



Hull Local Plan: 2016 to 2032

East Carr
Masterplan

Supplementary Planning Document 6

2nd Consultation Statement

August 2021

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 a 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 The Consultation Statement and accompanying Draft SPD 6 - East Carr Masterplan was made available for final public consultation prior to adoption between Monday the 8th of March 2021 and Tuesday the 6th of April 2021.
- 1.4 The draft SPD incorporated amendments already made in light of earlier consultation (in August / September 2020). This draft was reported to East Area Committee on the 4th of February 2021, to Planning Committee on the 16th of February 2021 and approved by Cabinet Committee on the 22nd of February 2021.
- 1.5 The final draft SPD and associated documentation was made available for inspection on the Council's website.

Consultation responses and main issues

- 2.1 Following the four-week consultation period, the Council received over four hundred comments from households and individuals, and a number of relevant organisations. These comments are set out in Appendix A (see below), together with the Council's response.
- 2.2 The main issues raised in this final consultation were similar to those raised during the previous consultation exercise undertaken in autumn last year.

2.3 In summary, these were:

- vehicle access to the East Carr site and wider traffic concerns;
- the impact on local services, and especially the inadequacy of local schools to cope with the potential increased capacity;
- potential light, air and noise pollution;
- concern about flood risk and the detrimental impact of development on drainage systems;
- concern about the size and principle of development; and
- the detrimental impact of this masterplan on the local environment, especially the loss of wildlife and important habitats.

Changes to the SPD

3.1 No further substantive changes have been made to the SPD in response to the second round of consultation, however a number of minor amendments have been made.

3.2 These include:

- in terms of the size of development, the indicative housing number for East Carr has been added to the front of the document within the Policy Context section;
- regarding concerns about the lack of local infrastructure, the Masterplan Principles now include that the phasing of any future development will have regard to the specific infrastructure needs of the whole area;
- with reference to managing impact, in particular traffic impacts, a sentence has been added to this section to acknowledge that access to many services and facilities will either involve buses or car usage and that the proposed layout and design will accommodate these forms of transport;
- in terms of impact on the local environment, a new reference has been made to highlight that opportunities should be taken to strengthen existing planting where required to further protect the amenity of existing housing;

- with regard to flood risk concerns, and especially potential drainage problems Section 5.2 (form, scale and density) now includes a reference to the possible removing of permitted development rights relating to the conversion garages to habitable rooms. The added text highlights that this can lead to increasing pressure for on-street parking and loss of garden space – reducing the capacity for natural drainage. This text also states that in terms of drainage consideration will also be given to removing permitted development rights preventing or reducing the extent to which front gardens can be 'hard surfaced'.
- A new appendix has been added to the document which sets out the key policies of relevance from the Hull Local Plan.

Appendix A - Comments received on the second East Carr SPD consultation, and Hull City Council's 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.	Reference to the indicative figure (689) has been moved to the front end of the document together with a brief explanation of how this relates to the figure in the Local Plan. Other than this, no further 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 further 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 and the SPD flags this as an issue.	No further 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. Strictly speaking however, construction disruption is not a material planning consideration.	No further 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 on a Local Plan – that level of consultation is reserved for more detailed matters such as at the planning application stage.	No further 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 further change to SPD required.
Consult3	Poor consultation (on SPD)			Consultation was 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 further 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. The SPD has already been amended to highlight that the document will act as a framework for guiding new development with a series of principles that will need to be adhered to.	No further changes to the SPD are required.
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 further change to SPD required.

EE2	Environmental value			<p>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.</p>	No further change to SPD required.
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 its 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. Greater emphasis on the importance of mitigating the potential for pollution added in response to first round of consultation</p>	No further change to SPD required
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 Flood Risk Assessment will be undertaken in advance of any planning application being considered. A more detailed assessment may still be required which will be informed by the nature, scale and layout of any particular 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.</p> <p>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. 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 Suttoncross. New development will be required to not further exacerbate the drainage situation within the existing housing area.</p>	No further change to SPD required

LF1	Local services (GPs, dentists)			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 further 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 further change to SPD required.
LF3	Services and facilities			The SPD encourages small scale commercial development to reduce the need to travel elsewhere for such matters.	No further change to SPD required.
LF4	Maintenance of open space			The Council recognises this as a key consideration which can be undertaken either by the council (often taking a contribution from the developer) or through a third party company (often involving ongoing payments from householder).	No further 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 further 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 further 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 further change to SPD required.
PC3	Loss of outlook / privacy			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. Amendments have been made to encourage existing planting around the edge of the site (where it faces new housing) to be strengthened	Add new statement in 3.2 '...and opportunities taken to strengthen this planting where required to further protect the amenity of existing housing'.

PC4	Property value			There is no evidence to suggest that existing property will be de-valued as a result of new development and in any event effect on property value is not a material planning consideration.	No further 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. The SPD has already been 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.	No further change to SPD required
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 respondents. 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.	No further change to SPD required

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

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
ECC1	I write as part of the consultation on the above document. I am very disappointed at the few changes to the plan and they do not seem to me to take account of the objections of amny local residents. The number of houses is now 720 which reminds me of a song from the 60's: "Little boxes" which the drawings and plans seem to indicate. One of my biggest concerns remains the amount of traffic which that number of dwellings cold generate on to what is already a poor road system because of the amount of on road parking. Traffic seems to have speeded up too during the last year. A possible 1400 + cars added to the mix is both dangerous and a cause of greater pollution.	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted. The number of houses referred to in the SPD has not changed. It remains at 689 (albeit this is an 'indicative' figure). To highlight the relationship between the Local Plan housing target and the lower indicative figure in the SPD, additional text will be added to the document. This is a clarrification and not an amendment to the SPD	Add 'In light of the sitespecific design considerations set out in this document, the indicative housing figure has been reduced to 689' to section 1.2
		T2	Wider traffic concerns	See T2 (wider traffic issues) above. The relationship to Sutton village as a consideration in the design and layout of this area is not considered to be signficat 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 further change to SPD required

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>The lay out containing the SUD roads is good in theory but who will be responsible for their upkeep. So often the areas provided as green and ecological spaces become a mess after a short while when nobody is actually responsible. This can be seen in other areas of the city, including the Howdale Road area.</p> <p>While local amenities are mentioned in the plan I could not find any mention of schools. Surely such an estate will put unnecessary pressure on local schools and again add to the traffic at certain times of the day.</p> <p>It does seem to me that the consultation process from last year and to now has really been a means to placate local objections to a scheme which had already been decided. I suppose being a Senior Citizen I should not be surprise for wherever I have lived in the country this seems to have been the norm.</p>	LF4	Maintenance of open space	See LF4 (Maintenance of open space) above	See above
	<p>While local amenities are mentioned in the plan I could not find any mention of schools. Surely such an estate will put unnecessary pressure on local schools and again add to the traffic at certain times of the day.</p> <p>It does seem to me that the consultation process from last year and to now has really been a means to placate local objections to a scheme which had already been decided. I suppose being a Senior Citizen I should not be surprise for wherever I have lived in the country this seems to have been the norm.</p>	LF2	School capacity	See LF2 (school capacity) above. This scale of development cannot justify the need for a new school. Careful consideration has however been given to capacity in other surrounding schools.	See above
	<p>It does seem to me that the consultation process from last year and to now has really been a means to placate local objections to a scheme which had already been decided. I suppose being a Senior Citizen I should not be surprise for wherever I have lived in the country this seems to have been the norm.</p>	Consult3	Poor consultation (on SPD)	See Consult3 (SPD consultation process) above	No further change to SPD required
ECC2	<p>I have concerns about getting on and off my property. When the new road and bridge goes through from Danby Close to the new housing estate. I have marked your map the position of my garage and think that this is a real safety issue. I also have real concerns about contractors vehicles parking adjacent to my property and blocking my entry and exit.</p> <p>There has also been talk of compulsory purchase for the four houses at the bottom of Danby Close – 2 either side of the road. Could you please put the record straight on this issue as it is making our lives a misery. We have spent a lot of money on our property, also time and effort and would like these rumours put straight.</p>	T1	Access (Danby Close/East Carr Road)	Detailed issues such as are best dealt with as part of the more detailed planning application stage	No further change to SPD required
	<p>There has also been talk of compulsory purchase for the four houses at the bottom of Danby Close – 2 either side of the road. Could you please put the record straight on this issue as it is making our lives a misery. We have spent a lot of money on our property, also time and effort and would like these rumours put straight.</p>	OO	Other Comment	The SPD makes no reference to compulsory purchase and there are no proposals for this	No further change to SPD required
ECC3	<p>Marked within the plan on the consultation letter – No houses stop this ####.</p>	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required
ECC4	<p>I have previously written regarding my concerns over the planned housing development of East Carr fields. Having looked at the new revised planning I wish to voice my concerns again.</p> <p>As previously stated, these fields are a natural habitat for a varied abundance of wildlife and a much used area for recreation as in dog walking, jogging and family walks and has been for many years for local residents and surrounding areas who are not blessed with having large gardens which I can presume the developers of this planned housing have? This is a valued green space as well as holding flood water back from the nearby housing, mine included. Building houses with a few wild hedgerows and flowers in-between does not compensate for an already well established wildlife habitat or prevent flooding when the fields are covered in concrete.</p>	EE2	Environmenta l value	See EE2 (environmental value) and Flood 1 (flooding and drainage) above	Comment noted

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
	There is nothing in these plans that will improve the quality of life for the residents that already live in the surrounding area, it will only have a detrimental affect. The infrastructure is not capable of supporting more housing. There are already problems with traffic and congestion especially at peak times around the estate and along Saltshouse road and Sutton. How will more housing and traffic improve this? The roads are especially dangerous during school runs causing traffic jams, dangerous parking and continual near misses and often crashes around Dunvegan road and the roundabout at Saltshouse Tavern were they are currently constructing a school opposite on the old deaf school site. This is not a small development either, it is a lot larger than the previous school, again, more traffic and dangerous parking on an already strained area.	LF1	Local services (GPs, dentists)	See LF1 (local services) and T2 (wider traffic issues) above	See above
	We also have a new housing development on the old Woodside site and housing not yet completed on the Ings road housing site, all of which add to the traffic. These are mainly not affordable homes but homes to price the local residents of East Hull out of the area.	T2	Wider traffic concerns	See T2 (wider traffic issues) above. This is a market led development but the Council will require a good mix of housing including large and small of which 10% will be affordable.	
	The new planning for East Carr states it will be mainly built with the intention of less car usage and designed for people to be within walking distance of services such as schools, shops and bus route. If this is the case, why is each house being designed with a car parking space and parking in each cul de sac? Were will family visiting drive cars or park them? I can assume they won't want to walk or catch a bus with children in tow in winter.	Des1	Design	It is corrrct to say that the SPD promotes a layout and design which encourages less reliance on cars but it would be urealistic to plan for housing in such a location which did not allow for car use - hence parking provision allowed for.	No further change to SPD required
	Family moving in to these homes with children at different schooling levels or working are not going to happily take them separately to the bus (presuming the bus time table coincides with each persons school, work or recreational activities?) backwards and forwards for each purpose or struggle on a bus with shopping and children.	T2	Wider traffic concerns	See previous comment	
	The only benefit anyone will reap in this planned application is the developers themselves, making money on the back of the local residents misery. They build, collect the money then walk away ready to blight another area that is already under pressure.	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted. The Council is required to plan for a certain level of new homes (on average 680 homes each year to 2032)	No further change to SPD required.
	So, as you may have gathered, I STRONGLY OBJECT to this development and no changing this planned housing will change that fact. Please put a stop to this development	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted	
ECC5	As a local east Hull resident,having read the revised planning proposals for the East Carr site, I remain unconvinced that this site should be developed for housing. Whilst I agree that Hull needs more houses,surely it would make more sense to develop brown field sites around the city? This proposed site is an important wild green nature site which would be lost forever,no matter how much cultivated green space was planned.	Allocate2	Focus on brownfield first	See Allocate 2 (brownfield development) and EE2 (environmental value) above	No further change to SPD required
	Added to this,the disruption for the local residents and the increased traffic and lack of local infrastructure to support the new development would,in my opinion,be awful.	T2	Wider traffic concerns	See Construct1 (Construction disruption), T2 (wider traffic issues) and LF1 (local services) above	No further change to SPD required
	Finally,can I just say,with the best will in the world,this part of Hull is a known flood area,even with all the flood risk messures proposed,something I can only imagine will get worse with more housing adding to the load.	Flood1	Flooding	See Flood1 (flooding and drainage) above	No further change to SPD required

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
ECC6	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.	T1	Access (Danby Close/East Carr Road)	See T1 (Traffic access) above	No further change to SPD required
	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 on a piece of land that wasn't originally build on for a reason!	EE4	Pollution	See EE4 (Pollution) above	No further change to SPD required.
	This area doesn't have the infrastructure as it is to deal with additional homes being build down the road and once lockdown is over, we are back to dealing with nonstop traffic jams so enough is enough.	LF1	Local services (GPs, dentists)	See T2 (wider traffic issues) and LF1 (local services) above	No further change to SPD required
	There is enough development already going on in this area, so much so, it is already having a great impact on the area and traffic as a whole.	T2	Wider traffic concerns	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
	Not only that there will be a significant impact on the environment, wildlife, local schooling and amenities, plus the loss of recreational use of that land, that many local residents use regularly. I urge you to not approve these plans and consider the significant impact this would have in this established area.	EE2 OO	Environmenta l value Other Comment	See EE2 (Environmental value) above Comment noted	No further change to SPD required. No further change to SPD required.
ECC7	as to the proposed houseing on east carr fields, rest assured, i am against a project that involves once again the building of any thing on our green fields. It is to house an already over populated nation, that is due to increase in the foreseeable future. Great Britain has in the past, maded mistakes in its governing policies, but it did make us GREAT BRITAIN. I feel this current policy, of over populating is a retregard step, and a policy, which in the future, we will live to regret. What we have got to ask ourselves, is why we are the most over populated country, by far, in Europe	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required.
ECC8	We have read all the relevant documentation regarding the proposed development of East Carr.	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required No further change to SPD required.
	Page 8 acknowledges the dearth of facilities in the area and the recognition that people may still choose to drive.	LF1	Local services (GPs, dentists)	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required
	Until such time as the development provides shopping, medical facilities etc. residents will find it difficult to reach the poor facilities we have in the area. (also mentioned on Page 11)			Given the scale of the proposed development, the likelihood of attracting services and facilities of this nature is limited - essentially such matters relate to commercial decisions. If an operator feels that they could run a profitable business then they would look to establish a business in the area. Similarly medical and dental pracices will consider the level of proposed population and make a commercial decision.	No further change to SPD required

