my boundary of my property this would increase noise levels that would impact on my way of life.</p> <p>Light pollution – If a road/path/cycle track is to be built next to my boundary it would require street lighting to illuminate it. This will affect my privacy in my back garden and will illuminate my property and having beams of light into my windows. This is an intrusion into my privacy.</p> <p>Privacy – Currently looking over fields I have trees and bushes on the other side of my boundary running along the field which gives me privacy and security what are the guarantees that the trees and bushes running along the field will be kept.</p> <p>The East Carr Green Country Fields – is the last piece of natural green open countryside on the edge of East Hull and should be protected and not destroyed. The beautiful wildlife living in the fields, bushes, undergrowth and trees, local people enjoy the pleasures what the open fresh countryside offers, walking, watching, wildlife, birdwatching, dog walking, exercising and children playing and more. To destroy these wonderful green fields would be tragic and have a massive impact on the environment and on the health and wellbeing of the community.</p>	<p>See EE2 (Ecological value) above</p>	<p>A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site</p>
EC35	<p>I feel the need to contact you with respect to the above proposed building work. There are many concerns relating to the area, and I am certain I will not be the first nor the last to raise them</p> <p>Firstly, the road infrastructure.....Danby Close/Howdale Rd/Robson Way/Dunvegan Rd/Salthouse Rd and most of all East Carr Lane are busy enough already.</p> <p>East Carr Lane is so narrow that there is JUST enough room for 2 vehicles, no larger than vans, to pass so how on earth will it withstand more traffic? What will happen to the Driving Range? (Not that I use it).</p> <p>Dunvegan Road is bad enough to navigate with parked vehicles on each side AND being a bus route as well. The road surface is in need of some TLC as it is.</p> <p>Danby Close, I feel sorry for the residents already there. If the new estate is to be no on street parking, then it will be a free for all in Danby Close and Howdale Road to park.</p> <p>Howdale Road is a VERY busy road along with being a bus route. It is a "drivable sweeping bend" which already attracts the idiots who see how fast they can go. Imagine adding another 1300 vehicles to the mix (averaging 2 vehicles per dwelling). At peak times there is already a back log for those trying to access Saltshouse Road or Robson way depending in which way you are going.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>See T1 (Traffic access) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>See above</p> <p>The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>Robson Way is the main bypass for Sutton On Hull, that in itself tells you the volume of traffic it takes.</p> <p>As for Saltshouse Rd.....well there are already 2 building sites ongoing, plus whatever it is that is planned for what used to be The School for Deaf children on the corner of Dunvegan Rd. The impact of the added vehicular movement is unimaginable.</p> <p>Amenities..... where will children go to school, the nearest schools are already at their capacity.</p> <p>Medical needs.....it is bad enough now getting an appointment under normal circumstances so where will the 1800 (averaging 3 per dwelling) go for medical attention? Shops, we don't have any shops locally other than a convenience store on Dalsetter Rise, therefore putting more traffic on the roads to simply get day to day needs. This when as a country are supposed to be cutting back on emissions.</p> <p>We were promised in the 90s we would get chemist, some shops and a pub/restaurant on Howdale Road, that never happened.</p> <p>Years ago planning was refused in this area and a "Green Belt" granted as it is a flood plain. So why is it different now? In 2007 the dyke at the back of our property overtopped. We live in an area which has the only natural "hill" in Hull, so another 650 dwellings are to be put at flood risk.</p> <p>The quality of life here is REALLY good, and I feel that that quality will diminish should that building work go ahead. Its quiet, very little or no vandalism or crime (thats just put the kiss of death on it), the council have spent a lot of money making the area safe for us in many ways. The impact of long term building work with the construction vehicles going back and forth, the noise of pile driving will all be detrimental to peoples mental health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Why not use Preston Road where the amenities and road infrastructure is already in place, or alongside the river where the old Lord Lines building is. There is more than enough room for expansion there.</p> <p>I do need to stress that this really is not a case of "not on my doorstep" but a real concern for everyone including the potential residents of the proposed dwellings</p>	<p>See LF1 (Local Services) above</p> <p>See LF2 (School capacity) above</p> <p>See LF1 (Local Services) above</p> <p>The previous position indicated that there would be an adverse impact on residents living on Danby Close and on the basis that the council at that time did not rely on this land to meet identified housing needs, saw no reason to accept this. In relation to Danby Close – there was no suggestion that access wasn't possible on a technical basis. With regards to east Carr Road, the council did highlight technical constraints. This remains the case i.e. access would involve an upgrade / improvement of this road. In addition, the position regarding need for housing land is now very different.</p> <p>Hull doesn't have a green belt</p> <p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p> <p>See Construct1 (Construction disruption) above</p> <p>See Allocate2 (Focus on brownfield) above</p> <p>The Preston Road site is allocated for housing and an application for this land is pending. The Local Plan establishes a need for housing over the period to 2032 and the East Carr site is one of many others that will contribute to meeting this need.</p> <p>Comment noted</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required</p> <p>No change to SPD required</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC36	<p>Via Councillor Healand</p> <p>Dear Councillor Healand</p> <p>My husband and me are opposed to this development on the environmental, wildlife, congestion and pollution grounds.</p> <p>We think it extremely important for physical and mental health to have green spaces.</p>	<p>See EE2 (Environmental value) above</p> <p>See EE2 (Ecological value) above</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site</p> <p>See above</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>Please note our opposition to this development and try to make sure it does not go ahead.</p> <p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Please try and stop this development. Keep our area as it is now!</p>	<p>See EE4 (Pollution) above Comment noted</p> <p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC37	<p>Email 1</p> <p>How can you reject the plans several times due to lack of infrastructure and traffic etc What has changed as there is more traffic than ever, even with covide. As per a letter I received from Mr Jenrick's office (from Rafal Pisula Planning Policy and Reform) Quote from letter It is important that we build new developments which is appropriately resilient, sustainable and can stand the test of time, inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided. The average elevation of Danby Close is roughly 0.70 metres above sea level with the lowest point being 0.50 mts This land is not suitable for the development and should be left alone as green field. As you are aware the infrastructure is not good as roads on Howdale and cracking with all the buses coming down the road and to add a possible 1000 more cars using these roads would need large roundabouts at the top of Howdale and Dunvergan As the buses struggle now at the top of Dunvergan. I believe the request for roundabouts have been talked about before but Mr Prescott did not want a roundabout outside his home so you rejected it. I have lived down Dany Close for 32 years and this year is the 1st time I have ever been notified of any changed to the land. You have not communicated with people, and our local councillors are against it and our MP Mr Turner is against it, so as a labour council what on earth are you doing upsetting the general public and disagreeing with your local councillors and MP. Why should we have 10 years of noise, drilling, lorries, builders, possible damage to our property, increased traffic, health and safety issues etc etc This cannot go ahead <i>Email 2 Via Councillor Healand</i> [repeat text from above] <i>Response to Councillor Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet</i> Bad idea <i>Sent email to Allen Healand, Karl Turner, Mr Craker, Mr Dunstan</i></p>	<p>The previous position indicated that there would be an adverse impact on residents living on Danby Close and on the basis that the council at that time did not rely on this land to meet identified housing needs, saw no reason to accept this. In relation to Danby Close – there was no suggestion that access wasn't possible on a technical basis. With regards to east Carr Road, the council did highlight technical constraints. This remains the case i.e. access would involve an upgrade / improvement of this road. In addition, the position regarding need for housing land is now very different.</p> <p>Comment noted</p> <p>Comment noted</p> <p>The suitability of the land was determined during the Local Plan process See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>See Consult3 (SPD consultation process) above</p> <p>See Construct1 (Construction disruption) above</p> <p>Comment noted</p> <p>Comment noted</p> <p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required. See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required</p> <p>No change to SPD required</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC38	<p>1.Via Councillor Healand I have been asking the same question, why and how did the land become allocated for housing?. I believe the original consultation was back in 2015 because that is when agencies like the RSPB etc objected to the plans. They also objected back in 1994 when the plans were rejected and the land was deemed unsuitable for a housing development.</p>	<p>See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>The council never consulted with local residents back in 2015 or in 2017 when the plans were adopted. They only delivered a few leaflets through some local residents doors a few days before the end of the consultation period (which I believe ended on the 23rd November the letters to object being delivered on the 18th November). I cannot see how a planning officer can make a fair decision on the allocation of the land when the local residents did not get much (if any) chance to object to the plans.</p> <p>I think the land needs removing from the Hull Plan 2016 and removed from housing allocation until the council go through the proper procedures and include the local residents in the consultation period. I have spoken to people in the area and some that have lived here 35 years have never been aware of the proposed housing until they received the letter from labour starting with 'you will be aware' and asking for their opinions. Most people thought they were able to object to the building of the houses but the council have sneakily allocated the land already.</p> <p>I have asked Karl Turner to answer this question on 2 occasions, the first reply was a copy and pasted comment from his facebook page and he has not even replied to my second email. I also asked why there is such a rush to build on this greenfield land when in 2018 the council were over 2 years in front of their 620 builds per year and there are masses of brownfield land still left to build on.</p> <p>I think it is plainly obvious to anybody who visits the area that the access to the land is not suitable, the roads etc would not cope with the extra traffic. The infrastructure is already stretched and the pollution it will bring will not be good for the local wildlife and local residents. I hope you have some success in getting these plans scrapped. Me and my wife are willing to help in any way we can, Thank you for reading my email</p> <p><i>Response to Councillor Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet</i></p> <p>A bad idea. I shouldn't need to go into detail, plainly obvious. Flooding and infrastructure of the area. Why not use Sutton Golf Course – 8 x the space and access via Salthouse Road then build flood protection on surrounding fields.</p> <p>I am responding to the recent consultation meeting me and my wife attended at the Salthouse public house. We were asked to send in our comments and concerns via email regarding what we would like to see in the supplementary planning documents that run alongside any future planning application for the proposed development of East Carr fields. I will list each area of concern in different paragraphs under separate headings to make it easier to read through.</p> <p>1. Allocation of the land.</p> <p>Firstly, one of my biggest concerns is the original allocation of the land for housing back in 2015 and the adoption of the Hull Plan in 2017 were on both occasions very little if any chance was given for local people to contribute and get involved in any consultation. This then led to only 12 objections from local residents ever making it into the final decision made by the planning officer at that time. These were by the few people who received letters through their doors on the 18th November 2015 with the consultation ending on the 23rd November 2015. I think it must come across rather strange to the planning department and Hull City Council that there are so many objections now 5 years later and some of them coming from the people who lived around here back then who did not seem to object at that time.</p>	<p>The council consulted on this land as part of the process of preparing the current Local Plan. The Local Plan establishes the principle of development. A Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) setting out precise dates and details of issues raised is available to view on the council's web site. Reference is made to letters being delivered a matter of a few days before the end of a consultation period. These were delivered by a ward member and were in addition to the council's consultation plan (as set out in the SCI)</p> <p>The Council more recently as part of this exercise has been consulting on the east Carr SPD – this consultation focusses on more detailed design considerations to inform any subsequent planning application.</p> <p>Comment noted</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>Comment noted</p> <p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>See above</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>We are also concerned that in the meeting John Craig and Chris Peach told us that allocation of land for housing always contradicts local plans when we mentioned the allocation of East Carr fields for housing contradicts the priorities and procedures set out in the Hull Plan 2016. What is the Hull Plan for if no-one follows it?. We were told though the allocation of housing on East Carr fields in the Hull Plan however is basically written in stone.</p>	<p>Reference to proposals 'contradicting' what is set out in the Local Plan – it is unclear what this relates to. The allocation is included in the Local Plan. The purpose of the SPD is to ensure that the council has a more detailed framework to ensure that the quality, design and layout of any subsequent proposal results in a better outcome. The principle of development is established in the Local Plan but the SPD provides an opportunity for local people to influence the detail of this development. There will be further opportunities as and when a planning application is submitted.</p>	<p>No change to SPD required</p>
	<p>2. Flooding. The land itself is classed as flood risk, you could argue all of Hull is classed as flood risk but not all of Hull is greenfield land and deemed as an urban greenspace of nature conservation interest back in 1994. Letters recently received from no.10 and the Ministry of Housing state that flood risk land should be avoided for housing unless it is necessary and there are no other suitable sites available with a lower flood risk. There are still lots of brownfield land sites available for building with less flood risk around Hull. I therefore cannot see how this development is necessary when Hull City Council were in front of their need for 620 house builds per year, in November 2018 they were 1437 houses above this target and recently reported they had been above their house build target for the 5th year in a row.</p> <p>The land behind Danby Close floods annually (this used to be every 10 years until recent years according to the environment agency). Flood alleviation measures have been put in place along with the functioning flood plain which runs to the west of the proposed development. If these measures were working correctly then surely the land behind Danby Close should not flood still. The Hull Plan was drawn up 5 years ago including this functioning flood plain. The government and Hull City Council have declared climate emergencies over the last year or so and scientists have said global warming is increasing at an alarming rate. I asked Rachel Glossop at the meeting if there should be a new assessment of the functioning flood plain carried out to see if it is still sufficient and she said there may need to be another one done in a few years time. We unfortunately feel that this may be too late and houses may already be built on land required to extend the flood plain. We strongly request that this is done sooner and should be added to the spd's at the very least.</p>	<p>Reference is made to a comment by an officer that new flood risk assessment may be required in the future – this is correct. However, in the meantime the council is satisfied that this land can be brought forward without placing new housing at risk and without transferring risk elsewhere. This will need to be confirmed through a detailed flood risk assessment as part of any planning application.</p>	<p>See above</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>The environment agency are currently having a consultation on the proposed Aquagreen in neighbouring fields to this proposed housing development. The Aquagreen is being installed to protect housing from Sutton to North Carr. We are very concerned that they have not taken the extra proposed 650 houses into their calculations. The environment agency bases their calculations on the last 10 years of rainfall only and this does not include increased volumes from global warming I believe nor does it include 'unprecedented' rainfall that seems to be flooding areas all other the United Kingdom in recent years. The environment agency are planning to pump all the water from the Holderness Drain into the River Humber. The proposed housing development will be using the Holderness Drain to take any surface water after the water containers are full. The water pumped into the River Humber will put other areas of Hull and Hessle under more flood risk so I believe this housing development will be adding to flood risk elsewhere and I cannot see how this could be mitigated in any way.</p>	<p>The proposed aquagreen in the neighbouring fields is part of the wider Holderness Drain Flood Alleviation Scheme which consists of a new pumping station where Holderness Drain discharges to the Humber estuary and the aquagreen. All flood alleviation schemes which require government funding have to go through a complex and rigorous appraisal process to justify the funding. This includes strategic catchment modelling to a specified approach which includes the latest government guidance on climate change (UKCP https://www.metoffice.gov.uk/research/approach/collaboration/ukcp/index) which is considerably more detailed than just 10 years of rainfall data. Any planning application for development on East Carr will have to restrict the surface water run-off from the development to the same run-off rates which are currently discharging off the site. This will be demonstrated in a Drainage Impact Assessment which would need to be submitted with any planning application for the site. The principles of how this could be done, through using sustainable drainage systems (SUDs) which mimic the natural drainage on site, are what is set out in the principles of the SPD. Therefore there will be no change in the amount of discharge into Holderness Drain as a result of development. The biggest issue on the Holderness Drain both now and in the future is the impact of sea level rise which prevents water in the Holderness Drain naturally been able to discharge to the estuary. When the tide is high the water in Holderness Drain is unable to discharge and starts to back up. This is why a key part of the flood alleviation scheme is the pumping station which ensures that water can continually discharge. The amount of water coming down the Holderness Drain is inconsequential to the Humber. The Humber estuary drains 20% of the total land surface of England so a small watercourse like Holderness Drain has no impact of the Humber and the North Sea.</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>
	<p>When we bought our house in 2017 we were told by Yorkshire Water that the sewers and drainage for this area were already at their maximum capacity. It concerns us that the proposed development will be using the same sewers and we strongly request that there is a proper assessment carried out and the sewers upgraded as far back as is required for them to cope with the increased demand not just from this development but from all the developments going on throughout the city. If an extra 650 households are running water and flushing toilets at the same time as the current households in the area, where is all the water and sewerage going to go?.</p>	<p>The majority of sewers in the country are at capacity as they were designed to only take roof water from property and not road and land drainage, however in many locations such as Hull nearly all the surface water discharges to the sewer system. There is also a difference in the industry standards for designing sewer systems which are designed to incorporate a storm or rainfall event which has a 5% risk of happening on an annual basis. In the last 15 years we have seen rainfall events which have exceeded the design standard, particularly very localised heavy intense rainfall which puts pressure on parts of the sewer system resulting in them becoming overloaded. Therefore in general the advice is to take steps where possible to reduce the amount of run-off getting into the sewer system, hence planning policy about not paving your drives and gardens and looking at more permeable surfacing or installing water butts and raingardens to slow the flow of water from the property roof into the gullies. In terms of new development Water Companies are a statutory consultee on Local Plans and allocation sites. Yorkshire Water did not object to this allocation site in the Local Plan process. They will be consulted on any planning application that may come forward for this site and it would be highly likely that their advice would be to ensure that any surface water from development is discharged to Suttoncross/East Carr/Holderness Drain as the existing situation rather than into the sewer system.</p>	<p>#N/A</p>
	<p>I would also like to note I have already have had to bury a pump in my back garden to pump excess rain water from the back of my garage and into the drains (they are actually sewers at my house due to it being at the end) to protect my garage from flooding.</p>	<p>Comment noted – but in line with the above, the proposed new development will have no impact on the current system as any planning application for the site would have to provide a Drainage Impact Assessment to show how the drainage for development would mimic the natural existing drainage and reduce run-off rates by using sustainable drainage systems (SuDs) as proposed in the SPD.</p>	<p>#N/A</p>

