

Appendix A: Draft South West Beverley Masterplan Consultation Feedback

Respondent	Summary of comments	Response and changes to the Masterplan.
Barton Willmore on behalf of Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes	Generally supportive of the need for a masterplan for the three allocations. Masterplan usefully sets out the range of land uses and how the Council sees these being delivered.	Support noted.
	Introduction of document should clearly explain what the purpose of an SPD is in line with the NPPF.	Additional detail on what the document is has been added to the introduction of the document as it relates to the masterplan. However, it is not necessary to repeat more generic policy and guidance contained within the NPPF/NPPG.
	Paragraph 3.14 of the Draft Masterplan document states that the masterplan “.....would have to be agreed by the planning authority before planning permission may be issued or any development is commenced on any part of the site.” This is factually incorrect as an outline permission has been granted on part of the site.	Masterplan has been amended to refer to full planning permission, which would only include outline permissions if a reserved matter had been approved relating to it.
	The approved outline application on the site east of Keldmarsh school as well as the submitted outline application south of this should provide part of the background and context to the site and should therefore be considered within the SPD.	It is recognised the applications are coming forward on the site; however this is an evolving situation with no guarantee that any approved application would be implemented. So, whilst it is important the masterplan doesn't contradict development that has already been approved, there is no need to specifically reference approved developments.
	At paragraph 4.9 of the Draft Masterplan document, the Council state that: “.....Foul water should discharged to the 900mm diameter sewer at the northern boundary of the site. There is a need to ensure that any development on the site would not preclude a connection to the 900mm diameter sewer from any other part of the site in future.” Our Client considers that this requirement is too specific and may not necessarily be the optimal solution to drain the site.	This text is based on information from Yorkshire Water. The masterplan already outlines some flexibility for applicants to demonstrate that a connection to the sewer network would be possible for the rest of the site via an alternative sewer connection without linking in at the northern boundary, should they wish to pursue alternative foul water disposal strategy.
	The SPD explains that built development should be avoided in the area of Flood Zone 3. It implies that the public open space required as part of the Masterplan can be delivered in the area of Flood Zone 3. The text should be reworded to be consistent with	Suggested rewording largely followed in revisions to the text.

	the rest of the SPD.	
	As part of the Masterplan Requirements set out in Chapter 6 of the SPD, Housing mix and affordable and specialist housing is commented on. Our Client has already made representations to the Affordable Housing SPD and has concerns that the requirements of affordable housing in Policy H2 and the associated SPD cannot be met. The affordable housing requirements are not based on up to date evidence and also the evidence base shows that the affordable housing percentage requirements cannot be met in many of the parishes. Therefore the affordable housing requirements are not viable and also not deliverable.	The masterplan does not elaborate on policy and supporting text on affordable housing already presented in East Riding Strategy Document policy H2 with the exception in how it applies to this specific site area (eg 25% affordable housing requirement). There is therefore no conflict between what the masterplan is saying and the content of the draft Affordable Housing SPD. Alongside the Local Plan evidence on development viability has been presented to justify the approach taken to affordable housing requirements.
	Whilst the Council can require a road to be built to adoptable standards, it is beyond its powers to require a developer to offer a road for adoption. It is therefore not possible to use the Masterplan as a way by which to force the grant of private law rights to others; to interfere with private land ownership or to force the removal of any “ransom” position a particular landowner may have.	Reference to roads being adopted to the boundary edge have been removed from the masterplan. This recognises that a section 106 agreement was not used to secure adoption of a spine road to the boundary edge of a recent approved outline application on the site.
	The Table at paragraph 7.3 sets out approximate costings for items of infrastructure required for the delivery of the Draft Masterplan. There is no explanation for the costs set out or how they have been calculated, and, in accordance with the advice set out in the NPPF, these need to be transparent and fully justified.	Further explanation has been added to the masterplan to show how the costs have been established for the infrastructure requirements.
	The Table also assumes that all off-site highway works and education provision need to be funded by the South West Beverley allocations. As set out in the NPPF, financial contributions need to be reasonably related to the proposed development and should not be used to make up any shortfall in existing provision. It is not clear from the Draft Masterplan document that the required highway works and the school provision is generated solely by the development and, in addition, whether or not the Council has some funds which could contribute or reduce the requirement. This needs to be clarified and the Draft Masterplan document amended accordingly.	Had it not been for the proposed development covered by the masterplan, the infrastructure requirements set out in the document would not be needed. Hence, there is a direct link between the proposed development and the infrastructure requirements of the masterplan linked to the relevant East Riding Strategy and Allocations Documents’ Policies.
	It is the case that in the determination of the planning application 13/02723/STOUT on land adjacent to Keldmarsh Primary School,	The requirements within the Masterplan do not prejudice the ability of planning Committee require the alternative delivery of