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
	The statement: Whilst it is unlikely that new development will reduce the risks associated with groundwater flooding in the existing area it should certainly not make matters worse. This intimates that the writer is fully conversant with future flooding possibilities and without full environmental assessment and expert consultation is making a dangerous assumption. Furthermore, the flood alleviation scheme will have positive benefits to existing housing. Please explain how the scheme will benefit the existing homes. Page 9 refers to green and blue infrastructure. What is blue infrastructure? Please explain.			The SPD repeats national and local policy insofar as future development should not be put at risk and existing risk should not be transferred to surrounding vulnerable uses (e.g. existing housing). The strategic level assessment that exists for the city suggests that this is possible but more detailed modelling is required to fully understand this issue - and the Council has already committed to doing this assessment. The principle aim of the related flood alleviation scheme is to reduce the pressure on existing drainage systems in the city. Blue and green infrastructure comprises natural and semi natural landscape elements which combine to deal with drainage in a more natural way (as opposed to more traditional 'grey' infrastructure. The SPD includes various examples including rainwater garedns, SuDs streets etc..)	No further change to SPD required
	Page 13 further archaeological evaluation of the site should be undertaken to determine the extent and nature of any unknown archaeological remains.	OO	Other Comment	It is normal practice to consider such matters as part of a planning application. This partly relates to the fact that it is only at that point in time when definate proposals are on the table in relation to numbers of houses and layout etc.... At a strategic level, an assessment of archaeological value has been undertaken but this simply flags up the fact that it is likely that there may be areas of interest but that these will need to be considered through more detailed assessment work. See previous comment	No further change to SPD required.
	When will this be undertaken? No one could predict Covid but expecting a flurry of assessments mentioned and required before granting building permission, when time is of the essence, is very worrying. There is also mention of a traffic usage assessment. A flooding assessment (Page 14). An ecological/environmental assessment (Page 13) and a transportation assessment. Can the Council provide a Timescale for all this assessing? Travel and transport figures are inaccurate at present due to lockdown. How can we rely on fairness and non-bias?	OO		See previous comment See previous comment	
	Page 14. The document mentions a consistent approach to flood management. What exactly does that mean? How is consistency evaluated? As such designs should take account of volumes for the 1 in 100 +30 for Climate Change rainfall events and include 10% for urban creep.			The Council has committed to undertaking transport and flood assessments in advance of a planning applications. Other assessments will be undertaken as part of any subsequent planning application. No application has been submitted as yet. Given that most Covid restrictions have now been lifted, such assessments (including that relating to transport) should reflect 'normal' circumstances. Should further retrictions be imposed then adjustments to traffic flows would need to be factored into such work. The reference to 'consistency' in this respect is intended to ensure that a 'fair share' of the cost of dealing with flood / drainage issues is applied across the whole site (avoiding significant costs being left to the final stages of development. This is particularly important in helping to ensure not only that benefits are gained from the outset but also to avoid situations (where there is more than one developer) that costs do not fall unfairly on the last phase of development.	No further change to SPD required
	This is a document allegedly in the public domain but the mention of "1 in 100 +30" event is unexplained and what is "urban creep"?	OO	Other Comment	The Council has a number of technical documents on flood risk and surface water which developers need to follow to ensure that new development does not increase flood risk either on the development or elsewhere. "Urban Creep" is an allowance to take into account householders changing gardens into hard-standings, patios or extensions etc., thereby increasing the impermeable area after the development has been completed. 1 in 100 +30 refers to the period of time over which any flood mitigation is expected to be effective with a 30% allowance for climate change. Agree that it would be useful to add a footnote to direct readers to the Council's Living With Water SPD	Add footnote to Section 3.2 as follows - Refer to SPD4 Living With Water -Approach to surface water drainage

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>Page 18. Referring to East Carr Road:- It is intended that there will be no through route (other than for emergency and other essential service vehicles) from one access point to the other. There is also mention of the other access point at Danby Close and the impact of traffic on Dunvegan Rd. Howdale Road which takes the bulk of the traffic is not mentioned at all.</p> <p>The obvious access road to any proposed development should be via the large expanse of land from Howdale Rd behind Whitstable and Deal Close which is currently used as playing field/dog walking field and by the Council for siting a Polling Station.</p>			<p>Following comment made to the first consultation draft, the document was amended to highlight the fact that consideration will need to be given to the wider highway network and that a transport assessment will be undertaken.</p> <p>This is not considered to be a suitable access road as it is some distance from the allocated land (and accordingly would result in signifiant costs) and also would result in the loss of a designated area of open space which has been designed dto deal with flood risk in the area.</p>	
ECC9	<p>I have looked at the info provided and I am shocked that housing will at some point be built on this land which should have never been granted in the first place is still beyond belief.</p> <p>It is only accessible on the over crowed Saltshouse road via Dunvegan Road and the race track commonly known as Howdale road.</p> <p>There is nothing in these documents for another road round the back of the estate to help the traffic flow or the current crowed dangerous roads.</p> <p>Also the fact houses are again going to be built on a flood plane is shocking but we are stuck with this and yes the developers have to comply with the safe guards printed in the document still does not make me happy.</p> <p>At the moment I am totally against any development of that area and will oppose all attempts to build another development of 600 to 700 homes.</p>	<p>Allocate1</p> <p>T2</p> <p>OO</p> <p>Flood1</p> <p>OO</p>	<p>Size / principle of development</p> <p>Wider traffic concerns</p> <p>Other Comment</p> <p>Flooding</p> <p>Other Comment</p>	<p>See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above</p> <p>See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above</p> <p>Comment noted</p> <p>See Flood1 (Flooding) above</p> <p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No further change to SPD required.</p> <p>No further change to SPD required.</p> <p>No further change to SPD required.</p> <p>No further change to SPD required.</p>
ECC10	<p>Dave Craker and the Labour led HCC signed this land off for housing development.</p> <p>The residents oppose this as it is a flood risk and the area won't cope with the traffic.</p>	<p>Allocate1</p> <p>T1</p>	<p>Size / principle of development</p> <p>Access (Danby Close/East Carr Road)</p>	<p>See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above</p> <p>See T1 (Traffic access) above</p>	<p>No further change to SPD required.</p> <p>No further change to SPD required</p>
ECC11	<p>After reading the revised plan I have to say I'm absolutely disappointed and quite frankly heart broken. Absolutely no consideration to the residents of howdale road and particularly Danby close. The small culisac is not equipped for a bus route! The road is narrow and residents rely on the parking.</p> <p>Children will not be able to play on their own street due to traffic and the noise pollution/ pollution will make it a very different and negative experience using your own garden. As a household we will have double decker busses passing by our house a few feet from our house from 5am till 11pm which is not acceptable, we have 2 young children who have to be up for school and both my husband and myself work full time.</p> <p>If this development takes place we will have no choice but to move. However how will that work, as who would want to live in a house with these breaches of privacy and peace in place</p> <p>and if we do manage to sell the value of our house may put us in negative equity and cause financial issues, is it really worth putting hard working family through this.</p>	<p>T1</p> <p>EE4</p> <p>PC3</p> <p>PC4</p>	<p>Access (Danby Close/East Carr Road)</p> <p>Pollution</p> <p>Loss of outlook / privacy</p> <p>Property value</p>	<p>See T1 (Traffic access) above</p> <p>See EE4 (Pollution) above</p> <p>See PC3 (Loss of outlook / privacy) above</p> <p>See PC4 (Property value) above</p>	<p>No further change to SPD required</p> <p>No further change to SPD required.</p> <p>See above</p> <p>See above</p>

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
	Where will all these families children go to school, spring cottage is already oversubscribed. I understand houses need to be built 50 or 100 would be reasonable and wouldn't effect the local area so drastically but the amount proposed will do untold damage to this area.	LF2	School capacity	See LF2 (School capacity) above	See above
ECC12	Having read the new SPD it is pleasing to hear that further consultation will take place on the 2 main important issues of impact on local transport and flooding.	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required.
	One area of concern I have is the statement at 2.3 Managing Impact, which mentions future occupants could walk freely around the site and have new facilities built on the development to reduce vehicular movement but no mention of the necessity to commute daily to work.	T1	Access (Danby Close/East Carr Road)	The SPD rightly seeks to reduce reliance on private transport (e.g. by encouraging bus penetration into the site and linking to existing cycle ways and footpaths - but it still acknowledges that many will choose to use cars (hence parking requirements and the need to ensure that existing access points are fit for purpose and to understand the imoact on the surrounding highway network. This will be assed fully through a transport assessment.	No further change to SPD required
	At peak periods the access route(s) will not be able to sustain this traffic.	T2	Wider traffic concerns	See above	See above
ECC13	I am in receipt of the attached and having read the Draft Revised Masterplan document respond as follows. It is my view that the amendments to the document in no way address any of the issues raised and identified in the SDP East Carr summary document.	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required
	My main issues with this proposed development are vehicle access, underground drainage and additional pressure on the existing, limited, public amenities.			See T1 (Danby Close), Flood1 and LF1,2 and 3 (local services) above.	
	The draft document still states that a minimum of 2 viable vehicle access points are required. Its is clear that Danby Close is deemed to be one of the viable access points but, the only other vehicle access point available via East Carr Lane, is clearly not suitable for a development of this nature. There are no suggestions or proposals as to how this could be made to be viable or what improvements any future developers would be required to make for it to be a viable access point . The lack of clarity clearly demonstrates that the location of the proposed development makes it highly improbable that 2 viable access points can ever be achieved. I would also comment that, as each property must be provided with 1 EVCP with ducting provision for a 2nd, this hardly constitutes a development that discourages the use of cars.	T1	Access (Danby Close/East Carr Road)	The document clearly states that upgrades to east Carr Road will be required. The extent to which upgrades will be required will depend on the proposed scale of development on the site and this will be considered further to the transport assessment that the Council has committed to undertaking.	No further change to SPD required
	With regards to the underground drainage systems I raised this query when I attended a consultation meeting. I was informed that "it was likely" that UGD for the proposed development would be connected to the existing drainage system on Danby Close. This suitability of this is not however addressed in the draft document nor is there any reference to any requirements a potential developer must comply with.	OO	Other Comment	The suitability of the sewer capacity will be determined by the water company	No further change to SPD required
I note that the East Carr SDP Summary document now details a local supermarket and Pavilion Café with wc and changing facilities but the reived draft document does not make reference to these or state whether or not they would be required as part of any planning application, these buildings alone would not relieve pressure that this development would have on the existing local amenities.	OO	Other Comment	The summary document shows exactly what is in the main SPD (on the final page).	No further change to SPD required	

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>Planning claimed that they held a 6 week consultation, claiming that that was already more than central government recommended. That is a blatant lie. The notice of consultation actually have two dates, one in August and one in September to be held in 10 minute sessions in the Saltshouse Tavern. What happened to the other 28 working days of the six weeks? Then it took 90 days afterwards to produce their findings. We have a new word around here. It is INSULTATION. Planning has now proposed a further four week consultation. Fine. But we do want to wait till the Covid lockdown is relaxed. Which might also be 90 days. Maybe! Then we want to have a proper, full consultation with residents and other interested parties, possible including Sutton councillors, perhaps Karl Turner MP, who has clearly stated his concerns about the development, the CE of the Council, perhaps the Council Leader and representatives of the emergency services. There are still a number of questions to be raised which were left out of the Planning Committee meeting vs because of potential overload. Councillors, we are looking at considerable financial losses to residential properties even now because of a rumour of a development. It might easily get worse. We have twice who the developer is, only to be fobbed off in spite of the fact that a company called Lovell has had a surveyor on site twice asking questions. Lying has become a fine art in Planning, adding to the lying and contempt mentioned earlier.</p>	OO	Other Comment	<p>The 'drop-in session' referred to were one part of the wider consultation / engagement process and were in response to the prevailing restrictions regarding Covid. The consultation period did run for 6 weeks and officers continued to receive comments beyond that date and indeed had meetings with local residents after the closing date. The consultation exercise was conducted in accordance with the Council's Stataement of Community Involvement albeit some refinements had to be made to deal with restriction in place at the time. The option to wait until Covid was over was considered however, Government advice on the planning system was to carry on wherever possible and the Council was mindful that a delay in preparing the document could result in it not being finalised in advance of the submission of a planning application - which would reduce the Council's ability to control and influence what happens on the ground. The Council cannot categorically say who the developer of this site will be. Lovells have clearly got an interest in the site but this does not necessarily mean that they will bring the site forward. Irrespective of the above, the Council will deal with any planning application in a consistent and professional manner - ensuring that consultation with local residents and other stakeholders is undertaken.</p>	No further change to SPD required
	<p>One final point. Sutton has 3 councillors. Two of them, Councillors Craker and Healand were even agreeing at the Area Committee, something not often seen. They have been helpful. The third Councillor Dunstan, has been absolutely useless. He appeared on a letter, along with Councillor Craker, on 25th July, being against the development. Nothing has been seen or heard of him since then. Not even an answer to emails. What are the rules for de-selection when a Councillor is not up for election?</p>	OO	Other Comment	Not a relevant matter for planning	No further change to SPD required
	<p>Members of the Cabinet, if you have read the excess of information you have had, thank you for that.</p>	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required
ECC15	<p>Natural England: Natural England has previously commented on this SPD and made comments to the authority in our letter reference 324778, dated 10 September 2020.</p> <p>The advice provided in our previous response applies equally to this revision.</p> <p>The proposed amendments are unlikely to have significantly different impacts on the natural environment than the original SPD. Should the SPD be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment then, in accordance with Section 4 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, Natural England should be consulted again. Before sending us the amended consultation, please assess whether the changes proposed will materially affect any of the advice we have previously offered. If they are unlikely to do so, please do not re-consult us.</p>	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required
ECC16	<p>We both feel it's a waste of time bringing forth new ideas as its going to go ahead anyway</p>	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
ECC17	Can't make head nor tails of the map. Writing is blurred. Still don't think it's a good idea to build on land that floods in winter and where is the traffic to go it's a farce.	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required
ECC18	I strongly object to this plan for the following reasons: "whilst recognising that people may still choose to drive." People will still choose to drive! The plan is contradictory as it suggests that each property requires the capacity for 2 electric charging points. 1 local shop will not prevent car usage. The existing properties in the area are car dependent due to a dearth of facilities, how will this development be any different? As an existing resident of the area, I struggle to get affordable home insurance due to the risk of flooding. The future flooding risk and impact will only be known once this development has been built. Too late for existing residents. It is morally reprehensible to consider building on a flood plain and risk the properties of the existing residents. The flood alleviation scheme benefits should be allowed to be seen before any building in contemplated.	T2 PC1	Wider traffic concerns Home insurance	By promoting public transport connectivity and a layout which allows people to move around and beyond the site then the Council is seeking to reduce reliance on private vehicles. Inevitably, many people will continue to rely of their own cars and accordingly the layout and design seeks to accommodate cars - charging infratructure should hopefully ensure that increasingly the carbon impact of cars will reduce. see PC1 (home insurance) above. Detailed modelling will be understand the precise level of risk associated with development and this will be used to inform the fine detail of any proposal - including the approach to drainage.	See above See above
ECC19	It's very laudable to encourage people to give up their cars we have to live in the real world (sensible cities are tearing up their cycle lanes) and people have work and family commitments which cannot be done on a cycle. Leaving East Carr untouched to avoid it becoming a rat run means Danby Close the only way in and out of the development for every vehicle. Apart from residents cars – some 1000 + - there will be delivery vans, visitors, taxis, refuse lorries, and the rest. Add to this the buses which on the current timetable will mean a bus travelling in either direction every 3-4 mins as each single journey to, or from the city centre means 2 trips down Danby Close. There must be another alternative entrance to the development instead of making Danby Close a dangerous road.	T1 T2	Access (Danby Close/East Carr Road) Wider traffic concerns	See T1 (traffic access) above. The decision to expand a bus route through the site will be a commercial one albeit the Council are keen to encourage this. It is however extremely unlikely that all services will divert to take in this area and therefore the level of bus movements along Danby Close is likely to be significantly less than suggested. See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	No further change to SPD required See above
ECC20	We have lived at the above address for over 30 years. There were no consultations before the planning for the housing estate for East Carr at the back of Howdale Road. The road on Howdale will not take the amount of cars, lorries and buses as our windows shake when buses go past as it is. The small roundabout at one end of Howdale is not adequate for the amount of traffic now. There have been near misses with cars coming down the hill and not stopping at junction. The land is also a flood risk. I know I speak for both myself and my husband that if this estate goes through we will not be voting for Labour again because we don't trust Labour to be truthful about what is happening in Sutton.	Allocate1 T2 Flood1 OO	Size / principle of development Wider traffic concerns Flooding Other Comment	See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above Danby Close and East Carr Lane remain the two most likely access points to the site. The SPD has already been amended to allow prospective developers to suggest alternative access points - and if such proposals come forward, the Council will consider the merits of these. Not a relevant matter for planning	No further change to SPD required See above See above No further change to SPD required