3. Roads and Infrastructure.

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>The roads around here are congested, Dunvegan Road being the worst. There have been numerous accidents. The proposed entrance to the development at Danby Close is on a bend. We have trouble crossing on this bend daily when taking our dogs for a walk. Sometimes we have to step back when crossing when a vehicle comes at speed around the corner. It is only possible to cross by listening for vehicles and choosing the right time to go. The entrance to East Carr is very narrow and restricted. The junctions are also congested and sometimes it is very difficult to get out at them due to the amount of traffic using Salthouse Road and Robson Way. There is no way this area could cope with the extra vehicles a development of this size would attract. It is plainly obvious the roads will need significant improvements to cater for the increased demand. This needs to include safe crossing areas for schoolchildren and other pedestrians, better control of the junctions (traffic lights maybe), widening of some roads (without forgetting the more concrete the more flood risk) and possible speed restriction measures if necessary. These things need to be assessed and the assessments need to be carried out when people are all back to work as normal and not during the current pandemic with people working from home etc.</p>		
	<p>The schools in the area are oversubscribed, the doctors, dentists and other health related organisations and businesses are also at maximum capacity and these problems will also need to be addressed and improvements made where necessary.</p>	<p>See LF1 (Local Services) above</p>	<p>See above</p>
	<p>4. Pollution</p>	<p>See LF2 (School capacity) above</p>	<p>See above</p>
	<p>One of the main reasons we chose to move into this area was the reduced amount of air, noise and light pollution. We used to live near a large roundabout with continuous heavy traffic and the pollution it created had an impact on our health. The air around here is cleaner and fresher being next to open fields. The traffic is less and we suffer very little traffic noise in comparison. We love to sit in our garden on an evening and see the stars clearly with very little light pollution. We feel this development will have a detrimental effect on these things we enjoy. We therefore would like to see minimum use of street lighting were possible and the extra number of cars, buses, delivery vehicles, dustcarts and even the vehicles required for the building works to be managed in a way to minimise this impact.</p>	<p>Any development of this scale would have to be accompanied by a Noise Assessment and Environmental Health would be consulted on such matters. Any development is likely to have some effect but in decision making the LPA need to take account of the acoustic environment and in doing so consider: whether or not a significant adverse effect is occurring or likely to occur; whether or not an adverse effect is occurring or likely to occur; and whether or not a good standard of amenity can be achieved. On most approvals these matters are often controlled by conditions such as Construction Management Plans, which control hours of construction, deliveries and dust etc.</p> <p>The Local Planning Authority will need to establish (through an Air Quality Assessment) the 'baseline' local air quality, including what would happen to air quality in the absence of the development; whether the proposed development could significantly change air quality during the construction and operational phases (and the consequences of this for public health and biodiversity); and whether occupiers or users of the development could experience poor living conditions or health due to poor air quality.</p> <p>On any submission the issue of light pollution would be considered and if necessary controlled through conditions (on any approval). As with other emissions, comments from bodies such as Environmental Health and also any neighbour response would be taken into account.</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>
	<p>The proposed plans state there will be electric charging points installed on the development for each house. This is all good and well but how many people actually own electric cars and vans etc? and will all the other vehicles entering the site all be powered by electric?. We know this is not really workable currently and it would be impractical to expect people buying the houses to only own electric vehicles, therefore there will be an increase in air pollution and this needs to be assessed and managed accordingly.</p>	<p>Accept that use of electric cars is currently very low but in coming years this will become the norm (hence the importance of future proofing new development and requiring charging points)</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>The heating systems in the new homes need to be the most environmentally friendly types that are available at this time regardless of cost. The government have announced they want to stop putting gas boilers in new builds by 2025. Would it not be a good time to demand this seeing as Hull City Council have recently declared a climate emergency?.</p>	<p>The introduction of new legislation prohibiting the use of gas boilers is likely to be incorporated in this development. It is important to note that no planning application has been received yet and that a considerable period of time is required to determine such applications and then to get a start on site. Thereafter, on any site of this scale, the number of houses completed in any given year is relatively small.</p>	<p>See above</p>
	<p>The proposed development will sit right next to The Loglands nature reserve and the land is a green corridor for wildlife. Lots of wildlife use the land currently and the development and any pollution it produces will have a negative impact on the animals and creatures who inhabit the land.</p>	<p>See EE2 (Ecological value) above</p>	<p>See above</p>
	<p>5. Other points When we moved into our property we found it difficult to get home insurance due to the flood risk. We need to have buildings insurance in place for our mortgage and are concerned the extra housing and flood risk may at the least put our premiums up or we will not be able to get insurance at all. We are also concerned our car insurance may go up due to an increase in accidents etc if the road structure is not managed correctly.</p>	<p>See PC1 (Home insurance) above</p>	<p>See above</p>
	<p>We find that the council currently seem to struggle to maintain the grass verges, trees, empty the public bins and maintain the surrounding area. How will they manage to maintain the development land?.</p>	<p>See LF4 (Maintenance of open space) above</p>	<p>See above</p>
	<p>People are already putting their houses up for sale due to this proposed development because they do not trust Hull City Council to make the right decision when it comes to the planning application being submitted. This is breaking up communities which have taken years to build.</p>		
	<p>Chris peach asked us what the council will get out of this development and says the council will not gain anything. Why have the council spent so much time drawing up plans and spending tax payer's money doing this when really that should be done by a developer and presented at the planning application stage?. The council will get 15% of the properties allocated for social housing (we were told this in the meeting). That equates to around 97 houses that the council can move anybody they feel into. The council tax alone will equate to at least £900,000 a year.</p>	<p>The Council is investing time and energy in the SPD to ensure that it has greater control over what comes forward through the planning application stage. Council Tax will be generated but this is used to deliver essential services. The Council is not the landowner so there is no other 'financial gain'. Land is allocated to meet an identified need.</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>
		<p>Reference is made to a requirement for 15% affordable housing. The actual requirement (as set out in the Local Plan) is 10%. These will not automatically transfer to the Council – these will be purchased (at a discounted rate) by a Registered Provider (which could be the Council). It may be that people on the Council's Housing Register could be allocated to these new properties but likewise, it could be people on the equivalent register of the successful Registered Provider.</p>	
	<p>We would like to see the 70% of the social housing (that has to be 2 bedrooms or below) be bungalows (possibly warden controlled) to cope with the demand due to people living longer, also this will increase the need to make sure the flood risk is managed correctly.</p>	<p>The type and size of affordable housing provided will be agreed in light of specific evidence of need. The point relating to bungalows and special attention to flood risk is noted.</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>
	<p>We believe that putting all the responsibility on the developer to put everything right is irresponsible of this council. Hull City Council as the local authority have a duty of care to all its residents to make sure any housing developments or building works are carried out in such a way to have the minimum impact and detrimental effect on all its residents old and new. The development and all works related to it should be overseen by this council to make sure everything is done properly. At the end of the day when the developer has moved on and made their profits the resulting problems will be left for this council (whichever party is in power) and the local residents to live with. We feel that this development is based on greed over need and should never of reached this stage in the first place. We would prefer to see this land used for greenspace and kept for possible future flood prevention as global warming increases.</p>	<p>The planning system operates in a manner which requires the Council (local planning authority) to produce plans which allocate land for new development. Through the planning application process a developer needs to provide the local planning authority with required detail to ensure compliance with a range of relevant planning policies. This will include assessments relating to transport, flood risk, impact on ecology alongside compliance with design standards etc...The SPD is considered to have a key role to play in driving up standards.</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>Thank you for reading our comments and concerns, we hope you consider them when any planning application for the development is put forward and include any of our points in the supplementary planning documents.</p> <p><i>Response to Councillor Craker/Dunstan leaflet</i></p> <p>We are totally against any housing development in this area. The reasons for this are when we purchased our property 3 years ago we were told by Yorkshire Water that the sewerage and drainage of this area is at its maximum it can take. This affects our home insurance due to the flood risk we already face. We do not believe the infrastructure of this area currently would be able to take the increased demand on services. The roads are already congested (ie Dunvegan Road) the schools and health services are already stretched from previous developments and the ever increasing size of Kingswood. We believe that it would be more beneficial to extend the nature reserves across the fields to join with the existing nature reserve.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>
<p>EC39</p>	<p>Via Councillor Healand</p> <p>I object to the 650 house development planned by HCC. A plan that I understand has been rejected at least twice before, in the 1980's and 1990's.</p> <p>This area is not suitable for a development of such a size for many reasons.</p> <p>All the roads in this area are narrow, 2 lane roads, of which the principle roads are bus routes. There are always cars parked, on Dunvegan Road, particularly at evenings, night, and early mornings as few of the houses have off road or garage parking, which makes overtaking difficult for busses and other vehicles alike.</p> <p>The situation is not helped by frequent driving school cars using the uphill side of the road for learner drivers to practice hill starts.</p> <p>The many housing developments along Saltshouse Road have already increased the traffic hugely.</p> <p>Traffic using Dunvegan Road to get onto Saltshouse Road at rush hour times often stretches past the end of the slope of the hill, often blocking traffic wanting to turn out of the Barra Close cul de sac. Many cars are used to take children to the only school in the area, thereby increasing the traffic numbers morning and afternoon.</p> <p>There is no longer a doctors practice in the area.</p> <p>The use of green space will detract from the area greatly. Flood plains could become a flooding threat to properties similar to the flooding in various areas, including the Spring Cottage, Howdale Road areas widely reported in recent times.</p> <p>Recently, information was circulated in this area regarding making the former Special School at the junction of Saltshouse Road and Dunvegan Road, across from the Saltshouse pub, into another Special School. I had no objections to this at the time. 650 dwelling development</p> <p>However, if it does go ahead, it could change my opinion because, as well as the extra traffic from the new housing development, this would cause more traffic problems directly on the corner of Dunvegan Road at its junction with Saltshouse Road, as the entrance to the School property is planned to be very close to the corner of the Saltshouse Road junction, requiring traffic for the school would be turning from Saltshouse Road, and needing to turn left immediately into the school access, thereby exacerbating the queues of traffic coming up Dunvegan Road to that junction.</p> <p>It could also be a traffic accident hazard to vehicles turning left into Dunvegan Road from Saltshouse Road, then wanting to turn right into the school grounds would have to wait for traffic coming up Dunvegan Road to let them through.</p> <p>All the queuing traffic in this area will create more pollution, and wear and tear on the road surfaces in the area, many of which are already in a poor state of repair, Robson Way being an example.</p>	<p>See Allocate3 (What has changed since 1994) above</p> <p>See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>See LF1 (Local Services) above</p> <p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p> <p>Planning approval has been granted for the new educational facility and construction is underway.</p> <p>See EE4 (Pollution) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	Church Street, Potterill Lane, Ings Raod, Leads Road, Bellfield Avenue, and others are already choked with drivers looking for other routes, and this development will make that increasingly worse.		
EC40	<p>I wish to offer my comments in opposition of the above development. It is totally unacceptable to use DANBY CLOSE as a vehicle access in such a narrow road. The amount of vehicles and buses proposed passing through daily is hard to imagine.</p> <p>EAST CARR ROAD is always busy and drivers need to stop and reverse continually to let others pass. The road takes traffic from Stornaway Square, Farm Lane and Gleneagles Park . The estate was built at a time when most familys had only 1 car if any at all, and now familys have 2 - 3- or 4 plus work vehicles. DUNVEGAN ROAD is already difficult to negotiate especially at school times and then all this traffic goes into HOWDALE ROAD. ROBSON WAY comes to a standstill everyday with queues towards Leads road roundabout and eastwards to the Diadem roundabout. How can this area take all the expected extra vehicles. With all this building in an area which is already a high flood risk house insurance will be difficult to obtain or at a very increased price. I live in Ingleby Close and have not been flooded but have been refused insurance by several companies over the past 5 or 6 years. It seems that the residents in the area were left in the dark about the allocation of land for housing in 2017 after planning officers rejected the proposal for development on the land in 1994 and the situation has worsened regards traffic and flooding.</p> <p>Hull City Council discourages " concrete gardens " yet think it is acceptable to build 650 houses. There are other areas of land in the city where HCC have demolished homes and left derelict which could be developed. Received via Cllr Craker/Dunston Oppose it as set out in my email. Slip returned to Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand when asked to let them know views or give details of issues to raise – a bad idea.</p>	<p>See T1 (Traffic access) above</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>See PC1 (Home insurance) above</p> <p>See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above</p> <p>See Allocate3 (What has changed since 1994) above</p> <p>See Allocate2 (Focus on brownfield) above</p> <p>Comment noted</p> <p>Comment noted</p>	<p>The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required</p> <p>No change to SPD required</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC41 Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	<p>We are encouraged to see the ambition to deliver a high-quality development at East Carr with aims to achieve a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain. In accordance with the draft British Standard (8683), proposals should show at an early stage a commitment to achieving a certain level of net gain, with management, monitoring and maintenance also considered along with responsible persons for each stage of implementation. However, we are concerned that the draft masterplans do not yet go far enough to constitute high quality green infrastructure or to protect the ecological interests on and around the site.</p>	<p>Comment noted and as a consequence a number of changes are proposed as follows;</p> <p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>The masterplan does not consider the importance of direct and indirect impacts upon the number of adjacent Local Wildlife Sites (LWS), including Risholme Carr and Hornsea Rail Trail to the north.</p>	<p>Agree to add text to specifically highlight the juxtaposition to adjacent Local Wildlife sites and to the need for Ecological Assessments and Appraisals. The requirement for mitigation measures for the adjacent Holderness Drain have been identified with the integration of green corridors alongside watercourses. See update below:</p>	<p>Add the following text under the ecology section, 'The ecological value of drains and other watercourses is recognised and will be safeguarded ensuring also that they continue to play an important role in protecting against the risk of flooding' and 'The ecological appraisal should assess the site in the context of the wider environment including locally designated wildlife sites'.</p>
	<p>LWS (formerly known as Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation) are of great significance as core wildlife-rich habitats of substantive nature conservation value and taken together with Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), they represent a major national asset, essential to nature's recover. LWS play a critical conservation role by providing wildlife refuges, acting as stepping stones, corridors and buffer zones to link and protect nationally and internationally designated sites – improving ecological coherence and connectivity and contributing to a climate resilient landscape. With no statutory status, their only form of protection is through good planning policy and decisions.</p>	<p>Refer to previous comment</p>	<p>No change to SPD required</p>
	<p>For a long time, it has been recognised that, whilst they are important, SSSI are not sufficient to truly protect biodiversity in England. So, together with SSSI, LWS support locally and nationally threatened species and habitats and they are the essential building blocks of ecological networks and the core from which we can achieve nature's recovery. Unlike SSSI, which for some habitats are a representative sample of the sites that meet national standards, LWS systems are more comprehensive and select all sites that meet the criteria. As a result, many LWS are of SSSI quality and together with the statutorily protected sites, contain most of the country's remaining high quality natural habitat and threatened species.</p>	<p>Noted - see previous comment</p>	<p>No change to SPD required</p>
	<p>Regardless of statutory status, it is absolutely paramount, that the countries core sites for biodiversity are protected from developmental loss and damage, if we are to avoid a net loss in biodiversity. The presence of a LWS, should always serve as a red flag that the development is highly likely to be damaging and alternative sites should be sought. The protection of LWS is therefore fundamental if we are to achieve the 25 Year Environment Plan goals. In circumstances where developments which impact upon LWS are approved because of 'over-riding need', then robust mitigation and compensation must be incorporated.</p>	<p>Noted - see previous comments</p>	<p>No change to SPD required</p>
	<p>In addition, the site the network of drains surrounding the site, including Suttoncross Drain to the north and that to the west of the site, highlight the ecological importance of this local area which will need protecting in perpetuity if we are to protect biodiversity and the ecological function of surrounding sites in the local area. Furthermore, the site itself is highlighted to compromise 'flood plain meadow'. This highlights the likelihood of priority habitats listed under Section 41 of NERC Act (2006) being present on site which must be retained and enhanced wherever possible. The presence of this habitat also highlights the potential importance of the site for species such as farmland and wetland birds which have undergone severe habitat loss in recent years. Retention of these habitats is therefore of great conservation value and ecological surveys must consider the use of the site by breeding, wintering and passage species.</p>	<p>Noted. Currently, permanent grassland is managed favourably for wintering birds. The suite of ecological surveys should be updated to include passage and wintering bird surveys to determine the status of the land as flood plain meadow.</p>	<p>Add reference to 'passage and wintering birds' in the ecology section.</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>Should the development come forward, there will be a requirement for significant ecological considerations to be made through an extensive suite of surveys to advise how development design can avoid, minimise and at worst compensate all potential direct and indirect impacts to protected sites, habitats and species, therefore applying the mitigation hierarchy as per industry standard. Once design has accommodated these considerations, biodiversity net gain should be considered.</p>	<p>Agree to add reference to detailed ecological appraisals and assessments and an acknowledged that design modifications may be required once ecological surveys have been undertaken.</p>	<p>Add to the end of the ecology section, 'It is acknowledged that design refinements may be required in light of the outcome of detailed ecological appraisal and assessment' plus a more general reference to the need for ecological appraisal and assessment.</p>
	<p>To achieve this, green infrastructure (GI) must be multifunctional; providing benefits for drainage, people, wildlife and carbon offsetting targets of the council, whilst being designed with local landscape characteristics in mind.</p>	<p>Agree to include additional text highlighting the importance of green infrastructure and the need to ensure that this serves a variety of different uses.</p>	<p>Add the following text under the heading of Climate Change Adaptation, 'Green infrastructure, such as the creation of SuDS, rain gardens, swales and reed beds should be multifunctional so that as well as achieving targets for drainage and flood risk, features may also provide benefits for people, such as through the use of rain gardens for grey water, and for wildlife by creating new high-quality habitat. These areas should be clearly defined for their intended purpose to ensure some undisturbed areas remain present to mitigate for species on site'</p>
	<p>As such elements such as attenuation basins should be designed with multifunctionality in mind. That is for instance, through the creation of SuDS, rain gardens, swales and reedbeds. As well as achieving targets for drainage and flood risk, features may also provide benefits for people, such as through the use of rain gardens for grey water, hence also reducing carbon footprints and costs; and for wildlife by creating new high-quality habitat. These areas should be clearly defined for their intended purpose to ensure some undisturbed areas remain present to mitigate for species on site.</p>	<p>Noted - refer to earlier comments</p>	<p>No change to SPD required</p>
	<p>In order to provide benefits for people, the GI should consider the current usage and structure of features in the local areas and be supported by community consultation. For instance, POS should offer opportunities such as allotments or community orchards to aid community cohesion in residential areas, whereas Suitable Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANGs) would also support residents and should be designed in line with Natural England guidance.</p>	<p>Agree to include reference to opportunities to improve community cohesion through better use of green infrastructure</p>	<p>Add the following text to paragraph 6.1, 'Public open space should also offer opportunities to aid community cohesion in residential areas by creating allotments or community orchards '.</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>The provision of green footpaths and cycle routes across the site will again further encourage community cohesion and carbon offsetting targets to support Hulls 2030 Carbon Neutral Strategy.</p>	<p>Agree to amend existing text to highlight potential value of footpaths and cycleways.</p>	<p>Amend section 6.1 to include reference to 'The provision of green footpaths and cycle routes across the site will encourage community cohesion and carbon offsetting targets to support Hulls 2030 Carbon Neutral Strategy.'</p>
	<p>It is imperative that for both wildlife and people, that connective routes cross the entirety of the site. We would encourage the retention and enhancement of all hedgerows across the site, supported by the creation of additional corridors where possible.</p>	<p>Agree to strengthen reference to connectivity. Sufficient reference already included regarding protecting hedgerows.</p>	<p>Add (in paragraph 2.5) 'It is imperative that for both wildlife and people, that connective routes consisting of green and blue infrastructure cross the entirety of the site'.</p>
	<p>Consideration of green roofs and living walls would also provide numerous benefits for people and wildlife, by providing additional habitat, reducing heating/air conditioning costs of buildings by further stabilising temperatures, aiding carbon sequestration targets and delivery positive health and wellbeing impacts. Passive house standards should also be considered in the design of buildings in order to reduce their carbon footprint.</p>	<p>Agree to add further detail by way of examples.</p>	<p>Add after the final sentence of the climate change and adaptation section, 'consideration of green roof systems, roof gardens, living walls and new tree planting which have numerous benefits including reducing heating/air conditioning costs of buildings, aiding carbon sequestration targets and delivering positive health and wellbeing impacts.'</p>
	<p>Whilst not currently a feature of the masterplan, we would advise that gardens do not back onto green space wherever possible to avoid fly tipping of garden waste and to preserve the quality of these areas.</p>	<p>Agree to specific reference.</p>	<p>Add the following text to paragraph 6.1, 'however private gardens should not back directly onto open spaces wherever possible to avoid fly tipping of garden waste and to preserve the quality of these areas'.</p>
	<p>We would encourage sensitive lighting design of the entire scheme to protect species such as bats and owls; and to minimise light pollution of the local area. Integration of other features such as bat and bird boxes, owl boxes, hedgehog homes/passes, and hibernacula should also be included in appropriate locations.</p>	<p>Green corridors and natural assets will be appropriately lit. Reference also to be added regarding provision of bat and bird boxes etc....</p>	<p>Add reference in ecology section to the balance that needs to be struck between lighting for the purposes of ensuring public safety and respecting natural environment. Also include reference to opportunities to support wildlife through provision of roosting boxes etc...</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>Consideration of sustainable and low carbon construction methods should also be considered for the development on site.</p> <p>Looking at the site as a whole, rather than a piecemeal approach for individual planning applications will ensure appropriate and affordable mitigation, compensation and enhancement can be incorporated at an early stage of development with minimal temporal lag.</p> <p>In order to incorporate the above, we would encourage the developers to seek advice from exemplar projects both nationally and internationally and consider schemes such as Building with Nature.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>Comment noted</p> <p>Comment noted</p>	<p>Add the following text to the climate change and adaptation section, 'Developers will be encouraged to consider the use of sustainable/low carbon materials and/or modular construction products to further minimise the impact on the environment'.</p> <p>No change to SPD required</p> <p>No change to SPD required</p>
EC42	<p>Via Councillor Healand</p> <p>I should like to express my deep concern at the proposal to build 650 new homes, in particular with a view to the huge increase in volume of traffic in the Howdale Road area. I live on Church Street and getting out at the end of the road onto Saltshouse Road in a morning is already difficult with the staggered junction with Howdale Road where a huge number of drivers cut through Church Street and down Potterill Lane – which incidentally is supposed to be a “Home Zone”. It will also put even more pressure on the junction of Wawne Road/Leads Road/Church Street/Robson Way which frequently has long queues as it is.</p> <p>As is the case these days, most home owners have at least one car if not two or more, so the potential for, say, at least 1,000 extra cars in that area is extremely worrying. It is also on a school route and will affect the 51 bus route on Dunvegan Road.</p> <p>It seems ludicrous to contemplate building on a flood plain and I really feel for the residents of Danby Close who must be horrified at the prospect. I regard it as foolhardy and a callous money-making scheme with no regard for the well-being of the local residents.</p>	<p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>See above</p>
EC43	<p>Via Councillor Healand</p> <p>This is green belt land a safe haven for wildlife and birds and I regularly see deer at twilight and in the early morning on these fields as well as owls and bats and this beauty will all be gone forever.</p> <p>I ask you what is the value of that priceless to the local community and wider community who walk this area. People come from far and wide to walk their dogs daily on this land, not all are local folks and they all enjoy it and class it as relaxation and freedom from the drudge and depression that city life can sometimes provide. Imaging a couple of months ago in lockdown if this land wasn't available , what would people have done then for their hours exercise!, I don't consider walking around 650 houses to be therapeutic in the same ways and I'm sure you don't.</p>	<p>Hull does not have a green belt</p> <p>See EE2 (Environmental value) above</p>	<p>A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>This hasn't been thought out at all and quite rightly people are annoyed I know I am and I know others are.</p> <p>There are many issues besides the fact you are building 650 homes you haven't thought about the local topography and road network?, as I type this on a Sunday morning there are more cars down east Carr road than the road can manage, have you walked the road recently?, have you spent time surveying the amount of road traffic there is?. It's ridiculous even now the road for a start is narrow, there are cars parked permanent on one side of the road so you can only get one car down it at a time and there are bottlenecks , arguments regularly with men or women not willing to reverse their cars after going around the blind corner at the beginning. I have seen many issues. The road is to narrow to busy and not safe for the local children, people who don't live their drive at high speed and I'm amazed that some child hasn't been hit by these cars, that is today and your thinking of putting more pressure on the local streets and narrow lanes!.</p> <p>I have studied this and will be studying and submitting car numbers at peak times to you all at some stage. It is dangerous today 650 homes would make it impassable and a danger for pedestrians and the young.</p> <p>There isn't the shops , schools, doctors surgeries or infrastructure to support 650 homes, there is no space for a dual carriageway without knocking homes down to widen it or make the golf course smaller .</p> <p>This is all wrong I'll thought and and will be stopped , we locals will be increasing our visibility in the local press if this is allowed to consider and I for one will be attending the consultations</p> <p>It should not be allowed, green belt land is green belt land, this land flooded terribly last winter the water was 3 feet deep in the centre of it was around 200 - 300 metres in diameter and remained flooded for 6 months. You are thinking of building homes on that !!! Beggars belief.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>See T1 (Traffic access) above</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>See LF1 (Local Services) above</p> <p>Comment noted</p> <p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p> <p>Hull does not have a green belt. In addition, whilst we know that flood risk is an issue (see above) if flooding to a depth of 3 feet on the field occurred last winter as suggested by the respondent, most of the houses between the field and Howdale road would have experienced flooding and several roads would have been impassible</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>See above</p>
EC44	<p>Via Councillor Healand</p> <p>I am writing to lodge my objection to the proposed building of 650 houses on this site. My objection is that the area is already massively overpopulated and is poorly served by amenities and services. Sutton Village is becoming dangerous. When I drive home from work, there are people double parked and on pavements and double yellow lines as they struggle to access the only gym, after school club, convenience store, chemist and takeaways. There really isn't a lot in Sutton and it's poorly served by buses and connections for the elderly. I feel the site would be better developed as a doctors/dentist/chemist complex, a community centre for adult classes/ weight loss clubs/ dance classes/ sports clubs etc and perhaps even a decent restaurant that isn't just a pub that does food. Somewhere that benefits the existing residents of the area rather than putting extra strain on the already overpopulated area.</p>	<p>See LF1 (Local Services) above</p>	<p>See above</p>
EC45	<p>Via Councillor Healand</p> <p>I am against the development on the land to the North of Danby Close because</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase in traffic which will have a detrimental effect on Danby Close and surrounding area. We are already suffering difficulties with the volume of traffic on the surrounding roads as far as Leads Road. The increase in traffic will impact on Sutton village 2. The fields flood regularly and do not drain quickly. We have already suffered subsidence and struggle with not only this but been in a flood area for house insurance. 	<p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p> <p>See PC1 (Home insurance) above</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>3. Restrictions on parking will have an impact on residents in Danby Close for not only them but visitors also. The development will have limited restricted parking this will impact on deliveries vehicles and residents/visitors to the properties on there.</p> <p>4. The fields have so much wildlife. Deer live and breed on there, this will be stop and possibly put them at harm.</p> <p>5. The general area of Howdale Road lack amenities and if the development went ahead those existing amenities would be stretched. The local primary school has always been oversubscribed.</p> <p>6. Houses which have the fields to the back of them will lose security, drain backs on to Danby Close, which stops the housing flooding</p> <p>7. Proposed bus route to the development will cause existing residents increase in traffic, noise pollution and could danger to pedestrians. Children from the development will have to have school bus transport provided to travel to secondary schools and further education colleges. Increasing the amount of buses more at busy rush hour times.</p>	<p>See T1 (Traffic access) above</p> <p>See EE2 (Ecological value) above</p> <p>See LF1 (Local Services) above</p> <p>See LF2 (School capacity) above</p> <p>The SPD proposes Sutton Cross Drain i.e. retaining it as a barrier (and making a positive impact on the threat of flooding). There are no plans to culvert the drain</p> <p>See LF2 (School capacity) above</p>	<p>The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required</p> <p>A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required. See above</p>
EC46	<p>Via Councillor Healand</p> <p>I am writing to you to object to the proposed housing development.the area does not have the infrastructure to support this.brownfield sites should be used.thank you</p>	<p>See Allocate2 (Focus on brownfield) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required</p>
EC47	<p>Via Councillor Healand</p> <p>The "Proposed Development" by Hull City Council (HCC) to build 650 houses on East Carr fields is really an insult to the electorate and I oppose it.</p> <p>Building housing on a green area used regularly as a healthy outdoor environment walking, running cycling, is a loss that cannot be acceptable now, more than ever with the ongoing Covid-19 devastation of people's lives.</p> <p>The mentioned 'new' east west orbital route Hedon to Hessle to access the rear of the proposed site, many years ago land was allocated for this purpose, not pursued, only to be put to other uses and is not available now.</p> <p>The lack of roads getting to the area, the movement of traffic and increased pollution has yet to be addressed by HCC.</p> <p>Hull City Council should now withdraw this proposed development, move on, address issues direct at ward meetings as in the past, these were great to meet councillors, I'm sure (the late) Councillor Ken Turner would have agreed, humility goes a long, long way in getting things done for the greater good of us all at these meetings.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>See EE2 (Environmental value) above</p> <p>There is no strategic justification for this proposal and no source of funding available.</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC48	<p>Via Councillor Healand</p> <p>1. The area of land associated with this planning application is prone to high levels of flooding as the land is located in the flood plain.</p> <p>2. The area is part of the Source Protection Zone 3. A detailed assessment must be undertaken and the implication of development on the water supply must be taken into consideration.</p>	<p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p> <p>A requirement for an assessment would be a part of any future planning approval.</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>3. The open green space is occupied by a large number of birds and a number of wild deer have also been seen. This indicates that a full Environmental Assessment must be carried out.</p> <p>4. Access to and from the location will have a major impact on the adjacent, surrounding and nearby properties, and as the highway construction in the vicinity are only minor local roads the implications for damage to the road network and surrounding dwellings make this development unsustainable in the long term.</p> <p>5. The development indicates a total of 650+ homes in addition to local amenities in the area. Taking into consideration that the average household has at least one vehicle means that the local road network would be overloaded particularly at peak times and local residents will suffer the implications of continuous traffic congestion, pollution and noise.</p>	<p>See EE2 (Ecological value) above</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p>	<p>A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site</p> <p>See above</p>
EC49	<p>Via Councillor Healand</p> <p>I'm writing to you to voice my objections to the building on East Carr Fields. My house backs onto these fields and the thought of building being approved on there fills me with sadness.</p> <p>A big reason I purchased my house was for the lovely views of the field that I have and this now is potentially going to be spoilt. This area is used by many myself and neighbours included and the use of this area has meant that we have a really good community spirit. Building in this area will also have a massive impact on our wildlife which we should be trying to protect not to mention the extra noise and fume pollution this will cause.</p> <p>I also have concerns about what this building work will do to the value of my own property as the view I have is a big selling point. I also worry for the people that could buy these new houses as they are going to be built on land that floods very badly in the winter months.</p> <p>Development of this land was rejected back in 1994 and also in the 80's the noise and fume pollution were one of the main objections and this has only got worse over the years so please please do not let them make it even worse.</p> <p>The previous position indicated that there would be an adverse impact on residents living on Danby Close and on the basis that the Council at that time did not rely on this land to meet identified housing needs, saw no reason to accept this. In relation to Danby Close – there was no suggestion that access wasn't possible on a technical basis. With regards to east Carr Road, the Council did highlight technical constraints. This remains the case i.e. access would involve an upgrade / improvement of this road. In addition, the position regarding need for housing land is now very different.</p> <p>Thank you for reading my e-mail. I hope that you will put my views forward and any future planning meetings and help us put a stop to the building of this development</p>	<p>There is no 'right to a view' in planning terms and of course in the not to distant past, the properties adjoining the proposed site will have been the new ones disturbing the view of others. The SPD seeks to ensure that the impact of new development (in relation to e.g. overlooking/privacy) is managed and that sufficient gaps are retained</p> <p>Whilst the council is aware that many people use the fields for dog walking and recreation, there is no public right of way or official public access onto these fields</p> <p>See EE2 (Ecological value) above</p> <p>See PC4 (Property value) above</p> <p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p> <p>See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above</p> <p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Very bad. I strongly object to this housing development. One of the big reasons I bought my house was for the lovely views that I have across the fields at the back of my garden and the fact its such a quiet area however if you build on here there is going to be a lot of noise and air pollution as well as causing a lot of extra traffic in this area not to mention all the effect it will have on the wildlife. These fields are used and enjoyed by a lot of people myself included and building on them would be a big upset to a lot of people. There are also school placement shortages in this area and if you build a further 650 houses this will mean less places for the people that already live here. I am concerned about what building new houses in this area will do to the value of my property. There is already a shortage of green space in this area and now you want to build on what we have left. I would strongly urge you to reconsider this development and consider the feelings and the effects it will have on the resident that are already here.</p> <p>2nd email If there are going to be any more meetings held re the proposed East Carr/Danby housing development at the Saltshouse Tavern could I please have an appointment I strongly object to this housing development. One of the big reasons I bought my house was for the lovely views that I have across the fields at the back of my garden and the fact it's such a quiet area however if you build on here there is going to be a lot of noise and air pollution as well as causing a lot of extra traffic in this area not to mention all the effect it will have on the wildlife. These field are used and enjoyed by a lot of people myself included and building on them would be a big upset to a lot of people. There are also school placement shortages in this area and if you build a further houses this will mean less places for the people that already live here. I am also concerned about what building new houses in this area will do to the value of my property. There is already a shortage of green space in this area and now you want to build on what we have left. I would strongly urge you to reconsider this development and consider the feelings and the effects it will have on the resident's that are already here. Received via Cllr Craker/Dunston I object to this housing development. [repeat of text sent to Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand leaflet]</p>	<p>Comment noted There is no 'right to a view' in planning terms and of course in the not to distant past, the properties adjoining the proposed site will have been the new ones disturbing the view of others. The SPD seeks to ensure that the impact of new development (in relation to e.g. overlooking/privacy) is managed and that sufficient gaps are retained</p> <p>See EE4 (Pollution) above Whilst the council is aware that many people use the fields for dog walking and recreation, there is no public right of way or official public access onto these fields See LF2 (School capacity) above See PC4 (Property value) above</p> <p>Comment noted Comment noted Already answered (above)</p> <p>Already answered (above)</p> <p>Comment noted</p> <p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required.</p> <p>See above See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required</p> <p>No change to SPD required</p> <p>No change to SPD required</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC50	<p>Via Councillor Healand I wish to register my objection to the proposed development in this area. It would be more suited to the recently cleared area around Preston Road as this already contains suitable infrastructure to support the new residents in terms of schools, transport and retail.</p>	<p>The Preston Road site is allocated for housing and an application for this land is pending. The Local Plan establishes a need for housing over the period to 2032 and the East Carr site is one of many others that will contribute to meeting this need.</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>See above See above See above</p>
EC51	Via Councillor Healand		

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>I am writing to protest against the proposed housing development on the land off East Carr Road and Danby Close. For one I don't want there to be access via Howdale Road and Dunvegan Road as these residential roads are already busy enough, particularly during school drop off and pick up times. I feel this would have a great impact on the safety of the area for the children plus the added pollution. I believe this will be irresponsible as a council to approve these plans. There is enough development already going on in this area, so much so, it is having a great impact on the area and traffic as a whole. Not only that there will be a significant impact on the environment and wildlife, local schooling and amenities, plus the loss of recreational use of that land, that many local residents use regularly.</p> <p>I urge you to not approve these plans and consider the significant impact this would have in this established area.</p>	<p>See T1 (Traffic access) above</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See LF1 (Local Services) above See LF2 (School capacity) above See EE2 (Environmental value) above See EE2 (Ecological value) above</p> <p>See EE4 (Pollution) above Whilst the council is aware that many people use the fields for dog walking and recreation, there is no public right of way or official public access onto these fields</p>	<p>The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required</p> <p>See above See above See above No change to SPD required. A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required.</p>
EC52	<p>Via Councillor Healand</p> <p>I'm writing to you to raise an objection to the proposed development of the green area off the land off East Carr road and Danby Close</p> <p>I have serious concerns that this would not only impact significantly in the natural environment by reducing the green area and wildlife, but it would also exacerbate the already high and dangerous level of traffic on East Carr road, Dunvegan road and Howdale road. I have already raised my concerns with Hull City council about the traffic on East Carr road and the number of RTA's that are growing.... this is down to the speed, volume and poor traffic calming measures on what is a small residential access road. This development will increase this issue tenfold and my concern is we will have a fatality if this is not resolved as it currently stands.</p> <p>Please take my concerns into consideration</p>	<p>See EE2 (Environmental value) above</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC53	<p>Via Councillor Healand</p> <p>I want to register my objection to the building of 650 houses which will be accessed via Danby Close / East Carr Road. The proposal is both impractical and ultimately dangerous as there is already significant traffic around Howdale Road, with people using it as a race track. We live near to the Kestral junction which is extremely dangerous as is a main turning on a bend, which we regularly see cars/vans/buses doing in excess of 40 mph. This is near a playing field for children so is a major problem. The proposal puts an additional junction of the opposite side of the field which will be just as bad as Kestral due to the additional volume of traffic.... would guess maybe a 1000 additional cars for the 650 houses.</p> <p>The development must be stopped for the safety of existing residents!</p>	<p>See T1 (Traffic access) above</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p>	<p>The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required</p> <p>See above</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
EC54	<p>Via Councillor Healand , I am sending you my petition for the proposed housing development on the land off East Carr Road and Danby Close houses (to start with) on the green field site and as access will be via Dunvegan Road that is already very high with traffic and causes of further increase and contractors. It is already a problem for Spring Cottage with traffic from surrounding area just doing school runs and make it difficult for residents to get parked this will only increase and as a disabled driver already struggle to get parked and coming to and from work.</p>	<p>See T1 (Traffic access) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p>	<p>The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required See above</p>
EC55	<p>Via Councillor Healand I am writing to you with my concerns and opinions regarding the proposed housing development at East Carr Fields near Danby Road / East Carr Road in east Hull. I am objecting to this development and would urge you to vote against the plans when the time comes. Spring Cottage is a relatively quiet and peaceful area despite there being a great many houses already on the estate. Having said that, there has over the past few years been a notable increase in the amount of traffic using the roads through the estate, roads which were never intended for this volume of traffic and this would only get considerably worse if the housing development were given the go ahead. It would be detrimental to the local environment with a large increase in pollution from traffic and noise, making the existing roads more dangerous and making the area more hazardous for children and families as well as the older members of the local community, of whom there are a number on the estate.</p> <p>There are precious few green field sites in this area, and to lose one of the few remaining open areas in this part of the city would be a tragedy, with a damaging impact for wildlife and the environment, as well as losing a vital recreational area for local people. There are many other 'brown field' sites within the city that are much more suitable for new housing developments, without the need to build on an area that has never had houses on before, while still fulfilling the local need for new dwellings. This area is also prone to flooding, so would be totally unsuitable for housing.</p> <p>I do hope you will consider the views of the local residents of this area when the Council meet to discuss this matter.</p>	<p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See EE4 (Pollution) above See EE2 (Environmental value) above See EE2 (Ecological value) above See Allocate2 (Focus on brownfield) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p>	<p>See above No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required. A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site No change to SPD required See above</p>
EC56	<p>Via Councillor Healand I am writing this email to confirm my objection to the current plans that are being put forward for 650 new houses to be built on the land off East Carr Road and Danby Close in Sutton, Hull.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>By definition a "Close" is a residential street without access.</p> <p>When planning was refused in 1994 the population in Hull was 308,000 it is now 259,778 therefore why more housing especially on green fields which have to be so important for wildlife, mental and physical wellbeing for all ages.</p> <p>Climate change is a global problem, we are experiencing more rainfall each year, in 2007 Howdale Road and Spring Cottage experienced flooding, the greenfields where the proposed development holds water this last year for up to 5 months. House insurance is not offered by all companies due to us already being on a floodplain.</p> <p>Highway safety and traffic generation and pollution – 650 houses will create as a minimum 650 cars plus work vehicles which is a very conservative estimate. Daily school runs. The proposed new route for the bus will enter and exit the proposed new development 6 times per hour. Refuse collections. Emergency services.</p> <p>Amenities – Spring Cottage school is already oversubscribed. Currently it is a problem to be able to see a GP in our area in a timely fashion.</p>	<p>Answered above</p> <p>Answered above</p> <p>Answered above</p> <p>Answered above</p> <p>Answered above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC58	<p>Via Councillor Healand</p> <p><i>Should this plan have been trialled at Kingswood where there is ample land for such an experiment?</i></p> <p><i>Plans for this site have been submitted and rejected in the past. Why is this time any different?</i></p> <p><i>The idea of sustainable, eco-friendly housing is a good one but too idealistic for most Hull residents. Many interested in this type of housing development could either not afford it nor would not want to live in this area. Those who want to live there will not become eco-friendly overnight ditching their current cars and changing their ways of life.</i></p> <p><i>What percentage of this development will be privately owned, landlord rented or social housing?</i></p> <p><i>Who will oversee and manage this site regarding ecology, health & safety etc?</i></p> <p><i>Page 12 of the consultation document mentions the dearth of facilities in the area. If the new development addresses those issues, they will not be readily accessible to the current residents of Chestnut Farm and Spring Cottage. Facilities have not improved in this area in the last three decades.</i></p>	<p>The "ample land at Kingswood" is already allocated for housing with a substantial amount either already built or having extant planning permission</p> <p>The previous position indicated that there would be an adverse impact on residents living on Danby Close and on the basis that the Council at that time did not rely on this land to meet identified housing needs, saw no reason to accept this. In relation to Danby Close – there was no suggestion that access wasn't possible on a technical basis. With regards to East Carr Road, the Council did highlight technical constraints. This remains the case i.e. access would involve an upgrade / improvement of this road. In addition, the position regarding need for housing land is now very different.</p> <p>The SPD seeks to outline the process, considerations, qualities, and opportunities that will help deliver high quality residential development.</p> <p>Affordable housing will be agreed through relevant Local Plan planning policy</p> <p>See EE2 (Ecological value) above</p> <p>See LF1 (Local Services) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site</p> <p>See above</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p><i>The council want to avoid the Chestnut Farm model of cul-de-sac housing but are in reality creating an isolated, drain-bordered development which for several years will have to go through Chestnut Farm or Bransholme to access any promised facilities.</i></p>	<p>See Des1 (Design) above</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority, Hull City Council will use the SPD as a framework and/or blueprint when working with developers to provide guidance and in assessing the acceptability of their proposals. Design principles in the SPD will not change. A revision to the SPD will include a new statement recognising that where design guidance takes the form of concepts and/or indicative design guidance alternative design approaches can be proposed for consideration by the Local Planning Authority. The Council will work proactively with developers / designers to ensure positive planning outcomes for this site and will use the SPD as a broad framework for doing so. Whilst there is considerable detail set out in the document which will assist in this ambition, an overly prescriptive approach is not No change to SPD required.</p>
	<p><i>The idea that this area is well-served by public transport is a joke. The bus services even before the Coronavirus epidemic were unreliable. The service numbers being changed several times with no service for the southern half of Howdale Road and none easily accessible for the residents of Sutton Court.</i></p>	<p>There is a bus stop 15m from the end of Sutton Court on one side of Howdale road and 90m on the other side from where several buses an hour travel to both the city centre and Northpoint Shopping Centre</p>	
	<p><i>Road surfaces in the area are very poor. Howdale & Dunvegan Roads are used as “rat runs” to avoid Robson Way at busy times. There is high density traffic along Howdale Road and speed calming measures are needed especially near Lunedale which provides the main access to Spring Cottage Primary School.</i></p> <p><i>Ideally, residents of the new development will be encouraged to cycle and walk. It will not happen. We witness this every day when school sessions begin and end. Howdale Rd is a parking lot. Not all parents walk to/from school nor to access shops etc. They drive everywhere. Will they be wealthy enough to use electric vehicles in this new development? Will they care about the ethos of their new environment?</i></p>	<p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p>	<p>See above</p>
	<p><i>The ecology requirements mentioned on page 14 outline the responsibilities of the developers. Who will monitor this and ensure continuity when several firms are involved in construction?</i></p>	<p>Answered above</p>	<p>A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>Similarly on page 15 the need for consistency of approach regarding flood management? We lived here during the 2007 floods and have witnessed subsequent heavy rainfalls which are becoming more frequent with climate change. The land is clay. It is low lying and is prone to flooding. Will the council and developers take responsibility for any flooding of homes which may occur as a result of this development? Will they ensure all Insurance Companies provide comprehensive cover to all current and future residents in this area? We hope costs will not be passed on to purchasers nor added on to Council Tax bands for current residents to fund this development.</p>	See Flood1 (Flooding) above	See above
	<p>Regarding cars and parking on the new development. Will all residents have one vehicle? Many families have 2 or more cars. Providing a parking space at the rear of the property is good but human nature makes people lazy. Some are expected to use works vans. Will future planning regulations stop residents from altering the one side garage they own into part of their home?</p>	See Des1 (Design) above	The Local Planning Authority, Hull City Council will use the SPD as a framework and/or blueprint when working with developers to provide guidance and in assessing the acceptability of their proposals. Design principles in the SPD will not change. A revision to the SPD will include a new statement recognising that where design guidance takes the form of concepts and/or indicative design guidance alternative design approaches can be proposed for consideration by the Local Planning Authority. The Council will work proactively with developers / designers to ensure positive planning outcomes for this site and will use the SPD as a broad framework for doing so. Whilst there is considerable detail set out in the document which will assist in this ambition, an overly prescriptive approach is not
	<p>The consultation document mentions the uses of open green spaces. We have lived here for 35 years and have experience of the open space behind Cragdale and Lunedale off Howdale Road. We are aware of the anti-social, inconsiderate nature of some people. Litter, fires, graffiti, using the area as a motor cycle circuit, drug dealing, gathering in large drunken groups, using the park as access to or an escape from the surrounding streets. No one polices that area so will the new "estate" for that is what it is, be any better served?</p>	New areas of public open space will be design to be well-used, well-overlooked and valued public spaces with a clear function and purpose.	No change to SPD required.
	<p>Rumours of compulsory purchase of housing on Danby Close are circulating.</p>	The Council does not consider that compulsory purchase is an issue with regards to this proposal i.e. there is no need for it	No change to SPD required.
	<p>The construction of a bridge across the drain to allow access to the proposed site from Danby Close is a major concern.</p>	Comment noted - engineering solution required which will be developed as part of planning application process.	No change to SPD required.