	<p>the Planning Committee preferred the applicant to finance improvements to the existing open space to the north of the Woodmansey Mile rather than to provide or contribute to on-site open space i.e. the financial contribution is towards improvements to existing facilities rather than the need to provide new open space. This approach was again reiterated by the Council in the Section 106 discussions. This approach is not consistent with the requirements stated in the SPD.</p>	<p>open space requirements off-site should there be material considerations that justify an alternative approach.</p>
	<p>The Masterplan requires developers to make a financial contribution to the costs of acquiring land for open space and education. It seems that a land value of approximately £500,000 per acre has been used to 'equalise' land values across the site but, again, this figure has not been justified. More importantly, this 'equalised' land value has no regard to potential alternative use values which are important when considering this issue. The land is being valued the same irrespective of whether or not it has development potential. By way of example, the open space has been allocated in that area of the allocation that is subject to 'high flood risk (flood zone 3a)' and which needs to be kept open 'to protect and enhance the landscape setting of the town and key views towards the Minster from the south' (para 3.9). As such this land has limited or no development value as it has no alternative use (i.e. it cannot be used for housing), and therefore cannot have the same equalised land value as other parts of the site which have the potential to accommodate residential development.</p>	<p>The off-site land 'cost' is based on the requirement to provide open space serving the allocation as a whole in line with the standards of provision set out in Policy C3 of the East Riding Local Plan Strategy Document and calculated within the opportunities and constraints section of the masterplan. Taking the allocation as a whole, open space that would otherwise need to be provided on-site within individual proposals is now being directed to flood zone 3a. This releases additional land within individual developments for use as residential development. It is therefore entirely appropriate that the land value for open space use is based on residential values in this instance.</p>
	<p>The infrastructure costings assume that the South West Beverley allocation will be implemented in full and within a relatively short period of time. Developers of early phases of development will be making financial contributions when there is no certainty that the whole of the allocated development will come forward as anticipated in the Draft Masterplan document. As such, developers could be over-providing and financing infrastructure works which may never be required or that that may not be required for a number of years. The Draft Masterplan document and costings make no allowance for these uncertainties and, as such, cannot be fairly related to the development as required by the NPPF.</p>	<p>Whilst there is never absolute certainty of any development coming forward, the required infrastructure and costing is based on the approximate dwelling capacity of the site based on best available evidence of deliverability including evidence of willing land owners and viability. Should infrastructure contributions via section 106 agreements not be spent on their intended use after a certain period of time, they will be returned.</p>

	<p>The NPPF and PPG state that the use of legal agreements (rather than use of conditions) is the preferred approach to ensure that each development within an allocation makes a commensurate contribution towards identified infrastructure requirements. Paragraph 10 of the PPG, which advises that the use of a negatively worded condition limiting the development that can take place until a planning obligation or other agreement has been entered into, is ‘unlikely to be appropriate in the majority of cases’. Paragraph 7.4 of the masterplan should be revised accordingly.</p>	<p>It is not the role of the masterplan to repeat National Planning Policy and Guidance.</p>
<p>Barton Willmore on behalf of Central Land Holdings</p>	<p>Broadly supportive of the need for a Masterplan document for the site. The Draft Masterplan document is helpful in setting out the range of land uses and how the Council see the allocation being delivered.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
	<p>Paragraph 3.14 of the Draft Masterplan document states that the masterplan “.....would have to be agreed by the planning authority before planning permission may be issued or any development is commenced on any part of the site.” This is factually incorrect as an outline permission has been granted on part of the site.</p>	<p>Masterplan has been amended to refer to full planning permission, which would only include outline permissions if a reserved matter had been approved relating to it.</p>
	<p>The Council has already granted outline planning permission for the development of CLH site adjacent to Keldmarsh Primary School (LPA Planning Application Reference: DC/13/02723/STOUT/STRAT).</p> <p>It is also the case that the approach taken in the Draft Masterplan document does not have regard to terms of this planning permission. The Planning Committee and the Heads of Terms made clear the infrastructure contributions that are required from the development are as follows:</p> <p>-Off-site commuted sums towards Children’s and Youth and Adult Open Space based on the formula contained within the Council’s ‘Supplementary Planning Guidance on the Provision of Outdoor Play Space on New Residential Developments’ (December 2007). An off-site contribution is required because an existing area of open space exists on the opposite side of Woodmansey Mile to the</p>	<p>The requirements within the Masterplan do not prejudice the ability of planning Committee to vary or require the alternative delivery of infrastructure requirements should there be material considerations that justify alternative approaches.</p> <p>It is noted that the application referred to was reported to Planning Committee prior to the draft masterplan being released.</p>