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
	Even if traffic doesn't come through Danby Close or Carr lane the traffic will still eventually come past us on Howdale Road.	T1	Access (Danby Close/East Carr Road)	See T1 (Traffic access) above	No further change to SPD required
ECC21	East Carr Residents Association: · What is your idea of an SPD main aims and criteria?	OO	Other Comment	The SPD is intended to provide further guidance to the strategic policy approach set out in the Local Plan. It will act as a framework for any subsequent planning application(s) ensuring that the overall layout and mix of uses and the quality of new development is of an appropriate standard. It is not intended to deal with all planning matters in detail e.g. although it clearly sets out the level and nature of flood risk / drainage challenges in the area and the general planning solutions to such matters, it does not repeat the specific policy as established in the Local Plan or the more prescriptive guidance set out in the Council's surface water drainage SPD.	No further change to SPD required
	· Explain the changes you have made to the SPD	OO	Other Comment	All changes made to the first draft document are set out in Consultation Response document which is available to view on the Council's web site and can be seen in the track change SPD that was made available as part of the second round of consultation. Key changes relate to a commitment to undertaking a transport and flood risk / drainage assessment. The changes made are intended to improve the document. It has not been possible to incorporate many suggestions put forward through consultation as these are considered to be either too detailed or questioning the need for the development at all.	No further change to SPD required
	· The current SPD leaves vast areas of it to interpretation and a lot more further detail is required which will help in ensuring any developer is clear on its requirements.	OO	Other Comment	As outlined above, the SPD by its very nature is intended to act as a framework for future development which will be used in combination with the long list of relevant policies in the Local Plan and other SPDs (e.g. dealing with house design, flooding/drainage, biodiversity, open spaces etc...). In considering any planning application, we will require considerable information and compliance with prevailing planning policy. The danger of producing an overly prescriptive document is that this will be of limited value in relation to dealing with future planning applications which may well come forward with an 'alternative' vision for the area. Our job is to ensure that any such applications meets the 'spirit' of the agreed SPD – recognising of course that in some cases, there may be scope for alternative arrangements which are actually better than those set out in the SPD.	No further change to SPD required
	· Where will the emergency bollards/access be situated to prevent access from one development to the other?	OO	Other Comment	This level of detail is not possible to prescribe in the SPD. It is unlikely that any future planning application will look exactly like the masterplan set out in the SPD and accordingly, reference to emergency bollards/access is highlighted as a 'principle' which will be required in any proposal. Such detail will be addressed as part of the planning application stage.	No further change to SPD required
	· How are you doing to ensure that there is two viable entrances?	OO	Other Comment	This will be done through either the transport assessment which the Council has undertaken to complete or through a planning application and any accompanying transport assessment required as part of that process. The Council's highways team will in any event need to be satisfied that adequate arrangements are in place.	No further change to SPD required
	· Can the number of houses for this development be set in stone as we have heard of a possibility of up to 800 houses?	OO	Other Comment	The Local Plan establishes an 'indicative' combined housing figure for this area of 702 units and the SPD (having regard to the specific layout proposed) proposes 689 units. The actual number of houses is clearly intended to be around this level but (as is the case with most sites) the actual number will be informed by any application that is submitted. The Council will need to be satisfied that the overall layout of any proposed development accords with the SPD and this inevitably will act as a constraint on numbers.	No further change to SPD required

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
	· Waste water connection where is it going to connect to.	OO	Other Comment	The public sewer system will be approved by Yorkshire Water, however it should be noted that Yorkshire Water are a statutory consultee on Local Plans so that they can make comment on the impact new development would have on the sewer system. It should also be noted that legally developers have the right to connect to existing sewers.	No further change to SPD required.
	· Surface run off water where will these drains be connected to.	OO	Other Comment	The drainage system following development will mimic the existing natural drainage on site so connections will be the same to Holderness Drain, Suttoncross and East Carr.	No further change to SPD required.
	· Garages shown on the plan with no vehicle access.	OO	Other Comment	All on-plot garages will be accessed from rear access routes and/or via driveways from the front.	No further change to SPD required.
	· Alternative routes to the two development what has been considered?	OO	Other Comment	The Council has always stated that it sees Danby Close and East Carr Road as being the two most likely access points to the new development. This was the case in relation to the (then) emerging Local Plan. The SPD has continues to promote this approach albeit recognising that other options may exist and that if such options are presented as part of a planning application that consideration would be given to them.	No further change to SPD required.
	· Pile driving for possible 10 years how do you expect the local residents to deal with this when some have lived in this area and quiet cul-de-sac for forty years plus.	OO	Other Comment	Unfortunately it is inevitable that there will be noise and disturbance associated with new development and whilst the Council can impose conditions to ensure that this is managed (in relation to e.g. operational hours) it will not be able to eliminate such matters in their entirety. Noise associated with construction is strictly speaking not a material planning consideration i.e it is not something that can be effectively taken into account in determining a planning application. Pile driving (which may or may not be required on this site) is but one part of the development process and is unlikely (if required) to be a constant throughout the life of the construction phase.	No further change to SPD required.
	· To the residents it looks like the planning department and council are very keen to rush this SPD through why please explain.	OO	Other Comment	The Council is keen to progress this SPD because the land is allocated in the Local Plan and there is a prospect that an application may be submitted to bring it forward for development. If this happens in advance of the SPD being adopted then, the Council will need to consider the merits of the applications in accordance with the Local Plan. The SPD allows for more detailed consideration of local issues including layout and design.	No further change to SPD required.
	Flood Prevention measures and drainage.				
	· Which financial year will the flood assessment take place and what format will this flood assessment be in?	OO	Other Comment	At present, I have no information in relation to when this assessment will be undertaken – the SPD does however include a commitment to undertaking this work prior to an application being considered. Likewise details of format are at present unknown – the Council employs officers with considerable knowledge and experience of such matters and they will be involved in procuring this assessment ensuring that it fully addresses all matters that it needs to. The work will however include a Flood Risk Assessment in line with government guidance to assess the risk and recommend ways to mitigate the risk and a Drainage Impact Assessment. This would assess the existing drainage on site prior to any development to evaluate run off rates and discharge locations. This would then be used to calculate the required storage volumes.	No further change to SPD required.

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
·	Houses build on stilts where is all the water underneath going to drain to.	OO	Other Comment	There is no reference to houses being built on stilts albeit in most cases in the city, new housing has to be built to a higher level than was traditionally the case. In any event, planning policy requires such matters to be fully considered before any approval can be granted. The Local Planning Authority needs to be satisfied not only that new housing is not placed at risk but also that existing flood risk is not simply transferred to surrounding housing. The detail of how this is considered will be considered in light of any detailed planning application that is submitted as this will allow for relevant calculations and assessments to be undertaken in light of proposed numbers of houses and layout etc...	No further change to SPD required.
·	What will stop residents paving their gardens causing further surface water run-off.	OO	Other Comment	This is a genuine concern and one that the Council is keen to address. Partly we do this through making assumptions about the continued loss of permeable surfaces post development and factoring this into drainage solutions. In addition, there will always be a strong focus on ensuring that planned drainage infrastructure is in public ownership. Given the particular drainage challenges associated with this area, there is a possibility of removing certain 'permitted development rights' which could for example prevent (or reduce) the extent to which front gardens can be 'hard surfaced' and I intend to add such a reference to the final draft SPD. Finally (and this is something that the Council is looking at across the City) we are keen to raise awareness of such matters with householders – with the intention of encouraging a different approach to such matters i.e. choosing not to undertake certain types of work for your own benefit and the benefit of neighbours.	Add the following reference to the SPD - 'consideration will be given to removing certain development rights which would impact on the drainage capacity of the site in light of information provided through detailed flood and drainage impact assessments'.
·	What will stop residents removing the water butts?	OO	Other Comment	See previous answer. It should be also noted that water butts will not be included in the formal storage calculations as whilst they can reduce flood risk significantly if used appropriately, it relies on individuals to do this and there is currently no way of enforcing everyone to do this effectively. Hence water butts would only be providing additional storage on what is required in the formal system.	No further change to SPD required.
·	Underground water storage tanks how will these be pumped out, where to and at what times.	OO	Other Comment	A Drainage Impact Assessment will determine the amount of storage required which would then need to be used by anyone developing the site to determine site layout and densities and how the required storage volume can be accommodated. At this stage there is no certainty that underground storage tanks would be required however if they are then the locations and discharge points would also be determined in the Drainage Impact Assessment. Please see susdrains website for more detail https://www.susdrain.org/delivering-suds/using-suds/suds-components/retention_and_detention/geocellular-storage-systems.html	No further change to SPD required.
·	Rain garden to take grey water please explain what this means.	OO	Other Comment	Essentially this relates to natural / semi natural drainage infrastructure (rain gardens, open spaces, tree pits etc...) which collects surface water (from roads and roofs) which otherwise would go straight into underground drainage infrastructure. The Council sees this as a key to addressing flood risk across the entire city and has secured considerable funding already to retrofit existing property. In any new development we are keen to reduce flows of water into an already highly pressurised drainage system.	No further change to SPD required.
·	East Carr River how will this river be crossed.	OO	Other Comment	The SPD clearly acknowledges that a crossing will be required but the mechanism for how best to achieve this will be for a developer to address – clearly the nature and design (including safety issues) will be addressed as part of any planning application.	No further change to SPD required.

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
	· EA lagoons how will this and the rest of the Holderness drain flood alleviation project prevent areas 861 and 862 flooding.	OO	Other Comment	The FAS will not directly benefit the proposed housing site. The intention of the FAS is to reduce the risk of flooding to existing housing. Any proposal coming forward for the East Carr housing site will need to address flood risk (both on site and off site)	No further change to SPD required.
	Traffic measures · Which financial year will the traffic assessment take place and in what format will this traffic assessment be in?	OO	Other Comment	At present, there is no information in relation to when this assessment will be undertaken – the SPD does however include a commitment to undertaking this work prior to an application being considered. Likewise details of format are at present unknown – the Council employs officers with considerable knowledge and experience of such matters and they will be involved in procuring this assessment ensuring that it fully addresses all matters that it needs to.	No further change to SPD required.
	· No roads parallel to neighbouring houses this is to reduce noise and light pollution for the local residents.	OO	Other Comment	The Environment Agency require an easement along all water courses and therefore it is not appropriate to have back gardens onto the drain. Although consideration was given to requiring a green strip with back gardens beyond, this was considered to have potentially negative outcomes i.e. fly-tipping lacking natural ‘surveillance’ from houses. In effect what we are looking at in such locations would be the drain, drain bank, then a recreational walkway (which forms the easement) then street trees, carriageway footpath, frontages/gardens and then the front of a house. To mitigate concerns about light and noise, street trees will be required and street lighting can be designed to minimise leakage/light pollution. These ‘tertiary’ streets can be designed to ensure that it is resident only traffic avoiding routes being used as a cut through / rat run.	No further change to SPD required.
	· Traffic measures to allow safe access for resident coming off their driveways, especially the ones near the current fence line in Danby Close.	T1	Access (Danby Close/East Carr Road)	This will be considered through the Transport Assessment. Any proposal will need to satisfy the Council that safe and sensible arrangements are made and the Council (as highway authority) will be involved in the whole planning process (including as consultees at the planning application stage).	No further change to SPD required
	· How do you propose to get some 1600 cars in and out of the development safely for the new and existing residents?	OO	Other Comment	See previous response	No further change to SPD required.
	· Will the bus route cover both developments?	OO	Other Comment	Given the constrained nature of East Carr Road (and the intention for this road to only serve a relatively small part of the wider area) and the fact that the SPD intends to restrict movement from one access point to the other, then it can be assumed that a future bus service would only serve that part of the site accessed from Danby Close. It is however possible that those living in the separate part of the development (accessed from East Carr Road) would still be able to benefit from such a service. The Council is keen to promote access to the site by buses but essentially this will be a commercial decision for bus operators and at this stage it is too early to be considering specific routes, bus stops etc... An ‘indicative’ route is shown on the SPD.	No further change to SPD required.
	Amenities				