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p><i>We hope you realise that the points we are making are valid. We do not oppose this development on ecological grounds but on the impact it will have on the lives of current and future residents.</i></p>		
EC59	<p>1. Email With reference to Hull local plan. East Carr Masterplan SPD As a resident in this area I'm against the development of this land because.</p> <p>1, Amenities in this area are scarce so it is very car dependent Having the additional traffic from 650 houses will overload already very busy roads. Howdale Road, Dunvegan Road, Saltshouse Road. Robson Way and Leads Road all experience significant problems with traffic congestion.</p> <p>2, This land is according to Hull City Council the last large greenfield area in Hull. In this age of global warming, pollution, endangered wildlife and loss of green space. East Carr is a wonderful natural wildlife habitat that should be preserved.</p> <p>3, This land is also low lying and is often flooded with some of the existing nearby properties unable to get flood insurance. Building on this land will remove a valuable soakaway making flooding to existing properties more likely in the future.</p> <p>4, Using Danby Close for access and potentially losing on street parking will impact the residents adversely. There are 20 properties that have drives directly onto this short stretch of the Close. Increased traffic be it car bus cycle or pedestrian will make entering and exiting driveways more difficult/dangerous. There is also the extra pollution which could impact my families and other residents health, which is a big concern</p> <p>5, I am horrified at the possibility of Danby Close being used as a bus route. The noise and vibration from these vehicles make the ground shudders when they pass down Howdale Road.</p> <p>6, The access to this land has never been down Danby Close. In Forty years there has been no dropped kerb and no bridge across Sutton Cross Drain. Access is via East Carr Road.</p> <p>7, Danby Close is a Close, by definition - "a residential street without through access".</p> <p>8, Spring Cottage Primary School is already oversubscribed so where will all the extra children be schooled?</p> <p>9, There are a lot of young children (including my own grandchildren) who play in what is a relatively safe environment, that would all change with this development.</p> <p>10, Whilst there's no denying Danby Close looks like it was designed as future access to East Carr Fields. I believe this relied on a second access road being added where Ramsgate Close/Canterbury Drive were developed. As this didn't happen it leaves no other option for a suitable second access road to the site. East Carr Road itself is totally inadequate even as a secondary access road. So any further development would turn Danby Close Into a giant cul de sac, which I believe goes against all development guidelines.</p> <p>Suggested changes to proposed development Stop any housing development on this land Incorporate the site in the adjacent Environment Agency Aquagreen scheme. Do our bit to stop the worldwide acceleration of rising sea levels, animal extinction and destruction of green space. It is not just clearing rainforests in other countries that matter, every area of green space no matter how small must be preserved. Via Councillor Healand</p>	<p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above</p> <p>See EE2 (Environmental value) above</p> <p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p> <p>See T1 (Traffic access) above</p> <p>See Transport Assessment above</p> <p>Answered above</p> <p>See LF2 (School capacity) above</p> <p>Whilst the council is aware that many people use the fields for dog walking and recreation, there is no public right of way or official public access onto these fields</p> <p>Answered above</p> <p>See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above The site is allocated for housing Comment noted</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required. See above</p> <p>The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required</p> <p>See above</p> <p>The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required</p> <p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required</p> <p>No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required.</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>There is talk of Hull City Council applying for planning permission to develop the land off East Carr Road, north of Danby Close and Stornaway Square in East Hull. As a resident in this area I'm against the development of this land because.</p> <p>1, Amenities in this area are scarce so it is very car dependent Having the additional traffic from 650 houses will overload some already very busy roads.</p> <p>2, This land is a wonderful natural wildlife habitat that should be preserved.</p> <p>3, This land is also low lying and is often flooded with some of the existing nearby properties unable to get flood insurance. Building on this land will remove a valuable soakaway making flooding to existing properties more likely in the future.</p> <p>4, Using Danby Close for access and potentially losing on street parking will impact the residents adversely. There are 20 properties that have drives directly onto this short stretch of road. Increased traffic be it car bus cycle or pedestrian will make entering and exiting driveways more difficult/dangerous.</p> <p>5, I am horrified at the possibility of Danby Close being used as a bus route. The noise and vibration, the ground shudders when buses pass down Howdale Road.</p> <p>6, The access to this land has never been down Danby Close. In Forty years there has been no dropped kerb and no bridge across Sutton Cross Drain. Access is via East Carr Road.</p> <p>7, Danby Close is a Close, by definition - "a residential street without through access".</p> <p>8, Spring Cottage Primary School is already oversubscribed so where will all the extra children be schooled?</p> <p>9, There are a lot of young children (including my own grandchildren) who play in what is a relatively safe environment, that would all change with this development.</p> <p>Are you able to give any Help, advice or support in fighting this proposal.</p>	<p>The city council is not applying for planning permission, but is setting out a framework for development should a planning application be received</p> <p>The remaining points made to Cllr Healand have all been answered above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC60	<p>Via Councillor Healand</p> <p>Regards the proposed housing development rear of Danby Close up to East Carr Lane I object on the grounds the local area will not cope with the additional traffic. Also a big concern is the land drainage regards flooding and waste water removal . Can Yorkshire Water sewage system cope ?. They have been proved wrong in the past. This will create more problems for the existing local housing.</p>	<p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>See above</p>
EC61	<p>I am writing to you to express my objections, concerns and issues that the above Development will create. With 40 years' experience working for Hull City Council Parks Department, covering many rolls from gardener to Horticultural Officer and was elected as the Sutton Ward Councillor 2010 – 2018 and sat as a Member of the Planning Committee for eight years, 2012 – 2013 Chairman of Environment and Infrastructure.</p> <p>I fully understand that more housing is required within the very tight City Boundary's; in my opinion this site is not suitable for such development. The impact on the surrounding area is far too important.</p> <p>Access / Regress</p> <p>Access / regress via Danby Close is inadequate the Close is far too narrow to accommodate the potential 1500 vehicles and buses every twenty minutes. Traffic spikes on the wider network of roads will increase from Holderness Road / Greenwich Avenue roundabout, through to Leads Road / Robson Way, as far as Stoneferry Road / Leads Road, let alone two junctions at the junctions of Howdale Rd and Robson Way, not forgetting Spring Cottage Estate, Dunvegan Road / Salthouse Road / Bellfield Avenue.</p> <p>No consideration has been given of Sutton Village Conservation Area that lays less than half a mile away from the development, the village roads will become over run.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>See T1 (Traffic access) above</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required</p> <p>See above</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>The potential construction of a bridge onto the site at the end of Danby Close would be taken over the Designated River not shown on any of Hull Local Plan 2016 – 2032; This River plays a large importance to the safety of residents from flooding, wildlife, and wild flora. In 2000 the Hull Local Plan given the status of Site 306 Existing Urban Greenspace to be retained NE1. Development on Urban Greenspace 0.25 hectares and above designated on the Proposals Map and listed in Tables NE1, NE2 and NE3 will not be allowed if this results in any of the following:</p> <p><u>Policy 43 City Plan.</u> Green infrastructure and Green Network Development that adversely affects the continuity and value will not be permitted. Development within or close proximity to the Green Network seek to protect and / or enhance the function and connectivity of the corridor.</p> <p><u>Biodiversity and Wildlife</u> Prevent migrating Birds and Bats a place for roosting and inhabit, Deer, Geese, Swans, Grass Snakes, Water Voles, and many other species that frequent East Carr area.</p> <p>Removal of natural water resources that forms a large part of the area for all to enjoy. Removal of linked corridor between Longhill Estate, Gangstead, Bilton through to Noddhill Way, Biggin Avenue, Kingswood, and Wawne Village.</p> <p><u>Loss of Biodiversity</u> NPPF states that planning should “minimise impact” on biodiversity and provide net gains in biodiversity where possible. Wildlife features of special interest to offer people the chance to study nature or simply to enjoy it.</p> <p><u>Air Quality</u> Air Quality will diminish with the increase of Vehicles thought out the whole area due standing traffic on already grid locked roads. In 2017 Councillors of East Carr asked for a traffic movement survey to be carried out due to the increase in the amount of Heavy Goods Vehicle travelling through Kingswood, Wawne Road to Salthouse Road/Holderness Road, I fully supported as Sutton Ward Cllr. Holderness Ward Cllrs also requested changes to Stoneferry Road for the same reasons.</p> <p><u>Schools</u> There will be a need to provide new Schools, as Spring Cottage and Saint James, Dorchester Road are near to Capacity. Other Facilities Doctors Closed in 2018/19.</p> <p><u>Rainwater Runoff</u> The Chair of the Metrological Office stated on the 13 August 2020 that more and I quote “extreme weather Hotter, Thunder, Lighting, Heaver Rain Storms in the future, surely this will mean more Rainwater Runoff and localised flooding putting the area at higher risk. The realization is no one can predict the weather on how things will make changes to our environment.</p>	<p>See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above</p> <p>See Allocate3 (What has changed since 1994) above The City Plan has been superceded by the Local Plan of 2017</p> <p>See EE2 (Ecological value) above</p> <p>See EE2 (Environmental value) above</p> <p>See EE4 (Pollution) above</p> <p>See LF2 (School capacity) above</p> <p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required No change to SPD required.</p> <p>A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>In my Roll as an Officer for the Council in 2007 was an experience I would not wish to under take a gain dealing with the aftermath of the flooding the Councils Facilities, also in 2016 and 2017 on Kestrel Avenue with the amount of water runoff. Sutton Park Golf Course relies on the proposed site to drain onto; with out this the Course will be closed far more frequently. Capillary action as not been taken into consideration water can and will travel up hill also.</p>	<p>Several local "Aquagreen" flood alleviation schemes have been completed in the area, including most recently one at Gleneagles which has re-established the old connection from the public open space via the golf course into East Carr Drain</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>
<p>EC62 Highways England</p>	<p>Thank you for consulting with Highways England on the East Carr Masterplan SPD. On this occasion Highways England has no particular comment to make given that the site is remote from the Strategic Road Network. However, we do fully support design that encourages sustainable travel modes and reduces single occupancy car use where ever possible.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>
<p>EC63</p>	<p>Back Ground</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Only after media coverage in the Hull Daily Mail where we aware of a proposed 650 house development on East Carr Fields. · Then we were made aware of the Consultation draft East Carr Master Plan by local councillor Allen Healand. · This immediately concerned myself and family who are Danby Close residents. · Two Facebook groups where set up which led to meetings and agreeing a combined effort in opposing this Proposal. A subsequent online petition was initiated which currently has 2400 signatures as well as approx. 100 on a paper version. Also has 85 plus objections at current time to screen application no. 20/00740/SCREEN <p>Danby close was build circular 1980 and shortly after planning applications where starting to be received to develop the land know as East Carr Fields to the north of Danby Close. The original plan to access this site was to potentially use Danby close and an additional site further along Howdale road. This additional site was never progressed and Canterbury drive and Ramsgate close where build with no through road.</p> <p>Various planning applications where received over the years to develop the site which finally came to a point in 1994 with the Director of Planning and Design for Hull City Council refusing planning permission for the site. Refusal letter attached.</p> <p>This refusal by Director of Planning and Design for Hull City Council was taken to the secretary of state for appeal by the developer. Subsequently the secretary of state for the environment sent his inspector down to access the proposed development site. The inspector for the secretary of state for the environment held a local inquiry from 10th of May to the 26th of June 1995. A 51 page report was compiled by the secretary of state's inspector. The secretary of state agreed with the inspectors conclusions and accepts his recommendations. Therefore for reasons given by the inspector, the secretary of state dismissed the appeal.</p> <p>The years go by but in October / November 2015 Hull Local Plan consultation was started. An anonymous leaflet was posted through some of Danby Close resident's doors half past 9 on a Friday night 5 days before the end of the consultation period giving the residents very limited time to respond. But respond in limited numbers they did objecting to the proposed inclusion of East Carr Fields know on the Hull Local Plan at that time as area 861 and 862. Attached is the objection from local resident to inclusion of area's 861 and 862. In 2016 government planning inspector William fieldhouse conducted a report into Hull Local Plan. A public meeting was held and due to the fact local residents had not been informed only one person attended. After some amendment in 2017 Area's 861 and 862 where adopted to the Hull Local Plan and yet again local residents where not informed and so not able to challenge Hull City Councils or the planning inspector's decision.</p>	<p>See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above</p> <p>The petition is held on the Council's consultation database and has been considered alongside all other representations received.</p> <p>See Allocate3 (What has changed since 1994) above</p> <p>See Consult1 (Local Plan consultation process) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required</p> <p>No change to SPD required</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>Local Amenities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How will the lack of local amenities be managed, again if not managed further increased traffic in local area! Building of new school and other local amenities to help reduce traffic congestion in the area. 	<p>Traffic generation will be considered in light of required Transport Assessments.</p> <p>See LF2 (School capacity) above</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>See above</p>
	<p>Environmental Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The local planned flood alleviation scheme how this will further protect the homes from Ramsgate to Gleneagles. What will form the basic design of proposed development houses i.e. level from grade to door threshold? 	<p>The planned flood alleviation scheme will allow excess flows from the Holderness Drain and Sutton Cross drain to be held in a storage lagoon until the main drain can cope with the additional water</p> <p>In relation to access arrangements, Building Regulations require level access to all housing.</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>The Local Planning Authority, Hull City Council will use the SPD as a framework and/or blueprint when working with developers to provide guidance and in assessing the acceptability of their proposals. Design principles in the SPD will not change. A revision to the SPD will include a new statement recognising that where design guidance takes the form of concepts and/or indicative design guidance alternative design approaches can be proposed for consideration by the Local Planning Authority. The Council will work proactively with developers / designers to ensure positive planning outcomes for this site and will use the SPD as a broad framework for doing so. Whilst there is considerable detail set out in the document which will assist in this ambition, an overly prescriptive approach is not</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How will the area be further protected from flooding, be guaranteed not to affect local housing and the area. 	<p>Answered above</p>	<p>See above</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a predetermined archaeological evaluation been carried out to determine the nature and extent of archaeological remains that are known to exist at the site? 	<p>Refer to EC which comprises commetns from Historic England. This refers to a 2017 assessment by the Humber Field Archaeology unit and to an identified need for a more detailed evaluation ro be carried out in advance of development coming forward.</p>	<p>No change to SPD required</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An environmental impact assessment is required for noise and pollution issues that the screening exercise already undertaken confirms that an EIA is not required will occur when accessing the site 	<p>See EE4 (Pollution) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>
	<p>Re-occurring Applications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why has the proposed area's 861 and 862 been added to the Hull Local Plan without informing the affected residents of the local area has it has for this Supplementary Planning Document East Carr Masterplan SPD6 consultation period. 	<p>See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>Why where the local residents not formally invited to give their options to the planning inspector at the public meeting which no one attended!!!</p> <p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>A bad idea.</p>	<p>See Allocate3 (What has changed since 1994) above</p> <p>See Consult1 (Local Plan consultation process) above</p> <p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required</p> <p>No change to SPD required</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC64	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>A Bad Idea. No to new houses. The area is nice and quiet. Building new houses will cause more traffic and crime.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC65	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand.</p> <p>A bad Idea</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC66	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>A bad idea</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC67	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>A bad idea. As I live facing the fields I find if this is going to happen causing an eyesore to the wonderful views we have now I wouldn't hesitate to sell up and move. As this has been my home for 15 wonderful years.</p> <p>Received via Cllr Craker/Dunston</p> <p>The reason we bought this house was the view from our garden, we face the field that you are planning a housing development on. We are devastated that you are planning to do this, we will have no privacy and the parking will be horrendous, we are not the lucky ones that can afford a drive built, my wife works long 12 hours shifts and already finds it hard to find a parking spot. We are nearly at pension age and will find the noise unacceptable, which would force us to consider selling and moving away from the home we have made.</p>	<p>There is no 'right to a view' in planning terms and of course in the not to distant past, the properties adjoining the proposed site will have been the new ones disturbing the view of others. The SPD seeks to ensure that the impact of new development (in relation to e.g. overlooking/privacy) is managed and that sufficient gaps are retained</p> <p>See PC3 (Loss of outlook / privacy) above</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>See above</p>
EC68	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>A bad idea. I thought this area was prone to flooding? – and Howdale Road is already a nightmare at busy times – Duvegan – busses!! Possible 650 cars – no chance.</p>	<p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>See above</p>
EC69	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>A bad Idea.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC70	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>A bad Idea. Enough houses and Development. Save us some green spaces. Already developments along Saltshouse Road, across from Spring Cottage and Howdale Road. Please leave us some green spaces.</p> <p>Received via Councillor Craker. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. Already housing development along Saltshouse Road, this will increase traffic and road that already gets quite congested , this proposed development will greatly increase traffic, pollution and noise. The above developments will already put pressure on schools etc and again the proposal will greatly add to this. Also, the development is proposed for a green space at the rate of development. We can ill afford to lose anymore green space, also flooding has been a major concern and such a development could lead to an increased risk of flooding, if such an occurrence happens because this development has been passed – who is responsible and who do I sue.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above</p> <p>See LF2 (School capacity) above</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p>
EC71	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>A bad idea. Too much traffic now on Howdale Road, Bus and cars etc – not a good idea.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>See above</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
EC72	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad Idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC73	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand Road access for building and subsequent buses and services inadequate. Lack of shops, schools, doctors make it unworkable. Received via Cllr Craker/Dunston Totally ridiculous! Access via Danby Close totally unsuitable for:- Building works vehicles. Buses, services, deliveries. Lack of infrastructure and amenities – schools, shops, doctors. Area incapable of providing flood risk free housing as is frequently proved by flooding of fields in question.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See LF1 (Local Services) above See LF2 (School capacity) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above	See above See above See above See above
EC74	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A good idea – if priority is given to residents in the Hull area and infrastructure is properly considered.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC75	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A good idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC76	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Would increase traffic congestion especially around Howdale Road – 650 houses – 1000 additional cars. Already big building projects along Salthouse Road this has to be better managed.	See T1 (Traffic access) above	The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required
EC77	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC78	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC79	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A Bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC80	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A Bad Idea. Received via Councillor Craker. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. This is what I think I live at no. 62 Danby Close and I have very limited car parking space and when the new road opens I will have a nightmare getting onto Danby Close. As it is now I park outside my property on Danby Close will I still be able to do that when the new road opens, what options are there for Danby Close residents. How will this new development affect the property prices. How will another 650 houses affect the infrastructure, we have one shop one garage and one school. We have problems getting building and contents insurance what chance with another 650 homes have they done a proper survey on the land, every winter all of those fields are flooded some nearly waist high. Finally has anyone thought about the upheaval this development is going to cause the residents of Danby and East Carr	Comment noted See T1 (Traffic access) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See PC4 (Property value) above The Local Plan requires the provision of infrastructure to meet the needs of new development. See LF1 (Local Services) above See LF2 (School capacity) above See PC1 (Home insurance) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above	No change to SPD The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required See above See above No change to SPD required. See above See above See above See above
EC81	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand		

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>A Bad Idea. There is already too much traffic around Howdale Road, many cars drive too quickly. Access onto Robson Way/Saltshouse Road is already difficult enough. Also this a vital Green Area for locals/children.</p> <p>Received via Cllr Craker/Dunston</p> <p>Do not agree with this at all. Howdale Road is already busy enough, access onto Saltshouse Road/Robson Way is very difficult as it is. Too many cars drive too fast anyway, adding more cars is asking for accidents. Spring Cottage Primary will not have capacity to cope, potentially causing problems for existing residents. Also this is a vital piece of green space for children to play and locals to utilise, especially in these times, not only due to cov-19 but also the obesity crisis.</p>	<p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>See LF2 (School capacity) above</p> <p>Whilst the council is aware that many people use the fields for dog walking and recreation, there is no public right of way or official public access onto these fields</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC82	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>In my opinion this development is far too big to be serviced by Danby Close approaching Howdale Road. Already every household has between 1 and 4 cars or vans on their drives of parked on the road which in turn start on the road space.</p> <p>Received via Cllr Craker/Dunston</p> <p>It is too large a development to use the Danby Close approach. As a resident of Danby Close since 1980s, I have seen a dramatic increase in traffic volume leading to multiple cars and vans parking on road and consequently narrowing the width of driving space to which it becomes single file traffic. Congestion will be inevitable, lorries, binmen buses will add to the congestion and if there is an incident no emergency vehicle will be able to gain access. A previous application in the 1980s was also not approved when planning permission for Mr Calvet was refused. Also there are the extra demand on utilities (eg water, gas etc) and future shopping and schooling requirements</p>	<p>See T1 (Traffic access) above</p> <p>See Allocate3 (What has changed since 1994) above</p> <p>See LF1 (Local Services) above See LF2 (School capacity) above</p>	<p>The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required</p> <p>No change to SPD required</p> <p>See above See above</p>
EC83	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>A bad idea.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC84	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>A good idea.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC85	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>A bad idea.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC86	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>A bad idea</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC87	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>A bad idea.</p> <p>Received via Cllr Craker/Dunston</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	How will the already busy Howdale Road and Dunvegan Road cope with the addition of a potential 1,300 extra vehicles? How does this new development fit with the Council's new incentive scheme of providing better amenities for cyclists whilst at the same time building on the outskirts of the City and adding more and more vehicles to our already poorly maintained roads? These two roads are both bus routes and even now are blighted by on-street parking obstructing the free flow of traffic, The roads around this area are continually busy and used as a "rat-run" by people cutting through from Saltshouse Road and in to Bransholme (Via Kestrel Avenue) and vice versa, thus avoiding the roundabout at the junction of Leeds Road, Wawne Road and Robson Way. Also, the eastern side of Howdale Road is already heavily congested and exiting onto Saltshouse Road can be extremely difficult especially during peak times. In addition to the increased traffic levels, what will be the impact on the environment? Will this development increase the risk of flooding to the surrounding properties and how will this potential risk be addressed? Why are the Council intent on the destruction of one of the City's greenfield sites when brownfield sites are available and should be the preferential option?	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See EE2 (Environmental value) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above See Allocate2 (Focus on brownfield) above See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above	See above No change to SPD required. See above No change to SPD required No change to SPD required.
EC88	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC89	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand Do you think the proposals to build 650 houses on the field off East Carr Road and Danby Close – I don't know.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC90	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC91	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Local school already oversubscribed. Traffic problems – most households have 2 cars or more. (70-800 more cars) Flooding problems – fields flood every winter.	Comment noted See LF2 (School capacity) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above	No change to SPD required. See above See above See above
EC92	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Shocking and unacceptable please stop it.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC93	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC94	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC95	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. It is one of the last green areas left in our area. It would also spoil the wildlife that visits regularly.	Comment noted See EE2 (Ecological value) above	No change to SPD required. A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site
EC96	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand		

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
EC97	A bad idea. Parking, Flooding. Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC98	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. It will create extra traffic on an already very busy area. The local school is already full to capacity also.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See LF2 (School capacity) above	See above See above
EC99	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC100	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC101	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A good idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC102	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. East Carr Road will not take traffic you are talking about 1000 cars +	See T1 (Traffic access) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required See above
EC103	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A good idea Would be very interested as first time buyers –please contact me with more info.	Comment noted Comment noted	No change to SPD required. Details passed to Housing Department
EC104	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Received via Councillor Craker. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. We don't need anymore houses. The disruption will be horrendous. Will want more facilities ie school, shops. Any green land left always has to be built on. So NO to houses.	Comment noted See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above See LF1 (Local Services) above See LF2 (School capacity) above	No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required. See above See above
EC105	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Received via Cllr Craker/Dunston	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>Regarding the above development and your request for feedback and comments. I am aware that nationally there is a shortage of housing stock including affordable homes and I am assuming that the council is under pressure from Central Government to try and meet the home shortages. I am also aware that within Hull city boundary land for building is in short supply but I feel that I need to make some comments on this proposal. I am assuming that the land has under gone a complete environmental survey? That the council is also aware that this land is classed as a flood plain and indeed does flood. What type of housing would be built on this area i.e. affordable family homes or high end homes or a mixture? When complete has any consideration been taken regarding schools, shops, play areas, green areas and traffic to accommodate these families. The primary schools in the area at present are already oversubscribed? The modern way of life is that families usually have two cars that could amount to 1200 vehicles travelling from home to work, school runs, shops and leisure. This would mean exiting onto Robson Way or Saltshouse Road by means of Dunvegan Road both ends of Howdale Road. At present there are mini roundabouts at the Dunvegan Road and one only on Howdale Road, The traffic at rush hour/peak times is appalling with long queues along Robson Way leading to Leads/Wawne road roundabout. We have spoken to councillors regarding a further roundabout at the top of the second Howdale Road exit with no feedback. Exiting this end of Howdale Road is a major problem during peak times. There are also housing developments on going on in the area on the former Ings Road estate and the former secure unit on Saltshouse Road which will add further traffic in the area. If this planning goes ahead what consideration has been given to vehicle movements during building stage i.e. deliveries, contractors vehicles, waste being removed and movement of plant and machinery because these vehicles will use the same roads as the locals and exits on to the main roads. With all the above taken into consideration I do not believe this development should be given planning permission.</p>	<p>See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>
		<p>See EE2 (Environmental value) above See EE2 (Ecological value) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required. A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site See above</p>
		<p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p>	

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
		See Des1 (Design) above	The Local Planning Authority, Hull City Council will use the SPD as a framework and/or blueprint when working with developers to provide guidance and in assessing the acceptability of their proposals. Design principles in the SPD will not change. A revision to the SPD will include a new statement recognising that where design guidance takes the form of concepts and/or indicative design guidance alternative design approaches can be proposed for consideration by the Local Planning Authority. The Council will work proactively with developers / designers to ensure positive planning outcomes for this site and will use the SPD as a broad framework for doing so. Whilst there is considerable detail set out in the document which will assist in this ambition, an overly prescriptive approach is not See above See above See above
		See LF1 (Local Services) above See LF2 (School capacity) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	
EC106	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC107	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC108	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC109	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Danby access not fit for purpose. Estate already overcrowded with cars !!	Comment noted See T1 (Traffic access) above	No change to SPD required. The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required
EC110	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC111	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC112	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>traffic speeding – not enough facilities. Building on a known flood area. Not enough capacity at school. They took over part of our field need school moving to new site if goes ahead.</p> <p>Received via Councillor Craker. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. Bad idea on a flood area. Not enough capacity at school, it needs relocating causes enough parking/traffic problems. They took over part of our designated field so could have more grass area. All these plus more need taking into account i.e. extra traffic, drainage, loss of green space, shops, buses. Then there is secondary schools to consider.</p>	<p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>See LF2 (School capacity) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p> <p>See LF2 (School capacity) above See EE2 (Environmental value) above See LF1 (Local Services) above</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>See above See above See above</p> <p>See above No change to SPD required. See above</p>
EC113	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>A bad idea.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC114	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>A bad idea</p> <p>Will enhance the risk of flooding in the area building on an are already prone to flooding.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required. See above</p>
EC115	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>A bad idea</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC116	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>A bad idea. Local roads in this area are already congested, parking is at a premium. This development could bring at least another 1000 vehicles on these roads.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required. See above</p>
EC117	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>A bad idea.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC118	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>A bad idea.</p> <p>I would have thought that your people in the know would have realised this is floodlands which are often under water through winter into Spring and building there would also create a hell of a build up of traffic. We also get a lot of wildlife there.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See EE2 (Ecological value) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required. See above</p> <p>See above A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site</p>
EC119	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>A bad idea</p> <p>We shouldn't be building on flood land.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required. See above</p>
EC120	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>A bad idea</p> <p>There is not the infrastructure to support 650 houses.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>The Local Plan requires the provision of infrastructure to meet the needs of new development.</p>	<p>No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required.</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	Received via Councillor Craker. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. Not the infrastructure in the area to support 650 extra houses. (Schools, GPs, shops, pubs etc) Increase in traffic on HOwdale Road which is already a problem due to being a bus route and blind bends. To begin with – why not finish the Ings Road Estate building and then see what is needed.	See LF1 (Local Services) above See LF2 (School capacity) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above	See above See above See above No change to SPD required.
EC121	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A good idea. Not forgetting this is a flood plain be prepared. Raise houses at least 3 feet from base.	A detailed flood risk assesmsnet will be required as part of any subsequent planning application and the council will require compliance with the flood risk policies in the Local Plan.	No change to SPD required.
EC122	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC123	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Howdale too busy for extra cars. Junction at Danby Close would be congested already major problems joining Howdale and Salthouse	Comment noted See T1 (Traffic access) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	No change to SPD required. The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required See above
EC124	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC125	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC126	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC127	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A good idea. but when are going to do something about noisy neighbours?	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC128	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Slips returned to Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand when asked to let them know views or give details of issues to raise. The whole populated area knows this land floods every winter and is under water for at least 6 months of the year. Traffic access was a main reason for turning down building houses in the 1990s, car volumes are far higher now, this would be a massive concern to traffic flow, in and out of the area. Effect on local wildlife habitat would be massively affected also!	Comment noted See Flood1 (Flooding) above See T1 (Traffic access) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See Allocate3 (What has changed since 1994) above	No change to SPD required. See above The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required See above No change to SPD required