	<p>CLH site and it was considered that two play areas in close proximity would not be necessary.</p> <p>-A contribution of £1000 per house towards the provision of education. CLH has already made a significant contribution towards education land through the donation to the Council of the land for the existing Keldmarsh Primary School.</p> <p>-Subject to justification, a highway contribution based on similar items set out in the Table at para 7.3 of the draft Masterplan document.</p>	
	<p>Masterplan needs to be amended to have regard to an approved outline approval on the site.</p>	<p>It is recognised the applications are coming forward on the site; however this is an evolving situation with no guarantee that any approved application would be implemented. So, whilst it is important the masterplan doesn't contradict development that has already been approved, there is no need to specifically reference approved developments.</p>
	<p>At paragraph 4.9 of the Draft Masterplan document, the Council state that: “.....Foul water should discharged to the 900mm diameter sewer at the northern boundary of the site. There is a need to ensure that any development on the site would not preclude a connection to the 900mm diameter sewer from any other part of the site in future.” Central Land Holdings considers that this requirement is too specific and may not necessarily be the optimal solution to drain the site.</p>	<p>This text is based on information from Yorkshire Water. The masterplan already outlines some flexibility for applicants to demonstrate that a connection to the sewer network would be possible for the rest of the site via an alternative sewer connection without linking in at the northern boundary, should they wish to pursue alternative foul water disposal strategy.</p>
	<p>The masterplan maps shows the 'broad' location of a vehicular access through the centre of the CLH site. Whilst Central Land appreciate that this plan is indicative, it would be more accurate to show the access on the boundary between the school and the residential allocation as set out in the Section 73 application. The same amendment needs to be made to the Masterplan Map at page 38 of the Draft Masterplan document.</p>	<p>Neither the section 73 application nor any detailed reserved matters residential application have been a determined for the site as yet providing more detail of site access and positioning of the proposed spine road.</p>
	<p>Whilst the Council can require a road to be built to adoptable standards, it is beyond its powers to require a developer to offer a</p>	<p>Reference to roads being adopted to the boundary edge have been removed from the masterplan. This recognises that a section 106</p>

	<p>road for adoption. It is therefore not possible to use the Masterplan as a way by which to force the grant of private law rights to others; to interfere with private land ownership or to force the removal of any “ransom” position a particular landowner may have.</p>	<p>agreement was not used to secure adoption of a spine road to the boundary edge of a recent approved outline application on the site.</p>
	<p>The Table at para 7.3 sets out approximate costings for items of infrastructure required for the delivery of the Draft Masterplan. There is no explanation for the costs set out therein.</p>	<p>Further explanation has been added to the masterplan to show how the costs have been established for the infrastructure requirements.</p>
	<p>The Table also assumes that all off-site highway works and education provision need to be funded by the South West Beverley allocations. As set out in the NPPF, financial contributions need to be reasonably related to the proposed development and should not be used to make up any shortfall in existing provision. It is not clear from the Draft Masterplan document that the required highway works and the school provision is generated solely by the development and, in addition, whether or not the Council has some funds which could contribute or reduce the requirement. This needs to be clarified and the Draft Masterplan document amended accordingly.</p>	<p>Had it not been for the proposed development covered by the masterplan, the infrastructure requirements set out in the document would not be needed. Hence, there is a direct link between the proposed development and the infrastructure requirements of the masterplan linked to the relevant East Riding Strategy and Allocations Documents’ Policies.</p>
	<p>In the determination of the CLH planning application on land adjacent to Keldmarsh Primary School, the Planning Committee preferred CLH to finance improvements to the existing open space to the north of the Woodmansey Mile rather than to provide or contribute to on-site open space i.e. the financial contribution is towards improvements to existing facilities rather than the need to provide new open space.</p>	<p>The requirements within the Masterplan do not prejudice the ability of planning Committee require the alternative delivery of open space requirements off-site should there be material considerations that justify an alternative approach.</p>
	<p>The Masterplan requires developers to make a financial contribution to the costs of acquiring land for open space and education. It seems that a land value of approximately £500,000 per acre has been used to ‘equalise’ land values across the site but, again, this figure has not been justified. More importantly, this ‘equalised’ land value has no regard to potential alternative use values which are important when considering this issue. The land is being valued the same irrespective of whether or not it has development potential. By way of example, the open space has been allocated in that area of the allocation that is subject to ‘high</p>	<p>The off-site land ‘cost’ is based on the requirement to provide open space serving the allocation as a whole in line with the standards of provision set out in Policy C3 of the East Riding Local Plan Strategy Document and calculated within the opportunities and constraints section of the masterplan. Taking the allocation as a whole, open space that would otherwise need to be provided on-site within individual proposals is now being directed to flood zone 3a. This releases additional land within individual developments for use as residential development. It is therefore entirely appropriate that the land value for open space use is based</p>