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
	· Lack of school provision the local school is oversubscribed on a year on year basis.	LF2	School capacity	The issue of school capacity was considered when the Local Plan was being drafted and at that time the Council's Education team confirmed that there should be sufficient capacity in local schools to accommodate this scale of development. This position was reached based on assumptions of build-out rates, likely numbers of children going through the education system and population projections / birth rates more generally. This position will be reviewed as and when an application is considered but there is no indication at present that a different outcome will be reached.	See above
	· Limited amount of shops, doctors surgery in the local area.	LF1	Local services (GPs, dentists)	Access to services and facilities is clearly an important planning consideration however, it is the case that in many parts of the city there is not going to be direct access to a full range of services. That said, in a relatively dense urban area most services should be within a reasonable distance and the fact that the area has regular bus services is of benefit in relation to accessing services, facilities and jobs. If proposals for small scale retail within this area came forward or indeed if such a proposal was included in a planning application for the site then the Council would look at this favourably. However, in the current economic climate and having regard to trends in retail (including the rapid increase in on-line shopping) it is perhaps unlikely that this will be the case.	See above
	The above would mean additional car journeys each and every day taking the children to school and going to a larger supermarket. Hull Local Plan	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted - refer to transport assessment	No further change to SPD required.
	· Can you please confirm how the 12 objections to areas 861 and 862 received during the drafting of the Hull Local Plan were contacted in the first instance ALEX CODD	OO	Other Comment	I am not able to categorically answer this question but would suggest that individuals became aware of the proposal during the plan making stage (on the basis of public notices, press notices etc...). If someone contacts the Council about a particular planning issue we will normally ask them if they want to be added to the Local Plan Consultation database (with a view to being kept informed of particular planning matters or planning matters in general). There was an extensive consultation database created for the Local Plan. This has now been deleted as the plan has been prepared and to comply with data protection requirements (i.e. we held information specifically related to the preparation of the Local Plan).	No further change to SPD required.
	· Hull Local Plan Revision Date.			A report is due to be presented to the Council's Planning Committee and Cabinet in July setting out proposals for a partial review of the Local Plan. This is with a view to commencing the review as a matter of urgency with a target date of the end of 2023 (reflecting Government's ambitions for all local planning authorities to have an up-to-date plan by then)	
ECC22	I would like to put forward my complaint on the proposed planning of East Carr and Danby Close. Traffic too noisy too much flooding	OO	Other Comment	See T2 (wider traffic concerns) and EE4 (pollution) above	No further change to SPD required.
	Bus routes using Danby Close.	OO	Other Comment	See Flood1 (flooding and drainage) above	No further change to SPD required.
	Not enough Schools for the amount of houses you are planning to build.	OO	Other Comment	See T1 (Danby Close) above	No further change to SPD required.
	The level of noise will be horrendous the state of the road with all the mud and muck that the huge lorries bring with them.	Construct1	Construction disruption	See Construct1 (Construction disruption) above	No further change to SPD required

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
	I believe the road will not be strong enough to accommodate all the traffic that will be using Danby Close.	T1	Access (Danby Close/East Carr Road)	See T1 (Traffic access) above	No further change to SPD required
	Our quiet Close will be in turmoil if this goes ahead. Neighbours are already leaving the Close because of this planning they have lived in the close for many years and they believe it will just disrupt there lives too much and why should we move because of this ridiculous planning application	PC3	Loss of outlook / privacy	See PC3 (Loss of outlook / privacy) above	See above
ECC23	I have received my newsletter and I am quite upset that the plans are still going ahead. The traffic is already so busy down East car lane and spring cottage in general. The amount of houses which are being planned to be built will just make this worse. I am very against the plans going ahead as I am aware many others are.	T2	Wider traffic concerns	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
	Building this many more houses in such a small area with no additional schools, local facilities will be unthinkable.	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required.
	The area is already a flood area and then to build more houses is defiantly a concern for me and my wife.	LF2	School capacity	See LF2 (School capacity) above	See above
	The area is lovely and quite and one of the reason we purchased our house but I worry all the noise, pollution and other issues building these houses are going to bring.	Flood1	Flooding	See Flood1 (Flooding) above	See above
	PLEASE STOP these plans from going ahead.	Construct1	Construction disruption	See Construct1 (Construction disruption) above	No further change to SPD required
		EE4	Pollution	comment noted	No further change to SPD required.
ECC24	I believe that there's more meetings regarding this idiotic proposal and I once more submit my letter of disgust at what the council is going to do over this site. 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. I also remember back in the 1990s that the council turned down planning permission mostly the same reasons as I give below	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted Comment noted	No further change to SPD required.
	These houses are to be built on a flood plain. Remember 2007 when this area looked more like a large lake. How can you consider a development in such an area? Which is contrary to the councils own Strategic policies regarding flooding and drainage. I still cannot believe that the council agreed to develop this green field flood site. It does not make any sense especially as I stated it contravenes the council's own policies.	Allocate3	What has changed since 1994 decision	See Allocate3 (What has changed since 1994) above	No further change to SPD required
	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.	Flood1	Flooding	See Flood1 (flooding) above. This land is an allocated site in the Local Plan and a series of specific planning policies within this plan will need to be considered should an application be received	See above
		Allocate2	Focus on brownfield first	See Allocate2 (Focus on brownfield) above	No further change to SPD required

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
	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.	T2	Wider traffic concerns	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
	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 Salhouse 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	T1	Access (Danby Close/East Carr Road)	See T1 (Traffic access) above	No changes to SPD required
	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.	LF2	School capacity	See LF2 (School capacity) above	See above
	What about insurance premiums for our homes with the additional threat of flooding increasing with this development.	PC1	Home insurance	See PC1 (Home insurance) above	See above
	Finally, the environmental impact on the wildlife we have left in this area would be drastic to say the least as well as noise pollution to deep pile the site to try to make it safer from flooding.	EE2	Environmenta l value	See EE2 (Environmental value) above	No further change to SPD required.
	Should you wish to contact me today my number is ##### and my mobile is ##### or alternatively my work email is #####.co.uk.	EE4	Pollution	See EE4 (Pollution) above	No further change to SPD required.
ECC25	I wish to express my concern regarding the proposal of building houses to the rear of Danby Close in Sutton-on-Hull.	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required.
	This will impact severely on the amount of wild life we get in the area and also the amount of green area we have, which then impacts on mental health issues.	EE2	Environmenta l value	See EE2 (Environmental value) above	No further change to SPD required.
	The traffic will impact enormously on the already over stretched access roads to the development.	T1	Access (Danby Close/East Carr Road)	See T1 (Traffic access) above	No further change to SPD required
	We have lost our only GP surgery and now have to travel to Longhill or Morrill Street to see a GP which is just about impossible to get an appointment due to them being overstretched already without the impact even more households will generate.	LF1	Local services (GPs, dentists)	See LF1 (Local Services) above	See above
	This area is a flood zone as we know from 2007 when a lot of the area was in flood causing houses to be flooded. Any building of houses will have a negative impact on where the water will flow causing more flooding to the existing houses around Howdale Road.	Flood1	Flooding	See Flood1 (Flooding) above	See above
	By the time people living in the area knew anything about the proposed housing development the land had already been sold and planning had been granted, this is so so wrong, it amounts to back handed ways which is not how things should be done. Councillors should be here to help us not to go behind our backs to line their own pockets, absolutely let down by the people we vote in.	Allocate1	Size / principle of development	Permission has not been granted for development and an application has not been received. The principle of development however has been established throughh inclusion in the Local Plan.	No further change to SPD required.
ECC26	Historic England				

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>As per our previous comments, 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. We also endorse the changes made to the heritage section of the SPD on page 13, highlighting the potential for hitherto unknown archaeological remains on the site, and the need for planning applications to be supported an appropriate archaeological evaluation. These changes respond positively to the comments made in our previous representation submitted in response to the draft SPD published in 2020. Historic England provides a pre-application service that we would recommend prospective applicants utilise at an early stage of project development.</p>	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required.
ECC27	<p>Having read the supplementary planning documents for East Carr we cannot see that any changes have been made that would improve the development for current residents therefore we still object to this development. We will enclose a copy of our previous objections but here is a summary.</p>	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required.
	<p>Increased traffic is our main objection the local roads already struggle to cope with current levels of traffic and will already see increases in traffic from current building at Sutton Place, Middlesex Road and the new school? at the mini roundabout at the end of Dunvegan Road. Also why is there any need to send buses down Dunvegan Road and/or East Carr Road. Its not such a long walk to Dunvegan or Howdale Road and certainly no further than other residents in Hull have to a bus stop. More consideration should be given to current residents who will not be compensated in any way for the reduction in quality of life.</p>	T2	Wider traffic concerns	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
	<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>	Allocate1	Size / principle of development	See Allocate1 (size/principle of development) and Consult1 (consultation on Local Plan) above	No further change to SPD required.

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
	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!	Allocate3	What has changed since 1994 decision	This land is one of the few remaining areas of open space on the outskirts of the city that is available for development. This is a fact. The Council will always look at opportunities to bring forward brownfield land for new development and has a very strong track record in doing so. However, brownfield land alone is not enough to deliver the level of new house building required over the plan period.	No further change to SPD required
	· 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.	Des1	Design	The Council is promoting a layout which seeks to reduce the dependance on cars. It is not the case that this site is being sold as a traffic free area.	No further change to SPD required
	· The nearest doctor's surgery is on Wawne road – a good 25-minute walk away. Few people will walk this far.	LF1	Local services (GPs, dentists)	See LF1 (Local Services) above	See above
	· Spring cottage primary school has been over-subscribed for many years meaning that residents will need a car to get their children to school.	LF2	School capacity	See LF2 (School capacity) above	See above
	· The local pharmacy is extremely busy already meaning very long waits to collect medication.	LF1	Local services (GPs, dentists)	See LF1 (Local Services) above	See above
	· 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 walk carrying shopping.	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required.
	· 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.	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required.
	· 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.	T2	Wider traffic concerns	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
	· 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.	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted - there is no intention of using East carr Road as a bus route. If the site is to be accessed by public transport it is likely that this will be via Danby Close.	No further change to SPD required.
	· 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.	T1	Access (Danby Close/East Carr Road)	See previous comment. Access issues will be considered further as part of the transport assessment.	No further change to SPD required
	· 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!	Flood1	Flooding	See Flood1 (Flooding) above	See above

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
	Please, please reconsider this terrible plan.	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required.
ECC28	Please see my objections detailed below to the East Carr Masterplan SPD no. 6				
	· The current SPD leaves vast areas of it to interpretation and a lot more further detail is required which will help in ensuring any developer is clear on its requirements.	OO	Other Comment	the SPD by its very nature is intended to act as a framework for future development which will be used in combination with the long list of relevant policies in the Local Plan and other SPDs (e.g. dealing with house design, flooding/drainage, biodiversity, open spaces etc....). In considering any planning application, we will require considerable information and compliance with prevailing planning policy. The danger of producing an overly prescriptive document is that this will be of limited value in relation to dealing with future planning applications which may well come forward with an 'alternative' vision for the area. Our job is to ensure that any such applications meets the 'spirit' of the agreed SPD – recognising of course that in some cases, there may be scope for alternative arrangements which are actually better than those set out in the SPD.	No further change to SPD required.
	· Where will the emergency bollards / access be situated to prevent access from one development to the other?		#N/A	This level of detail is not possible to prescribe in the SPD. It is unlikely that any future planning application will look exactly like the masterplan set out in the SPD and accordingly, reference to emergency bollards/access is highlighted as a 'principle' which will be required in any proposal. Such detail will be addressed as part of the planning application stage.	No further change to SPD required
	· How are you going to ensure that there is two viable entrances?	OO	Other Comment	This will be done through either the transport assessment which the Council has undertaken to complete or through a planning application and any accompanying transport assessment required as part of that process. The Council's highways team will in any event need to be satisfied that adequate arrangements are in place.	No further change to SPD required.
	· Can the number of houses for this development be set in stone as we have heard of a possibility of up to 800 houses?	OO	Other Comment	The Local Plan establishes an 'indicative' combined housing figure for this area of 702 units and the SPD (having regard to the specific layout proposed) proposes 689 units. The actual number of houses is clearly intended to be around this level but (as is the case with most sites) the actual number will be informed by any application that is submitted. The Council will need to be satisfied that the overall layout of any proposed development accords with the SPD and this inevitably will act as a constraint on numbers.	No further change to SPD required.
	· Waste water connection where is it going to connect to.	OO	Other Comment	The public sewer system will be approved by Yorkshire Water, however it should be noted that Yorkshire Water are a statutory consultee on Local Plans so that they can make comment on the impact new development would have on the sewer system. It should also be noted that legally developers have the right to connect to existing sewers.	No further change to SPD required.
	· Surface run off water where will these drains be connected to.	OO	Other Comment	The drainage system following development will mimic the existing natural drainage on site so connections will be the same to Holderness Drain, Suttoncross and East Carr.	No further change to SPD required.
	· Garages shown on the plan with no vehicle access.	OO	Other Comment	All on-plot garages will be accessed from rear access routes and/or via driveways from the front.	No further change to SPD required.
	· Alternative routes to the two development what has been considered?	OO	Other Comment	The Council has always stated that it sees Danby Close and East Carr Road as being the two most likely access points to the new development. This was the case in relation to the (then) emerging Local Plan. The SPD has continued to promote this approach albeit recognising that other options may exist and that if such options are presented as part of a planning application that consideration would be given to them.	No further change to SPD required.

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
	· Pile driving for possible 10 years how do you expect the local residents to deal with this when some have lived in this area and quiet Cul De Sac for forty years plus.	OO	Other Comment	Unfortunately it is inevitable that there will be noise and disturbance associated with new development and whilst the Council can impose conditions to ensure that this is managed (in relation to e.g. operational hours) it will not be able to eliminate such matters in their entirety. Noise associated with construction is strictly speaking not a material planning consideration i.e it is not something that can be effectively taken into account in determining a planning application. Pile driving (which may or may not be required on this site) is but one part of the development process and is unlikely (if required) to be a constant throughout the life of the construction phase.	No further change to SPD required.
	· To the residents it looks like the planning dept and council are very keen to rush this SPD through why please explain.	OO	Other Comment	The Council is keen to progress this SPD because the land is allocated in the Local Plan and there is a prospect that an application may be submitted to bring it forward for development. If this happens in advance of the SPD being adopted then, the Council will need to consider the merits of the applications in accordance with the Local Plan. The SPD allows for more detailed consideration of local issues including layout and design.	No further change to SPD required.
	Increased risk of flooding · Which financial year will the flood assessment take place and what format will this flood assessment be in?	OO	Other Comment	At present, I have no information in relation to when this assessment will be undertaken – the SPD does however include a commitment to undertaking this work prior to an application being considered. Likewise details of format are at present unknown – the Council employs officers with considerable knowledge and experience of such matters and they will be involved in procuring this assessment ensuring that it fully addresses all matters that it needs to. The work will however include a Flood Risk Assessment in line with government guidance to assess the risk and recommend ways to mitigate the risk and a Drainage Impact Assessment. This would assess the existing drainage on site prior to any development to evaluate run off rates and discharge locations. This would then be used to calculate the required storage volumes	No further change to SPD required.
	· Houses build on stilts where is all the water underneath going to drain to.	OO	Other Comment	There is no reference to houses being built on stilts albeit in most cases in the city, new housing has to be built to a higher level than was traditionally the case. In any event, planning policy requires such matters to be fully considered before any approval can be granted. The Local Planning Authority needs to be satisfied not only that new housing is not placed at risk but also that existing flood risk is not simply transferred to surrounding housing. The detail of how this is considered will be considered in light of any detailed planning application that is submitted as this will allow for relevant calculations and assessments to be undertaken in light of proposed numbers of houses and layout etc...	No further change to SPD required.