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
		See EE2 (Ecological value) above	A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site
EC129	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. The worst idea (the land is a flood plain).	Comment noted See Flood1 (Flooding) above	No change to SPD required. See above
EC130	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Received via Cllr Craker/Dunston The environmental impact of a possible 650-1300 cars having to use Saltshouse Road and the bypass around Sutton which is already a very congested road is nightmarish. Then there is the 600-1000 children that would move in as Spring Cottage Primary is already oversubscribed where would you put them? Then there is the problem of acces to the new estate East Carr Road cannot handle the traffic now with a blind corner and one way system (because of double yellows and parked cars). It has seen an increase in traffic upto the woods/fields and driving because of covid and has had quite a few accidents and bumps becuae of it and the poor people that live in and around Danby Close must be very upset it has always been a place children can play out but with the amount of cars that will now cut through it would not be safe. Only a few months ago we were told the Council were looking for Yorkshire Wildlife trust or someone similar to take on the land as a wildlife haven what happened to this? I could go on and on with reasons not to build, the voice of the little person is rarely heard. Those fields are flood plains they should not have houses on them. My view on the housing development behind Danby Close is fields here were originally marsh land and ditches were built to drain away some of the water which worked partially for a time but the fields now spend over 6 months under water. I have lived near the fields formost of my life and have been walking on them for the last 12 years every day with my dogs. I know things must progress and many people across the country have fought and lost battles over land for housing but I am still amazed that someone would think it a good idea to build on land that sits under water for half the year and a drain that floods constantly and we have been told because of Global Warming this will only get worse. I am no expert on building but my and many other gardens flood on Spring Cottage when we get a lot of rain will this now get worse because you are building on the land as water always has to go somewhere. When the men digging the test holes were on the fields I spoke to one who told me it would cost 3 times as much to build a house here and would not be cost effective because of the ground state. So who is willing to build houses like that? There is also the wildlife that will be affected deer/owls/kingfishers/newt/grasses/flower etc.	Comment noted See EE2 (Environmental value) above See LF2 (School capacity) above See T1 (Traffic access) above This comment appears to be referring to the proposed flood alleviation scheme on the adjacent fields See Flood1 (Flooding) above Comment noted See EE2 (Ecological value) above	No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required. See above The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required No change to SPD required. See above No change to SPD required. A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	This has been used extensively during lockdown by people from all over the city if the plan goes ahead you would at the very least have to put in a walkway/bike path that runs along the drain to the Hornsea railway track as many people use this to commute.	Whilst the council is aware that many people use the fields for dog walking and recreation, there is no public right of way or official public access onto these fields	No change to SPD required.
EC131	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>A bad idea.</p> <p>Traffic at the Howdale Road/Saltshouse Road is already heavy almost impossible to get out of Howdale at peak times, plus the intake for new pupils at our local primary school (Spring Cottage) already exceeds the demand for places they have and its not fair to the residents of Danby Close</p> <p>Received via Cllr Craker/Dunston</p> <p>Against. Building on a flood plain will increase the risk of flooding to existinghouses off Howdale. Schools are at full capacity at present. Howdale Road is busy enough now without the potential of an extra thousand vehicles. Would there be a shopping area, Sutton Village parking is already hard to park. Not Happy.</p> <p>Received via Councillor Craker. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. It has come to my attention that planning permission was refused on 17 Aug 1994 on the grounds of access and detriment to local residents. Nothing has changed with regard to access. One change is that there are more vehicles now than in 1994. This plan is absolutely ridiculous. Local school is already at full capacity.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>See LF2 (School capacity) above</p> <p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p> <p>See LF1 (Local Services) above</p> <p>See Allocate3 (What has changed since 1994) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required</p>
EC132	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>A bad idea It will overcrowd the area which currently benefits from how quiet it is.</p>	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC133	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>A bad idea. All roads leading to and from this development are totally notsuitable. At least 600 vehicles using these roads.</p>	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
EC134	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>Roads not good for more traffic.</p>	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC135	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>A bad idea.</p>	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC136	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>A bad idea.</p>	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC137	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>A bad idea. Howdale Road congested. Motorists speeding its already dangerous.</p> <p>School cannot cope with more children.</p> <p>Lack of green areas.</p> <p>Danby Close not big enough.</p>	<p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>See LF2 (School capacity) above</p> <p>See EE2 (Environmental value) above</p> <p>See T1 (Traffic access) above</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>Received via Councillor Craker. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. Howdale Road is very over used by traffic you are often waiting in a queue to get out onto Robson way. People are using Howdale Road as a race track the speed of people racing to get up the hill near Kildale is extremely worrying. My daughter had her cat killed by a speeding motorist and I don't just mean a few miles over the limit. We need to safeguard the children on this very heavily used road. Spring Cottage School is heavily oversubscribed so what would happen if they build all these new houses which school would the children go to. There is not man green areas left around this area. What about dog walking, children playing and nature reserves. Danby Close is not big enough as an access road. I could go on and on, please try and help us stop this neighbourhood from being ruined.</p> <p>Received via Councillor Craker. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. Spring Cottage school cant take anymore children. Howdale Road can't take any more vehicles it is a nightmare at rush hour now. The area is a flood plain. The plans were refused in 1994 siting the flooding – nothing has improved and Howdale Road not being being able to take more vehicles. If that was the case in 1994 then its obvious it can't take anymore now as if you look at figures there are far more cars on the road now than there were in 1994. Most households have at least two cars even more if grown up children are still living at home as due to the economy this is now a major factor. Please help us to make the Council see sense.</p>	<p>Answered above</p> <p>Mainly answered above, rest see below</p> <p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above See Allocate3 (What has changed since 1994) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>See above No change to SPD required</p>
EC138	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC139	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea The area is a valuable resource for wildlife, like deer, foxes, owls and other birds of prey, not to mention the smaller animals too. Its an open space that's peaceful and has that rural feel to the area. The impact on the surrounding roads due to potential increase in traffic would cause problems. East Carr Road is already a problem because of the parking on the blind bend which daily causes near misses, so more traffic wouldn't help. All the homes backing onto the field are lucky to have such a view and it would be a shame to spoil it.</p>	<p>Comment noted See EE2 (Environmental value) above</p> <p>See T1 (Traffic access) above</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above There is no 'right to a view' in planning terms and of course in the not to distant past, the properties adjoining the proposed site will have been the new ones disturbing the view of others. The SPD seeks to ensure that the impact of new development (in relation to e.g. overlooking/privacy) is managed and that sufficient gaps are retained</p>	<p>No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required.</p> <p>The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required See above See above</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	Received via Councillor Craker. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. Obviously want the planning to be refused. The area is a valuable resource for wildlife including deer, owls and other birds of prey, and that's not including the smaller wildlife that lives there. It has a peaceful, rural feeling overlooking the field. Whichever area, Danby or East Carr has the entrance to the estate would cause an increase in traffic, which is bad enough on East Carr due to the parking on the blind bend resulting in near misses daily. Hopefully the views of a few households will make a difference.	Answered above	No change to SPD required.
EC140	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC141	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. A really bad idea, been turned down once for bad drainage. Whats changed. Too many young children down Danby.	Comment noted See Flood1 (Flooding) above	No change to SPD required. See above
EC142	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. What about green belt, flooding and drainage, schools and already full. More traffic in the area to get in and out of site. Some people already think Howdale is a racetrack. Received via Cllr Craker/Dunston Flooding and drainage. Schools in area are already full. Surely it is green belt land. More traffic trying to get in and out of this project. Some people already think Howdale is a race track.	Hull does not have a green belt See Flood1 (Flooding) above See LF2 (School capacity) above See T1 (Traffic access) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above Answered above	No change to SPD required. See above See above The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required See above No change to SPD required.
EC143	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand Don't know if it a good idea or not. Is there sufficient access from Howdale Road and Danby Close for say another 150 vehicles. Parked vehicles on Howdale cause enough blockages at busy times. Ask the bus drivers. Is there a risk of flooding from Holderness Drain.	See T1 (Traffic access) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above	The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required See above
EC144	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Would cause too much chaos and traffic on east carr road.	Comment noted See T1 (Traffic access) above	No change to SPD required. The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required
EC145	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. We have too many vehicles on the estate and nowhere for them to park cars. The bus service is no good. Not enough play areas and too much dogs. Received via Cllr Healand/Mr Rhys Furley	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>I do not agree with this idea of 650 houses because we have enough problems with heavy traffic down Dunvegan Road also on Spring Cottage which is highly popular. Also there are not enough Doctors. We also have a lot of elderly people who do not go out because of the amount of youths around the estate. Also the bus service is not very good a lot of the elderly use them because they do not have cars. I have objected to all parties who have contacted me.</p> <p>Received via Councillor Craker. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. I say no because this estate has enough houses, also the busservice on this estate would not cope with more people, we also have a lot of young people who roam the streets the elderly and those who live by themselves are afraid to go out.</p> <p>Also we have people who have dogs who do not pick up their mess.</p>	<p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>See LF1 (Local Services) above Comment noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>See above No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC146	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>A bad idea. This area has enough houses and school is not big enough for new children. It's a nice area to walk and get exercise. Area will have more chance of flooding. More traffic on the roads.</p>	<p>See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above</p> <p>See LF2 (School capacity) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>See above See above See above</p>
EC147	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>A bad idea. Using access from Danby is going to cause traffic problems for Howdale Road. The pressure for Spring Cottage school is ridiculous!</p>	<p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>See LF2 (School capacity) above</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>See above</p>
EC148	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>A bad idea.</p> <p>Received via Councillor Craker. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. That it wil impact on the environment and surrounding infrastructure which is already maximised. The new site proposal will be on a flood plain and we are at risk of another flood like 2007. There are enough brownfield sites already around the area which are being built on, which is adding to existing traffic. The new proposed site will add at a minimum 650 cars+ also public transport, that why we are against the project.</p> <p>Received via Cllr Craker/Dunston</p> <p>Bad idea – increased traffic, building on flood plain, pressure on school and local infrastructure and services. Already lots of other housing construction taking place in the area. Impact on environment and peoples Health and wellbeing.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>See EE2 (Environmental value) above</p> <p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above See Allocate2 (Focus on brownfield) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>Answered above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>See above No change to SPD required See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC149	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>A bad idea.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC150	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>A bad idea. I think its going to cause a lot of traffic problems for area especially for school children.</p> <p>Received via Cllr Healand/Mr Rhys Furley</p> <p>I do not think the Labour council is concerning itself about Sutton households. I am disgusted with them in thinking of allowing this to go this far. As I said before it will cause big problems for that area. I hope you can convince them to scrap this housing plan.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	Received via Councillor Craker. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. They would be big problems with transport ie cars, lorries etc. Also I would be very worried concerning school and children because of extra traffic. I think it's a bad idea.	Answered above	No change to SPD required.
EC151	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Too much traffic for the area.	Comment noted See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	No change to SPD required. See above
EC152	Hi i am a resident of Danby Close. And ny concerns are Traffic pollution noise of traffic, safety down the close, flooding. Is the road strong enough, i was told it isn't it needs strengthening how is this going to be done. Schooling, The amount of cars going through Dany Close. The traffic will not only cause chaos down Danby Close. But also Howdale Road . It will be impossible to even get out of Danby Close. This is a ridiculous proposal who even thought of this. The construction traffic will not only be horrendous but will cause a lot of stress to all the residents of Danby Close	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See T1 (Traffic access) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above See Construct1 (Construction disruption) above	See above The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required See above No change to SPD required
	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. What we want you as a Councillor to do is arrange a meeting for all the residents of Danby Close.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
	Received via Councillor Craker. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development . I am against the building of the houses because of the amont of traffic through our small close (Danby) where will our children play? The flooding is also a big problem. We have lived here for 40 years and can't imagine having buses and lorries running up and down.	Answered above	No change to SPD required.
	Received via Councillor Craker. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. Traffic volume, pollution, no new school, planned bus route, rumours about housing being knocked down. Very worried about traffic volume, noise, accidents happening. Not very happy about all the residents have had no communication about this housing plan. We the residents of Danby Close would like a meeting.	See EE4 (Pollution) above	No change to SPD required.
		See LF2 (School capacity) above	See above
EC153	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Received via Councillor Craker. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. I do not agree when the proposed housing development behind Danby Close for several reasons. Howdale Road/Dunvegan/Danby/East Carr Lane and Saltshouse Road cannot cope with the extra traffic the development will bring. Our school cannot cope! The extra traffic will make our area more unsafe for our children. There is also wildlife in these fields of the proposed site which brings joy to our community. We do not need this housing development in our already busy community.	Comment noted See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See LF2 (School capacity) above	No change to SPD required. See above See above

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
		See EE2 (Ecological value) above	A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site
		See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above	No change to SPD required.
EC154	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Look like it's a done deal. Earth movers already on site paper exercise again.	No application has been received and no construction has started	No change to SPD required.
	Received via Councillor Craker. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. As a Resident of Howdale Road please explain to me how the infrastructure of this area can cope with another 650 houses myself and many others can't get GP appointment. Schools are full and you have the new development on the grounds of Sutton Place where I once worked. But the earth movers are already in so I reckon this response is a waste of time. Really a paper exercise.	See LF1 (Local Services) above	See above
		See LF2 (School capacity) above The Local Plan requires the provision of infrastructure to meet the needs of new development. AS stated above, no construction has started	See above No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required.
EC155	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Our schools are already fit to bursting! Ive moved here to get my children into a specific school. I refuse to take them further when this is on my doorstep.	See LF2 (School capacity) above	See above
EC156	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Received via Cllr Healand/Mr Rhys Furley Bad idea/not wanted. Traffic congestion, noise, strain on local services. Loss of our greenspace. For walking and dog walking. Flood risk. Many newbuilds nearby.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
		Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
		See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See LF1 (Local Services) above Whilst the council is aware that many people use the fields for dog walking and recreation, there is no public right of way or official public access onto these fields See Flood1 (Flooding) above See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above	See above See above No change to SPD required. See above No change to SPD required.
	Received via Cllr Craker/Dunston Not wanted . Traffic congestion, noise, strain on local studies, loss of greenspace for walking and dog walking, flood risk. Lots of new builds nearby.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
		See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See EE2 (Environmental value) above See LF1 (Local Services) above Whilst the council is aware that many people use the fields for dog walking and recreation, there is no public right of way or official public access onto these fields See Flood1 (Flooding) above See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above	See above No change to SPD required. See above No change to SPD required. See above No change to SPD required.
	Received via Councillor Craker. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. Object Bad idea!!	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC157	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand		

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	A bad idea. Should use brownfield sites only. Loss of wildlife habitat for deer/owls/snakes and numerous birds and insects. Also floods several months /yr. Concrete will only make things worse.	See Allocate2 (Focus on brownfield) above See EE2 (Ecological value) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above	No change to SPD required A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site See above
EC158	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Increase in traffic/pollution/loss of green space. Risk of flooding increasing.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See EE4 (Pollution) above See EE2 (Environmental value) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above	See above No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required. See above
EC159	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. To build more houses on this quiet greenspace is deplorable. It will make it noisy and dirty withhouses and building materials being moved. Build on one of these bg manor estate owned by the wealthy politicians and landowners.	See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above See Construct1 (Construction disruption) above	No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required
EC160	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea – Congestion.	Comment noted See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	No change to SPD required. See above
EC161	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Received via Councillor Craker. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. Proposed development of 650 houses will severely affect me and my wife who live at Danby Close. We bought our house (now paid for) in 1990 as it was a quiet cul-de-sac, brilliant for bringing a family up in. The increase in traffic of at least 650 cars, lorries, buses etc will make it dangerous especially for young children and the elderly. Originally designed as cul-de-sa only- changing could affect house prices at least in short term. Noise pollution and car exhaust pollution will rise. Vibration from buses will adversely affect houses – the road is NOT wide enough. Getting in and out of driveway will become difficult. Heavy traffic would cause pot holes. People could park in front of driveways. Increase in flooding due to houses built on fields (which regularly flood in winter). Barmston Drain nearly broke is banks in 2007.	Comment noted See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See PC4 (Property value) above See EE4 (Pollution) above Comment "the road is NOT wide enough" - the part of Danby Close where access is being considered is the same width as Howdale Road See T1 (Traffic access) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above	No change to SPD required. See above See above No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required. The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required See above
EC162	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
EC163	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC164	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. (Who is building and what sort of houses) (Builders do not consider parking) 650 houses = possible 1300 cars. School unable to copy and congestion in the area itself – to get to roundabout bad as it is.	A planning application is yet to be received, therefore details of any potential builder or house types are not known. SPD sets out expectations on parking provision and design. See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See LF2 (School capacity) above	No change to SPD required. See above See above
EC165	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC166	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. This field often floods after heavy rain. What about extra school/doctors needs. Howdale Road is heavy with traffic as it is. Received via Cllr Craker/Dunston Bad idea. That field floods after heavy rain. We need that land to take the water. Traffic is already building in the area. All those new houses would increase this, making our roads less safe. Where are all these people supposed to go for doctors? School?	See Flood1 (Flooding) above See LF1 (Local Services) above See LF2 (School capacity) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above Answered above	See above See above See above See above No change to SPD required.
EC167	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A Bad idea. Would put extra pressure on schools, traffic etc. Another silly idea from this Council such as bus lanes.	See LF2 (School capacity) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above See above
EC168	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Danby Close will not be able to cope with the extra traffic. I went up the Close on my bike this morning. There was parking on both sides of the road. Certainly not wide enough for cars coming from and going to the site.	The part of Danby Close where access is being considered is the same width as Howdale Road	No change to SPD required.
EC169	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Area cannot cope with increase in traffic. It would cause an excess of traffic along with the build development of Sutton Place on Saltshouse Road. Going to have a negative impact on current residents and further overload local amenities, i.e. schools, drs, dentists, roads.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See LF1 (Local Services) above See LF2 (School capacity) above	See above See above See above
EC170	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC171	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC172	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC173	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Dangerous idea!! Will cause traffic congestion in and around a primary school route!!	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
EC174	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand Don't know if it a good idea or not. Hadn't heard about this before (except from Labour day previous to this). Initially no objections but how do we find out more info: e.g. what type of houses, are there plans for bungalows? Also impact of traffic top of Howdale Road.	The type of houses etc. proposed will be determine through a future planning application. See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	No change to SPD required. See above

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
EC175	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A Bad idea. We do not want this!	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC176	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A Bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC177	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Greatly increase traffic in the area and cause inconvenience for local residents.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
EC178	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC179	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Received via Councillor Craker. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. Terrible idea. The traffic is awful now let alone adding 650+ houses/cars to the issue. What about flood issues, schooling, GP surgery, shops? This cannot go ahead.	Comment noted See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above See LF1 (Local Services) above See LF2 (School capacity) above	No change to SPD required. See above See above See above See above
EC180	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC181	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Flood plain. No thought to infrastructure. No thought to local residents.	See Flood1 (Flooding) above The Local Plan requires the provision of infrastructure to meet the needs of new development.	See above No change to SPD required
EC182	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC183	I would like to offer my support for the East Carr Masterplan SPD. I believe it will ensure that if the fields at East Carr are developed for housing, it will ensure that the development is of a high standard, not just another estate of boxes. I do feel that work will need to be carried out on the Saltshouse Road junctions, as getting out of Howdale Road can be difficult and the additional traffic will only compound the problem. I feel that the SuDS are vital and should not be allowed to be weakened by any developer by reason of cost, viability, safety or otherwise.	Comment noted See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above Comment noted	No change to SPD required. See above No change to SPD required.

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	I note that you include reference to the inclusion of EV charging facilities with ducting to increase future capacity to 2 charging points per home. I think that two charging points should be provided at the outset to reinforce the “tackling climate change” message.	See Des1 (Design) above	The Local Planning Authority, Hull City Council will use the SPD as a framework and/or blueprint when working with developers to provide guidance and in assessing the acceptability of their proposals. Design principles in the SPD will not change. A revision to the SPD will include a new statement recognising that where design guidance takes the form of concepts and/or indicative design guidance alternative design approaches can be proposed for consideration by the Local Planning Authority. The Council will work proactively with developers / designers to ensure positive planning outcomes for this site and will use the SPD as a broad framework for doing so. Whilst there is considerable detail set out in the document which will assist in this ambition, an overly prescriptive approach is not
EC184	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Serious concerns about traffic levels (and speeds) on Howdale Road and exits onto Robson Way and Saltshouse Road!	Comment noted. See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	No change to SPD required.
EC185	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Very bad idea, building on flood area. No road for more traffic Howdale Road I already a nightmare. No good for heavy plant etc.	See Flood1 (Flooding) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See Construct1 (Construction disruption) above	See above See above No change to SPD required
EC186	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC187	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. This will cause problems for schools – not enough places, congestion on the roads as there is only one main access road, being Howdale Road. I also think the design of the buildings look like warehouses.	See LF2 (School capacity) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above Comment on design noted - no alternative options presented.	See above See above No change to SPD required
EC188	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. It is very near the Loglands nature trail and very bad for the environment. The quality of life for us residents would be adversely affected. Also flooding risk.	See EE2 (Environmental value) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above	No change to SPD required. See above

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
EC189	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. There is enough traffic going through Howdale Road without adding more.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
EC190	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Area is unsuitable for housing due to it being prone to flooding. There would be a large increase in traffic and the roads are not built to take the volume of traffic this development would attract.	See Flood1 (Flooding) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above See above
EC191	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC192	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC193	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Anybody buying a house on there would be a fool with their money. Houses would be built on marsh lands. Fields flood after heavy rainfall. East Carr Road traffic is bad enough now as it is.	See Flood1 (Flooding) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above See above
EC194	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. More noise. More pollution. More traffic. More antisocial behaviour. More money in the pockets of the developers (and their mates) and to hell with anything else.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC195	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC196	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. There is wildlife on the field and the increase of traffic wouldn't be safe for children. The primary school is over prescribed as it is without extra houses being built.	See EE2 (Ecological value) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See LF2 (School capacity) above	A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site See above See above
EC197	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC198	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC199	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC200	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Too much traffic. Drivers love this steep hill and have driven over limit for the 51 years I have lived here. This was once a lovely small estate. Also there are now very few children able to get a place in the school which was built for Spring Cottage families.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See LF2 (School capacity) above	See above See above
EC201	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Too much traffic already and local resources are already stretched.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See LF1 (Local Services) above	See above See above
EC202	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	Received via Councillor Craker. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. Traffic increase, already like a speed track down Howdale, plus more people in the area taking up too much green land. Spoiling the view and area. Very bad idea.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See PC3 (Loss of outlook / privacy) above	See above See above
EC203	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Increased traffic – strain on school availability. Impact on existing house prices.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See LF2 (School capacity) above See PC4 (Property value) above	See above See above See above
EC204	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. The area will not cope with the increased traffic. It would cause noise pollution and air quality problems. The properties already in the area including mine would be at a greater risk of flooding. The newest houses on Howdale flooded in 2007, the whole area would be at risk!	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See EE4 (Pollution) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above	See above No change to SPD required. See above
EC205	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Flood risk. Both roads not capable to take all the extra traffic. Existing utilities gas/water/electricity/sewers not capable of coping with another 650 houses!	See Flood1 (Flooding) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above The Local Plan requires the provision of infrastructure to meet the needs of new development.	See above See above No change to SPD required.
EC206	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. The roads/streets leading to the proposed site are congested with cars parked on both sides of the street. One wonders how access will be achieved in such circumstances without exasperating the problem.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
EC207	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC 208	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
EC209 Historic England	<p>Historic England welcomes the references made in the draft SPD to the importance of Swine Castle Hill Scheduled Monument, the Grade I listed Church of St James and Church of St Mary, and the Sutton Village Conservation Area in developing a masterplan for this site. Retaining key views to these heritage assets will help to instil a sense of place and to aid legibility.</p> <p>The Assessment of Archaeological Potential prepared for this site by Humber Field Archaeology in 2017 during the preparation of the Local Plan highlighted the potential impact which the planned construction of houses might have on hitherto unknown archaeological remains. The report concluded that it would not be appropriate for such development to proceed without further attempts to more fully determine archaeological potential in advance and recommended that archaeological evaluation be undertaken in line with paragraph 189 of the National Planning Policy Framework (formerly para 128 of the 2012 NPPF at the time the report was written). The SPD should be amended to refer to this report and its conclusions.</p> <p>Historic England provides a pre-application service that we would recommend prospective applicants utilise at an early stage of project development: https://historicengland.org.uk/services-skills/our-planning-services/charter/Our-pre-applicationadvisory-service/</p>	<p>See Des1 (Design) above</p> <p>Comment noted and new text will be added to the SPD</p> <p>Comment noted</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority, Hull City Council will use the SPD as a framework and/or blueprint when working with developers to provide guidance and in assessing the acceptability of their proposals. Design principles in the SPD will not change. A revision to the SPD will include a new statement recognising that where design guidance takes the form of concepts and/or indicative design guidance alternative design approaches can be proposed for consideration by the Local Planning Authority. The Council will work proactively with developers / designers to ensure positive planning outcomes for this site and will use the SPD as a broad framework for doing so. Whilst there is considerable detail set out in the document which will assist in this ambition, an overly prescriptive approach is not Add after second paragraph of heritage section (page 13)...'As part of the process of preparing the Local Plan, the Humber Field Archaeology Unit advised that prior to any development occurring, further archaeological evaluation of the site should be undertaken to determine the extent and nature of any unknown archaeological remains. This will be a requirement as part of any future planning application'</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC210	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand		

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	A bad idea. Field floods every year. Howdale Road is too narrow to take more traffic. Received via Councillor Craker. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. This is floodland. Dunvegan Road and Howdale Road could not cope with the extra traffic. Dunvegan Road is narrow with parked cars both sides it is very hard and unsafe to cross particularly for school children. Cars always go fast so do the buses.	See Flood1 (Flooding) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above Answered above	See above See above No change to SPD required.
EC211	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. I thought the fields were supposed to be for flood control.	See Flood1 (Flooding) above	See above
EC212	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC213	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. The area cannot take any extra housing with everything that comes with it i.e. extra vehicles, children etc the schools cannot take the extra or the facilities, also it is a flood plain.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See LF2 (School capacity) above See LF1 (Local Services) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above	See above See above See above See above
EC214	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC215	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC216	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand Received via Councillor Craker. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. I have no objection to the houses but the traffic would be a problem at both roundabouts. It would be better if it were traffic lights should the houses be built.	Answered above	No change to SPD required.
EC217	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC218	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Infrastructure: Shops/school/excessive traffic. Where is main access going to be – Danby Close or Dunvegan Road or ?	The Local Plan requires the provision of infrastructure to meet the needs of new development. See LF1 (Local Services) above See LF2 (School capacity) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See T1 (Traffic access) above	No change to SPD required See above See above See above The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required
EC219	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Flooding is a concern. Extra traffic is a concern. Where are the young children going to go to school?	See LF2 (School capacity) above	See above
EC220	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. The field behind my house floods very badly and at times it is a lake!	See Flood1 (Flooding) above	See above
EC221	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC222	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC223	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand		

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	A bad idea. 650 new homes, this means at least 650 extra cars using Howdale Road causing chaos! Response to Councillor Craker/Dunstan leaflet 650 new homes means at least 650 extra vehicles using Howdale Road, this would cause chaos! The primary school is already over subscribed. Flooding issues.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above Answered above	See above No change to SPD required.
EC224	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC225	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC226	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. How can you build 650 houses on a flood plain? Where will the flood water go? Where will the children on the pipe dream estate get their schooling. Car free estate? Where is the planned access onto the estate?	See Flood1 (Flooding) above See LF2 (School capacity) above The SPD promotes a form of development which encourages residents to make sustainable travel choices, and aims to make walking and cycling convenient. Nowhere does the SPD use the phrase 'Car free'. See T1 (Traffic access) above	See above See above No change to SPD required. The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required
EC227	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC228	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Safety of residents should come first. The access on Danby Close is ridiculous. 650 houses means far too many cars, and are our schools. Suitable for many more children. It is a ridiculous suggestion.	See T1 (Traffic access) above See LF2 (School capacity) above	The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required See above
EC229	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. It is the last green space we have left for walking in the area. Without it we have to drive out miles to the country. The road is not big enough to cope with more housing. Not enough local school places. Traffic is bad already.	Whilst the council is aware that many people use the fields for dog walking and recreation, there is no public right of way or official public access onto these fields See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See LF2 (School capacity) above	No change to SPD required. See above See above
EC230	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Too much traffic. School in the area not big enough for more houses. Destroying of wildlife and taking away open fields which people look onto.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See LF2 (School capacity) above See EE2 (Ecological value) above See PC3 (Loss of outlook / privacy) above	See above See above A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site See above
EC231	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
EC232	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC233	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC234	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC235	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC236	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Traffic is already very busy, this would increase to conjection considerably.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
EC237	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC238	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. I don't think Saltshouse Road could cope with the extra volume of traffic. Building could increase the risk of floods in the area. Not enough schools, drs etc in area.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above See LF2 (School capacity) above See LF1 (Local Services) above	See above See above See above See above
EC239	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC240	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC241	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Because the amount of buses and human traffic going up and down Danby Close will be immense in such a small area to service such a huge development.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
EC242	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC243	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Traffic already very busy on the Howdale Road. Flooding issue? Always a queue at Robson Way/Howdale Road roundabout. Traffic overload!!	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above	See above See above
EC244	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC245	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Dunvegan Road is already badly congested at peak times, evenings and school run times with the buses as well. We don't want to see a large increase in traffic. The buildings are on a greenfield site which is prone to flood. A while ago the Council agreed to only building on brown field sites.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above See Allocate2 (Focus on brownfield) above	See above See above No change to SPD required
EC246	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC247	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Current infrastructure does not support the additional impact due from extra vehicles and personnel.	The Local Plan requires the provision of infrastructure to meet the needs of new development.	No change to SPD required
EC248	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Too much traffic. Not enough school places. Where will the flood water go!	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See LF2 (School capacity) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above	See above See above See above

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
EC249	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand Don't know whether it is a good idea or not. Consider Danby Close is not suitable for buses. School places for this many children. How many cars? What mix of housing. 2 beds or 5 beds – affordable housing?	See T1 (Traffic access) above The housing mix and tenure will be determined through a planning application.	The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required No change to SPD required.
EC250	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Too many lorries and cars on Saltshouse Road and adjoining area at the moment. Plus toxic emissions I see a thick cloud of it every day from my window overlooking Saltshouse Road and Bellfield Avenue. I am disabled and traffic comes flying down now. I dread to think what its going to be like during and after construction.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See EE4 (Pollution) above See Construct1 (Construction disruption) above	See above No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required
EC251	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Received via Cllr Craker/Dunston Spring Cottage/Howdale Road is already a very busy estate all roads are at full capacity with most homes having more than one vehicle. 650 additional homes will increase both noise and pollution on our estate/area. About 30 years ago we viewed a house on Danby Close, which backed on to the cow fields (which is what the green area is called) a lovely house but decided against the property due to rumours/talks that the field may be developed. I certainly did not want to take the chance on the property in case this development went ahead all those years ago and I am still against the development as strongly today. It would make our estate far too big for the roads and amenities, which is far too busy already. Also spoil the small amount of countryside we have in the area causing a significant impact on the environment and wildlife. The field is also used regularly by many including dog walkers keeping the park area near the school for the children to play for the purpose it was developed. Also dog waste will become more of an issue for the children/parents/pedestrians going to school with the fouling of pathways around the estate if the rural walks are lost. Just like the area lost on Gleneagles area forcing walkers to the park. Also the area floods and is like a swamp every time it rains and has done this for years. I was lucky enough to be brought up on a farm but unfortunately children in the town don't see much countryside. The rural areas are safe places for everyone to cycle and embrace the environment, wildlife and fresh air. One thing that sticks in my mind was hearing the humming of the combines on the estate from the back fields so you knew the harvest was underway become more of an issue for the children/parents/pedestrians going to school with the fouling of pathways around the estate if the rural walks are lost. Just like the area lost on Gleneagles area forcing walkers to the park. My children were about 8 years old when I said can you hear the humming of the combine they knew the sound but their friends didn't have a clue and said "what is a combine" – so we headed off the fields so they could experience the harvest and see the corn being collected. It would be a real shame and a significant loss to develop this area, which is also educational.	Comment noted See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See LF1 (Local Services) above Whilst the council is aware that many people use the fields for dog walking and recreation, there is no public right of way or official public access onto these fields See Flood1 (Flooding) above Comment noted	No change to SPD required. See above See above No change to SPD required. See above No change to SPD required.
EC252	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Response to Councillor Craker/Dunston Strongly object. Land floods with heavy rain, water logged. Poor access for that amount of houses. Unacceptable amount of traffic.	Comment noted See Flood1 (Flooding) above	No change to SPD required. See above

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
		See T1 (Traffic access) above	The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required
EC253	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC254	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Road accesses only one road in or out?	See T1 (Traffic access) above	The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required
EC255	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC256	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. If a booster is added to improve our water supply we have no objections. We are Barra Close, when Hamilton Drive was built it massively reduced our pressure.	The Local Plan requires the provision of infrastructure to meet the needs of new development.	No change to SPD required.
EC257	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Too much traffic already not enough school places.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See LF2 (School capacity) above	See above See above
EC258	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC259	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC260	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. The land at the back of Ramsgate Close floods during heavy rain. More houses will only make it worse.	See Flood1 (Flooding) above	See above
EC261	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. No shops, No doctors. Limited infrastructure (roads), Area already prone to flooding.	See LF1 (Local Services) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above	See above See above
EC262	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC263	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. We think it's a very bad idea as there isn't enough places in the schools. Howdale Road is already very busy, plus the fields are flood planes. It is also very bad road to cross as there's blind spots.	See LF2 (School capacity) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above See above See above
EC264	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Flood area should be kept as fields. More traffic will cause problems around Howdale, East Carr Road and Dunvegan. Received via Councillor Craker. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. We don't agree with the housing development. The area is a bad flood area and should be left as fields. Traffic will increase around Howdale and East Carr and Dunvegan wick will cause issues. People already speed around those streets and more traffic will cause chaos.	See Flood1 (Flooding) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above Answered above	See above See above No change to SPD required.
EC265	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Very	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC266	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand		