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
	· What will stop residents paving their gardens causing further surface water run-off.	PC1	OO	This is a genuine concern and one that the Council is keen to address. Partly we do this through making assumptions about the continued loss of permeable surfaces post development and factoring this into drainage solutions. In addition, there will always be a strong focus on ensuring that planned drainage infrastructure is in public ownership. Given the particular drainage challenges associated with this area, there is a possibility of removing certain 'permitted development rights' which could for example prevent (or reduce) the extent to which front gardens can be 'hard surfaced' and I intend to add such a reference to the final draft SPD. Finally (and this is something that the Council is looking at across the City) we are keen to raise awareness of such matters with householders – with the intention of encouraging a different approach to such matters i.e. choosing not to undertake certain types of work for your own benefit and the benefit of neighbours.	Add the following reference to the SPD - 'consideration will be given to removing certain development rights which would impact on the drainage capacity of the site in light of information provided through detailed flood and drainage impact assessments'.
	· What will stop residents removing the water butts?	OO	Other Comment	See previous answer. It should be also noted that water butts will not be included in the formal storage calculations as whilst they can reduce flood risk significantly if used appropriately, it relies on individuals to do this and there is currently no way of enforcing everyone to do this effectively. Hence water butts would only be providing additional storage on what is required in the formal system.	No further change to SPD required.
	· Underground water storage tanks how will these be pumped out, where to and at what times.	OO	Other Comment	A Drainage Impact Assessment will determine the amount of storage required which would then need to be used by anyone developing the site to determine site layout and densities and how the required storage volume can be accommodated. At this stage there is no certainty that underground storage tanks would be required however if they are then the locations and discharge points would also be determined in the Drainage Impact Assessment. Please see susdrains website for more detail https://www.susdrain.org/delivering-suds/using-suds/suds-components/retention_and_detention/geocellular-storage-systems.html	No further change to SPD required.
	· Rain garden to take grey water please explain what this means.	OO	Other Comment	Essentially this relates to natural / semi natural drainage infrastructure (rain gardens, open spaces, tree pits etc...) which collects surface water (from roads and roofs) which otherwise would go straight into underground drainage infrastructure. The Council sees this as a key to addressing flood risk across the entire city and has secured considerable funding already to retrofit existing property. In any new development we are keen to reduce flows of water into an already highly pressurised drainage system.	No further change to SPD required.
	· East Carr River how will this river be crossed.	OO	Other Comment	The SPD clearly acknowledges that a crossing will be required but the mechanism for how best to achieve this will be for a developer to address – clearly the nature and design (including safety issues) will be addressed as part of any planning application	No further change to SPD required.
	· EA lagoons how will this and the rest of the Holderness drain flood alleviation project prevent areas 861 and 862 from flooding.	OO	Other Comment	The FAS will not directly benefit the proposed housing site. The intention of the FAS is to reduce the risk of flooding to existing housing. Any proposal coming forward for the East Carr housing site will need to address flood risk (both on site and off site)	No further change to SPD required.
	Highway safety · Which financial year will the traffic assessment take place and in what format will this traffic assessment be in?	OO	Other Comment	The SPD includes a commitment to undertaking this work prior to an application being considered. At present there is no date for the work to be undertaken. Likewise details of format are at present unknown – the Council employs officers with considerable knowledge and experience of such matters and they will be involved in procuring this assessment ensuring that it fully addresses all matters that it needs to.	No further change to SPD required.

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
	· No roads parallel to neighbouring houses this is to reduce noise and light pollution for the local residents.	T2	Wider traffic concerns	The Environment Agency require an easement along all water courses and therefore it is not appropriate to have back gardens onto the drain. Although consideration was given to requiring a green strip with back gardens beyond, this was considered to have potentially negative outcomes i.e. fly-tipping lacking natural 'surveillance' from houses. In effect what we are looking at in such locations would be the drain, drain bank, then a recreational walkway (which forms the easement) then street trees, carriageway footpath, frontages/gardens and then the front of a house. To mitigate concerns about light and noise, street trees will be required and street lighting can be designed to minimise leakage/light pollution. These 'tertiary' streets can be designed to ensure that it is resident only traffic avoiding routes being used as a cut through / rat run.	See above
	· Traffic measures to allow safe access for resident coming off their driveways, especially the ones near the current fence line in Danby Close.	T1	Access (Danby Close/East Carr Road)	This will be considered through the Transport Assessment. Any proposal will need to satisfy the Council that safe and sensible arrangements are made and the Council (as highway authority) will be involved in the whole planning process (including as consultees at the planning application stage).	No further change to SPD required
	· Will the bus route cover both developments?	OO	Other Comment	Given the constrained nature of East Carr Road (and the intention for this road to only serve a relatively small part of the wider area) and the fact that the SPD intends to restrict movement from one access point to the other, then it can be assumed that a future bus service would only serve that part of the site accessed from Danby Close. It is however possible that those living in the separate part of the development (accessed from East Carr Road) would still be able to benefit from such a service. The Council is keen to promote access to the site by buses but essentially this will be a commercial decision for bus operators and at this stage it is too early to be considering specific routes, bus stops etc... An 'indicative' route is shown on the SPD.	No further change to SPD required.
	Inadequate access · Through both Danby Close and East Carr Road.	T1	Access (Danby Close/East Carr Road)	See T1 (Traffic access) above	No further change to SPD required
	· How do you purpose to get some 1600 cars in and out of the development safely for the new and existing residents?	T1	Access (Danby Close/East Carr Road)	This will be considered through the Transport Assessment. Any proposal will need to satisfy the Council that safe and sensible arrangements are made and the Council (as highway authority) will be involved in the whole planning process (including as consultees at the planning application stage).	no further change to SPD required
	Increase noise and disturbance	PC3	Loss of outlook / privacy	See PC3 (Loss of outlook / privacy) above	See above
	Pollution, noise/smells	EE4	Pollution	See EE4 (Pollution) above	No further change to SPD required.
	Impact on the environment	EE2	Environmenta l value	See EE2 (Environmental value) above	No further change to SPD required.
	Loss of ecological habitats	EE2	Environmenta l value	See EE2 (Environmental value) above	No further change to SPD required.

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
	Loss of recreational/green space	OO	Other Comment	The development will clearly result in the loss of open space (albeit this open space is in private ownership and access could be restricted by the owner). Planned new open space will be provided as part of the development and land further to the north east will be opened up for public access as part of the flood alleviation scheme.	No further change to SPD required.
	Pressure on local amenities, schools, doctors and dentists, etc.	LF1	Local services (GPs, dentists)	See LF1 (Local Services) above	See above
	· Lack of school provision the local school is oversubscribed on a year on year basis.	LF2	School capacity	The issue of school capacity was considered when the Local Plan was being drafted and at that time the Council's Education team confirmed that there should be sufficient capacity in local schools to accommodate this scale of development. This position was reached based on assumptions of build-out rates, likely numbers of children going through the education system and population projections / birth rates more generally. This position will be reviewed as and when an application is considered but there is no indication at present that a different outcome will be reached.	See above
	· Limited amount of shops, doctor's surgery in the local area.	LF1	Local services (GPs, dentists)	Access to services and facilities is clearly an important planning consideration however, it is the case that in many parts of the city there is not going to be direct access to a full range of services. That said, in a relatively dense urban area most services should be within a reasonable distance and the fact that the area has regular bus services is of benefit in relation to accessing services, facilities and jobs. If proposals for small scale retail within this area came forward or indeed if such a proposal was included in a planning application for the site then the Council would look at this favourably. However, in the current economic climate and having regard to trends in retail (including the rapid increase in on-line shopping) it is perhaps unlikely that this will be the case	See above
	Overlooking and loss of privacy	PC3	Loss of outlook / privacy	See PC3 (Loss of outlook / privacy) above	See above
	· Potential three story houses.	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required.
	Loss of visual amenity	PC3	Loss of outlook / privacy	See PC3 (Loss of outlook / privacy) above	See above
	Inappropriate layout and density of the development · If the developer gets his way to develop 800 houses.	Des1	Design	See Des1 (Design) above	No change to SPD
ECC29	1.Firstly can I just point out that I was the only member of the public that attended the very unpublicised meeting with yourselves and building contractors and this was only because of my persistent emails with Councillor Codd's assistant that I found out that there was actually a meeting, so then I was formally invited. No other residents were aware of this meeting.	OO	Other Comment	It is assumed that this reference is to the Local Plan examination process. The Council consulted widely and in accordance with national regulations and with its own Statement of Community Involvement.	No further change to SPD required.
	In this meeting I was informed that residents would have input in what building types would be actually built near our boundaries, and the layout in general.	OO	Other Comment	This is partly the role of the SPD and will also be dealt with through consultation on any planning application.	No further change to SPD required.
	If this plan does proceed regardless of the residents objections and now ALL council parties seemingly objecting, including Labour, there are certain criteria that we think must be applied, listed below			Comment noted - Planning Committee and Cabinet have endorsed the SPD	No further change to SPD required

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
	1. Residents, especially the ones whose homes currently look onto the fields, MUST be involved with the masterplan, if this land is handed over to builders. Public meetings with the planners from the very beginning through the entire process, are a must. Residents must be allowed to put their proposals forward	OO	Other Comment	If an application is received for the site, there is a requirement for public consultation. Developers will also always be encouraged to consult with residents at an early stage in the process.	No further change to SPD required.
	2. Are all the original field boundary hedges definitely remaining as shown on your plans, to help the wildlife?	OO	Other Comment	The SPD highlights the importance of hedgrows and seeks to ensure 'no net loss' with potential for the creation / improvement of hedgrows.	No further change to SPD required.
	3. Having looked at the sketches in your paperwork, it shows numerous 3 stories houses, surely this won't be allowed, but also no bungalows??	OO	Other Comment	The SPD does not specify house types albeit some of the illustrative material (which is taken from the Councils Residential Design Guide) highlights 3 storey houses. The mix of housing will be informed by the policy within the Hull Local Plan which seeks to meet identified needs and to re-balance' the existing stock of housing (e.g. if there is a need for more smaller houses then that would be a priority in any given area)	No further change to SPD required.
	4. One of the main problems is the infrastructure for the residents of another 800 homes/1200 vehicles. The access through Danby Close is not a viable option as there is no scope to widen the close at all . Also, East Carr Road is a no through road leading to a Cul de Sac, to a track , to a driving range. This would need major structural improvement to be viable at all.	T2	Wider traffic concerns	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
		T1	Access (Danby Close/East Carr Road)	See T1 (Traffic access) above	No further change to SPD required
	5. Would it be more feasible to make an entrance from Salthouse Road, and rehash the rear of Sutton Park golf course to provide a main road in and out, as a similar road runs through Ganstead Park golf course, ie Longdales Lane	OO	Other Comment	The cost of building a new road of this length would be prohibitive	No further change to SPD required.
	6. Any traffic assessments that are done by the Council, must be done once all Covid restrictions have ended and the schools are actively open. This is the only way to do a fair assessment for the volumes of traffic that currently use the area.	OO	Other Comment	Restrictions have now largely been lifetd and although traffic levels have not necessarily returned to pre pandemic levels it is likely that by the time an assessment is undertaken that they will have done so. If not then allowances will need to be made to reflect previous levels of traffic movement. It would clearly not be appropriate to model traffic impact on the basis of artificially low levels of movement.	No further change to SPD required.
	7. Section 5.2 scale and density - quotes 'Cul de sac housing works best on a small scale with vehicle access to the rear of the plots, but you will allow 1200 vehicles to access Danby close, which is also a Cul de Sac. Double standards comes to mind.	OO	Other Comment	Dalby Close is at present a cul de sac but clearly has the potential to be opened up to allow for further development.	No further change to SPD required.
	8. 8 meter easement for servicing of the drain- need more detailed plan of what will be after the 8 meters, will there then be the 14 - 18 meters as in figure 17, edge of development plan.	OO	Other Comment	The SPD provides indicative maps / diagrams - in effect what we are looking at in such locations would be the drain, drain bank, then a recreational walkway (which forms the easement) then street trees, carriageway footpath, frontages/gardens and then the front of a house. More accurate plans will be required as part of any planning application and such plans will be available for public comment.	No further change to SPD required.
	9. Flooding potential - where does all the water go once the 'Butts' are full???	OO	Other Comment	Water butts are but one of the devices that can be used to slow down the release of water - on their own they would clearly not be adequate to deal with the drainage requirements of the area.	No further change to SPD required.
	10. Figure 18, suds street concept - will our boundary have these to prevent flooding for us	OO	Other Comment	Any new development must be constructed to ensure flood risk elsewhere is not increased	No further change to SPD required.
	SuDS are designed to empty whilst the sewers are able to cope, but provide additional storage capacity in times of heavy rain+F263:H263+D260	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required.

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
	It is with a bit of sadness that I have read the consultation plan and read the bits in red. The following is just a small amount of my thoughts.	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required.
	I see that water butts and SUDS are a big part of the plan to try and reduce surface water but a water butt soon fills up and then it's poured on the ground to water the flowers SUDS do the same once full over flow	OO	Other Comment	Water butts are but one of the devices that can be used to slow down the release of water - on their own they would clearly not be adequate to deal with the drainage requirements of the area. SuDS are designed to empty whilst the sewers are able to cope, but provide additional storage capacity in times of heavy rain	No further change to SPD required. No further change to SPD required.
	I see that the same drawings and plans of the houses are still the same with the same comments about possible upgrade of East Carr lane. The original reason that this build was declined before was due to flooding and that the road infrastructure was not suitable for any more traffic.	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required.
		Allocate3	What has changed since 1994 decision	See Allocate3 (What has changed since 1994) above	No further change to SPD required
	I do feel that as the same as East Riding Council has done ,with just building on land that has been knocked back for three times, that Hull City Council will build these houses regardless of public objections and concerns.	OO	Other Comment	The land is allocated for housing in the Local Plan and the SPD adds a greater degree of control of what may come forward as and when a planning application is received. Development cannot occur until an application is approved and this will need to be in accordance with a wide range of policies in the Local Plan.	No further change to SPD required.
	Lovells is a major big wealthy company and along with HCC they will get round what ever problems arise. We have not seen any road improvements in this area and now all these new houses have been built on the B1237 up near Saltshouse Tavern the traffic is going to be horrendous. There is no Traffic survey info or even the Environment Impact survey and I still feel HCC will push this development through anyway.		Comment noted	Any proposals will need to be in accordance with the Local Plan and other national planning policy requirements	No further change to SPD required
		T2	Wider traffic concerns	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
	The houses that will be built will not be affordable housing will be out of reach of first time buyers. If only 25 per cent of these house will be available for Council tenants then how is this correct. HCC will just cash in on this build.	OO	Other Comment	The SPD includes a commitment to undertaking a transport assessment which will inform decisions on any subsequent planning application. A range of other assements will also be required as is the case with other development proposals across the city. Curent planning policy requires a minimum of 10% of new housing to be affordable.	No further change to SPD required. No further change to SPD required.
		OO	Other Comment	Affordable housing provided on this site is likely to be purchased by a housing association and whilst tenants on the Council's waiting list may be eligible for this housing there is no financial benefit to the Council (i.e. rental income would be paid to the housing association)	No further change to SPD required.
	I seriously strongly appose any development on this land	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required.
ECC31 & 43	The first point to emphasise here is that affected residents were not given adequate opportunity to object when the land was allocated for housing development. This period of so called consultation follows the sham at the Saltshouse Tavern last summer of what should have been a proper public meeting (which could have been arranged after COVID).	Allocate1	Size / principle of development	See Allocate1 (Size/principle of development) above	No further change to SPD required.
		OO	Other Comment	The Council has undertaken consultation on this document in accordance with its Statement of Community Involvement (which ensures that the Council operates in line with prevailing national regulations). Some different apporaches were taken to deal with the consequences of the pandemic. The option to delay the whole process was considered to run the risk of not completing the SPD before a planning application was received. If that had been the case then the application of the SPD would have to have been considered against the more generic policies in the Local Plan. The SPD adds considerable additional detail to ensure that a better quality of development is achieved on the ground.	No further change to SPD required.

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
	It all smacks of capitalistic greed with developers hovering to make a kill. Bet nobody is planning to build any bungalows which do not make enough profit.	OO	Other Comment	Prevailing planning policy seeks to ensure the new housing meets identified needs and 're-balances' existing stock (e.g. providing more smaller houses where there is an oversupply of larger ones). Applications are often submitted to the Council with for example too many large houses and the Council will negotiate to ensure that a better mix of housing is provided. Consideration will be given to including bungalows as part of this proposal although (as is the case in many other parts of the city) such housing can present additional challenges in relation to risks associated with flooding.	No further change to SPD required.
	The number of houses now seems to have risen to 800+ which will bring at least 1000 extra vehicles up and down Danby Close plus public transport. This cul-de-sac currently has 34 houses mainly semi detached. When opened up it will bring havoc with all the contractors' lorries, etc. The prospect having pile driving for the next 10 years is terrible to say the least.	T2	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	The SPD includes an indicative figure of just under 700 houses. See T2 (wider traffic issues) above	See above
	We note the comments on flood alleviation but whatever the builders are supposedly asked to do will not resist the increased risk of flooding. The Castlehill Aquagreen proposals may help the area west of Danby Close but will not save East Carr once all the slabs of concrete are in the ground.	OO	Other Comment	The SPD is clear to the extent that new development will not be placed at risk from flooding and that any new development must be constructed to ensure flood risk elsewhere is not increased	No further change to SPD required.
	However, the main concern is the volume of extra traffic that will cripple the Danby Close access area with the significant additional risk to health and safety. An alternative (and safe) access needs to be found otherwise this piece of the local plan should be scrapped.	T1	Access (Danby Close/East Carr Road)	See T1 (Traffic access) above	No further change to SPD required
ECC32	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.	Allocate1	Size / principle of development	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required.
	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.	Allocate3	What has changed since 1994 decision	See Allocate3 (What has changed since 1994) above	No further change to SPD required
	The document states that objections were raised in 2017, whom by? What process was followed? Information was not sent to us regarding this proposal.	OO	Other Comment	Consultation on the Local Plan was carried out at various points during its preparation in accordance with the Government's requirements. It was then examined by a Government Planning Inspector. Comments received were considered, and some of these comments were objections to the allocation. It is not appropriate (or allowable under the terms of the GDPR) to provide specific names / addresses.	No further change to SPD required.
	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.	Allocate1	Size / principle of development	These figures are incorrect. The population of the city has actually increased over this period.	No further change to SPD required.
	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.	PC1	Home insurance	See PC1 (home insurance) above. The SPD outlines how such matters will be addressed albeit the detail of any approach will need to be determined in light of a specific application being submitted (which will confirm numbers of dwellings/layout etc...)	See above

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
	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.	T2	Wider traffic concerns	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
	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	School capacity	See LF2 (School capacity) above	See above
	Access via Danby Close and East Carr Road is not safe or viable. If this planning is allowed to go ahead it will have a detrimental effect on hundreds of lives.	T1	Access (Danby Close/East Carr Road)	See T1 (Traffic access) above	No further change to SPD required
ECC33	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust We are encouraged to see a number of our recommended considerations included within the amended masterplan document. However, we have noted that the document only states a 10% gain in hedgerows is required. In line with emerging guidance and the NPPF, we would expect to see commitments to a 10% net gain for all biodiversity on site.	OO	Other Comment		No further change to SPD required.
ECC34	Re; SPD6 East Carr Masterplan 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;	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased risk of flooding 	Flood1	Flooding	See Flood1 (Flooding) above	See above
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic generation and congestion 	T2	Wider traffic concerns	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highway safety 	T2	Wider traffic concerns	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase noise, disturbance and pollution 	EE4	Pollution	See EE4 (Pollution) above	No further change to SPD required. See above
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on the environment 	LF1	Local services (GPs, dentists)	See LF1 (Local Services) above	See above
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on wildlife 	EE2	Environmenta l value	See EE2 (Environmental value) above	No further change to SPD required. See above
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pressure on local amenities 	LF1	Local services (GPs, dentists)	See LF1 (Local Services) above	See above
	I sincerely hope that the you take my objections on board when considering the development.	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required.
ECC35	Re; SPD6 East Carr Masterplan I wish to object to the proposed development on the ground of;				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased risk of flooding 	Flood1	Flooding	See Flood1 (Flooding) above	See above
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highway safety 	T2	Wider traffic concerns	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic generation Increase noise and disturbance Impact on the environment 	T2	Wider traffic concerns	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
		EE4	Pollution	See EE4 (Pollution) above	No further change to SPD required.
		EE2	Environmenta l value	See EE2 (Environmental value) above	No further change to SPD required.
ECC36	<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. Some estates are not serviced by any buses, Lindengate, Western Gail's and I'm sure there are probably others in the city.</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>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>We understand that a development of this size could take up to 13 years to complete.</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>	Allocate1	Size / principle of development	The land is allocated for housing in the Local Plan. Danby Close is one of two proposed access points. Traffic generation wwill be assessed through a transport assessment which is intended to be undertaken in advance of an application being received. In determining any subsequent planning application, the impact on local communities including those living on Danby Close will be considered.	No further change to SPD required.
		OO	Other Comment	The decision to extend a bus service into this site wil essentially be a commercial one albeit the Council are supportive of such an approach as this will assist in reducing car dependency. It is highly unlikely however that each service currently running along Howdale Road will choose to do so.	No further change to SPD required.
		PC1	Home insurance	See Flood1 (flooding and drainage) and PC1 (home insurance) above	See above
		PC4	Property value	See PC4 (Property value) above	See above
		Construct1	Construction disruption	See Construct1 (Construction disruption) above	No further change to SPD required
		OO	Other Comment	Completeion rates will depend on whether or not the site is being brought forward by one or more developers and also having regard to the strenght of the market over a period of time. It is certainly considered that a period of 10 years + is a reasonable estimate.	No further change to SPD required.
		OO	Other Comment	No land has been allocated in the East Riding in this vicinity	No further change to SPD required.
		LF1	Local services (GPs, dentists)	See LF1 (Local Services) above	See above
		LF2	School capacity	See LF2 (School capacity) above	See above
		PC3	Loss of outlook / privacy	In such locations the intention beyond the drain bank is to create a recreational walkway (which forms the easement) then street trees, carriageway footpath, frontages/gardens and then the front of a house. There will therefore be some distance between existing housing and new housing but also some natural surveillance which will help in relation to security. The SPD already seeks to protect existing planting in such areas but agree to expand this to encourage such planting to be strengthened to protect amenity of existing housing.	Add the following statement to the SPD, 'and opportunities should be taken to strengthen this planting where required to further protect the amenity of existing housing'

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
ECC37 & 38	<p>I am writing to you to OBJECT to the proposed and amended East Carr Supplementary Planning Document (SPD6) for the following reasons; SPD6</p> <p>The council has previously stated that approving the SPD would provide restrictions to how the land is used and developed. However, within the revised opening paragraphs of the latest SPD6 version, it is stated that this just offers guidance and NO clear restrictions. As local residents this gives us no clear indication as to what could potentially be built on our doorsteps and therefore the SPD6 is misleading to the general public.</p> <p>Traffic and Transport</p> <p>Adding 702 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.</p> <p>I note that traffic surveys are going to be undertaken and available to the public prior to any further planning applications, however this needs to take place under 'normal' circumstances when people are not working from home due to Covid restrictions, giving a fair view of how congested the roads already are.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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?</p> <p>Danby Close is not fit for traffic access for 702 houses let alone a bus route down it. The revised SPD6 acknowledges that "people may still choose to drive" only backs up previous objections with regards to traffic volume and inadequate infrastructure.</p> <p>Furthermore, the additional statement "EU directive on Electric Vehicle (EV) parking is relevant to this development. All homes should include a single operational EV point, and the ducting only needed to install a second charging point in the future. Operational EV points should be 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." Clearly shows the expectation on every property owning at least one vehicle, with the development allowing for 2 per household.</p>	OO	Other Comment	The SPD provides a framework for the future development of the site including an indicative layout and a series of principles that should be followed in drawing up plans for the area. This goes significantly beyond the more 'strategic' policy approach in the Local Plan and accordingly ensures a better planning outcome. It is not possible to be more prescriptive than this as ultimately the developer of the site may well have their own views - these will however need to broadly accord with the SPD which (once adopted) will carry weight in the decision making process.	No further change to SPD required.
	Adding 702 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.	T2	Wider traffic concerns	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
	I note that traffic surveys are going to be undertaken and available to the public prior to any further planning applications, however this needs to take place under 'normal' circumstances when people are not working from home due to Covid restrictions, giving a fair view of how congested the roads already are.	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted. Most restrictions have now been lifted albeit the level of traffic on the roads may well not have returned to normal levels - it is envisaged that by the time the assessment is undertaken that a more normal level of traffic will be evident. If this is not the case then necessary adjustments would need to be made. There is no benefit in progressing this with a artificially low level of traffic movement.	No further change to SPD required.
	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.	OO	Other Comment	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above.	No further change to SPD required.
	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?	Construct1	Construction disruption	See Construct1 (Construction disruption) above	No further change to SPD required
	Danby Close is not fit for traffic access for 702 houses let alone a bus route down it. The revised SPD6 acknowledges that "people may still choose to drive" only backs up previous objections with regards to traffic volume and inadequate infrastructure.	T1	Access (Danby Close/East Carr Road)	See T1 (Traffic access) above	no further change to SPD required
	Furthermore, the additional statement "EU directive on Electric Vehicle (EV) parking is relevant to this development. All homes should include a single operational EV point, and the ducting only needed to install a second charging point in the future. Operational EV points should be 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." Clearly shows the expectation on every property owning at least one vehicle, with the development allowing for 2 per household.	OO	Other Comment	The SPD proposes a layout and design which seeks to reduce dependance on private vehicles and promotes greater use of public transport and more active travel choices. It is however still necessary to plan for private car ownership and accordingly car parking standards have been applied. The push towards use of electric vehicles is important to deliver wider carbon reduction targets and to future proof housing as such infrastructure is likely to be required going forward with the move away from petrol/diesel vehicles. See Allocate3 (what has changed since 1994) above.	No further change to SPD required.

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
	The last planning permission was rejected due to the infrastructure not being fit for purpose, what has changed with the roads and infrastructure since the last planning application was last rejected? And how does the SPD6 address and overcome this issue?	Allocate3	What has changed since 1994 decision	See Allocate3 (what has changed since 1994) above. The SPD has been drafted against a very different policy background and although challenges still exist in relation to the capacity of roads / access points, it is intended that the transport assessment will establish what improvements are required to allow the development to come forward	No further change to SPD required
	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.	OO	Other Comment	This is correct. There are a couple of island refuges on Robson Way, one on Saltshouse Road and an underpass at the western end of Robson Way but no zebra or light controlled crossings between Wilberforce College and Wawne Road or on the estate. The transport assessment will consider safety issues and make recommendations in relation to whether or not the proposed development will add to any existing problems.	No further change to SPD required.
	With the new plans 702 houses introduce more children crossing roads and more cars on the road, thus becoming an increased safety hazard and significantly increases the risk of an accident! Average cars per household is 1.2 meaning an extra 842 cars in and around the community, which will be using the existing not fit for purpose infrastructure. How does the SPD6 address and overcome this issue?	OO	Other Comment	The SPD includes a commitment to undertaking a transport assessment which will inform decisions on any subsequent planning application.	No further change to SPD required.
	Negative Impact On the Local Community	OO	Other Comment		No further change to SPD required.
	The introduction of 702 house means potentially there could be 1,685 people introduced into the community, this is the equivalent to bringing a village like Skirlaugh into this area.	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required.
	The dearth of local amenities will mean they will be stretched beyond their limits. By adding a sentence regarding the small row of shops to the revised SPD6, only highlights how short on amenities the area already is and yet no additional amenities have been introduced into the amended SPD6 to accommodate the proposed additional housing.	OO	Other Comment	This land is allocated for housing but should a proposal come forward including retail (or other small scale services and facilities) then these would be regarded as ancillary to the main use and accordingly would likely be supported. This is essentially a commercial matter though. If a commercial operator sees an opportunity to provide a specific service then they will do so. However, given trends in retail etc. in recent years (and in light of more recent experience over the last 18 or so months) there is clearly a shift away from such uses.	No further change to SPD required.
	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.	OO	Other Comment	The planning service works closely with colleagues in the health sector in plan making with a view to ensuring that necessary investment in health care facilities can be aligned with future growth. No concerns were raised with regard to the allocation of this land for housing. In addition, it should be noted that such investment is again essentially a commercial matter.	No further change to SPD required.
	The local School (Spring Cottage) is currently oversubscribed and with the proposed planning of 702 more houses, where will these additional children be schooled?	LF2	School capacity	See LF2 (School capacity) above	See above
	Traffic issues again at school pick up and drop off times. Average children per household is 0.7 meaning potentially an additional 492 children will need a school to go to.	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required.
	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. How does the SPD6 address and overcome this issue?	T1	Access (Danby Close/East Carr Road)	See T1 (Traffic access) above	No further change to SPD required
	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.	OO	Other Comment	New open space will be created as part of this proposal and in addition, public access to the wider area to the east will be improved as part of the flood alleviation scheme. It should be noted that at present the land is in private ownership and public access to it could be removed / restricted.	No further change to SPD required.