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>A bad idea. Received via Councillor Craker. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. It should not go ahead. There is lots of wildlife in the area that it would affect. The area already struggles with the traffic going in and out of East Carr Road it cannot take anymore. My other concern is where would all the children go to school. Spring Cottage Primary is already high in demand. I have a baby and worry if this went ahead would I struggle to get her in the school.</p>	<p>Comment noted See EE2 (Ecological value) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See LF2 (School capacity) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required. A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site See above See above</p>
EC267	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. The traffic on/off East Carr Road is horrendous now so what will it be like when building starts.</p>	<p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p>	<p>See above</p>
EC268	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. What type of housing is this? Private or rented/council. Large increase to traffic on Howdale Road, already a problem getting out on Robson Way/Leads Road at roundabouts. Received via Councillor Craker. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. Additional traffic on Howdale Road is already bad. Getting from roundabout to Leads Road. Loss of green belt land. Risk of flooding on an already boggy area. Traffic on both Howdale Road and Dunvegan Road will be horrendous</p>	<p>The housing mix and tenure will be determined through a planning application. See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above Hull does not have a green belt See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required. See above No change to SPD required. See above</p>
EC269	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. A very bad idea.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC270	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Received via Cllr Healand/Mr Rhys Furley There is enough housing development going on in the area as it is. Need the green fields for children to play safe and for walkers and dog walkers alike. It is not safe around the east carr road entrance (Parked cars, speeding bikes and cars). Money would be better spent repairing the roads and markings in area.</p>	<p>Comment noted See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above The SPD promotes significant open space and facilities for children to play. Whilst the council is aware that many people use the fields for dog walking and recreation, at present there is no public right of way or official public access onto these fields See T1 (Traffic access) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required. The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required</p>
EC271	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC272	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. This is part of a flood plain meaning development will make whole area more likely to flood. Car-free streets? Where will visitors park – on already busy Howdale Road</p>	<p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above The SPD promotes active forms of travel specifically walking and cycling. Nowhere does the SPD use the phrase 'car free'.</p>	<p>See above See above</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	Received via Councillor Craker. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. This is part of a flood plain, therefore development will make whole area more likely to flood. Car free streets?? Where will visitors park, on already busy Howdale Road?? Most houses have more than 2 cars + usually + works vehicle!	Answered above	No change to SPD required.
EC273	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC274	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Less land for excess flood/rain water to soak into. Overload of already problematic sewer and drainage system. Excess traffic, too much as it is especially school times.	See Flood1 (Flooding) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above See above
EC275	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Too much traffic anyway already and roads not in a good state.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
	Received via Councillor Craker. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. Not a good idea!! Too much traffic as it is and roads in bad condition.	Answered above	No change to SPD required.
EC276	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Damage environment (use instead re-develop existing derelict land). Increase flooding in susceptible area, increase congestion the houses already shake from the traffic!	See Allocate2 (Focus on brownfield) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	No change to SPD required See above See above
	Received via Councillor Craker. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. Too much impact on the environment. Plenty of brownfield/derelict sites that could be used for housing without using greenspace and damaging the environment further. Taking away further drainage land when this area has floated previously is wrong and will have detrimental effect on the existing properties and residents and make the more liable to flood. Traffic congestion will increase and the roads are already busy and the houses vibrate/shake from traffic without the added impact of additional construction/development and approx. 1200 extra vehicles. Parking will also be an issue as most houses have 2 cars/vans.	Answered above	No change to SPD required.
EC277	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Isn't that a field of flood plain? Very bad idea to build on flood plains. Hull already very low lying. Whatever mitigation put into the new build houses it leaves existing houses and area more susceptible to flooding!	See Flood1 (Flooding) above	See above
EC278	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC279	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC280	Petition received Please find attached both an online and handwritten petition signed by the following numbers as of 17:15 17 September 2020. Online – 2464 Written 115 Total 2579		
	Can these be included in the report on the SPD6 and noted as objections	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>Dear Councillors This petition has been signed by Families Neighbours and friend of residents in the Spring Cottage and Howdale Road areas. They all object strongly to the Proposed Green Field Development on East Carr. Objections raised relate to the effects on the Environment, Wildlife and loss of Hulls remaining Countryside, Severely Increased Traffic and associated Road safety, Pollution and noise, Existing residents Privacy violation and changes to accustomed life in these areas Over stretched local Amenities</p>	<p>See EE2 (Environmental value) above</p> <p>See EE2 (Ecological value) above</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See EE4 (Pollution) above See PC3 (Loss of outlook / privacy) above See LF1 (Local Services) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site</p> <p>See above No change to SPD required. See above See above</p>
EC281	<p>We are against the development on the land to the North of Danby Close because</p> <p>1. The land floods in winter and does not drain away easily or quickly. How would Bransholme pumping station cope at times of high-level rain fall if the surrounding drainage land were built on. Bransholme pumping station has failed previously.</p> <p>Residents struggle with home insurance costs each year as we are classed in a flood area.</p> <p>2. The increase in the volume of traffic would impact on Danby Close into the development. The scheme promotes less car usage however even if each household had 1 car this would mean 650+ cars in and out of Danby Close/Howdale Road.</p> <p>The width of Danby Close and buses using it could prevent the emergency services getting down the street.</p> <p>3. The fields have so much wildlife. Deer live and breed in the fields. Building on this land would kill our beautiful countryside. You are taking away natural habitats. These fields are one of the last remaining green spaces we have.</p> <p>4. Restrictions on parking down the street will impact on residents with the loss of been able to park outside your own home. A parking permit scheme may have to be looked at as vehicle parking will increase down our street from construction workers and residents/visitors to the new houses who cannot park within the development.</p> <p>5. The increase in more houses will impact on an already over subscribe primary school in the area. Residents in the area have struggled to get their children in Spring Cottage over the years. The area lacks a local GP surgery.</p> <p>6. The housing backing onto the fields would lose their security if more of the shrubs were removed behind them to ensure the development looks good.</p> <p>7. This development would have a massive impact on the residents of the area during the several years the build would take with us living on a building site entrance. The noise, pollution of site traffic and the impact on the daily lives of residents who live in a quiet street.</p>	<p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p> <p>Bransholme Pumping Station does not serve this area See PC1 (Home insurance) above</p> <p>See T1 (Traffic access) above</p> <p>Access arrangements of any future development will be will be subject to the requirements of the Local Highways Authority, in this case Hull City Council. See EE2 (Environmental value) above</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>The SPD includes provides guidance on the provision and integration of parking spaces. See Construct1 (Construction disruption) above See LF2 (School capacity) above</p> <p>See LF1 (Local Services) above See PC3 (Loss of outlook / privacy) above</p> <p>Answered above</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required See above</p> <p>See above See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>8. The proposed bus service onto the new development would impact on Danby Close residents. This would not just include the daily bus services but school buses. The traffic congestion would increase on the entrance to the Close. There are estate Lindengate Aveue and Western Gales Way two built in Hull that do not have a bus service on it. mention 2. Council estate do not have bus services that go to the back of the estates why should we have the disruption. The proposed bus route into the development means 16+ buses each hour in/out on normal services only. The concerns for the safety of our children and elderly with the increase in the traffic on the street is a major concern</p> <p>9. If you are working with East Riding Council on the pumping station and flood risk do you not think another access route not been looked at near the golf course or over the drain. The track to Hornsea goes over the drain and took trains. You need to look at what can be done for access which does impact on a built up residential area already on Howdale Road</p>	<p>Answered above</p> <p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>Consider a new access point to the site from Kestral Avenue</p>
EC282	<p>I would like to submit my objections as below</p> <p>I am against the development on the land to the North of Danby Close because</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Danby Close is a closed area, narrow roads and parking problems already exist with the volume of vehicles existing residents have. Limitations for access for emergency vehicles. 2. East Carr Lane area has wet land area, wildlife live and breed in the area. 3. There will be an increase in noise, pollution and large site vehicles in the area. 4. Our houses are classed as been in a flood area with many insurance companies which impacts on the premiums we have to pay. We have suffered subsidence and reducing drainage could impact on us further. 5. Education facilities will be impacted on increase on the students wanting to attend them in the area. This will be the primary school, secondary schools which children have to travel to now living in the area and the local further education collage. There would be a rise in traffic taking and picking up children in an already busy environment. 6. Facilities in Howdale Road area now are non-existent with no GP surgery on the area now. 7. The road is narrow down Danby Close and with parked vehicles will cause traffic congestion with the proposed bus route into the development. 	<p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>See EE2 (Ecological value) above</p> <p>See EE4 (Pollution) above See Construct1 (Construction disruption) above See PC1 (Home insurance) above</p> <p>See LF2 (School capacity) above</p> <p>See LF1 (Local Services) above</p> <p>Access arrangements of any future development will be will be subject to the requirements of the Local Highways Authority, in this case Hull City Council.</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site</p> <p>No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC283	<p>As a resident of Danby Close, I strongly object to the development proposals for the following reasons:</p> <p>Previous development</p> <p>A development was proposed back in 1995 and was rejected. What has changed between the initial development and the newly proposed development? Surely, the issues remain the same or cause for greater concern, in terms of the land, environmental impact and traffic flow issues.</p> <p>Flooding</p>	<p>See Allocate3 (What has changed since 1994) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	Correspondence from the Flood Risk Planning Officer on the portal indicated that flood risk needs to be formally assessed prior to the validation of any planning application and that they would object if the developer cannot show this development will not increase flood risk elsewhere.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
	We are already at risk of flooding, with the land that the development will be built on playing an important role to reduce flooding for current residents. It is challenging to see how the current plans mitigate an increased risk of flooding to residents, especially if the water is displaced. This may also impact current residents in terms of housing insurance, which can already be challenging to obtain. Especially as previous applications and reports indicated that it is not possible to have a bridge or a culvert built. It would be essential that the developers can guarantee no extra risk to current residents and that the development is not detrimental to them either.	See PC1 (Home insurance) above	See above
	Additionally, there are mixed initiatives across Hull. The current plan for the aqua green at Castle Hill to prevent flooding in our area does not take into consideration the extra 650 houses. It is currently only designed to protect homes in North Carr and Sutton that are currently at risk of flooding from water in the Holderness drain.	Flood alleviation for any extra housing would be a requirement of any planning approval	No change to SPD required.
	Traffic The introduction of 650 houses will potentially increase the traffic flow by over 1000 cars. The area already suffers from congestion and in recent weeks there have been a number of accidents, which would be worsened by an increased number of cars. A traffic survey would need to be conducted to understand the impact that such a build would have on an area that already struggles with traffic. This would have to reflect usual practice, which is currently impacted by COVID.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
	Under managing the impact, the report highlights that there are only two obvious entry points, which could risk turning the while area into a large cul-de-sac resulting in congestion and bottlenecks. The plan does not outline how this will really be managed or provide suitable solutions to manage this. It only promotes cramming in houses to an otherwise limited and already populated space. It is deluded to think that providing some local amenities will resolve this issue.	See T1 (Traffic access) above	The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required
	Additionally, it is not clear what road improvements can be made to mitigate issues. The plan relies heavily on people using alternative modes of transport, which isn't always possible and can't be policed or dictated, so will not be possible to control. Many current residents rely on vehicles for work. The proposal needs to fit the site and its context, as it stands, it does not achieve this.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
	Environment This a green space used by the community, cyclists, ramblers etc. It is home to a variety of animals. To keep removing green spaces, no matter how environmentally friendly, has little regard for the current climate change crisis.	Whilst the council is aware that many people use the fields for dog walking and recreation, there is no public right of way or official public access onto these fields See EE2 (Environmental value) above See EE2 (Ecological value) above	No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required. A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site
	Having electric points for electric vehicle parking is all well and good but according to figures only 3.2 people per 1000 own an electric car (from 2018). So, despite the intention of keep commuting green, it is unlikely that this will be upheld by those who buy the properties if they are built.	Noted	No change to the SPD required.

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>Also, indicated in correspondence on the portal, the Environmental Health stated that they believe there is potential for adverse environmental impacts, and a significant impact at that. This is the view at just the consultation stage, and would require a formal evaluation if going forward to planning, to mitigate how these would be addressed.</p>	<p>This comment appears to be directed at the planning application regarding if an EIA is required. It is not a comment Environmental Health have made in relation to this SPD</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>
	<p>Local amenities</p>		
	<p>Local amenities, such as schools, are at capacity and introducing 650 new homes, which are likely to attract families, will not improve this situation and place extra demand on local services that they are not equipped for.</p>	<p>See LF1 (Local Services) above</p>	<p>See above</p>
		<p>See LF2 (School capacity) above</p>	<p>See above</p>
	<p>Our situation</p>		
	<p>I chose and bought this house as it was on a quiet cul-de-sac. I have spent time and money investing in this property to make it a home for myself and my partner. I work night shifts and require quiet to be able to sleep during the day and my partner works from home. The noise pollution from the development would greatly impact us, as would the extra through traffic if it is built. It has been something we have worked hard for and that would be ruined by this development. We are also unable to relocate at this time, as we have invested in our current home.</p>	<p>See EE4 (Pollution) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>
	<p>Although the land has been allocated for housing in 2017, doesn't mean it should have been, nor that the proposed development is suitable for the area for which it has been ear marked for. This allocation has also been made without suitable assessment of the area and impact, e.g. environmental and flooding impacts. These factors must be considered.</p>	<p>See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>Additionally, in line with the design principles of the master plan, these issues highlighted above fall under and negate all of them. It is important to consider these issues in the design and managing the impact, as well as appreciating adding the structure and scale of 650 houses to the area. Additionally, the areas resilience to these changes and what damages it might incur in years to come.</p>	<p>See Des1 (Design) above</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority, Hull City Council will use the SPD as a framework and/or blueprint when working with developers to provide guidance and in assessing the acceptability of their proposals. Design principles in the SPD will not change. A revision to the SPD will include a new statement recognising that where design guidance takes the form of concepts and/or indicative design guidance alternative design approaches can be proposed for consideration by the Local Planning Authority. The Council will work proactively with developers / designers to ensure positive planning outcomes for this site and will use the SPD as a broad framework for doing so. Whilst there is considerable detail set out in the document which will assist in this ambition, an overly prescriptive approach is not</p>
EC284	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. It's a flood plain and the fields flood for 6 months every year. 650 houses = 2cars per house = 1300 cars down Dunvegan Road which is already congested and danger. Government says don't build on flood plains.</p>	<p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p>	<p>See above See above</p>
EC285	<p>The proposed development would generate a massive increase in the traffic volumes in the surrounding area. The road network and local junctions would be overloaded, leading to greater congestion and pollution. This would be during and after any construction work with the associated delivery vehicles to the site and workforce cars parking on the existing roads. The house design requirements include the provision of at least 2 cars per plot, it would be realistic to expect at least 1000+ cars going to and from this development. This would generate major traffic problems at both Robson Way/Howdale – junctions, together with Saltshouse Rd/Dunvegan Road and Kestrel Avenue/Howdale, Kestrel Avenue/Noddle Hill Way. The layout design suggested is not a quality design. It would create masses of on street parking leading to congestion within this site. The concept of parking at the rear was used extensively in areas such as Sutton Park estate and has not been used on developments now to the extent shown on your proposals.</p>	<p>See T1 (Traffic access) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p>	<p>The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required See above</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>Suggested Changes Do not build this development</p>	<p>See Des1 (Design) above</p> <p>Comment noted</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority, Hull City Council will use the SPD as a framework and/or blueprint when working with developers to provide guidance and in assessing the acceptability of their proposals. Design principles in the SPD will not change. A revision to the SPD will include a new statement recognising that where design guidance takes the form of concepts and/or indicative design guidance alternative design approaches can be proposed for consideration by the Local Planning Authority. The Council will work proactively with developers / designers to ensure positive planning outcomes for this site and will use the SPD as a broad framework for doing so. Whilst there is considerable detail set out in the document which will assist in this ambition, an overly prescriptive approach is not</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC286	<p>As a local resident living off Kestrel Avenue, close to the site I wish to make you aware that I strongly object to the development in that the proposals will have a serious negative impact to the local area and the standard of living of the current residents. My specific objections are;</p> <p>Increased risk of flooding Traffic generation and congestion Road access</p> <p>Highway safety Increase noise and disturbance Pollution Impact on the environment</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See T1 (Traffic access) above</p> <p>Comment noted See Construct1 (Construction disruption) above See EE4 (Pollution) above See EE2 (Environmental value) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>See above See above The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required.</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>Impact on wildlife</p> <p>Loss of recreational/green space</p> <p>Pressure on local amenities, schools, doctors and dentists, etc.</p> <p>Overlooking and loss of privacy</p> <p>Loss of visual amenity</p>	<p>See EE2 (Ecological value) above</p> <p>Whilst the council is aware that many people use the fields for dog walking and recreation, there is no public right of way or official public access onto these fields</p> <p>See LF1 (Local Services) above</p> <p>See LF2 (School capacity) above</p> <p>See PC3 (Loss of outlook / privacy) above</p> <p>See EC2 above</p>	<p>A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC287	<p>This email is to OBJECT against the proposal of building 650 + homes in the East Carr Area.</p> <p>I believe to the best of my knowledge this land should have never been allocated as a Housing Site by the Hull City Council. The residents where never consulted on this plan and according to Hull City Council the residents where.</p> <p>At no time in 2015 did we receive the letter which is in your consultation plan as Correspondence to residents. The letter is a Hull City Council official letter which has the date of the consultation running from Monday 12th October noon and runs for 6 weeks until the 23 November 2015 noon. I have seen a spreadsheet which is part of your database and would like you to NOTE – our comments on there are NOT from the letter, and if the HCC deemed to think they are , they are completely wrong and would like to know if the Planning Inspector was given the impression the residents received this letter. Our comments are from a leaked document around the 18th November very late in the evening.</p> <p>The highways would need a full assessment as the planning inspector in 1994 deemed Danby close as NOT a viable entrance. During this consultation the Highways department ie Jason Shakesby refused to answer my email and passed this over to another colleague as unable to answer. Why would he be at the consultation to represent the highways if no knowledge. Paul Robinson was also representing the Highways at my meeting and when questioned that the roads have been deemed as unsuitable in 1994 he knew nothing of this and went red in the face. I think this is absolutely unacceptable and feel that we don't count.</p> <p>During the consultation period a Full Council meeting has taken place and Cllr Alan Gardiner was presented with a question through the lib democrats which did come the residents (and I would like to say my objections are not political), what consultation was made with the residents and he point blank refused to answer which I believe is an insult to all the residents and what they are going through. Then he then leaves his chair straight away to what seemed like he found the question he didn't answer funny by going to see another Cllr which you can clearly see is Cllr Denise Thompson and start laughing. Was this a coincidence ??</p> <p>Cllr Craker seemed to think that the Flood Alleviation scheme in which 28 Million pound is being spent would cover the proposed area, was this impression given when the land was allocated ??? as the proposed Flood Alleviation scheme will NOT protect any new developments putting our homes at more risk then they already are.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above</p> <p>The letter (delivered 4 days before the end of the local Plan consultation period) was delivered by a ward member. This was in addition to other consultation undertaken by the Council (in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement)</p> <p>See Allocate3 (What has changed since 1994) above</p> <p>See Consult2 (Officer responses to questions) above This comment is outside the scope of this consultation</p> <p>The flood alleviation scheme proposed nearby (unsure where the figure of £28m in the respondent's comment comes from) covers existing housing. Any new development will be required to provide its own flood alleviation as part of any planning approval</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required</p> <p>No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>The proposed access points of Danby Close and East Carr should be reconsidered and not just be on the SPD because this is the cheapest option for the Council as stated in my consultation meeting.</p>	See T1 (Traffic access) above	<p>The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required No change to SPD required.</p>
	<p>There is an actual disgrace that our homes, families are of no concern but a cheap option at the council's expense,</p>	Comment noted	
	<p>You should be looking at alternative routes. You have Wimpy field which could be looked at as an area for access also the field at Gleneagles just as you come down the hill from Salthouse Road, go round take part of the Golf Course off and get access that way. The amount of traffic already in the area is on the increase and unable to cope with anymore.</p>	See T1 (Traffic access) above	<p>Consider a new access point to the site from Kestral Avenue</p>
	<p>You state the proposed development will be a car free zone, then contradict by saying the proposed houses will have 2 Electrical points for cars.</p>	<p>It isn't a car free estate, but the Council is keen to promote a form of development which encourages residents to make more informed and sustainable travel choices</p>	No change to SPD required.
	<p>So that would mean 650 houses at a minimum x 2 is 1300 Cars. The area cannot cope with this amount of traffic. Also getting off Howdale especially rush hour is ridiculous. The middle entrance of Howdale is a very difficult area to get out of has no roundabout. This should be taken into consideration and put a large roundabout which you can see and not used as a racing car track at times because the small ones on Robson Way leading up to Salthouse tavern which passes two other small roundabouts cars just go straight across, Hence the amount of traffic collisions. This should be duly noted and not only taken into account the Police would have to attend, which is at the time when in the unfortunate event someone has been hurt.</p>	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
	<p>The field at the back of Danby/Stornaway Square have large amounts of water which struggles to drain away and the proposed flood alleviation site hasn't taken this into the calculation when taking into consideration how they feel the water will reach Holderness drain which is already at capacity. I presume you have already carried out or taken into consideration an FRA to provide evidence that the proposed site would not increase flood risk to the development and the surrounding area. I would have thought this would have been common sense to do prior to been allocated as land in the local plan as you wouldn't know if the site was suitable for housing.</p>	See Flood1 (Flooding) above	See above
	<p>The local infrastructure isn't enough for the residents now as no doctors on Howdale Road, the school is oversubscribed and has been for many many years, as I well know. I had to appeal to succeed in getting a place for my daughter in Spring Cottage around 18 years ago and is still the same now.</p>	See LF1 (Local Services) above	See above
		See LF2 (School capacity) above	See above
	<p>When you gave planning permission for Ramsgate and Canterbury you could have made this accessible for a road to go through or yet again was this another oversight of the council. Leadhills way on Noddle Hill also has the same type of finish to the road as Danby Close and many fields around which you can have housing and extend.</p>	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
	<p>This are additional to an Objection sent in by my husband and the Council should have consulted with residents back in 2015, I'm utterly appalled with the whole idea and another point is we have elderly residents in the area, residents whom don't use social networking, don't have internet access and residents whom feel intimidated and over spoken at the recent consultation. I for one had to ask Chris Peach to let me have my say as he had the opportunity to reply to some of my questions in several emails – from his reply here is the link. This is just another way of been obstructive in my eyes.</p>	See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above	No change to SPD required.
	<p>I would also like you to acknowledge my recent of my emails as I have had to help some residents get appointments with many emails going back and forth with XXXXXXXX to acquire these. In the event of this I as a resident don't feel confident that all objections will have been logged, would you please confirm all have been logged in the event if in the future we have residents saying theirs hasn't been received and will all objections be able to accessed under the Freedom of Information.</p>	All comments have been logged	No change to SPD required.

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
EC288	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. This area cant cope with that much traffic nobody agrees with it! I know several people on the Stornaway Square Street overlooking the field are wanting to move because of this.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
EC289	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC290	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Im a pensioner and the roads are already congested. Bad for the environment and flooding. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. It will have a very bad impact on the environment and increase floding in the area. Build on derelict/developed land not greenfields! There are already too many cars/vehicles for Howdale Road and almost houses have over 2 cars and many also a van. The issues with traffic and parking will be a major problem for the area.	See EE2 (Environmental value) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above See Allocate2 (Focus on brownfield) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	No change to SPD required. See above No change to SPD required See above
EC291	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Received via Cllr Craker/Dunston A very bad idea because it is a lovely walk, a lovely view around that area. It will also stop a lot of wildlife.	Comment noted Whilst the council is aware that many people use the fields for dog walking and recreation, there is no public right of way or official public access onto these fields See EE2 (Ecological value) above	No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required. A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site
EC292	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. We are against the development:- Increase in traffic, both private and contractors. Saltshouse Road already at saturation point, more residences opening on the lngs Estate and the Old Sutton Place – so will get worse. We at Sutton Court struggle to access main road, in car already. Spring Cottage oversubscribed already. No doctors surgery. Tiny amount of shops. Loss of green space. Damage to wildlife. More pollution Bus service would need to increase.	Comment noted See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See LF2 (School capacity) above See LF1 (Local Services) above See LF1 (Local Services) above See EE2 (Environmental value) above See EE2 (Ecological value) above See EE4 (Pollution) above	No change to SPD required. See above See above See above No change to SPD required. A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site No change to SPD required.

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	Received via Councillor Craker. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. No !! Increase in traffic, contractors and private, when done. No school (Oversubscribed) no doctors surgery. No play areas, bus service would not cope. No greenfields left if this is built on. We already have trouble getting into the main road from Howdale (Sutton Low End) by car. East Carr Road not suitable for more traffic, neither is Danby Close. Our bus service for Sutton Court is already abysmal.	Answered above	No change to SPD required.
EC293	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC294	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Where are the children going to attend school. Spring Cottage is oversubscribed. The road onto Howdale cannot cope now with the small roundabouts.	See LF2 (School capacity) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above See above
EC295	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC296	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC297	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Private house area. Pensioners bungalows area (already had break-ins). Need grass areas for exercise and dog walking.	#N/A Comment noted Whilst the council is aware that many people use the fields for dog walking and recreation, there is no public right of way or official public access onto these fields	#N/A No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required.
EC298	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC299	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Received via Councillor Craker. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. Our peace and quiet will be a thing of the past. This idea will severely effect the value of our houses as no one wants to live next to a building site. The volume of traffic is a concern, first lorries and heavy vehicles etc then residents vehicles. The pollution will be 10fold. Also, these roads are not built for heavy traffic. Howdale Road is already used as a race track. This type of development will increase the dangers for everyone on this estate, are the planners aware they would be building on a flood plain? If this land is built on it means when it rains heavy we are all going to flood. There are lots of wildlife living in these fields including deer, foxes, owls and pheasants. The wildlife is very important to the environment. This land is green belt..	Comment noted See PC4 (Property value) above See Construct1 (Construction disruption) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above See EE2 (Environmental value) above See EE2 (Ecological value) above Hull doesn't have a green belt	No change to SPD required. See above No change to SPD required See above See above No change to SPD required. A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site No change to SPD required.

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	It is our (residents) lives they are messing with. They care causing major headaches for all the residents who have lived here for decades. We live here because we love the peace and quiet. No one is in favour of this work. They are causing havoc and stress to all of us. I live right on the junction with Howdlae Road and I won't get my car off the drive as it will be so busy. I cant imagine what they are thinking of. Just leave us alone.	See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above	No change to SPD required.
EC300	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Not enough local facilities (doctors etc). Spring Cottage primary school already oversubscribed. Concerns over increased traffic in the area. Howdale Road needs speed bumps! Like a race track. Received via Councillor Craker. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. Not a good idea. Not enough local facilities i.e. doctors. Where will the children go to school! Spring Cottage Primary already oversubscribed. Concerns over increased traffic in the area. Particularly at school times, as Howdale Road is like a race track (speeding cars) * needs speed bumps.	See LF1 (Local Services) above See LF2 (School capacity) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above Answered above	See above See above See above No change to SPD required.
EC301	Response Cllr Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet A bad idea. We've already got a lot of traffic cutting through Kestrel Avenue. Most of them going too fast. (Could do with speed bumps down here) Response to Cllrs Craker/Dunstan leaflet. I am againt it as Kestrel Avenue is already a busy road with cars going far too fast. This road is a cut-through for most of the traffic, so a lot more cars around here is a worry.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above Answered above	See above No change to SPD required.
EC302	Response Cllr Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet A bad idea. It will be detrimental to the area – it will increase the amount of traffic in the area, put pressure on a currently oversubscribed school and ruin the surrounding area. Response to Cllrs Craker/Dunstan leaflet. I think it will be detrimental to the area. It will increase the amount of traffic on the roads (roads which have a lot of cars anyway – especially Dunvegan Road), it will put pressure on an already oversubscribed school to find places for new pupils (or it may affect siblings getting into school), it will ruin the surrounding area – many of use moved into the area for the green space accessed quickly – walks along the bank to spot wildlife and for peace and quiet would be ruined by a large housing estate.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See LF2 (School capacity) above Answered above. Also, whilst the council is aware that many people use the fields for dog walking and recreation, there is no public right of way or official public access onto these fields	See above See above No change to SPD required.
EC303	Response Cllr Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet A bad idea. Traffic is the main problem, sometimes we are unable to see getting out of our street due to the parking. People parking on bends and the buses.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
EC304	Response Cllr Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet A bad idea. Far too many houses with especially bad access onto Danby. The developments on nearby Saltshouse haven't been completed yet, its impact on traffic and services can't be known yet. Received via Councillor Craker. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. It's a far too big development with what appears to have particularly bad access on Danby Close. Howdlae and Dunvegan Road already suffer traffic and speeding cars. The housing development on Saltshouse haven't completed yet so the impact on services and traffic cannot be known yet surely. I am against this development.	See T1 (Traffic access) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above Comment noted	The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required See above No change to SPD required.
EC305	Response Cllr Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet A bad idea. Very bad idea. Access ridiculous.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
EC306	Response Cllr Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC307	Response Cllr Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC308	Response Cllr Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet A bad idea. The field nearest East Carr is always flooded. The school on Spring Cottage is not big enough for the amount of children there would be. And how many would be rentable through Council or would most be private. Roads not suitable for that many.	See Flood1 (Flooding) above See LF2 (School capacity) above Housing tenure, types and mix would be determined when an application is received See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above See above No change to SPD required. See above
EC309	Response Cllr Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet A bad idea. Not viable because of overload on present housing i.e. access, flood risk, utilities. Green space needed as a flood plain. This development will leave al (apart from the profiteers) in a bad situation.	See T1 (Traffic access) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above See LF1 (Local Services) above See LF1 (Local Services) above	The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required See above See above See above
EC310	Response Cllr Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC311	Response Cllr Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet A good idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC312	Response Cllr Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet ??????	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC313	Response Cllr Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet A bad idea. Very bad idea. We need more land to walk on and view traffic would be hell.	Whilst the council is aware that many people use the fields for dog walking and recreation, there is no public right of way or official public access onto these fields See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	No change to SPD required. See above
EC314	Response Cllr Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet A bad idea.It is ridiculous. There is not the infrastructure to cope with it. Use brownfield sites there are plenty of them.	See LF1 (Local Services) above See Allocate2 (Focus on brownfield) above	See above No change to SPD required
EC315	Response Cllr Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC316	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Saltshouse Road needs sorting before anymore houses being built.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
EC317	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. There are not enough schools in area to accommodate more children and areas around entrance will become congested.	See LF2 (School capacity) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above See above
EC318	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Impact schools, Impact wildlife, Area prone to flooding, Traffic use already high, New houses – more cars/noise/pollution, Scale of development unfair on residents, Negative impact on green area (not many remaining).	See LF2 (School capacity) above	See above

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
		See EE2 (Ecological value) above	A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site
		See Flood1 (Flooding) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above See EE2 (Environmental value) above	See above See above No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required.
EC319	Response Cllr Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC320	Response Cllr Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC321	Response Cllr Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC322	Response Cllr Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC323	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. I think there is enough houses on here as is, and there is nothing wrong with leaving some green space!	See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above	No change to SPD required.
EC324	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. The two existing roads are not suitable for the traffic generated by 650 houses.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
EC325	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A good idea if rented. A bad idea if for sale. Any Council homes are a good thing.	Housing tenure, types and mix would be determined when an application is received	No change to SPD required.
EC326	Response Cllr Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC327	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. 100% against it!!! It will cause increase in noise and fume pollution. It will impact on the wildlife and environment. We need more fields not houses!!	See EE4 (Pollution) above See EE2 (Environmental value) above See EE2 (Ecological value) above See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above	No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required. A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site No change to SPD required.
EC328	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Congestion of traffic will dangerously increase, theres no provisions made for an extra school to be built.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See LF2 (School capacity) above	See above See above
EC329	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. I purchased my property in Jan 2000 as it is I a quiet cul-de-sac. Parking on street is already busy. Using this as a main access to the site proposed would cause many issues weaving in and out of cars already down this street. It is quiet and will become overloaded with vehicles driving through.	See T1 (Traffic access) above	The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
EC330	Response Cllr Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC331	Response Cllr Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC332	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Received via Councillor Craker. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. I do hope you put in place more safe road management policies/procedures in place ie double yellow lines. Possible one way system? East Carr Lane is a particularly congested road and more traffic will exaspate this. One question Mr Craker: Some time ago we asked for double yellow lines in Clearview: This was passed and is legally required – what is happening?	Comment noted See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	No change to SPD required. See above
EC333	Response Cllr Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC334	Response Cllr Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC335	Response Cllr Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC336	Response Cllr Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC337	Response Cllr Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC338	Response Cllr Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC339	Response Cllr Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC4340	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Not enough amenities. More risk of flooding, nightmare with extra traffic – Howdale/Dunvegan already a speed run.	See LF1 (Local Services) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above See above See above
EC341	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. It's a terrible idea. The traffic on Howdale Road and Robson Way is so busy at most times of the day and with a possible 1300 plus more cars using it. It a disaster waiting to happen.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
EC342	Response Cllr Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC343	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Its bad enough youths going to the shops from Howdale throwing at the windows.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC344	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Risk of flooding. Lack of schools, shops, play areas. Green space *Traffic *Pollution	See Flood1 (Flooding) above See LF1 (Local Services) above See LF2 (School capacity) above See EE2 (Environmental value) above See EE4 (Pollution) above	See above See above See above No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required.
EC345	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand		

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	A bad idea. Too many cars and not enough facilities as it is now. Already lots of new builds in the area! Very bad idea! Received via Councillor Craker. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. There's already lots of new houses being built in this area – is not needed. Too many cars already queuing traffic getting out of Howdale. The cycle track is lovely and very popular this will be affected. It will be far too over populated in this area.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See LF1 (Local Services) above See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above Comment noted	See above See above No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required.
EC346	Response Cllr Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC347	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Where will children go to school? Howdale Road is very busy and have to snake through parked cars as it is. Could Stromness Way be made one way for extra cars? And school.	See LF2 (School capacity) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above See above
EC348	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. It would be more urban sprawl on green open low lying land (flood plain) creating short-term employment building houses with problematic access to/from site, increasing traffic on an already busy Saltshouse Road	See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above See T1 (Traffic access) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	No change to SPD required. See above The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required See above
EC349	Response Cllr Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC350	Response Cllr Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC351	Response Cllr Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC352	Response Cllr Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC353	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Cause congestions	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
EC354	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. We strongly object. We do not want another housing estate, the traffic is very high on all these roads already and the pollution. We need to keep our green fields.	See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above See EE4 (Pollution) above See EE2 (Environmental value) above	No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required.
EC355	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. There is already too much traffic in this area, it would be a disaster to allow extra houses to be built it would not cope with all the extra pressure.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
EC356	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Building on a flood plain and infrastructure:- are the roads suitable for another 600+ cars, gps, schools and shops.	See Flood1 (Flooding) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See LF1 (Local Services) above See LF2 (School capacity) above	See above See above See above See above

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
EC357	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. The main issue is traffic it will go on to Saltshouse Road and with all the new properties under development in this area it will be nightmare!	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
EC358	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. The roads cant take 650+ extra cars and the loss of green areas is wrong.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See EE2 (Environmental value) above	See above No change to SPD required.
EC359	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC360	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. nThere is too much traffic down Saltshouse Road and into Sutton Village as it is, and too many houses crammed in.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above	See above No change to SPD required.
EC361	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC362	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Very Bad Idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC363	Response Cllr Healand/ Rhys Furley leaflet A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC364	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. What about green places for walks. Children to play etc we are losing them all its not right. Received via Councillor Craker. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. How many houses do we need? They are taking over all the green spaces. Nowhere for kids to play?	Whilst the council is aware that many people use the fields for dog walking and recreation, there is no public right of way or official public access onto these fields See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above	No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required.
EC365	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC366	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. The poor wildlife doesn't stand a chance. What about the poor owls, deer, foxes, hedgehogs to mention a few.	See EE2 (Ecological value) above	A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site
EC367	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC368	Survey responses to leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand. Just another thought Heavy Machinery diggers, etc will not be welcomed down Danby Close I'm sure. If Mr Prescott lived down Danby Close would he allow this to happen? I don't think so.	See Construct1 (Construction disruption) above	No change to SPD required
EC369	Survey responses to leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand.		

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>Regarding the blind bend on Mallyan Close. It appears common sense is not being used. Thus the only option is to restrict parking. With yellow lines, safety is the top priority. There is also a problem with parking cars on Howdale Road directly opposite Mallyan Close Rule 243 of the Highway Code(Rule applies to both instances parking on a bend and at a junction) (But is not law) Yellow lines are law. This rule states 10 metres wither side of a junction/bend. This allows drivers emerging from or turning into the junction to have a clear view of the road they are joining just common sense really. We need to rid ourselves of poor parking and keep the highways safe as possible. Also we need a crossing for school children to allow them to cross Howdale Road between Lunedale Close and Hovingham Close, to safely access Spring Cottage School.</p> <p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Received via Cllr Craker/Dunston</p> <p>A definite no to this development. My questions that need answering are enclosed. In response to the question what are your thoughts on the housing development being planned at the rear of Danby Close which will see 650 houses built. What size plot is earmarked for this proposed development. Who owns the land. At what stage is the planning. Is there just one developer. Do the Council support low cost housing i.e. Self Build as Mallyan Close. Do planning really think Howdlae Road could cope with the massive increase of traffic. Will the proposed plan cater adequately for parking off road. Is a school planned for the development. Are cycle paths to be considered. Will there be a road north to join up with Castlehill Road or east to East Carr Road or access to the A165 (Low Farm Road).</p>	<p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>Comment noted</p> <p>This consultation is about the SPD. Most of these questions cannot be answered until a planning applivation is received</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC370	<p>Traffic is bad enough in this area as it is without adding anymore. There are not enough amenities for all these extra houses. Danby Close as the main access to the site is a bad idea. The road is not wide enough and people down there bought their houses because it is a cul-de-sac and a safe place to bring up their children. Turning it into a main road is wrong.</p>	<p>See LF1 (Local Services) above</p> <p>See T1 (Traffic access) above</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required</p>
EC371	<p>Email to Councillor Craker</p> <p>I would like to voice my opinion reagarding the proposed development at the back of Danby Close. My concerns are that this would lead to an increase in vehicles, increase in air pollution, childrens safety (ie school area). This area is also a bus route which would add to more congestion on the surrounding roads. There is no roundabout at the end of Howdale Road opposite John Prescott's house which would lead to more congestion. At the moment this area is like a speed area now so before anything else is dealt with we need to have a 20mph speed limit put in place before there is a terrible accident.</p>	<p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>See EE4 (Pollution) above See T1 (Traffic access) above</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required. The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required</p>
EC372	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>A bad idea. We object to this development.. It will create too much traffic in an already busy area especially at rush hour and noise and pollution. Big impact on wildlife, amenities in this area, schools plus the loss of recreational use that we and many others enjoy. Extra risk of flooding for us in a vulnerable area.</p>	<p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p>	<p>See above</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>Received via Cllr Craker/Dunston Shouldn't go ahead due to additional traffic will cause; Impacts on the environment, schools, amenities; loss of recreational use; possible flooding in an already vulnerable area. The noise and pollution will increase and it will cause more traffic jams at rush hour which are bad enough as it is in this area. Please stop this development from going ahead.</p>	<p>See EE4 (Pollution) above See EE2 (Ecological value) above</p> <p>See LF1 (Local Services) above See LF2 (School capacity) above Whilst the council is aware that many people use the fields for dog walking and recreation, there is no public right of way or official public access onto these fields See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p> <p>Answered above.</p>	<p>No change to SPD required. A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site</p> <p>See above See above No change to SPD required. See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC373	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. No doctors. The traffic is bad enough at the moment cars and bikes travelling too fast down Howdale Road. The children are unsafe crossing the road to get to Spring Cottage School as cars parked at both sides it is dangerous.</p>	<p>See LF1 (Local Services) above</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>See above</p>
EC374	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC375	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Too many people and too many cars in an already congested area. (Howdale Road and Robson Way). Another green space gone. Concerns about flooding, noise and fume pollution. Impact on local schooling and amenities, wildlife and the environment.</p>	<p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>See EE2 (Environmental value) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above See EE4 (Pollution) above See LF2 (School capacity) above See LF1 (Local Services) above See EE2 (Ecological value) above</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required. See above No change to SPD required. See above See above A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site</p>
EC376	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>I think this is a bad idea because, firstly I understood the area designated for building was a flood plain for the existing estate, secondly the proposed development seems to be roughly the same size as the estate enclosed by Howdale Road arc, thirdly and most significantly to me I do not believe the current infrastructure can support a development of this size – road access appears to be limited to Danby Close and any increased traffic from the development will put extra pressure on an already busy Howdale Road. I would also like to know if the proposed development would include amenities/services is school, shops etc. or simply houses.</p>	<p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p> <p>See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above The Local Plan requires the provision of infrastructure to meet the needs of new development. See T1 (Traffic access) above</p> <p>See LF1 (Local Services) above See LF2 (School capacity) above See LF1 (Local Services) above See Des1 (Design) above</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required.</p> <p>The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required See above See above See above The Local Planning Authority, Hull City Council will use the SPD as a framework and/or blueprint when working with developers to provide guidance and in assessing the acceptability of their proposals. Design principles in the SPD will not change. A revision to the SPD will include a new statement recognising that where design guidance takes the form of concepts and/or indicative design guidance alternative design approaches can be proposed for consideration by the Local Planning Authority. The Council will work proactively with developers / designers to ensure positive planning outcomes for this site and will use the SPD as a broad framework for doing so. Whilst there is considerable detail set out in the document which will assist in this ambition, an overly prescriptive approach is not</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	Received via Councillor Craker. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. Its is a bad idea. This development seems to be about the same size as the existing Spring Cottage/Howdale 'estate'. I don't believe the proposed development can be supported by the current infrastructure. Also I understood the area of land planned for the proposal was a flood plain for the existing estate!	Answered above.	No change to SPD required.
EC377	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>Don't know if it is a bad idea or not. Need to consider that this is land that regularly floods,can sewers and drains cope? Increase in traffic in Sutton, Kingswood, Spring Cottage. Chestnut Farm areas. Capacity of schools, doctors surgeries to cope with influx. Local wildlife and greenspace area.</p> <p>Received via Cllr Craker/Dunston</p> <p>Planning permission should be refused, for the following reasons!</p> <p>Land regularly floods. Traffic congestion is already bad in Sutton, Saltshouse/Wawne Roads, Kingswood, Spring Cottage. Added noise and fume pollution. Area provides greenspace for nature, walkers, cyclists in a safe environment. Will require further school places, doctors surgeries and public amenities. Plenty of open land which was previously built on in Ings Road/Bellfield area . Cannot this be re-used?</p> <p>Received via Cllr Craker/Dunston</p> <p>Would like to know more and probably reduce the number of houses because: Historically this land floods. Will new drains and sewers have enough capacity for this number of homes? Traffic increase in Sutton, Spring Cottage, Chestnut Farm, Kingswood, Robson Way, Saltshouse Road. Local greenspace/wildlife area. Its quiet, good for walkers and cyclists. Safe. Capacity of local schools and doctors surgeries to meet the increased population needs.</p>	<p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See LF2 (School capacity) above See LF1 (Local Services) above See EE2 (Ecological value) above</p> <p>Whilst the council is aware that many people use the fields for dog walking and recreation, there is no public right of way or official public access onto these fields</p> <p>See EE4 (Pollution) above See Allocate 2 (focus on brownfield) above. Significant areas of land in the Ings Road / Bellfield area are allocated for new housing and this collectively will contribute to meeting the city's identified need for housing.</p> <p>Answered above.</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>See above See above See above</p> <p>A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC378	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC379	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. There are plenty of brown field sites and these should be used first.	Comment noted See Allocate 2 (focus on brownfield) above.	No change to SPD required.
EC380	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. The increased number of houses would put a considerable strain on the already traffic on Howdale Road. It is very difficult to get out onto Robson Way now. We have a constant stream of teenagers walking to the garage through Gillamoor Close this will increase.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above Comment noted	See above No change to SPD required.
EC381	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand		No change to SPD required.

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>A bad idea. Absolutely ridiculous, school is not big enough to cope with extra children. The infrastructure not capable to handle increase in traffic. How can estate be car free?</p> <p>Received via Councillor Craker. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. Its ridiculous building too many houses. Estates cannot be car free and Danby is unsuitable for access, onto Howdale. Spring Cottage School cannot cope with more children, more buses needed.</p>	<p>See LF2 (School capacity) above</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>It isn't a car free estate, but the Council is keen to promote a form of development which encourages residents to make more informed and sustainable travel choices</p> <p>Answered above.</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC382	<p>Slips returned to Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand when asked to let them know views or give details of issues to raise.</p> <p>I don't feel good about the plans at all. I think the extra traffic and noise that it will be horrendous.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC383	<p>Slips returned to Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand when asked to let them know views or give details of issues to raise.</p> <p>Our household (4 adults) are totally opposed to the housing development East Carr . It will worsen an already bad traffic congestion on Howdale Road.</p> <p>Increase pollution, risk of flooding and damage environment.</p> <p>We already have inadequate Healthcare provision which will be made worse.</p> <p>We also want a total reversal of the decision to close the bus lanes to motor vehicles. The traffic congestion is intolerable.</p>	<p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>See EE4 (Pollution) above</p> <p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p> <p>See EE2 (Environmental value) above</p> <p>See LF1 (Local Services) above</p> <p>The comment about bus lanes is outside the scope of this consultation</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC384	<p>Slips returned to Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand when asked to let them know views or give details of issues to raise.</p> <p>We already have a problem securing home insurance, because this postcode is classed as a flood plain (risk)!. What is the point of building more homes that are a flood risk? The road infrastructure is totally inadequate.</p> <p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>A bad idea. Home insurance almost impossible to get regarding this area, are the Council planning to cover our outrageous insurance quotes? There are plenty of sites in Bransholme that the Council created by demolishing existing homes.</p>	<p>See PC1 (Home insurance) above</p> <p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>See Allocate 2 (focus on brownfield) above. Cleared housing sites have already been allocated for new housing and this land will contribute to meeting the City's overall need for new housing over the plan period.</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required</p>
EC385	<p>Slips returned to Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand when asked to let them know views or give details of issues to raise.</p> <p>Oppose new housing development of East Carr due to increase of noise, traffic and flood risk and suggest more attention given to brownfield sites.</p>	<p>See Construct1 (Construction disruption) above</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p> <p>See Allocate2 (Focus on brownfield) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required</p>
EC386	<p>Slips returned to Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand when asked to let them know views or give details of issues to raise.</p> <p>The badly thought out plan to build 750 houses in an already compact area like Sutton Fields , Howdale Road and Robson Way are already very busy. I walk round the area every day and another possible 1500 vehicles – 2 per house would be very detrimental to this area.</p>	<p>See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC387	<p>Slips returned to Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand when asked to let them know views or give details of issues to raise.</p>		

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>East Carr Lane – I do not agree with this at all for many reasons. The traffic is bad now the congestion will only get worse. Then the wild life on those fields would be lost for ever. There are a lot of deprived families who use these fields to take children to experience the countryside and it is so beneficial to their well being mentally and physically.</p>	<p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>See EE2 (Ecological value) above</p> <p>Whilst the council is aware that many people use the fields for dog walking and recreation, there is no public right of way or official public access onto these fields</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC388	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>A bad idea</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC389	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>A very bad idea. No extra facilities or infrastructure. Cause overload in traffic adverse to area and spoil area.</p>	<p>See LF1 (Local Services) above</p> <p>The Local Plan requires the provision of infrastructure to meet the needs of new development.</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>See above</p>
EC390	<p>Regarding the building of up to 650 houses behind Howdale Road. I certainly do not agree with the above plans. We have more than enough through traffic in our area and to add to that with even more coming from access via Howdale, East Carr and Dunvegan Road is just asking for trouble. Public transport has difficulty on the bend near East Carr Road as it is now, never mind adding more traffic to spoil our area. The amenities we have: School, shops etc are not enough to cover – even more pressure on them. Also the loss of recreational use and the impact on the environment/wildlife. As for the flood risk this could cause, if it was to come to fruition, I know who I would be claiming damages from! Please don't spoil a nice area!</p>	<p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>See LF2 (School capacity) above</p> <p>See LF1 (Local Services) above</p> <p>Whilst the council is aware that many people use the fields for dog walking and recreation, there is no public right of way or official public access onto these fields</p> <p>See EE2 (Environmental value) above</p> <p>See EE2 (Ecological value) above</p> <p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site</p> <p>See above</p>
EC391	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p> <p>A bad idea.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>Though I live on Gleneagles Park and I would hope that the proposed new housing complex wouldn't have a direct impact on my family I have still indicated that I am against the proposal. My main objection with regard to the proposal is in regard to the amount of traffic that it will generate and that the use of East Carr Road as one of two routes off the new estate would be impractical. East Carr Road is a narrow thoroughfare with residential parking on the road, in fact, it can become impassable if there is traffic coming from both directions, My fear would be that, at the busiest times, East Carr Road will become gridlocked and that drivers will naturally use Gleneagles Park as a 'rat run' in order to circumvent the congestion. The road that runs around Gleneagles Park is a relatively quiet and is predominantly used by residents. Rightly or wrongly, because it is so quiet, many children ride on it on their bikes and scooters on the road. Should it become a 'rat run' for those leaving the new estate then potentially, and in their frustration to beat the logjam, they may come through Gleneagles Park at speed thus increasing the chance of a serious accident. On a note with regard to the general impact on the local environmental, East Carr fields are a beautiful area full of fantastic views and nature. I often walk down there with my family and my dog and we see many young families walking to and from the Loglands Nature Reserve at the end of East Carr Road. Again, with the potential increase of traffic, it would become impractical for families to walk down to Loglands Nature Reserve without having to dodge cars. I am not a 'NIMBY' and recognise that there is a need for more housing within the Hull City Council area but to increase the amount of traffic to an unacceptable level, the potential of road traffic collisions and the fact that young families would lose out on the opportunity to spend time in the countryside when the Council are encouraging people to get out and exercise, would be both disastrous and short-sighted.</p>	<p>See T1 Access (Danby Close and East Carr Road) and T2 (Wider Traffic Issues) above</p> <p>See T1 (Traffic access) above</p> <p>See EE2 (Environmental value) above See EE2 (Ecological value) above</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required. A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site</p>
EC392	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. This area is a flood plain. Traffic is bad as it is now. The road is far too narrow for extra traffic.</p>	<p>See T1 (Traffic access) above</p>	<p>The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required</p>
EC393	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. It would create more traffic in the area, noise, pollution and would remove a green area already used by people for walks.</p>	<p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>See EE4 (Pollution) above Whilst the council is aware that many people use the fields for dog walking and recreation, there is no public right of way or official public access onto these fields</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required.</p>
EC394	<p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
EC395	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea Received via Councillor Craker. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. The proposed impact on the existing services, can the local schools and doctors surgeries cope, Its difficult at the moment. The increase in traffic Danby Close cannot be the only access onto the site, an additional entrance is required. The lost green space – this area is prone to flooding – construction traffic over a long period will be a nuisance. Brownfield sites within the Hull area should be considered to help regeneration in those areas. The local driving range has been flooded twice within the last 12 months – this is a cause for concern if this site is developed.	Comment noted See LF1 (Local Services) above See LF2 (School capacity) above See T1 (Traffic access) above See EE2 (Environmental value) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above	No change to SPD required. See above See above The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required No change to SPD required. See above
EC396	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea Its going to cause flooding, why don't they use the land behind John Prescotts if they're so desperate.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC397	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Need to keep fields. Wildlife running out of space. Traffic will be bad. No chance of kids playing out down Danby Close if more traffic.	See EE2 (Environmental value) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See T1 (Traffic access) above	No change to SPD required. See above The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required
EC398	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea Dunvegan Road is already conjested with traffic and how buses manage through the parked cars?? Disaster waiting to happen.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC399	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC400	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC401	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea Too many homes are already in this area – more houses equal more flood risk. Traffic problems already a problem in the area.	See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	No change to SPD required. See above See above
EC402	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea Access to site is very restricted increase traffic.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC403	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea Although it wont affect me much. I think it will be bad for people living in the area with much more traffic and the need for many facilities also it could be a problem with flooding.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above	See above See above
EC404	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand		

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	A bad idea. Since living here since 1986 all fields have been built on, the school up near Saltshouse Tavern knocked down and not one new shop, pub, takeaway built – another 650 houses trying to get onto Saltshouse Road is ludicrous.	Comment noted See LF1 (Local Services) above	No change to SPD required. See above
EC405	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC406	Received via Cllr Craker/Dunston Concerned regarding flooding. More traffic using Kestral Avenue as a short cut, building on green field.	See Flood1 (Flooding) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above See EE2 (Environmental value) above	See above See above No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required.
\$C407	Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development Please don't do it. We love the fields and open space. We don't need more traffic and pollution. Received via Cllr Healand/Mr Rhys Furley We need open space. Not more houses and not more traffic. It's a flood zone.	Comment noted See Flood1 (Flooding) above	No change to SPD required. See above
EC408	Received via Councillor Craker. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development We've lived on Spring Cottage for nearly 20 years and its quiet, friendly and weve had no trouble. The thought of this development is worrying and causing us sleepless nights. We walk our dog over the fields 3 times a day as there is nowhere else to go. This morning we saw 4 deer what's going to happen to them. Also traffic is worrying. It will be horrendous if it goes ahead.	See EE2 (Ecological value) above Whilst the council is aware that many people use the fields for dog walking and recreation, there is no public right of way or official public access onto these fields See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site No change to SPD required. See above
EC409	Received via Cllr Craker/Dunston Although the proposed housing development doesn't affect me as being close by. But I feel we must preserve as much green space as possible. Don't let us lose anymore habitat for wildlife. They deserve to be allowed to survive.	See EE2 (Environmental value) above	No change to SPD required.
EC410	Received via Cllr Craker/Dunston We object to the building of more houses off Howdale Road it is used by a lot of large lorries and a short cut of boy racers.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC411	Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. This is not a good idea. Local schools are already oversubscribed. Traffic on Howdale Road will increase. The roundabout on Robson Way is an accident waiting to happen. Traffic speeds on Howdale Road. Houses could be built on Wawne Road near the meadows public house. Or build more on the Ings Road development. Not behind Danby Close. Received via Cllr Healand/Mr Rhys Furley	See LF2 (School capacity) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above	See above See above No change to SPD required.

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>The roundabout on Robson Way leading up to Howdale Road is already an accident waiting to happen. Traffic speeds round Howdale Road. Building 650 new houses will further add to traffic. Schools are already over subscribed. Houses could be built near the meadows public house on Wawne Road or build more on the new Ings development. Not on Howdale.</p> <p>Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. This is a bad idea. Traffic already race Howdale Road. The roundabout on Robson Way leading up to Howdale Road is an accident waiting to happen. The local school is already oversubscribed. We are sure houses could be built elsewhere like Wawne Road at the rear of the Meadows Public House formally known as the swallow. We strongly object to this proposed housing development</p>	<p>Answered above.</p> <p>Answered above.</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC412	<p>Received via Councillor Craker. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. I'm not really sure what the plans are however I know that Spring Cottage Primary School is full to its capacity, so I would like to know if there are any plans to extend the school in any way. Also the traffic is going to be a major issue.</p>	<p>See LF2 (School capacity) above</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>See above</p>
EC413	<p>Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. Totally against Sutton gone. Terrible traffic on Howdale Road is horrendous now never mind 650 more houses. More of the countryside gone? Why not build them on Preston Road, St Johns Grove area or Ings Road area.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Land is already allocated for new housing in the locations referred to and collectively this will contribute to meeting the City's identified need for new housing.</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>
EC414	<p>Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. We fully agree with concerns already raised but also the extra infrastructure needed:- schools, doctors surgeries as these are already overstretched.</p>	<p>See LF2 (School capacity) above</p> <p>See LF1 (Local Services) above</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>See above</p>
EC415	<p>Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. It should not go ahead. The traffic increase alone would be too much for the estate. If you take an average of 3 people per house and 2 vehicles per house there would not be enough facilities. Years ago an application to build on there which was declined. The impact on the estate would be detrimental. We have a quiet estate now. Where would the children go to school? Where would they go for medical care? What about the impact on the residents.</p>	<p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p>	<p>See above</p>
EC416	<p>Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. One concern is flooding. Will extra houses cause flooding in wet periods? Also extra traffic can't be good for everyone. Where will the main road in and out be?</p>	<p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p> <p>See T1 (Traffic access) above</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required</p>
EC417	<p>Definitely opposed reasons as below. 1. Flood plain. 2. Access, Howdale Road is already congested enough especially at school times. 3. No facilities for that amount of houses e.g. schools</p>	<p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p> <p>See T1 (Traffic access) above</p> <p>See LF2 (School capacity) above</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required</p> <p>See above</p>
EC418	<p>Received via Cllr Craker/Dunstan</p>		

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>Bad Idea. Loss of countryside/destruction of habitat. Traffic issues – Dunvegan Road. Access to East Carr and Danby/Howdale Road increase volume already issues with parking/public transport. Impact on local primary school. Flooding always a problem – how will houses be insured sufficiently. What will happen to East Carr Rescue centre.</p>	<p>See EE2 (Environmental value) above</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See T1 (Traffic access) above</p> <p>See LF2 (School capacity) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above See PC1 (Home insurance) above See LF5 (Dog rescue centre) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>See above The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required</p> <p>See above See above See above See above</p>
EC419	<p>Received via Cllr Craker/Dunston</p> <p>We have no objection to houses being built but strongly against the access route through Danby Close. This is a close not a road. We have lived in the close for 40 years, our children played here and rode bikes as our grandchildren do now. The thought of all the traffic, buses, lorries etc passing every minute of the day makes me shudder. Our children won't be safe anymore. The car parking would also be a big problem as when you get to the bottom of Danby there are no kerbs to park cars.</p>	<p>See T1 (Traffic access) above</p>	<p>The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required</p>
EC420	<p>Received via Cllr Craker/Dunston</p> <p>Spring Cottage has always been a quiet peaceful neighbourhood, this development would destroy our peace. The additional people/children cars and construction traffic would create noise pollution and dirt on already congested roads. The effect on Loglands Nature Trail would be disastrous for wildlife (deer, rabbits, butterflies) etc would suffer. Access roads are too narrow for this development. The school is full, where would the children go? Walking round Loglands kept me sane during lockdown!</p>	<p>See Construct1 (Construction disruption) above</p> <p>See EE4 (Pollution) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See T1 (Traffic access) above</p> <p>See EE2 (Environmental value) above See EE2 (Ecological value) above</p> <p>See LF2 (School capacity) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required</p> <p>No change to SPD required. See above The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required. A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site See above</p>
EC421	<p>Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. This area is fast deteriorating under the present Council do not see the point in extending it anymore – roads, footpaths, walkways are in poor condition and overgrown. I strongly object to the development.</p> <p>Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	A bad idea. This area is being neglected by this Council and is deteriorating fast. If roads, pavements, verges and green areas; Building more houses will just make matters worse and increase traffic.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC422	Received via Cllr Craker/Dunston Is this a joke completely madness.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC423	Slips returned to Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand when asked to let them know views or give details of issues to raise. I have moved down Howdale a year ago. When children are at school I find the roads very busy. So if Hull City Council go forward with the proposed housing development the roads will be awful.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
EC424	Received via Cllr Craker/Dunston Against many houses are already being built along Saltshouse Road. There is insufficient schools for anymore children in the area. Also the traffic is horrendous enough getting out of Howdale Road/Dunvegan Road without anymore cars, all trying to get on to Saltshouse Road. Our countryside will be lost to houses and over development!	See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above See LF2 (School capacity) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	No change to SPD required. See above See above
EC425	Received via Cllr Craker/Dunston A bad idea. Apart from noise, mud and dust of the years of building work, when the houses are built there will be that much traffic we will not get off my drive. 650 houses = 650 cars a bus every 15mins that's 8 buses an hour all going down a road where two cars can not pass because of parked cars. Flooding – Two of the fields were under water for 6 months, Holderness Drain flooded the golf driving range this year. Are they going to raise the banks of the drain all the way to the Humber? Facilities – Schools are full. Doctors are full? Wildlife – We often see deer, foxes, barn owls, rabbits and bats from our bedroom window. It's a shame their habitat will be bulldozed.	See Construct1 (Construction disruption) above See T1 (Traffic access) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above See LF2 (School capacity) above See LF1 (Local Services) above See EE2 (Ecological value) above	No change to SPD required The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required See above See above See above See above A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site
EC426	Received via Cllr Healand/Mr Rhys Furley I would not like an estate build.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC427	Received via Cllr Healand/Mr Rhys Furley 650 houses means 600+ cars in a small estate. No means no for our children's safety.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC428	Received via Cllr Healand/Mr Rhys Furley The amount of extra traffic on Howdale Road is my main concern. Also Danby and East Carr will become main roads and they were not built for that.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
		See T1 (Traffic access) above	The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required No change to SPD required.
	Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. My main concern is the amount of extra cars that will be on Howdale. Also Danby Close will become a main road – in effect a street.	Answered above.	
EC429	Received via Cllr Healand/Mr Rhys Furley Concerned regarding flood area. More building on greenfield. Kestral Avenue been used more as a shortcut.	See Flood1 (Flooding) above See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above No change to SPD required. See above
EC430	Received via Cllr Healand/Mr Rhys Furley Only 2 roads in and out ridiculous. I have severe concerns about this development. I will be unbearable. What about flooding. Also will there be more houses built just like Kingswood. Where will children go to school. Where will the horrendous flood waters go, its always flooded in that area even with very little rainfall. Local wildlife will be decimated. Someone is making money from this.	See T1 (Traffic access) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above See LF2 (School capacity) above See EE2 (Ecological value) above	The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required See above No change to SPD required. See above A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site
EC431	Received via Cllr Healand/Mr Rhys Furley Thank you for asking. We think Saltshouse Road is already too congested and a further 650 houses will add to the traffic using and at times misusing it. Everyone should have a home and garden but roads, shops, schools, surgeries and the like should be thought about.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See LF1 (Local Services) above	See above See above
EC432	Received via Cllr Healand/Mr Rhys Furley Grass verges, cutting never finished off properly and too much rubbish littering paths and bushes which are overgrown all around Howdale area. Housing down Danby area cannot take the expansion on the roads, schools etc. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. The area is inadequate to see a development such as this. The area and school cannot accommodate 650 plus houses. This area has changed a great deal with first time buyer properties being snapped up by investors and unkept properties. Don't need it to further deteriorate due to over population. Development is too big for the area to cope. Too many private developments and usually unaffordable. Hence investors buying and renting for more than people can manage it for that needs stopping as does Council house sales. No wonder Councils cannot afford to replace them and give people a home.	See LF4 (Maintenance of open space) above See LF1 (Local Services) above See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above	See above See above No change to SPD required.
EC433	Received via Cllr Healand/Mr Rhys Furley		

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	We do not want or need anymore chaos around East Carr Road, eg dodging in and out of parked cars traffic at school times is a nightmare. No greenspace left adding to the risk of potential flooding. Nowhere for children to play.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See EE2 (Environmental value) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above Whilst the council is aware that many people use the fields for dog walking and recreation, there is no public right of way or official public access onto these fields	See above No change to SPD required. See above No change to SPD required.
EC434	Received via Cllr Healand/Mr Rhys Furley I do not see the point of building many houses on clean land. There re many areas that have derelict houses that could be demolished to make room for many new that are needed.	See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above See Allocate 2 (focus on brownfield). The Council continues to regenerate parts of the city where housing has become obsolete and several sites are allocated in the Local Plan for new housing.	No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required
EC435	Received via Cllr Healand/Mr Rhys Furley The Council have spent a lot of money on the field on Gleneagles have they any left as money would be well spent on the road around Gleneagles at the back along golf course it is very bad. It is a nightmare ring a cycle around there with it being concrete in winter it is very icy.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC436	Received via Cllr Healand/Mr Rhys Furley I absolutely against these houses going 1. It floods. 2. Wild life exist on there. We're losing enough of our country. 3. Traffic build up so no no no.	See Flood1 (Flooding) above See EE2 (Ecological value) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site See above
EC437	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC438	Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. Reject it (if you want re-electing).	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC439	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea. Traffic on East Carr Road is already horrific with most driving in an unacceptable manner. We love having the greenspace to walk around. It would be a great shame to lose this. Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. Traffic on East Carr Road is already horrific to build more houses would only make this work. Our cars are often damaged due to the road being very narrow. Cars often fly down the road and with this being a family area this would make our children even more unsafe.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above Whilst the council is aware that many people use the fields for dog walking and recreation, there is no public right of way or official public access onto these fields Answered above.	See above No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required.
EC440	Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand A bad idea.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
EC441	Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. Traffic already very busy on Howdale Road. Flooding issue too! Would be detrimental to the area. Kingswood still under development which is huge!! Think it would be too much for the area. Spring Cottage Primary School is always massively over subscribed. Not enough shops – (local small ones) in area. I aprk on Langsett Road!!!	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above See LF2 (School capacity) above See LF1 (Local Services) above	See above See above No change to SPD required. See above See above
EC442	Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. A ridiculous idea. Obviously these people don't remember the flooding of Howdale Road. Hull has a lot of Brown field sites, which are in desperate need of regeneration, surely this would make more sense. I hope the roads will be improved if this goes ahead. Howdale Road is not designed to cater for the extra traffic.	See Flood1 (Flooding) above See Allocate 2 (focus on brownfield). The Council continues to regenerate parts of the city where housing has become obsolete and several sites are allocated in the Local Plan for new housing. A combination of brownfield and other land is required to meet the identified need for housing in the City See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above No change to SPD required See above
EC443	Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. Dear Sirs, my view on the Danby Close development is as follows. Howdale Road, is at times a very busy, but more disturbingly a dangerous road. Being one of only a few hills in this area, it seems to encourage too many drivers to treat it as some kind of a race track, some the speeds we encounter are frightening. So another 650 houses can only make this more dangerous. I have tried on more than one occasion to get some form of traffic calming measures in place but as of yet unsuccessful. At the top of Howdale exiting in Saltshouse Road can already be stressful so again more traffic would only make things worse. At the other end of Howdale at the mini roundabout with Robin way again more traffic would only make things worse and here it noted for accidents because drivers don't seem to acknowledge the roundabout at all. So it is my belief that 650 houses more would the traffic situation much worse.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
EC444	Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. Howdale Road is not big enough to sustain traffic for 650 house and a further bus route and the amount of traffic around this area will become unmanaged. Saltshouse Road and Leads Road are already bottlenecks!!	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
EC445	Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. The council spent a lot of money creating a flood alleviation scheme in the area after the floods in 2007. Now a development is to be built on another flood plain! Where will that water go? The traffic will be double and the bus route is to go down a former cul-de-sac. Doesn't make sense. Also the local schools are currently oversubscribed will another school be built!	See Flood1 (Flooding) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See T1 (Traffic access) above See LF2 (School capacity) above	See above See above The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required See above

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
EC446	Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development I think its terrible its all the countryside weve got left round here. What about the wildlife we heard it was going to be a nature reserve and thought that a lovely idea. Im sure there must be land elsewhere that would be better.	See EE2 (Ecological value) above	A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site
EC447	Received via Cllr Craker/Dunston It is a bad idea. The roads round this area are already congested at peak times, evenings and school run times. The area for the housing development is a Greenfield area that is prone to flooding. A few years ago the Council agreed to only build on brown sites. Access to Dunvegan and Holwell Roads from Saltshouse Road is not very good. People do not treat the mini roundabouts as roundabouts, they use them as T junctions. There are near misses quite regularly.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above See Allocate 2 (focus on brownfield). A mix of brownfield and other land is required to meet the City's identified need for new housing. There has never been a commitment to deliver housing on only brownfield land.	See above See above No change to SPD required
EC448	Response received by Cllrs Craker/Dunstan to their letter to residents asking for views on East Carr development. Local road in this area are already congested, parking in some areas off Howdale is just waiting for an accident to happen. This development could bring at least another 1000 vehicles.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
EC449	Received via Cllr Craker/Dunston Rep Ref EC1	Representation Concerned over the size of the development. Limit the number/style of the development. Move the development to a more suitable location. 0 Height of the properties and close proximity. Style of the houses not in keeping with the area/location. Sutton is an historic village. 0 Flow of traffic to the area – roads/access are unsuitable. Access for emergency services.	Representation Ref Allocate1 Des1 T1
EC450		0 Light to properties that will face the new development. 0 Devaluation of my property. 0 Flooding to existing properties in the area. 0 Issues obtaining home insurance and the cost.	PC2 PC4 Flood1 PC1
EC451		0 Change access to the development to another area – consider alternative options. 0 Received via Cllr Craker/Dunston 0 Schools and Education.	T1 LF2
EC452	EC2	Environment 0 We have the pleasure of overlooking the first field off East Carr Road and with that comes the hours of watching the various wildlife that goes with it throughout all seasons each year. We wake up and observe Deer grazing just at the back of our fence, Foxes with their cubs playing in the early morning sun.	EE3
EC453		0 Barn Owls flying around the field hunting for field mice. Sparrow Hawks also hunt on this land. Grass snakes and frogs live in the grass. Pheasants, Partridge & Woodcock ground nest on the fields. Woodpeckers feed on our bird food and the trees around the fields. Numerous songbirds live and nest in the Hawthorn hedges surround the fields and lane. Wildfowl including Shelducks, Malards, Swans, Geese (Pink footed, Greylag and Canadas) & Grey Heron all arrive when the fields are in flood - which I will come on to. 0 This land is one of the last green field spaces within the city boundary and as such should be protected against this proposal.	EE3

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
EC454		<p>0 Generations of children have played and exercised on this land and it allows City kids to explore and reap the benefits of a wide countryside space right on their doorstep. Every year children play on the hay bales harvested and this brings back happy memories of when I was a child. Do you as a City councillor really want to take this pleasure away from future generations?</p> <p>0 It's nice to see the older kids camping out on the fields and most do so responsibly, taking rubbish home with them; Probably out of respect for the land they have grown up using.</p>	0
EC455		<p>0 We have noticed a significant reduction in pollution during this pandemic, not only in this area but as a City. This will be drastically increased due to the traffic needed to build a development of this scale and the future occupiers' cars. This could be in the region of 1000 extra cars. Most families now have at least 2 cars nowadays, so I don't think that is an unreasonable figure to assume.</p> <p>0 Flood risk</p> <p>0 Every year the field at the rear of Stornaway Square floods. I have notice this has got worse every year with this winter being without doubt the most concerning. It very nearly entered many of our neighbour's properties. The Golf driving range flooded twice this year</p> <p>0 Not only that field but also all the others involved hold significant amounts of water which saves the houses on Stornaway Sq, Inglby, Danby & Higham from being flooded. Sutton Cross drain is a key part of the drainage network to Holderness Drain which along with the adjacent fields, this must be preserved. Properties along Stornaway Square Flooded during 2007 and I fear will happen again should the development progress.</p>	EE4 Flood1
EC456		0 Roads/Traffic	0
EC457		0 I understand proposed access to this site will be via Danby Close and East Carr Road. Although I don't live on Danby, I have noticed an increase in parked cars down there in the 10 years I've been in the area. This development can only have a significant impact Danby Close and the surrounding streets.	T1
EC458		<p>0 I use East Carr Road to access our street on Stornaway Square. Traffic use on this road has got worse over the last few years along with on street parking. it can be border on unpassable sometimes. Regular head to head confrontations occur on the blind corner and there have been 2-3 serious accidents along East Carr Road in the last 6 months that I'm aware of. Are HCC really considering increasing this traffic along here by another 3-400 cars a day if not more??</p> <p>0 I have read Hull City Councils planning archives for the area and note with interest that traffic access was one of the main reasons for refusing planning applications for similar developments on multiple occasions in the 90's. Have the road networks changed since then? Yes - for the worse unfortunately!</p> <p>0 The knock-on effect will have further ramifications on Dunvegan and Howdale Roads. Dunvegan has a parking problem and when you add the buses that use the road, it is a dangerous route for cyclists and pedestrians as it is. Spring Cottage School had a pupil hurt as a direct result of the parking and traffic use at term time.</p> <p>0 Tring to pull out onto Dunvegan Road at present is hard enough with parked cars which will become worse with the addition road load.</p>	T2
EC459		0 Further afield there are frequent delays using Salthouse Road/Robson way leading to Leads Road which will only increase as a result of this plan.	0
EC460		<p>0 Local Amenities.</p> <p>0 I have already mentioned the recreational use of this land. Where else can the children play? I'm sure there would be an increase in anti-social behavior during and following the development. You only need to look at the issues on Orchard Park & Marfleet Lane developments whilst they were in progress. There are few play areas as it is for the local children and this will reduce further.</p>	LF1