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
	What plans are in place to deal with this given that the issue is not being dealt with effectively already?			As above	
	Poor Concept Design	Des1	Design	See Des1 (Design) above	No further change to SPD required
	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.	OO	Other Comment	The SPD is clear that it intends to limit and control parking on front gardens and streets. Garages are proposed as part of the solution to parking but reference is also made to curtilage parking (preferably to the side of the property) and parking to the rear of properties involving in some instances courtyard parking.	No further change to SPD required.
	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?	OO	Other Comment	Do not agree that tis is a contradiction. To encourage the use of public transport it is sensible to promote penetration of the site rather than rely on people walking to access a service.	No further change to SPD required.
	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.	OO	Other Comment	The Council cannot require a bus operator to amend an existing service or create a new one. This is largely a commercial matter (i.e. based on number of potential customers / scale of development and consequences for the effectiveness of the particular service) albeit the Council will encourage operators to do so.	No further change to SPD required.
	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.	OO	Other Comment	The Council is committed to improving cycling infrastructure across the city and to promoting active travel in general. The ability to do so is clearly influenced by the availability of funding and limitations imposed by the existing infrastructure and the built environment. New development presents an opportunity to do things differently with a view to a more informed active transport approach which over a period of time can be linked into a wider 'retrofit' of existing areas.	No further change to SPD required.
	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.	PC3	Loss of outlook / privacy	Opportunities will be taken to protect and enhance existing vegetation in such areas with a view to maintaining privacy and helping with security. The fact that new housing will be provided on the other side of the drains (albeit some distance away from the rear of the existing housing) will introduce more active natural surveillance. This new housing will face towards the drain but will be seperated by a minor road, footpath/cycle track, easment strip and the drain itself.	See above
	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.	OO	Other Comment	In determining any planning application the Council will consult with the Police and such matters can be dealt with at that point (i.e. techniques to control / avoid illegal use of footpaths / cycleways)	No further change to SPD required.
	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?	OO	Other Comment	See Flood1 (flooding and drainage) above	No further change to SPD required.
	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? How does the SPD6 address and overcome these issues?	OO	Other Comment	This is a matter that will be dealt with through a planning application and in particular through consultation with Yorkshire Water (who are a statutory consultee on such matters). If there is a need for existing infrastructure improvements then this would be identified at this stage.	No further change to SPD required.
	Negative Impact On the Local Wildlife and Ecology 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.	EE2	Environmenta l value	See EE2 (Environmental value) above	No further change to SPD required.

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
	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 SPD already acknowledges there is some ecological value associated with the fields and specifically states that there will be the need for an ecological appraisal and assessment (including consideration of bats)	
	The adjacent field is earmarked as a nature reserve area, however the building work alongside this will contradict what this is hoping to achieve.	OO	Other Comment	It is assumed that this reference is the the adjacent flood alleviation scheme which will involve improvements to the ecological value of the land. The assessments and related ecological management plan which will be required as a condition to any planning application will have regard to this with a view to ensuring that harm is not caused by the new development.	No further change to SPD required.
	What mitigations will be in place to ensure no impact on the current wildlife aspects in the area during both construction and going forward?	Construct1	Construction disruption	See previous comments regarding ecological appraisal and assessment and subsequent ecological management plan. It is only when such assessments etc... are undertaken that detailed knowledge of value will be available and accordingly mitigation measures identified.	No further change to SPD required
	We note that the need for an ecological appraisal has been identified within the SPD6, but at who's cost? This should be at the full cost of the developer.	OO	Other Comment	Such an assessment would normally be produced by the applicant / developer.	No further change to SPD required.
	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, the remnants of the winter just gone can still be seen in certain areas. 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 works has started.	OO	Other Comment	The majority of the fields are not functional floodplain - the only part (to the north of the fields) is explicitly excluded from the development proposals. Since 2007 the Council has constructed 7 Aquagreens (local flood alleviation schemes) in the city. 4 of these are in the Sutton area to address run off. A further large flood alleviation scheme is being progressed by the Environment Agency, also in the Sutton/Bransholme area.	No further change to SPD required.
	It was confirmed by the panel at the consultation on the 9th September 2021 that the flood alleviation plans were completely separate to the proposed housing development and does not take into account any additional housing.	OO	Other Comment	That is correct. The proposed flood alleviation scheme will largely benefit existing housing. The new development will need to address flood/drainage concerns seperately - and this is a clear planning policy requirement (at both national and local level).	No further change to SPD required.
	We also have in writing confirmation from the Engagement Specialist for the Holderness Drain Flood Alleviation Scheme at the Environment Agency, that "the Castle Hill flood storage area has been designed to protect existing properties in the North Carr area and does not cover the proposal for new housing at East Carr".	OO	Other Comment	That is correct.	No further change to SPD required.
	Your statement in the revised SPD6 "The related flood alleviation scheme top the northwest of the site will however have positive benefits to existing housing" is therefore false and needs to be removed from this document. In place should this not state "managing surface water and flood risk at the site will be at the cost and responsibility of the developer"?	OO	Other Comment	The reference in the SPD is correct. That is escatly what the flood alleviation will do. The SPD provides guidance for developers on what is required for a range of different matters - including a section of flooding and drainage. Reference is made to the specific policy requirements in the Local Plan on such matters.	No further change to SPD required.
	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?	Construct1	Construction disruption	The Council regularly imposes conditions on plannign approvals to deal with such matters - informed by an assessment of the particular pollution threats and advice from other relevant parties (e.g. environmental health)	No further change to SPD required

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
	We note that the following statement has been written into the SPD6 “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.” At who’s cost will this be? It should be stated that the developer will cover all associated costs regarding this.	OO	Other Comment	As previously stated, such matters are commonly included as 'conditions' on planning approvals and the cost of such work (which needs to be reviewed and agreed by the Council) is covered by the applicant / developer.	No further change to SPD required.
	Negative Impacts On Local People’s Health and Wellbeing.	OO	Other Comment		No further change to SPD required.
	The introduction of 702 house means that potentially there could be 1,685 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.	EE4	Pollution	See EE4 (Pollution) above	No further change to SPD required.
	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.	EE4	Pollution	Comment noted. When considering planning applications the Council will regularly consult with colleagues in environmental health regarding a range of matters including noise. Where appropriate, mitigation measures can be introduced including for example sound attenuation barriers / buffer planting. It is unlikely however that levels of noise associated with housing development will be significant (notwithstanding the fact that undoubtedly the character of the area including noise levels in general will change from those experienced at present)	No further change to SPD required.
	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? SPD6 fails to acknowledge that construction work may also be in progress on the next door flood alleviation scheme in parallel.	Construct1	Construction disruption	See Construct1 (Construction disruption) above	No further change to SPD required

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
	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 (AQMA) 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. Dust is also going to be a significant problem during the drier months and has not been addressed in the SPD6. SPD6 fails to acknowledge that construction work may also be in progress on the next door flood alleviation scheme in parallel.	EE4	Pollution	See EE4 (Pollution) above. The Council is required to identify and support the delivery of a certain level of new housing each year to meet identified needs. The challenges and threats identified will apply across the city as a whole. Development closer to the city centre will result in less movement and hence less carbon emissions and accordingly the Council is keen to promote growth in such areas - a very significant number of houses have been approved in the city centre over the last 5 years and there is further potential going forward. However the overall level of need cannot be accommodated there alone. It is therefore necessary to plan for growth elsewhere and to ensure that measures are put in place to reduce carbon emissions and other pollutants. National Building Regulations are being tightened up considerably in this respect and it is likely that houses built from 2025 onwards will be around 75% more energy efficient. Measures such as linking new development to active travel opportunities, electric vehicle charging infrastructure and public transport are all important elements in managing such matters	No further change to SPD required.
	Light Pollution – Light Pollution affects not only people in a negative way but also has an effect on the Wildlife and Ecosystems. 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 702 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.	EE4	Pollution	See EE4 (Pollution) above. The SPD does not claim that there will be no impact on the surrounding area or indeed to the natural environment (refer to section 2.3 of the SPD - Managing impact). But as stated above, growth is required and having established the location (through the Local Plan process) it is now necessary (through the SPD and then separately through the process of determining a planning application) to seek to minimise any impacts	No further change to SPD required.
	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?	Allocate3	What has changed since 1994 decision	See Allocate3 (what has changed since 1994) above. In addition, the Council has developed a far more accurate picture of flood risk in the city and this has resulted in the allocation of land as less risk of flooding (as compared to higher risk areas). That part of this site which lies within the functional flood plain is excluded from the development site.	No further change to SPD required
	The amended SPD has now increased again from 650 as stated Labour’s letters to local residents dated 15th July 2020 to 689 stated in the SPD draft V2 to now being 702, a further increase without any justification or consultation.	OO	Other Comment	The SPD has always referred to an indicative figure of 689. 650 may have been quoted in a leaflet - but this was not correct. Reference to 702 is from the Local Plan. The figure has reduced through the process of preparing the SPD which has allowed for more detailed consideration of site layout and design and location and quantity of open space.	No further change to SPD required.
	The works for the flood elevation scheme haven’t even begun and already the developers are pushing for more housing development in the area, despite it not allowing for additional housing.	OO	Other Comment	The figure in the SPD is 689 (indicative). No alternative figure has as yet been presented to the Council. If a higher figure is promoted by the developer then they will need to be able to demonstrate that this will still satisfy the principles and policy requirements in the SPD and the Local Plan - including importantly impact on movement in and out of the site and on the wider highway network and in relation to flooding and drainage. As stated above the relevance of the nearby flood alleviation scheme to this development is negligible.	No further change to SPD required.

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
	Around Hull I think there is enough land and regeneration areas that should be built on and progressed before 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.	allocate1	Size / principle of development	See Allocate 1 (size and principle of development) and Allocate2 (Brownfield land) above	No further change to SPD required.
	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.	OO	Other Comment	See allocate1 (size and principle of development) above	No further change to SPD required.
	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 councils 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.	OO	Other Comment	Information (not available to view on line) is available to view by request.	No further change to SPD required.
	In recent years this has site has been accepted into the Hull Masterplan without any consultation to local residents. Had we have 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.	Allocate1	Size / principle of development	See Allocate1 (size and principle of development) and Consult1 (inadequacy of Local Plan consultation) above	No further change to SPD required.
	We have questioned our local councillor who claims that he was only made aware of the SPD a year ago, but a letter from the council dated November 2020, states a consultation was taken place in October and November 2015 with the Preferred Option Consultation being taken to Hull City Council committees / meetings around this time. How did our local councillor not become aware of this and bring it to the attention of the local community?	OO	Other Comment	The decision to adopt the Local Plan was a Council decision made in light of due process regarding the preparation of the plan (having regard also to meeting required levels of consultation).	No further change to SPD required.
	The local councillor says that without the SPD in place, the council would be unable to halt the development of East Carr field. The council say that all procedures have been followed however, without the SPD surely procedures still have to be followed, the same procedures that resulted in the last planning application put forward being rejected.	Allocate3	What has changed since 1994 decision	The SPD provides the Council with a stronger approach to consider any subsequent planning application as it is based on a more detailed assessment of the land and a specific set of principles to guide development. Without the SPD, the Council would have to determine any planning application on the basis of the more stratgic planning policies in the Local Plan. The circumstances relating to the previous aplication in 1994 are significantly different as outlined in Allocate3 (what is different from the 1994 decision).	No further change to SPD required
	I would therefore again 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?	OO	Other Comment	The land was allocated for housing as part of the process of preparing the Local Plan. This was independently considered (and approved) by a Government Planning Inspector - having regard to the City Council's approach to consultation.	No further change to SPD required.
	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.	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required.
	I strongly object to the proposal and SPD6, and believe they should be refused by the Council along with all other relevant local and national Planning Authorities.	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required.
ECC39	I am writing as a Spring Cottage resident to object to the proposed housing development on East Carr Greenland.	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required.