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
EC461		<p>0 I note there is to be a new shop on the site but assume it will be a corner shop or small Tesco type store (leading to more delivery and shopping traffic use). I suspect most new occupiers will be either using on-line delivery shopping or heading to the larger supermarkets – Again, More traffic.</p> <p>0 Spring Cottage school is vastly oversubscribed every year along with schools outside the catchment area – Where will all the new children go??</p> <p>0 The local Dog rescue center is on East Carr Road and can be heard from our house most days. As a Dog owner this doesn't bother me but I'm sure the potential new homeowners won't like this noise and I can only see the home having to move elsewhere in the future.</p>	<p>LF1</p> <p>LF2</p> <p>LF5</p>
EC462		<p>0 I read that there are to be many green areas on the new site. Who will be responsible for their upkeep? H.C.C. cannot maintain and weed the existing grassed areas around Spring Cottage adequately, let alone anymore!</p> <p>0 Personal reasons</p> <p>0 As I mentioned earlier, I love looking out across the fields when I wake in the morning and dread the thought of having someone looking back at me from the new houses. All aspects of our privacy will be taken from us should this development happen.</p>	<p>LF4</p> <p>PC3</p>
EC463		<p>0 We sit out on the field on a summers evening and enjoy the near silence. That will be taken once a building site begins for years to come and will continue with the new occupants.</p>	Construct1
EC464		<p>0 We exercise our dogs on these fields and they enjoy their freedom to run and play with other dogs whilst we chat with our neighbours and many visitors from surrounding areas. It is quite a community.</p> <p>0 Our house value will drop as a result of this proposal. Many Neighbours paid extra for the luxury of not being overlooked and the beautiful outlook.</p> <p>0 Whilst I accept that there is a need for new housing, I firmly believe that brown field developments need to be considered first along with utilizing Town Centre sites and using the Old Docks. A new Victoria Dock development should be done around the Lord Line buildings long before even thinking about using our last Green fields.</p> <p>0 Email</p> <p>0 Following the recent Public consultation meetings at Saltshouse Tavern, I would like to have my comments recorded for inclusion in the cabinet report.</p> <p>0 1. Transport & road infrastructure</p>	<p>EE2</p> <p>PC4</p> <p>Allocate2</p> <p>OO</p>
EC465		<p>0 I am extremely disappointed and embarrassed to have Hull City Council highways as my local authorities highways section. Despite numerous questions asked regarding what the council will allow and expect from a potential developer, there was no reassurance or any ideas given, to how the Council expect to overcome the issues that they themselves overturned the last application with in 1994. The traffic situation has increased significantly since then and would drastically increase again should this proposal be allowed.</p> <p>0 A comment on the screening process for this plan stating -there would be be no significant potential environmental impact as a result of this development - How on earth can anyone, let alone a senior council officer, come out with a statement like that? There HAS to be an impact as a result of another 1000+ vehicles using the estate roads. Ridiculous statement and the officer in question should be scrutinised by council and disciplined/dismissed unless he can prove otherwise.</p>	<p>Allocate3</p> <p>EE1</p>
EC466		<p>0 I understand that crossing the proposed development entering via Danby and leaving by East Carr wouldn't be possible except for emergencies. I understand that any new development on this scale requires two access points. By not allowing transversing traffic, this will now require 4 viable routes in, in total. Where are the other 2 going to be?? Why wasn't this stated on the SPD?</p> <p>0 2. Flooding and drainage</p>	<p>T1</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
		<p>0 Again I was disappointed that the council official couldn't again offer any advice and comfort to residents over the issue of flooding of both the rivers, drains and the fields themselves. It appeared that the council officials hadn't even seen the fields in flood as they were surprised by the quantities of water estimated and indeed the worst field affected wasn't identified as the flood plain.</p> <p>0 3. Local amenities</p> <p>0 The SPD incorrectly identified 2 GP surgeries on Howdale Rd which haven't been operating for some 4-5 years now. The nearest is over 2 miles away. Lack of foresight by the planning team hadn't considered this on the SPD and they should have.</p> <p>0 Reassurance on Additional School places couldn't be made by the council planner which again is a massive oversight. All schools in the area are over subscribed and should be addressed at this stage and not left to a developer to fudge around.</p> <p>0 To Summarise, I feel this SPD has been ill thought out with no concerns for existing residents and has been rushed through under cover of COVID-19. It was also poorly advertised to the local community. Only 550 letters distributed to an estate of 2000-3000 homes is poor. The Environment Agency have sent out 1350 as part of their consultation for North Carr Flood alleviation!!</p>	<p>Flood1</p> <p>LF1</p> <p>LF2</p> <p>Consult3</p>
EC467		<p>0 Lamp post signs were taken down before the 1st meeting and poorly re-fitted once HCC were made aware.</p> <p>0 Local notice board didn't even have a copy posted..</p> <p>0 Flood alleviation works need to be put in place and thoroughly tested to ensure that existing properties AND any potential new developments are protected.</p> <p>0 The existing road network needs serious attention and upgrading well before any possible consideration to allowing the proposed development being granted permission. How can this possibly be allowed with the current road network? Preston Road redevelopment has been put on hold due to traffic issues and there is an existing network in place So how can East Carr be allowed?</p> <p>0 More consultation with residents to discuss what will and won't be allowed Must be done to ensure those residents lives will have minimal disruption before during and after any possible development completes.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>Flood1</p> <p>T2</p> <p>Consult3</p>
EC468	EC3	<p>We have concerns around flooding risks and traffic access. Traffic congestion. Lack of school places. Doctors surgeries. Loss of the last natural green space in Hull.</p>	<p>Flood1</p> <p>0 T1</p> <p>0 T2</p>
EC469		<p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p>	<p>0 LF2</p> <p>0 LF1</p> <p>0 LF1</p>
EC470		<p>0 Can anyone from the council guarantee we will not flood due to these houses being built? Will our home insurance go up from increased risks? Will we still be able to get insurance?</p>	<p>Flood1</p>
EC471	EC4	<p>0</p> <p>0 Can the council guarantee volumes of traffic will not increase and pollution increase? The roads are not suited to large volumes of traffic.</p> <p>0</p> <p>0 Surely brownfield sites are better for sustainability and lessening the impact of environmental pollution.</p> <p>Object strongly to the proposed Green Field Development on East Carr. Objections raised relate to the effects on the Environment, wildlife and loss of Hull's remaining countryside, severely increased traffic and associated road safety, Pollution and Noise, Existing residents privacy violation and changes to accustomed life in these areas. Overstretched local amenities.</p>	<p>0 PC1</p> <p>T2</p> <p>0 EE4</p> <p>Allocate2</p> <p>EE1</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
		0	0 EE2
		0	0 EE3
EC472		0	0 T1
		0	0 T2
		0	0 EE4
		0	0 PC3
EC473		0	0 LF1
		0	0 LF2
		0	0 LF1
EC474	EC5	I disagree with the proposed plans for the following reasons,	0
EC475		<p>0 1) I live on Danby Close, I chose to live there as it is a cul-de-sac, its quiet and friendly. We get very little trouble/disturbances due to the fact we are a cul-de-sac. I have a 6 year old boy who is coming to an age where he will want to play out the front. As it is now I could let him, no speeding traffic, no buses all the neighbours know him and would look out for him, there are no strangers as such as mostly the only people that come down Danby live down Danby. This proposal changes all that, everything we bought when we purchased the property, gone. I know this a very selfish view but if you have children yourself you will understand you want them brought up in as nice an environment as possible. This is why we chose to live here and not a main road.</p> <p>0 2) The fields flood on a regular basis (I believe some of the neighbours have photographs to back this up). Where is this water going to go with 650 houses built on it? They will flood and the surrounding area is more likely to flood. Houses will flood, insurances will go up. I suppose we could all start commuting via Kayak, which brings me nicely onto the next points.</p> <p>0 3) Increased traffic on the roads. These roads are already busy in fact the whole of East Hull is an absolute nightmare for traffic and not just at rush hour. Most houses have at least 2 cars and I know from the plans each one of these houses is supposed to have 1 parking space and a garage, that's potentially an extra 1300+ cars all coming down Danby, Howdale Road and Dunvegan Road each day, joining the already congested Salthouse Road and Robson Way. I hope no one is in a hurry as they won't be moving very fast. Traffic and Noise pollution will increase, not very environmentally friendly but hey the new houses will have the electric point shame very few people in Hull can afford an electric car!</p> <p>0 4) I think we can all agree we mainly have vehicles to commute to work, there are a number of work vans down the street including my husbands, they can't use the bus. I'm a working parent I cannot rely on buses (currently the bus takes 40 to 50 minutes to get into town that's with the bus lanes!). I drop my son off at the schools breakfast club at 7.30am and have to be at work for 8am (obviously I am always late due to the extremely bad traffic management in Hull and the fact that numerous roads are closed at the same time!). I cannot be late collecting him from school so have to time my journey to the last minute. A bus is out of the question, they are not reliable and it doesn't matter how many bus lanes you throw at us. They are unreliable due to the fact they stop at every bus stop along the way. Even with the bad traffic commuting in a car is still quicker. I know what you're going to say, why not use your bike. I'm sorry but most bikers are fair weather bikers what happens in the winter? I know we now have more bus lanes to use but I'm sorry I'm not taking any chances with a bus. If a car knocks me off whilst over taking I stand a chance of surviving but a bus? No thanks!</p>	<p>T1</p> <p>Flood1</p> <p>T2</p> <p>0</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
		<p>0 5) I appreciate you there are so many cars on Danby due to the lack of amenities and in the plans they are some on the new estate. What sort of amenities are they planning on building? Unless there is a supermarket people are still going to shop at supermarkets they need to drive to. Putting a couple of small shops on the estate will not have the desired effect. All it will do is encourage groups of youths to hang around the estate. If we need to pop to a local shop we have quite a few in the vicinity, The local garage has a shop, there is one on Dalsetter close near the school, there are a number in Sutton Village and Tweendykes. All of these are in walking distance and are well used by most of the estate.</p> <p>0 6) Schools, Doctors and Dentists are already oversubscribed with huge waiting lists and parents actually battling it out about school places. Where are all these extra students and patients going to go. How can the existing infrastructure cope with an extra 1300+ people?</p>	<p>LF1</p> <p>LF2</p>
EC476		<p>0 7) This is one of the last green spaces in this area, its home to various wildlife, birds, bats, various wild flowers and hedgerows . We have even seen a family of deer on these fields on numerous occasions. What will happen to all these?</p> <p>0 8) Nature and exercise helps with peoples mental health (Something Hull struggles with) and many people uses this area for these purposes. People work hard and have a lot going on in their lives being able to get back to nature without having to leave the city is fantastic and it's not only used by residents of Danby, Howdale and East Carr. Residents from Bransholme, Sutton Village, Sutton Park and even further reap the benefits of these fields and the surrounding areas.</p> <p>0 9) The plans suggest that the developers are wanting to create communal community areas which I appreciate, however by building these houses they are ruining our existing community and changing many people's lives and lifestyle. When HCC are already well above their building target I personally feel the Cons most definitely out way the Pros.</p>	<p>EE2</p> <p>OO</p> <p>Allocate1</p>
EC477	EC6	<p>Email 1</p> <p>0 I have a few issues I would like to raise about the planned housing on East Carr and why I am appalled that this is even being considered although I have heard that it's more or less a 'done deal' I am hoping this is not the case.</p> <p>0 This housing estate will have nothing but a detrimental effect on all who already live around this area as this is a much used natural habitat by a great many people. The space they are allocating to leave for a green space are Loglands Nature Reserve and one field next to the Hornsea track. Here are my issues with this :</p> <p>0 Many people, myself included, let dogs run free on walks on the present fields with enough space to socially distance which has become a part of life at the present time and for the foreseeable, this would not be possible on the field next to the track as there is not enough space and as there are mopeds, joggers and cycles going up and down the track at all times the dogs would chase them. Also, as a lot walk dogs early mornings to see the wildlife on the fields and to exercise in the peace and quiet, we would have to walk through the new housing estate to get there. Having a small garden as do many on Spring Cottage, my dogs don't have the room to run, so what should I do? Well maybe I should then drive them somewhere else to exercise but I don't have a big enough car so maybe I should buy a van, then I could drive a long distance to exercise them, which then defeats the object of a new estate being built that encourages the home owners to not have a car so as to promote cleaner living but at the same time, everyone else has to use their cars more because they have no green space to use.</p> <p>0 Then what about Loglands Nature Reserve? We walk down a track to get to it which is in itself a lovely scenic walk but this track is to be made into a major road for the planned housing estate so this will also be destroyed, again, leaving us residents with no enjoyable green space and no home for wildlife.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>OO</p> <p>0</p> <p>EE2</p> <p>T1</p>
EC478		0 Who are the people this proposed housing is aimed at?	OO

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
		<p>0 Eco friendly people who want a world without cars and to save the Earth by using a cycle instead of a car? Yet they are happy about a wildlife habitat being bulldozed and built over and everyone else having to use their cars to accommodate this?</p> <p>0 First time buyers? That's young couples who will want cars for social outings and work vans.</p> <p>0 Families? They will have cars to transport children to schools, activities, shopping.</p> <p>0 Middle aged couples? Children all grown up and moved out but will make regular visits in their cars with their own children.</p> <p>0 Older pensioners? Maybe don't want a car but will still have family visiting regularly in their cars, will maybe need ambulances which will have a restricted route to prevent the pollution of traffic.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p>
EC479		<p>0 Because of the proposed restricted car access due to 'eco friendly' planning, all these new residents and their visitors will park on the surrounding areas which do not have the capacity for this, making it a dangerous and extra fume filled environment for all the residents of Spring Cottage and Howdale Road. Adding extra to this is the proposed extended bus route spilling noise and fumes round the estate and dangerous traffic levels putting a great many lives at risk.</p> <p>0 Which ever way you look at this, it is not for anyones benefit, these are just excuses to build on green space and nothing what so ever 'eco' about the whole idea.</p>	<p>T2</p> <p>0</p>
EC480		<p>0 As this is apparently the only green space left to build on in Hull, what do you propose when this is gone? Where will the council plan to build the quota of housing each year when there is no space left to build on? They have to stop somewhere , for once could the council please listen to the residents and put a stop to this planned estate and let us keep our already natural eco friendly zone?</p> <p>0 Email 2</p> <p>0 I have previously emailed my reasons for my objections to this planned housing estate on the understanding that my email counts as an objection. I have filled and returned any objection forms sent and emailed anyone I can who is involved in this matter.</p> <p>0 The reason I am emailing again is because I feel so strongly opposed to this scheme as do a great many others but there are some that do not have the capabilities or confidence to do this and after some attending the consultations (of which I attended myself) felt upset, uncomfortable and made to feel belittled which I can quite understand as I would have felt that way myself if it wasn't for the fact I am a strong personality and after politely informing the 3 interviewees (as that was what the whole set up felt like) that I had only 10 min to have my say, I did not want to have that 10 min taken over by each of them telling me things I already knew (that is what I was there objecting about) and taking up my time so as not to give me a chance to speak. This was an appalling way to belittle people and I am disgusted with the way this was carried out. Not one of the 'interview' panel knew of the area or ever been there to see what the problems are. This again appalls me. I did not see one person take notes of what I was saying which leads me to believe they had no interest in my opinion or any others.</p>	<p>OO</p> <p>0</p> <p>OO</p> <p>Consult2</p>
EC481		<p>0 At the end of my consultation after giving very valid reasons on all my objections, the final word from one of the interviewees was " well, the property developers have got to make their money somewhere ".</p> <p>0 This is NOT a valid reason to build a housing development on highly valued green space and wildlife habitat and in an area which has no facilities or infrastructure to support yet more housing on an estate that I can guarantee not one of these so called 'considerate' property developers would ever live on themselves! They create concrete jungles, take their money and walk away to their nice big house and garden in a lovely spacious and clean area and leave the rest of us to live in the hell they create.</p> <p>0 As I am sure you can see, I still strongly object.</p>	<p>Consult3</p> <p>EE2</p> <p>OO</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
		0 Email 3 (Via councillor Healand) 0 Dear Councillor Healand,	0 0
EC482		0 I understand you are opposed to the planned housing and trying to assist the local residents in this matter? I for one, greatly appreciate this. I have sent you this copy of an email I have sent to Karl Turner and our local labour Councillors with a few issues I have with this development : 0 [repeat text from e-mail 1 above] 0 Via Leaflet circulated by Rhys Furley and Councillor Healand	OO 0 0
EC483	EC7	0 A bad Idea We live at Nordale Close and are very distressed to hear about the potential building of over 650 houses on the area to East Carr Road with an entry on Danby Close. 0 Howdale Road is already a very busy road with parking and buses and to increase the volume of traffic to this new site would be dangerous and cause a lot more congestion than there already it.	OO OO T2
EC484	EC8	0 There are already bottlenecks at Sutton Village/Leeds Road/Wawne Road roundabouts, the top of Howdale Road and Dunvegan Road and also going onto Holderness Road at the Diadem roundabout. To add further traffic to this busy area would be downright dangerous and cause massive tailbacks and at all areas. 0 If the new project could have an entrance and exit onto Kestrel Ave and bypass Howdale Road it would be better than adding further bus routes to already busy residential area, were children play out and the elderly walk. 0 We also moved to this area of Hull because we were right on top of lovely fields and walk ways to Hornsea, Great Highfield, etc and that would be taken away from us all. 0 Therefore we would like to add our objections to this site as being particular a bad idea. I have lived on Spring Cottage Estate since 1981, regarding the proposed planning on this land for 650 houses, people should realise this land has not been cultivated due to the land flooding, during winter months this land remains water even he golf course still floods, it happened last year, the council has put in place flood defences on the green field on Spring Cottage Est and the green field area off Howdale Road. There will be issues of flooding &	0 0 0 OO Flood1
EC485		0 I can't get house insurance with certain insurance companies due to this issue. Where will the water go, once built on. 0 The next issue will be traffic on East Carr road where due to people parking on one side of the road which they are entitled to do, you have to wait till on coming traffic before having access to travel on to Stornaway Square or Gleneagles housing Estate, if a proposed number of 650 houses are to be built, take in too account say average of 450 vehicles this will become a hazard even with access to Danny lane.	PC1 T2
EC486	EC9	0 There is also the issue of schools, Spring Cottage primary school is full, you cant access Spring Cottage at certain times of the day when the local school opens & closes due to the volume of traffic Hi, my Wife and I live on Princess Royal Park and we are very concerned by what the council is advocating, my first concern is the extra amount of Traffic on Salthouse Road, it is already over used with	LF2 T2
EC487		0 HGVs, Vans Cyclists, motorists and Motorcyclists already, now you (The Council) wants to add several hundreds more of Vehicles everyday, Stupidity is what I call it, I am a car drive of many years and sometimes I take my life in my hands to get out of Princess Royal Park, enough of traffic, so what a bout the FACT THAT YOU WILL BE BUILDING ON A FLOOD PLAIN. Which doesn't seem to bother you.	Flood1

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	EC10	<p>0 The excuse of needing more affordable houses is RUBBISH, the ones that are being built on Salthouse Road right now, they are standing empty, do you know why, because they are too expensive these house are certainly not Affordable houseing.I am almost sure that none of the council officers will contemplate buying a house within a flood plain area so why would expect Normal Folk too. These houses wouldn't be, being built for the Illegal Immigrants currently Residing in The Royal Station Hotel would they. Its about time that this council started worrying about the people that actually pay Poll Tax and treat them as good as you do the Benefit Wallahs of Hull.</p> <p>What makes you think this is a good practical idea when we cant get flood insurance for existing homes in the area now! Insurance companies already class this area as a great flood risk!</p> <p>0 "I don't believe it". See your turning me into Victor Meldrew</p>	<p>0</p> <p>PC1</p> <p>OO</p>
EC488	EC11	<p>Email 1 As a local resident living on Howdale Road, close to the site I wish to make you aware that I strongly object to the development in that the proposals will have a serious negative impact to the local area and the standard of living of the current residents. My specific objections are;</p> <p>0 Increased risk of flooding</p>	<p>OO</p> <p>OO</p> <p>0</p>
EC489		<p>0 Traffic generation and congestion</p> <p>0 Road access</p> <p>0 Highway safety</p> <p>0 Increase noise and disturbance</p>	<p>Flood1</p> <p>T1</p> <p>T2</p> <p>Construct1</p>
EC490		<p>0 Pollution</p> <p>0 Impact on the environment</p> <p>0 Impact on wildlife</p> <p>0 Loss of recreational/green space</p> <p>0 Pressure on local amenities, schools, doctors and dentists, etc.</p> <p>0</p> <p>0 Overlooking and loss of privacy</p> <p>0 Loss of visual amenity</p> <p>0 Please would you confirm whether the Local Plan was examined by the Planning Inspectorate back in 2017 when the site was allocated for housing or was the decision made at a local level? I also believe that plans for its inclusion go back a number of years prior to the allocation. If this is correct what were the reasons for the plans non-allocation prior to 2017 and what changed in 2017?</p> <p>0 Email 2 Via Councillor Healand</p> <p>0 As a local resident living on Howdale Road, close to the site I wish to make you aware that I strongly object to the development in that the proposals will have a serious negative impact to the local area and the standard of living of the current residents. My specific objections are as follow;</p> <p>0 Overlooking and loss of privacy</p>	<p>EE4</p> <p>EE2</p> <p>EE3</p> <p>LF1</p> <p>LF1</p> <p>0 LF2</p> <p>PC3</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>OO</p> <p>0</p>
EC491		<p>0 Loss of visual amenity</p> <p>0 Traffic generation and congestion</p> <p>0 Road access</p> <p>0 Highway safety</p> <p>0 Increase noise and disturbance</p> <p>0 Pollution</p> <p>0 Impact on the environment</p> <p>0 Impact on wildlife</p>	<p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p>
EC492		<p>0 Loss of recreational/green space</p> <p>0 Pressure on local amenities, schools, doctors and dentists, etc.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>0</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
EC493		0 Increased risk of flooding	0
EC494		0 I sincerely hope that the you take my objections on board when considering your own stance on the development and that you will make the necessary representations to ensure these proposals do not go ahead	0
EC495	EC12	Dunvegan Road and East Carr Road can't take anymore traffic it's a nightmare now trying to drive down East Carr its not wide enough. The fields flood in winter where will all that water go? Onto Spring Cottage. Not enough schools, doctors and shops to cope with 650 new homes, why not use the land on Bransholme on Wawne Road, its stood empty for years now. Leave us some green space so that people can use it as they do now.	T2 0 Flood1
EC496		0	0 LF1 0 LF2
EC497	EC13	0 I understand from your correspondence the Hull Local Plan was adopted in November 2017 and has been allocated for house development. We have lived in Danby Close since 1985 which is a quiet close of 46 houses. By definition a "Close" is a residential street without access.	0 EE2 Allocate1
EC498		0 We objected to the development of this land in 1994 and planning was denied due to environment issues and heavy traffic congestion via Danby Close and East Carr Road, this request was for 350 houses. What has changed, apart from more cars on the highway and global warming both very significant reasons for this planning not to go ahead.	0
EC499		0 The document states that objections where raised in 2017, whom by? What process was followed? Information was not sent to us regarding this proposal.	0
EC500		0 The population in Hull in 1994 was 308,000 it is now 259,778. Why more housing? Especially on green fields which have shown to be so important for wildlife, mental and physical wellbeing for all ages. 0 Climate change is a global problem more so than in 1994, we are experiencing more rainfall each year, in 2007 Howdale Road, Spring Cottage and surrounding areas experienced flooding. Where the development is proposed these fields hold water, this last year for up to 5 months. House insurance is not offered by all companies due to us already being on a floodplain.	Flood1
EC501		0 Highway safety, traffic generation and pollution will all be impacted on the proposed plan of 650 houses. 650 houses will create as a minimum of 650 cars plus work vehicles, this is a very conservative estimate, add to this daily visitors and the increased vehicles that online shopping has created, daily school runs and a proposed new bus route all via Danby Close, additionally refuse collections and emergency services all being accessed by Danby Close.	0 PC1 T1 0 T2
EC502		0 Spring Cottage school is already oversubscribed. Currently it is a problem to be able to see a GP in our area in a timely fashion.	LF2
EC503	EC14 Lovell Developments	Page 6: The document states it should be read as a Design Code. This makes it much more prescriptive than a simple guidance document. Clarity is therefore required - on Design Codes used historically the masterplan and content has been set in stone and had to be followed. How restrictive will this be? This is particularly important when considering the technical requirements for the delivery and how these have been factored into the design features being sought.	0

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
		<p>0 With regards to the flood risk and drainage suggested amendments in red with the original text struck out. Hull asked for 40% climate change in the meeting – SPD mentions 30%. Hull also require a further 10% for urban creep. Page 13 General comment – SUDS should be SuDS in line with current industry practice. Flood risk and drainage Guidance provided in this SPD should be read in conjunction with Hull City Council’s Living With Water SPD. It is recommended to divide the site/catchment into two cells: Yorkshire Water main drain systems; and the Environment Agency watercourse system. Surface water management will follow the hierarchical approach for disposal of surface water run-off. Consideration should firstly be given to discharge to soakaway/infiltration system, watercourse and public sewer in that priority order. The existing site drains to Suttoncross Drain and into Holderness Drain (designated as Main Rivers) and it is envisaged that run-off from the development will drain to these watercourses, but at a restricted rate. The restricted rate will be equivalent to the existing greenfield run-off rate as agreed with the Environment Agency and Hull City Council Flood Risk Management. Restricting the run-off to greenfield rates for the development mimics the existing site so as not to increase flood risk downstream. On-site surface water storage will be required and this will provided within the lowest parts of the site, to take advantage of existing natural topography. Surface water storage will also be provided throughout the SuDS and drainage systems across the site. For the purposes of modelling a run off rate of 3.5 litres per/sec applies to the site (greenfield). Overland flows and breach outcomes must be picked up in modelling for the Flood Risk Assessment that accompanies any future planning applications, as will details of the Flood Zone B area. Flood risk from all sources must be considered, including failure of defences and surface water overland flows from extreme storm events. There is a need for a consistent approach to flood management and the phasing of construction and drainage implementation throughout the site if multiple developers are involved. An holistic approach to Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS), both above and below ground, is expected with SUDS incorporated into the design of homes, streets and open space. SUDS are to be designed in line with the new Codes for Adoption so that Yorkshire Water can take on the role of maintaining the system. As such designs should take account of volumes for the 1 in 100 +30% for Climate Change rainfall events.</p>	0
		<p>0 SUDS should be integrated across the whole development wherever reasonably practicable possible i.e. within streets, pocket parks, tree pits, and boundary treatments. This holistic approach to SUDS will help take a proportion of the required storage volume. There is an opportunity to open the culverted drain in the southwest corner of the site. An 8m maintenance easement along all Main River watercourses is required by the Environment Agency, there is an opportunity to design this easement in such a way that provides a perimeter path/green corridor around the site encouraging pedestrian and cycle movements, and linked to surrounding open space and the Trans Pennine Way cycle route. In terms of building design all facility buildings to utilise store and reuse methods whilst it is expected that as a minimum all houses will be installed with water butts, the volume of which is to be agreed with Hull City Council Flood Risk Management Team.</p>	0
		<p>0 Page 16: Highway improvements to be funded - how much, what improvements and what developments will contribute - clarity required for viability purposes.</p>	0
		<p>0 Figure 6: The number of roads shown to the outer perimeter of the development and along green corridors serving plots on only one side is excessive and could be commercially unviable. The route alongside the central hedge should be shown as a pedestrian/cycle rather than vehicle.</p>	0
		<p>0 Page 23: Where reasonably practicable and adoption and maintenance protocols will allow, SuDS zones will be incorporated between the footpaths and carriageway and will include features such as street trees in cell systems and rain gardens. Private frontages to the buildings must be a minimum of 2m but this can be extended as appropriate.</p>	0

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
EC504		0 Page 24: SUD zones on the peripheries of the site - if we are going with PD's rather than single sided streets how does this work - will it be resident's responsibilities.	0
EC505		<p>0 The street section and description (carriageway, 2 footways and cycleway) is a costly solution which may affect viability. There needs to be flexibility to use a range of different arrangements on the site perimeter and against existing hedges. The following should therefore be incorporated: - Where reasonably practicable and adoption and maintenance protocols will allow.....</p> <p>0 Page 25 SuDS systems within the streets – need to add in somewhere SuDS streets will be incorporated where reasonably practicable, where adoption and maintenance protocols will allow and where access for maintenance can be incorporated. SuDS features on the cross section need to be a depression / shallow swale – not a mound.</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p>	0
EC506	Pleased to see that Flood Zone 3b will be kept as undeveloped open space.	Comment noted	See above No change to SPD required.
Environment Agency	Holderness Drain is at capacity, therefore discharge to Holderness Drain will only permitted if there is an existing connection to the site, and the proposed discharge rate is lower than the existing.	Agree. Suttoncross and East Carr Drains and the existing land already discharge to Holderness Drain so any development of the land will need to mimic existing drainage and comply with drainage rates requested by the EA and HCC. We would not accept any surface water from the site into the sewer system to the west as no water currently discharges in this direction.	No change to SPD required.
	Policy 39 of the local plan suggests a 1.4l/s/ha greenfield runoff rate, this SPD states 3.5 l/s. What is the reason behind the difference?	This SPD relates to a more recent HCC SPD (4) which was produced jointly with Yorkshire Water. The rate of 3.5 is actually a litre per second rate for the whole site, regardless of size rather than per hectare. The reason for this is because the majority of surface water from new development in Hull discharges into the sewer system, which is at capacity. Reducing run-off rates down to 3.5 l/s for large sites is stringent but achievable if proper sustainable drainage with multiple benefits are utilised. For small sites it was impractical to achieve the 1.4l/s/ha, as to restrict flows to this extent meant the solutions used were easily blocked and needed extensive maintenance. If this site was to discharge to the sewer system a rate of 3.5l/s would be required for the whole development rather than greenfield run-off rates.	No change to SPD required.
	We fully support the inclusion of suds/planting/gardens. Will there be anything written in to property deeds or similar to ensure these features are retained to ensure the future sustainability of the scheme? Time and time again we see green features paved over, if the suds features proposed are part of a holistic approach then these should be secured for the lifetime of the development.	Noted. The Living with Water partnership aims to raise awareness of flooding and the steps everyone can take to reduce their own risk, including planting and using permeable surfaces for drives and patios. Until we get to this stage we have to ensure that any sustainable drainage features, such as the ones in the SPD are within the public realm such as the open spaces or adjacent to highways to ensure that they can be adopted and maintained.	No change to SPD required.
	Any proposal will be sense checked with our future modelling scenarios to ensure they're both acceptable now and after the schemes have been delivered.	Noted and we strongly support this stance.	No change to SPD required.