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>I have lived on Stornaway Square, Spring Cottage for 23 years. The proposed 702 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.</p>	T1	Access (Danby Close/East Carr Road)	See T1 (Traffic access) above	No further change to SPD required
	<p>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. Extreme importance that East Carr Road is not a possible route option to accommodate the enormous increase of traffic to a safe highway standard. The access track to the golf range/kennels cannot accommodate the enormous increase of traffic and cannot be widened 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.</p>	T2	Wider traffic concerns	The SPD acknowledges that improvements would be required to enable East Carr Road to be used as an access to the site and in addition that should access be taken from this road it would only serve a relatively small part of the new housing development.	See above
	<p>I drive around my area with apprehension as it is and do not want anymore traffic. At the moment I am having to cycle to work and I have found cycling in my area and Saltshouse Road scary due to the amount of all traffic including buses whizzing by me so close and at speed. The traffic is extremely busy at weekends causing severe traffic congestion in the area.</p>	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required.
	<p>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.</p> <p>Currently there is a huge housing development being built off Middlesex Road/Bellfield Road, I have noticed new road access that will join onto Saltshouse Road from this development not far from Dunvegan Road, this will cause additional traffic congestion in my area.</p> <p>Currently there is a 23 house development being built at the old Sutton Place Unit on Saltshouse Road. The road access is between Dunvegan Road and Howdale Road. This will cause additional traffic congestion in my area.</p>	OO	Other Comment	<p>Refer to T2 (wider traffic concerns) above. New development and traffic arising as a result will be factored into the transport assessment required as part of this proposal</p> <p>Refer to T2 (wider traffic concerns) above. New development and traffic arising as a result will be factored into the transport assessment required as part of this proposal</p> <p>Refer to T2 (wider traffic concerns) above. New development and traffic arising as a result will be factored into the transport assessment required as part of this proposal</p>	<p>No further change to SPD required.</p> <p>On change to SPD required</p> <p>No further change to SPD required</p>
	<p>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.</p>			Refer to T2 (wider traffic concerns) above. New development and traffic arising as a result will be factored into the transport assessment required as part of this proposal	No further change to SPD required

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
	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.	OO	Other Comment	Refer to T2 (wider traffic concerns) above. New development and traffic arising as a result will be factored into the transport assessment required as part of this proposal	No further change to SPD required.
	My experience travelling by car 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.	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required.
	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.	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required.
	The areas infrastructure cannot take more traffic, more traffic pollution, more noise pollution and years of construction traffic on narrow congested roads. Inadequate mini roundabouts at the top of Dunvegan Road and Bellfield Road. 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 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.	OO	Other Comment	The Council has considered a wide range of planning issues as outlined in this response in allocating the land for housing and this position was supported by the Government's appointed Planning Inspector. As with any other site, there will be a need for a range of detailed assessments to support a planning application and the Council will need to be satisfied that new development proposed can be accommodated having regard to e.g. the impact on the local highway network and consequences for flooding and drainage.	No further change to SPD required.
	If the development goes ahead I need to be respected as a resident in the area:	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required.
	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 to remain. All Trees and Bushes to remain all around the fields.	PC3	Loss of outlook / privacy	The SPD includes a specific reference to targeting 'no net loss of hedgerows and a 10% gain in quality of habitats including for example the creation of new hedgerows'. A further reference will be added to the document to ensure that opportunities are taken to strengthen existing planting around the boundary of the proposed development to ensure that the amenity of existing housing is protected. There will be some distance between the existing properties and any new housing given the existing drain and requirements for a service strip on the other side (required by the Environment Agency), footpath/cycle track, road (designed for low levels of movement) and the front gardens of new housing.	See above
	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.	OO	Other Comment	The SPD already includes a specific reference requiring developers to mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from the new development	No further change to SPD required.

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
	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 from my property. 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.	EE4	Pollution	The SPD already includes a specific reference requiring developers to have regard to the need for lighting strategies that seek to protect local amenity	No further change to SPD required.
	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.	OO	Other Comment	The drain at this point is already culverted albeit the SPD highlights the potential to 'de-culvert' which would have potential benefits in relation to dealing with flood risk locally.	No further change to SPD required.
	Benches: Benches should not be located in the development this will cause youths to gather and cause nuisance antisocial behaviour and damage the benches.	OO	Other Comment	There is reference within the SPD to seating which will largely be related to planned areas of open space (including pocket parks). Care will be taken to ensure that such seating does not give rise to issues of noise and nuisance for nearby housing. It is however important to include such infrastructure to assist in delivering a quality and accessible layout.	No further change to SPD required.
	Road Blocks: Road blocks will be needed to stop speeding around the development by residents and non-residents using the roads.	OO	Other Comment	The SPD clearly sets out that streets serve a number of different roles including but certainly not restricted to private vehicles. Streets will be designed to be inclusive having regard to the needs of walking, cycling, playing (as well as parking and the circulation of traffic)	No further change to SPD required.
	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 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 be more tidier.	OO	Other Comment	The SPD highlights the importance of delivering a scheme which is not dominated by car parking (avoiding where possible parking in front gardens and on the street). It seeks to focus parking at the side of houses or to the rear (including in some cases garages) and in dedicated parking spaces within internal courtyards.	No further change to SPD required.
ECC40	Thank you for taking the time to have a meeting in my front garden back in September.	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required.
	With regard your circular letter dated 6th March 2021. Having studied the changes, I still cannot see how the roads can take the extra traffic from this huge 800 housings estate. I have lived on Chestnut Farm since 1985 and seen, first hand, the increase in traffic.	T2	Wider traffic concerns	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
	We also had 2 doctors surgeries, now we don't have any. I was a parent governor for Spring Cottage for 10 years and the school was always over subscribed and we always had a problem with traffic and the safety of children crossing Dunvegan Road.	LF2	School capacity	See LF2 (School capacity) above	See above
	It would be very sad to see the green space disappear and all the wildlife. Every morning and evening there is two deer that cross this open space. The amount of hedgehog's has declined and their habitat would be decimated.	EE2	Environmenta l value	See EE2 (Environmental value) above.	No further change to SPD required.
	The fields are still flooded since Autumn.	OO	Other Comment	Refer to Flood1 above	No further change to SPD required.
	There is a natural spring in East Carr field.	OO	Other Comment	Refer to Flood1 above	No further change to SPD required.
	Is there any possibility if this build has to go ahead, the amount of houses could be at least halved? Hull City Council have already hit their target of new builds. Shouldn't brown sites be utilised first?	Allocate2	Focus on brownfield first	See Allocate1 (size and principle of development) and Allocate2 (Brownfield) above.	No further change to SPD required
	This development seems to have far too many negative impacts.	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required.

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
ECC41	<p>Having read through the revised document on SPD6 I cannot really see a lot of change. I have noted that a traffic impact survey is going to be done but obviously because of covid it would not be accurate at the moment as many commuters are still working from home.</p> <p>Saltshouse Road is a nightmare to travel on in normal times with accidents at the 3 mini roundabouts happening every few weeks then on sunny days the queue from Diadem roundabout can stretch as far as Sutton. I work in North Point shopping centre and this in normal times takes me 15-20 minutes to travel less than 2 miles.</p> <p>Also East Carr is the only way I can get to my property and its already a bottleneck as you say so to have more cars lorries buses etc would make living here unbearable.</p> <p>Then there is the schooling of what could be 500 or more children to an already over subscribed primary on Spring Cottage.</p> <p>As I stated on my barely 10 minutes meet last summer I had spoke with the men who were doing the test holes in the field next to East Carr Road and he said that no one would build on that particular field as the foundations would have to do down 3 times as far as a normal house and it was not economically viable for a builder to do it so who would build houses on land that would cost more to build then sell?</p> <p>Another option for the land would make you look at other areas around the country I have travelled to some excellent tourist walking and outdoor spaces. We have two walking tracks in Hull that could be a massive tourist pull join them up along the Holderness drain and you could have something like the excellent Ferry Meadows near Peterborough it would really put Hull on the tourism map. The works done by the environmental agency a couple of months ago around the Holderness Drain up East Carr did not work too well as the day they packed up and left it flooded very badly nearly reaching the 2 houses in the nature reserve if this happens as 6 weeks of work it does not bode well for other schemes to stop the drain flooding. I did take photos of the flood as I was that amazed having just passed all the vehicles just leaving.</p> <p>And finally from the heart I have played, walked and worked in these fields for most of my 54 years of life I love them with a passion I see lots of different animals daily and cannot imagine it not being here it has been a godsend through lockdown to myself and many others please consider this when making your final decision.</p>	OO	Other Comment	The majority of restrictions have now been lifted albeit traffic movement may not have returned to previous 'normal' levels yet. The transport assessment has not been undertaken as yet and it is anticipated that traffic movements will continue to return to previous levels. If they have not, then adjustments will need to be made to reflect this fact - there is little point in measuring artificially low levels of traffic movement.	No further change to SPD required.
		T2	Wider traffic concerns	See T2 (Wider traffic issues) above	See above
		T1	Access (Danby Close/East Carr Road)	The SPD is clear that improvements will be need to east Carr Road to allow access to the new site. It also highlights that only a relatively small part of the new site will be accessed from this particular road - recognising the limitations that exist.	no further change to SPD required
		LF2	School capacity	See LF2 (School capacity) above	See above
		OO	Other Comment	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required.
		OO	Other Comment	Comment noted. This developmet does provide opportunities to open up access along the Holderness Drain from the footpath along the drain to the south connecting to the Hornsea cycle track (and the land that is proposed to form part of the Holderness Drain Flood Alleviation scheme which will be opened up far more for pulic access and enjoyment).	No further change to SPD required.
		OO	Other Comment	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required.
ECC42	<p>Our main objection is the increase in the number of houses from the initial 650 proposed for development on this site. I realise that the plans are subject to change but this increase in unexplained and reinforces concerns from the previous round of feedback. These include:</p>	OO	Other Comment	Both versions of the SPD (the original draft that was consulted on and the revised draft taking into account responses received) have included a reference to the same housing figure (i.e. an indicative figure of 689). The Local Plan refers to 702 but this was based on a city wide approach to density. The advantage of producing the SPD is that it has allowed for a more site specific design approach to be taken - and as a consequence in this instance the housing target has reduced to 689.	No further change to SPD required.

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>The introduction of 702 houses will potentially increase the traffic flow by over 1400 cars. The area already suffers from congestion and there have been a number of accidents in this area, which would be worsened by an increased number of cars. I do not see how the impact on usual traffic flow could be assessed until the pandemic is over, especially with the increase in the number of houses proposed. I realise the report acknowledges this but residents need assurance that this assessment will not be done in haste. Additionally, it is not clear what road improvements can be made to mitigate these issues. The plan relies heavily on people using alternative modes of transport, which isn't always possible and cant be policed/dictated, so will not be possible to control. Many current residents rely on vehicles for work, and this is likely to be true of potential residents. The proposal needs to fit the site and its context, as it stands, it does not achieve this. Changes needed to support this kind of infrastructure and development need to be addressed first (prior to development) to ensure it is adequate before the development begins and currently, it seems more like a tick box statement. We agree these would need to be considered and partially funded by the developer.</p>	T2	Wider traffic concerns	See T2 (wider traffic concerns) above. Restrictions across the country have now largely been lifted albeit it is accepted that levels of traffic on roads may not yet have returned to pre-pandemic levels. The transport assessment has not yet been undertaken and it is anticipated that by the time it is undertaken, traffic levels will have returned to normal. If this is not the case then adjustments will need to be made to the assessment. The assessment will have regard to the Council's ambitions (expressed partly through this SPD) to reduce reliance on private vehicles but will also be based of expeience of travel patterns and behaviours.	See above
	<p>The report highlights that there are only two obvious entry points, which could risk turning the whole area into a large cul de sac resulting in congestion and bottlenecks. The plan does not outline or provide suitable solutions to manage this. It only promotes cramming in houses to an otherwise limited and already populated space. Danby close will be the main route of access for vehicles for the build and future residents. As a resident of this access route, I do not see how it will not impact the current residents. The report acknowledges Danby Close is a two-lane cul-de-sac and that a number of residents require the use of on-street parking, which limits this road to one lane. This is an accurate observation, and in practice, Danby is a single-lane area due to the parking needs of current residents. It does not address how the development may impact on-street parking. If the East Carr single-lane entrance is not a suitable entryway, why is Danby when it is often a single lane capacity? Are current residents expected to change their parking practices during the development and how will the development impact this after it is built? I would also worry about damage to residents' vehicles with wagons and lorries using it for access to the development, especially as East Carr is not a suitable access point. The quiet safe cul-de-sac (which drew residents to the areas) will become a traffic-laden access road. It says that Danby Close has been designed with the intention of extending - I do not know how the report can make this assumption. It is a fenced-off area that borders the proposed development site, this statement could be made for many current estates bordering nature sites.</p>	T1	Access (Danby Close/East Carr Road)	See T1 (traffic access) above. The transport assessment which will be undertaken to support the development of this site will explore amongst other things the improvements / traffic management measures which may be required to allow the site to come forward. In determinging any subsequent planning application, not only will full regard need to be given to this assessment but also to the amenity of existing residents affected by the proposal. Reference has been made to the fact that in estates such as this it is not uncommon for roads to be left open allowing for future expansion.. This is clearly the situation here and indeed there are plans that have been produced over the last 30 - 40 years which clearly set out ambitions for the continued growth of this area. That however is somewhat academic. The need for development has been assessed in light of the present time and the suitability of the site (including traffic impact) has and will continue to be considered likewise.	no further change to SPD required

Rep Ref	Representation	Representati on Ref	Representati on Topic	HCC response	HCC action
	<p>I do not see how this increase in the number of properties is going to be supported without further impacting residents in the area, who were already strongly impacted by the initial proposal. 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 earmarked for. This allocation has also been made without a suitable assessment of the area and impact, e.g. flooding and traffic. It is important that proper assessments are completed to fully determine the number of houses and the impact on the area, as well as ensuring the infrastructure to support this development is in place before attempting to build.</p> <p>I hope these factors are considered.</p>	OO	Other Comment	The SPD includes a clear commitment to undertaking all necessary assessments before determining the final suitability of this land for housing development. The principle is however accepted through inclusion in the Local Plan	No further change to SPD required.
		OO	Other Comment	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required.
ECC44	The area is over saturated with houses already the road access already is appalling. You obviously have no feelings for the local residents or you wouldn't be letting this take place. Conservatives wouldn't let this happen. I'm so pleased I'm not a Labour supporter.	OO	Other Comment	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required.
ECC45	<p>I am a resident of Danby Close Howdale Road Hull my main issue/concern on East Carr Housing development is the proposed development vehicle access; the draft document states that minimum of 2 vehicle access points are required. It's clear that Danby Close is deemed to be one and East Carr Lane the other. These are both clearly not suitable for a development of this nature.</p> <p>Why is it that Danby Close and East Carr Lane are the only 2 possible access points for vehicles when you have what is known as whimpy playing fields/ Noddle Hill, which would give a much better and safer access to the development.</p> <p>On the East Carr Masterplan it shows lots of green spaces for dog walkers and children's playing areas. So the public will not be losing green space.</p> <p>Other access points need to be considered for the safety and the quality of life, this is going to have an enormous effect on the community.</p>	T1	Access (Danby Close/East Carr Road)	See T1 (Traffic access) above	no further change to SPD required
		OO	Other Comment	The two proposed access points appear to be the most obvious ones but the SPD makes reference to the fact that should an applicant / developer come forward with alternative proposals then these will be considered. The alternative proposed would involve significant investment in relation to the length of new road required, would involve the loss of a significant part of an identified area of open space and would potentially impact significantly on the role that this land plays in protecting flooding in the local area.	No further change to SPD required.
		OO	Other Comment	Comment noted	No further change to SPD required.
		OO	Other Comment	The two proposed access points appear to be the most obvious ones but the SPD makes reference to the fact that should an applicant/developer come forward with alternative proposals then these will be considered .	No further change to SPD required.