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>There is no mention of the Hull SFRA 2016. We recommend this is included and that this document is read in conjunction with the Hull SFRA 2016 red cell guidance. This should then cover the requirement to follow local guidance on mitigation requirements.</p> <p>The SPD discusses potential de-culverting and an 8m easement for a walkway. It should be included that "The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 require a permit to be obtained for any activities which will take place on or within 8 metres of a main river (16 metres if tidal)".</p>	<p>Agree to amend text to include rference to SFRA 2016</p> <p>Agree to add a reference to this</p>	<p>in section 3 after "guidance in this SPD should be read in conjunction with Hull City Council's Living with Water SPD" add: and the Council's detailed level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment which has modelled the flood risk to the city in greater detail than the national mapping. http://www.hull.gov.uk/environment/adverse-weather/strategic-flood-risk-assessment</p> <p>Add following text to the end of the final paragraph in section 3, ' Please note: The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 require a permit to be obtained for any activities which will take place on or within 8 metres of a main river (16 metres if tidal)'.</p>
EC507	I grew up on spring cottage from been four and a half when it was surrounded by fields I've also lived down Danby close where I had my three girls the eldest now 32 in now back on Stromness Way for the last 20yrs .As I've spent most if my life in the area I value the countryside and wildlife that surround it ,it would be heartbreaking to see it disappear.Also the East Carr rd entrance would be horrendous theres accidents there already no more traffic is needed	See EE2 (Environmental value) above	No change to SPD required.
EC508	Changing this quiet close into a main road the road won't be able to cope with the extra traffic and 20 buses per hour the parking at.times is bad enough without considering buses. Wing mirrors.will.be lost daily. East Carr Road has restricted view when your driving down there, again parked cars, so extra traffic it wont cope.	See T1 (Traffic access) above	The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required
EC509	I live on Danby Close and do not want the cul-de-sac turning into a main road and bus route. Not to mention the increased traffic on the whole estate and the damage done to the wildlife that live on those fields. The local amenities especially schools and doctors cannot cope with the numbers as it is without the increase of a possible 1200 extra people.	<p>See T1 (Traffic access) above</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>See EE2 (Environmental value) above</p> <p>See LF2 (School capacity) above</p> <p>See LF1 (Local Services) above</p>	<p>The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required</p> <p>See above</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
EC510	I think howdale road housing is already big enough we have been on nice walks around the area where you are planning on building and there is loads of lovely wildlife on there also not enough schools to accommodate more children	See EE2 (Ecological value) above See LF2 (School capacity) above	A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site See above
EC511 resident	Cyprus To stop further traffic conditions, prevent further flooding, protection of open space, stop further pollution of this city	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC512	I am a local resident who does not want homes built in vulnerable to flood areas	See Flood1 (Flooding) above	See above
EC513 UK resident	Too many house building sites in Hull at the moment and don't need anymore . There won't be any green areas in the city soon	See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above	No change to SPD required.
EC514	Name, but no comment was given	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC515	The local school is already over subscribed- where do Hull CC plan on educating the children that move into these proposed houses? Traffic down Dunvegan Rd is heavy - how will adding more cars and buses keep those that currently live around here safe? Over the last two years, flooding around the Holderness Drain area has increased-and you're proposing to cover an absorbent field with concrete?!!	See LF2 (School capacity) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above	See above See above See above
EC516	The roads are already congested by vehicles poluting the air. Where are the children going to go to school, what about medical facilities it's hard enough in this area to get a doctor's appointment. And finally your going to destroy a Green space full of birds, insects and wild plants used by the community for outdoor recreation. My answer is an emphatic NO.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See LF2 (School capacity) above See LF1 (Local Services) above See EE2 (Ecological value) above	See above See above A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site
EC517 resident	UK I want the land to remain countryside and not a built up area affecting many people who bought their because they like the countryside to go for walks and take dogs and house price depreciation of ending up in the middle of a concrete jungle	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC518 Aldbrough Resident	Such areas as this should be kept green, places for our children and their children to enjoy and learn. Use brown fill sites for housing!	See Allocate2 (Focus on brownfield) above	No change to SPD required
EC519	There is already a high volume of traffic for such a small road. There has been an increase in traffic accidents over the last few years. This is the only green area left in this area and is used by many and homes lots of wildlife. We also need it to remain as a floodplain to protect people's homes.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
		See EE2 (Ecological value) above	A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site
		See Flood1 (Flooding) above	See above
EC520	The draw of living here was the fresh, clean, country air for our children to grow up in, the absence of traffic noise, and the feel of living in a peaceful village setting, whilst being in such close proximity to the open countryside, which we're very blessed to appreciate every day. Not to mention the beautiful array of wildlife we see here. This will all be lost if this development goes ahead, not to mention the already full to capacity primary school places and the added flood	See EE2 (Environmental value) above	No change to SPD required.
		See Flood1 (Flooding) above	See above
EC521 resident	UK Save our environment, wildlife, head space and flood risk area	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC522	They well be no wildlife fields or farming left if this carries on. The schools are already over populated in this area. Absolutely disgusting the lot of it."	See EE2 (Environmental value) above	No change to SPD required.
		See LF2 (School capacity) above	See above
EC523	It's wrong!!!	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC524	This land had visible standing water on it from October to April last winter as it seems to have most winters. It doesn't matter what they put in place drainage wise or if they give the scheme a fancy name (SUD sustainable urban drainage). developing this land may cause more flooding problems to existing properties in the area with some already unable to insure for flooding, other concerns are loss of a wonderful wildlife habitat, schools already over subscribed, no amenities so area already very car dependent, the idea that people will not want cars and will use public transport or walk/cycle is fanciful and increased traffic on already congested roads.	See Flood1 (Flooding) above	See above
		See EE2 (Ecological value) above	A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site
		See LF2 (School capacity) above	See above
		See LF1 (Local Services) above	See above
		See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
EC525	We need to preserve all the green space we can! Without nature there is no us!	See EE2 (Environmental value) above	No change to SPD required.
EC526	The impact on the local area and residents down Danby Close. This will bring a huge amount of traffic down a quiet street that will not cope with the amount of work and resident vehicles.	See EE2 (Environmental value) above	No change to SPD required.
		See T1 (Traffic access) above	The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
EC527 Bridgenorth Resident	Flooding and environmental issues - leave the green space for wildlife and people to enjoy.	See EE2 (Environmental value) above	No change to SPD required.
EC528	This is marsh land full of wildlife, the local infrastructure cannot take added pressure, use empty city centre land instead	See Flood1 (Flooding) above See EE2 (Environmental value) above See LF1 (Local Services) above See Allocate2 (Focus on brownfield) above	See above No change to SPD required. See above No change to SPD required
EC529 resident	UK They could develop these spaces to bring community projects, education, good health and environmental issues such as flood defences by planting, growing and teaching generations to respect our beautiful spaces, wildlife and environment. I'm sure the community would love to be involved at expanding knowledge and growth on our amazing spaces. Please don't build and take away our headspace and countryside that we love, let's develop it to expand our natural beautiful spaces for everyone to enjoy for future generations.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC530	Houses and business will get flooded	See Flood1 (Flooding) above	See above
EC531	The idea of building houses on Marsh flood plains is irresponsible and the 1300 cars it would create on the roads around already very very congested roads is madness I could go on but putting it in a letter	See Flood1 (Flooding) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above See above
EC532	I've already written to the councillors about this development. More unnecessary loss of wildlife when we have brownfield sites unused. Plant trees not houses!	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC533	This land is enjoyed daily by many people. It is good for people's mental health to have that piece of countryside on their doorstep, as well as for health reasons. East Carr Road is already hard to drive down due to traffic and parking, I have witnessed numerous near misses regarding traffic.	See EE2 (Environmental value) above See T1 (Traffic access) above	No change to SPD required. The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required
EC534	Build on brown field land and empty properties	See Allocate2 (Focus on brownfield) above	No change to SPD required
EC535	I live close by and this will cause heavy traffic disruption. The planned access roads to the planned estate run through a small residential street and a quiet lane. This will also cause problems for the local primary school which is already over subscribed.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See T1 (Traffic access) above See LF2 (School capacity) above	See above The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required See above
EC536	We need to keep wildlife areas and it's beautiful why spoil it with houses- find somewhere else- where there would be less wildlife.	See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above	No change to SPD required.
EC537	This development will cause heavy traffic disruption to a quiet residential area. It was also cause problems for the local primary school which is already over subscribed.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See LF2 (School capacity) above	See above See above
EC538	Where next ...	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC539	There are sufficient houses already built, plenty standing empty, the council should take steps to make these houses habitable before building more, in already congested areas	See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above	No change to SPD required.

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
EC540	It will be one of the last green areas left around East Hull. Also all the wildlife will suffer especially the ducks, as they will miss the pond when the field floods severely.	See EE2 (Ecological value) above	A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site
EC541	It would be an absolute disaster for the area. The traffic would be horrendous. The local schools could not support this many houses.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See LF2 (School capacity) above	See above See above
EC542	Because there are existing Brownfield sites in Hull, why encroach further into open countryside?	See Allocate2 (Focus on brownfield) above	No change to SPD required
EC543	I often use these fields for camping and star gazing with my telescope,	Whilst the council is aware that many people use the fields for dog walking and recreation, there is no public right of way or official public access onto these fields	No change to SPD required.
EC544	We, and I'm sure many others, moved here because East Carr was a nice quiet road and we loved the fact that the fields were a minute's walk away. Not to mention the horrendous traffic problems and dangers this would cause, we are also about to experience a huge mental health crisis due to this pandemic and you are considering taking away the open green space that is a mental health lifeline for many. LEAVE OUR GREEN SPACE ALONE. I do not want hundreds of cars passing my house, it was never meant to be a main road to anywhere.	Whilst the council is aware that many people use the fields for dog walking and recreation, there is no public right of way or official public access onto these fields See T1 (Traffic access) above	No change to SPD required. The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required
EC545	Lovely green area where I enjoy walking with my dogs and family. Please don't turn it into another concrete jungle	Whilst the council is aware that many people use the fields for dog walking and recreation, there is no public right of way or official public access onto these fields	No change to SPD required.
EC546	Infrastructure isn't adequate. Schools already over subscribed. Access to a new housing estate through a cul-de-sac is totally unacceptable and an invasion of privacy for existing residents.	See LF1 (Local Services) above See LF2 (School capacity) above See T1 (Traffic access) above See PC3 (Loss of outlook / privacy) above	See above See above The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required See above
EC547	I think people who already live in the area should have a say about their environment!	See EE2 (Environmental value) above	No change to SPD required.
EC548	When will it all stop . There's hardly any greenfield left . It's going to be one big housing estate . Think family planning would be a better idea and stop trying to house the world	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC549	this area floods when it rains	See Flood1 (Flooding) above	See above
EC550	If it's already prone to flooding what is the sense of building houses on this green land. Leave the area alone for the good of wild life and man	See Flood1 (Flooding) above	See above
EC551	Traffic flow and no capacity for schools	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See LF2 (School capacity) above	See above See above
EC552	I do not believe that there is enough room in the school to accommodate the children from these houses and no room to expand also the traffic down east carr road and dunvegan road is horrendous at the best of times getting off the estate at 8.30 to 9.00 in a morning is ridiculous	See LF2 (School capacity) above	See above

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
		See T1 (Traffic access) above	The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required
EC553	Environmental, wildlife protection, flooding, the traffic situation is already a problem in the East Carr area. There is tremendous pressure on schools in the area. The issue with flooding & how this will effect future residents will be horrendous, the council needs to remember this was called Carr land for a reason, the ground floods regularly and the drainage system is totally inadequate. Even with the large drain in existence the environmental department doesn't manage it properly, the drain isn't regularly dredged & local people & farmers suffer large losses due to the flooding. Common sense should prevail.	<p>See EE2 (Environmental value) above</p> <p>See EE2 (Ecological value) above</p> <p>See LF2 (School capacity) above See T1 (Traffic access) above</p> <p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p>	<p>No change to SPD required.</p> <p>A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site See above The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required See above</p>
EC554 Preston Resident	Stop building on beautiful green land people use and form wildlife	See EE2 (Environmental value) above	No change to SPD required.
EC555	Need more green spaces to enjoy in our local areas.	See EE2 (Environmental value) above	No change to SPD required.
EC556	It's a flood plain and hull floods enough without pushing this water elsewhere. Flood plains are there for a reason.	See Flood1 (Flooding) above	See above
EC557	We need green spaces	See EE2 (Environmental value) above	No change to SPD required.
EC558 London Resident	We need green space	See EE2 (Environmental value) above	No change to SPD required.
EC559 Australian Resident	I was born and grew up in Hull, moving away in 2007. My nana lived on Spring Cottage in her later years and I remember this area as one of the few green areas left in Hull.Please do not build on this land.	See EE2 (Environmental value) above	No change to SPD required.
EC560	We moved down East Carr Road because it was a quiet road, and because we have the lovely green area just a minute's walk away. Building on those fields will cause horrendous traffic and pollution, I do not want my road to become a thoroughfare for hundreds of cars, neither do the residents of Danby Close. LEAVE OUR GREEN SPACES ALONE!! Those fields are used by so many people, escaping the stresses of everyday life. Green spaces are VITAL for mental and physical well-being. I strongly oppose this proposal."	<p>See T1 (Traffic access) above</p> <p>Whilst the council is aware that many people use the fields for dog walking and recreation, there is no public right of way or official public access onto these fields</p>	<p>The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required</p> <p>No change to SPD required.</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
EC561 Burstwick Resident	The wildlife of around and we need areas like this x	See EE2 (Ecological value) above	A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site
EC562	By definition a "Close" is a residential street without access. When planning was refused in 1994 the population in Hull was 308,000 it is now 259,778 therefore why more housing especially on green fields which have shown to be so important for wildlife, mental and physical wellbeing for all ages. Climate change is a global problem, we are experiencing more rainfall each year, in 2007 Howdale Road and Spring Cottage experienced flooding, the green fields where the proposed development holds water this last year for up to 5 months. House insurance is not offered by all companies due to us already being on a floodplain. Highway safety, traffic generation and pollution 650 houses will is a very conservative estimate. Daily school runs. The proposed new route for the bus will enter and exit the proposed new development 6 times per hour. Refuse collections. Emergency services Amenties Spring Cottage school is already oversubscribed Currently it is a problem to be abl	Already answered in EC13	No change to SPD required.
EC563	We need to keep green space especially as Hull is becoming more urbanised.	See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above	No change to SPD required.
EC564	This is a crazy decision on every level. The area already suffers with a lot of congestion and I don't believe this is the right move in adding to more risk of incidents in the area. Additional to this, this land provides for local livestock in the area and is used by many people for all kinds of leisure.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above There has been no livestock on the fields for a number of years, and whilst the council is aware that many people use the fields for dog walking and recreation, there is no public right of way or official public access onto these fields	See above No change to SPD required.
EC565	Green spaces in urban areas are precious.	See EE2 (Environmental value) above	No change to SPD required.
EC566	There are so many brown field lands that could be used instead, hope about almost the whole of Preston road for example? I don't know how many homes used to be there but surely over 50 or maybe 70? Use the Land you have! Stop destroying natural Habitats. The infrastructure already exists on preston road too...	See Allocate2 (Focus on brownfield) above	No change to SPD required
EC567 Resident	UK My daughter has just bought a house down Danny and parking is already difficult enough when I visit, the street is congested already without this becoming an access to 620 new houses	See T1 (Traffic access) above	The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required
EC568	Green belt land being built on again out on.	Hull doesn't have a green belt.	No change to SPD required.
EC569	My mum uses this all the time to walk her dog, so peaceful	Whilst the council is aware that many people use the fields for dog walking and recreation, there is no public right of way or official public access onto these fields	No change to SPD required.
EC570	There's plenty of land to build modern houses on withing the city. (Preston Road area) No need to build on the green belt.	See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above Hull doesn't have a green belt.	No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required.
EC571	Already too many empty houses. We need our green fields to help out mental health. Kids need to be able to see wildlife. How sad if we live in a fully urban areas.	See EE2 (Environmental value) above	No change to SPD required.
EC572	We can't afford to lose more green field sites. The City Council should be re developing brown field sites in the city centre, docks and old industrial locations. Losing all that wildlife would be criminal. Roads are already at capacity without the traffic generated by 650 homes.	See Allocate2 (Focus on brownfield) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	No change to SPD required See above

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
EC573	There is enough spaces with the city to build, grassland were houses once stud and waist land were factories once stud, no need to spead the city out even more, its deprived enough!!!	See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above	No change to SPD required.
EC574	Having happily grown up in East Hull in the years before the awful floods, it seems absolute madness to even consider building more homes in a known regularly flooded area. Also, East Hull residents are not generally affluent and this could be a valuable resource for free exercise etc.	See Flood1 (Flooding) above Whilst the council is aware that many people use the fields for dog walking and recreation, there is no public right of way or official public access onto these fields	See above No change to SPD required.
EC575 Hedon Resident	We need green belt areas	Hull doesn't have a green belt.	No change to SPD required.
EC576 Wallington Resident	This is flood plain land and also marsh land. To build here could be disastrous for the existing housing nearby who already have foundations built on rafts. It risks disturbing that when they try to bring in water supply and power. The access roads will cause chaos, I am concerned about the the lack of transparency over what is truly planned here regarding amenities - dig deeper and there is much more to this. The fact that it is being touted as just a few houses is concerning enough for me to sign this and to share far and wide!	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC577	The houses in this area are already at risk from flooding and this development will only increase the risk. This is Hull City Council looking at ways of making extra revenue without thinking of the full impact on the already overstretched infrastructure of the area.	See Flood1 (Flooding) above This site is in private ownership and will be brought forward a housebuilder. It is not Council led development.	See above No change to SPD required.
EC578 Bilton Resident	Need to keep green space . What will happen if floods like 2007, can't believe building on a flood plane again!!	See Flood1 (Flooding) above	See above
EC579 Howden Resident	There isn't much green space left for wildlife around Hull. Houses should be built on brown sites not green sites.	See Allocate2 (Focus on brownfield) above	No change to SPD required
EC580	It's a crying shame to build on this flood plane forcing the wildlife away. This is a quiet peaceful area and we want to keep it that way.	See EE2 (Ecological value) above	A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site
EC581	I have friends on this street who I visit regularly, they are classed as vulnerable and during the recent outbreak I was having to bring supplies and medicine as they were not allowed out, I know only too well how bad it is to drive along this street and parking most of the time is difficult and at points impossible, this street is only wide enough for 2 car to pass each other but once you add in parked cars or large work vans and a blind corner you struggle to squeeze an average sizes car around the street and frequently have very near misses with other cars coming into or out of the street, more houses will not help this area it will make this street an accident hotspot	See T1 (Traffic access) above	The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required
EC582	I grew up on Spring Cottage and this was and still is a wonderful green space. Leave it be.	See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above	No change to SPD required.
EC583	I agree Simon, brown field sites first, and there are plenty of them.	See Allocate2 (Focus on brownfield) above	No change to SPD required
EC584	Have family living on Spring Cottage. Keep the green space for future generations.	See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above	No change to SPD required.
EC585 Swanland Resident	We lived next to this field in the 90s and successfully campaigned against building there at the time. John Prescott was very helpful with our efforts. Good luck to all involved	See Allocate3 (What has changed since 1994) above	No change to SPD required
EC586	Stupid plan to build on flood plain land.	See Flood1 (Flooding) above	See above

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
EC587 Australian Resident	Leave the green belt alone... children and wildlife need this areaif it's allowed to become a concrete jungle it will be lost to them forever.	Hull doesn't have a green belt, and whilst the council is aware that many people use the fields for dog walking and recreation, there is no public right of way or official public access onto these fields	No change to SPD required.
EC588	Leave the green belt alone. Redevelop the brownfield sites on North Hull and Preston Road first if there is such a pressing need for housing.	Hull doesn't have a green belt See Allocate2 (Focus on brownfield) above	No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required
EC589	Roads aren't designed for the mass increase in traffic. There are no zebra crossings and the local school is over subscribed. Buses? Increase noise, wildlife disturbed, flooding already occurs	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See LF2 (School capacity) above See EE2 (Ecological value) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above	See above See above A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site See above
EC590	Have looked back at the original council documentation from 2017. The plan is for 1450 homes in total!!! The 650 is the initial build only, with the plans outlining additional properties during the 10 year build! Yes, 10 years!! Transparency please Hull City Council.	The land is allocated in the Local Plan for 702 houses and the SPD promotes a figure slightly below that.	No change to SPD required.
EC591	I am signing because this is the last green space in East Hull. It is enjoyed by many locals who love to walk & cycle in the area. During COVID-19 as we were unable to drive anywhere this gave us vital access to countryside & provided us with essential area to Exercise & enrich our life's. We do not have any remaining green belts left in the East of the city especially now the fields have been built on from Wawne Rd all the way to Kingswood & beyond . The East Carr green belt is rich habit which supports a variety of ecosystems & wildlife including finches, kestrel, owls. Deer, hare, bats badgers even possibly otters, protected under the Wildlife and countryside act 1981, which are returning to our waterways, many of which other water mammals exist in this area water voles? Along with the hedgerows & trees. Any mitigation's usually agreed to as part of a development ie trees & green space are never enough to support the loss of natural habit & this development should not try to suggest it can mitigat"	Whilst the council is aware that many people use the fields for dog walking and recreation, there is no public right of way or official public access onto these fields The proposed site is part of a much larger swathe of open land running along the eastern boundary of the city. See EE2 (Ecological value) above	No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required. A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site
EC592	This was a duplicate of EC591 by the same person	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC593	I am a resident of Spring Cottage and I strongly oppose this development.... it will reduce the natural environment and wildlife as well as exacerbate an already high level of traffic that has already caused accidents , due to its volume	See EE2 (Environmental value) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	No change to SPD required. See above
EC594	Green space is also important	See EE2 (Environmental value) above	No change to SPD required.
EC595 Cottingham Resident	The roads around this proposed development already suffer from on-street parking that affects the free flow of traffic. Adding a potential 1300 vehicles will only create further congestion, plus more vehicles will add to the difficulty of exiting the eastern side of Howdale Road onto Saltshouse Road especially at peak times. Noise pollution and traffic fumes will effect the environment and wildlife habitats will also be lost. Hull City Council should be looking to redevelop brownfield sites rather than one of the few remaining greenfield sites left in the City.	See T1 (Traffic access) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required See above

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
		See EE4 (Pollution) above See EE2 (Environmental value) above See Allocate2 (Focus on brownfield) above	No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required
EC596	East Carr Fields is one of the very few green, recreational sites in the area and as such it should be retained. The area is prone to flooding and is totally unsuitable for housing. The infrastructure is not built to cope with a large increase of housing on this scale.	Whilst the council is aware that many people use the fields for dog walking and recreation, there is no public right of way or official public access onto these fields See Flood1 (Flooding) above See LF1 (Local Services) above	No change to SPD required. See above See above
EC597 Leeds Resident	Too many green fields are being built on. People need places to walk. Thought that was the government's new mantra exercise	Whilst the council is aware that many people use the fields for dog walking and recreation, there is no public right of way or official public access onto these fields	No change to SPD required.
EC598 Driffield Resident	The traffic will not cope.leave this beautiful greeny alone.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
EC599	Enough houses to much traffic already	See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above	No change to SPD required.
EC600 Shrewsbury Resident	STUPID IDEA ON A FLOOD RISK SITE ! IDIOT COUNCIL . WE ARE SUPPOSED TO BE MITIGATING FLOOD DAMAGE BY NOT NOT NOT BUILDING ON THESE AREAS !	See Flood1 (Flooding) above	See above
EC601 Derby Resident	I may not live in the area but have, along with many others, seen the stupidity of building on flood plains and the subsequent damage to property, and the wider area.	See Flood1 (Flooding) above	See above
EC602	Traffic problem	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
EC603 Epsom Resident	My biggest concerns are the risk of flooding and Danby Close becoming a main bus route. An area that is already at risk of flooding and affected with higher home insurance costs Is going to get worse. This lovely quiet close will not be able to withstand the extra traffic or the buses going up and down it potentially every 10-20 minutes.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC604	The whole area is at capacity for a safe and functional existence. Just because there is a green field it doesn't make it viable to dump another 650 houses on it. Each with an average of 4 people! 2,600 people. NO.	See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above	No change to SPD required.
EC605	We don't need more housing on our GREEN areas.	See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above	No change to SPD required.
EC606	We need our green spaces.	See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above	No change to SPD required.
EC607	I live close by and there are already houses being built on the old ings estate. Too many houses will denigrate the area.	See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above	No change to SPD required.
EC608	Building here won't be good for the environment and is destroying natural habitat for wildlife	See EE2 (Environmental value) above	No change to SPD required.
EC609	I am a resident on Howdale Road near one of the proposed entrances. I am very concerned about the increased level of traffic, the loss of green space, impact on local services and increased risk of flooding this development could bring. The traffic is already busy coming into both Howdale entrances from Saltshouse Rd.	See T1 (Traffic access) above See EE2 (Environmental value) above See LF1 (Local Services) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required No change to SPD required. See above See above See above
EC610	We need the green land. Build on the waste land of Preston Road isn't that why the houses were knocked down in the first place.	See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above	No change to SPD required.
EC611	because it is an ill thought out Project.	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC612	Please leave our green spaces alone! If it floods every winter then it's unsuitable for houses anyway.	See Flood1 (Flooding) above	See above

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
EC613	Already pay heavy price for insurances, living in a high flood risk area Lived here 29 yrs had subsidence, years ago had had prices to pay for years relating to this plus insurance wouldn't touch us. Already suffer traffic congestion in and around Howdale area's road not suitable for more heavy goods traffic buses, schools over crowded loss of wildlife and habitat	See PC1 (Home insurance) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See LF2 (School capacity) above See EE2 (Ecological value) above	See above See above See above A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site
EC614	Because I live here, and love the wildlife	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC615	It will cause this area to be too busy as it already is its bad enough !!	Comment noted	No change to SPD required.
EC616	I agree with comments expressed by local residents that the area has not got the infrastructure to support such a large development; there is already too much traffic and the land is not suitable for housing, it is regularly flooded. A really bad proposal!	See LF1 (Local Services) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above	See above See above See above
EC617	Local traffic in the area is already too heavy at peak times, this will only add to the problem. The roads leading to the centre are not fit to cope with the added traffic from these houses.	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
EC618	Because it's not fair on the dog rescue near this it's also it stops floods it would be wrong to build houses on here	See LF5 (Dog rescue centre) above See Flood1 (Flooding) above	See above See above
EC619	The roads in the area won't be able to cope with the extra traffic	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
EC620	I live on spring cottage, the roads are already a nightmare, i moved around here as it is quiet, an it wasn't a cut through...so doesn't attract crime and anti social behaviour, from the passers by, also love the green space around were i live an its going to be an absolute travesty to loose it, just for some fat cat in the office, to get even fatter...it will effect house prices and everything.	Comment noted See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above See PC4 (Property value) above	No change to SPD required. No change to SPD required. See above
EC621	It is a lovely green belt which is enjoyed by the whole community. HCC should focus on developing the numerous brownfield sites around the city!	See Allocate2 (Focus on brownfield) above	No change to SPD required
EC622	Wild life matters	See EE2 (Ecological value) above	A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site
EC623	It's a flood plane and nothingvshould be built there	See Flood1 (Flooding) above	See above
EC624	There are plenty of brown sites available. The traffic through put will be horrendous. The area is very prone to flooding. It will affect the nearby nature reserve	See Allocate2 (Focus on brownfield) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	No change to SPD required See above

Rep Ref	Representation	HCC response	HCC action
		See Flood1 (Flooding) above See EE2 (Ecological value) above	See above A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site
EC625	Big worry about floods in the area if this land is built on	See Flood1 (Flooding) above	See above

Representa HCC respor HCC action

Size / princ See Allocat No change to SPD required.

Design The relatio No change to SPD required

Access (Dai See T1 (Tra The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required

Loss of ligh See PC2 (Lc See above

Property va See PC4 (Pr See above

Flooding See Flood1 See above

Home insur See PC1 (H See above

Access (Dai See T1 (Tra The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required

0 0 0

School cap: See LF2 (Sc See above

0 0 0

Ecological \ See EE2 (Ec A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site

0 0 0

Ecological \ See EE2 (Ec A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site

0 Whilst the 0

0 0 0

Pollution See EE4 (Pc No change to SPD required.

0 0 0

Flooding See Flood1 See above

0 0 0

0 0 0

Access (Dai See T1 (Tra The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required

0 0 0

Wider traff See T1 (tra See above

0 See T2 (wic 0

0 0 0

0 0 0

0 0 0

Local servic See LF1 (Lo See above

Local servic See LF1 (Lo See above

School cap See LF2 (Sc See above

Dog rescue See LF5 (Dc See above

Maintenan See LF4 (M See above

0 0 0

Loss of out See PC3 (Lc See above

Constructic See Constr No change to SPD required

Environme See EE2 (Er No change to SPD required.

Property v See PC4 (Pr See above

Focus on bi See Allocat No change to SPD required

0 0 0

Other Com Comment r No change to SPD required.

0 0 0

What has c See Allocat No change to SPD required

Environme See EE1 ab No change to SPD required

Access (Da See T1 (tra The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required

0 0 0

Flooding See Flood1 See above
0 0 0

Local servic The SPD wi SPD will be amended to reflect closed surgeries

School cap: See LF2 (Sc See above

Poor consu See Consul No change to SPD required

0 0 0
0 0 0

Flooding See Flood1 See above

Wider traff See T2 (wic See above

Poor consu Further cor No change to SPD required

Flooding See Flood1 See above

Access (Dai See T1 (Tra The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required

Wider traff See T2 (Wic See above

School cap: See LF2 (Sc See above

Local servic See LF1 (Lo See above

Local servic See LF1 (Lo See above

Flooding See Flood1 See above

Home insu See PC1 (H See above

Wider traff See T2 (Wic See above

Pollution See EE4 (Pc No change to SPD required.

Focus on bi See Allocat No change to SPD required

Environme See EE1 (EI No change to SPD required

Environment: See EE2 (Er) No change to SPD required.

Ecological: See EE2 (Ec) A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site

Access (Dai): See T1 (Tra) The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required

Wider traffic: See T2 (Wic) See above

Pollution: See EE4 (Pc) No change to SPD required.

Loss of out: See PC3 (Lc) See above

Local services: See LF1 (Lo) See above

School capacity: See LF2 (Sc) See above

Local services: See LF1 (Lo) See above

0 0 0

Access (Dai): See T1 (tra) The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required

Flooding: See Flood1 See above

Wider traffic: See T2 (wic) See above

0 Comment r 0

Local servic See LF1 (Lo See above

School cap: See LF2 (Sc See above

Environme See EE2 (Er No change to SPD required.

0 See EE2 (er 0

Size / princ See Allocat No change to SPD required.

0 0 0

Other Com Comment r No change to SPD required.

0 Comment r 0

Environme See EE2 (Er No change to SPD required.

Access (Da Although tl Amend SPD to make reference to maintaining / improving routes to Loglands Nature Reserve.

Other Com This is a m: No change to SPD required.

0 As with any 0

0 Comment r 0

0 Comment r 0

0 Comment r 0

0 Comment r 0

Wider traff Any new d See above

0 Comment r 0

Other Com The Council No change to SPD required.

0 0 0

Other Com Comment r No change to SPD required.

Officers un It is dising No change to SPD required.

Poor consu Reference No change to SPD required

Environme Comment r No change to SPD required.

Other Com Comment r No change to SPD required.

0 0 0
0 0 0

Other Com 0 No change to SPD required.

0 0 0
0 0 0

Other Com Comment r No change to SPD required.

Other Com Comment r No change to SPD required.

Wider traff The two pr Add text to encourage consideration of alternative access arrangements

0 See T2 (wic 0

0 Comment r Consider a new access point to the site from Kestrel Avenue

0 Comment r 0

Other Com Comment r No change to SPD required.

Flooding See Flood1 See above

Home insui See PC1 (H See above

Wider traff See T2 (Wi See above

School cap See LF2 (Sc See above

Wider traff See T2 (Wi See above

Flooding See Flood1 See above

0 The reason No change to SPD required

Home insur See PC1 (H) See above

Other Com Comment r No change to SPD required.

Other Com Comment r No change to SPD required.

0 0 0

Flooding See Flood1 See above

Access (Dai See T1 (Tra The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required

Wider traff See T2 (Wir See above

Constructic See Constr No change to SPD required

Pollution See EE4 (Pc No change to SPD required.

Environme See EE2 (Er No change to SPD required.

Ecological See EE2 (Ec A number of changes are proposed to the SPD (chapter 3) and a reference will be added to the SPD on a requirement for off-site compensation may be necessary given the biodiversity value of the site

Local servic See LF1 (Lo See above

Local servic See LF1 (Lo See above

School cap See LF2 (Sc See above

Loss of out See PC3 (Lc See above

0 0 0

0 The Local P No change to SPD required.

Other Com Comment r No change to SPD required.

0 See comme 0

0 0 0

0 0 0

0 0 0

0 0 0

0 0 0

0 0 0

0 0 0

0 0 0

0 0 0

0 0 0

0 0 0

0 0 0

0 0 0

Wider traff See T2 (Wit See above
Flooding See Flood1 See above
Local servic See LF1 (Lo See above
School cap: See LF2 (Sc See above
Environme: Land at Bra No change to SPD required.

Size / princ See Allocat No change to SPD required.

0 Refer to All No change to SPD required

0 In preparin No change to SPD required

0 The popula No change to SPD required

Flooding See Flood1 See above
Home insui See PC1 (H: See above

Access (Dai See T1 (Tra The SPD confirms that improvements to East Carr Road will be required. No change to SPD required
Wider traff See T2 (Wit See above

School cap: See LF2 (Sc See above

#N/A The SPD dc Add text to Section 1.1 clarifying the purpose of the document

0 Comments Add 'plus 10% for urban creep' after the sentence "As such designs should take account of volumes for the 1 in 100 +30 for Climate Change rainfall events".

#N/A 0 0

#N/A This will on 0

#N/A Figure 6. is No change to the SPD required

#N/A It is not cor 0

0 No change No change to the SPD required

0 Street secti No change to the SPD required

0 Refer to ea No change to the SPD required