	<p>flood risk (flood zone 3a)' and which needs to be kept open 'to protect and enhance the landscape setting of the town and key views towards the Minster from the south' (para 3.9). As such this land has limited or no development value as it has no alternative use (i.e. it cannot be used for housing), and therefore cannot have the same equalised land value as other parts of the site which have the potential to accommodate residential development.</p>	<p>on residential values in this instance.</p>
	<p>It is the case that as part of its planning permission for the land to the east of the Keldmarsh Primary School, the Planning Committee require CLH to upgrade the open space area to the north of the Woodmansey Mile. It is, therefore, unreasonable to require CLH to make additional contributions towards the cost of providing land for open space elsewhere in the wider BEV-J allocation. This needs to be made clear in the Draft Masterplan document.</p>	<p>It is not for the Masterplan itself to dictate how its requirements will be applied. It cannot prejudice the ability of planning Committee require the alternative delivery of open space requirements off or on-site should there be material considerations that justify an alternative approach relating to specific planning applications.</p>
	<p>The infrastructure costings assume that the South West Beverley allocation will be implemented in full and within a relatively short period of time. Developers of early phases of development will be making financial contributions when there is no certainty that the whole of the allocated development will come forward as anticipated in the Draft Masterplan document. As such, developers could be over-providing and financing infrastructure works which may never be required or that that may not be required for a number of years. The Draft Masterplan document and costings make no allowance for these uncertainties and, as such, cannot be fairly related to the development as required by the NPPF.</p>	<p>Whilst there is never absolute certainty of any development coming forward, the required infrastructure and costing is based on the approximate dwelling capacity of the site based on best available evidence of deliverability including evidence of willing land owners and viability. Should infrastructure contributions via section 106 agreements not be spent on their intended use after a certain period of time, they will be returned.</p>
	<p>The NPPF and PPG state that the use of legal agreements (rather than use of conditions) is the preferred approach to ensure that each development within an allocation makes a commensurate contribution towards identified infrastructure requirements. Paragraph 10 of the PPG, which advises that the use of a negatively worded condition limiting the development that can take place until a planning obligation or other agreement has been entered into, is 'unlikely to be appropriate in the majority of cases'. Paragraph 7.4 of the masterplan should be revised accordingly.</p>	<p>It is not the role of the masterplan to repeat National Planning Policy and Guidance.</p>
Beverley and District	<p>The Civic Society continues to be disappointed about the high</p>	<p>Consultation and debate regarding the amount of development</p>

Civic Society	percentage of development allocated to the Beverley area, particularly to the South beyond the Woodmansey Mile which was always regarded as the Southern boundary in the Adopted Local plan, and omitted without any consultation soon after 1996. It is accepted that this allocation is far advanced and it is too late to change (although the Local Plan has still not yet been approved), but nevertheless the Civic Society will continue to make the point that this large amount of development will create environmental problems, during and after construction.	proposed for Beverley have been taking place throughout the Local Plan's production and is an issue for the Local Plan rather than this Masterplan. This includes changes to the development limit of the town from just north of Woodmansey Mile to the new By-pass.
	We repeat that it is regrettable that development on both sides of the railway could not be considered as a planning entity since they are interlinked by so many common factors.	The release of this masterplan for South West Beverley has given us the opportunity to consider its content and linkages with the development brief for South East Beverley the other side of the Hull to Scarborough Rail line. Final versions of both documents will be informed by consideration of linkages between the two areas.
	The Civic Society considers it is important to ensure that the main focus of the detailed design is creating a community that can have an identity of its own, and not be wholly reliant on the Principal Settlement and appearing as purely an extension into the open land. We feel that a central community area should be established as a focus for the development incorporating the new school, shops, accommodation for the elderly and other essential community services such as medical and dental practices. Ideally this should be located to take advantage of the value of Long Lane as a connector for pedestrians and cyclists. This location, being accessible from all parts of the development would encourage a sustainable form of development reducing the need for unnecessary trips by car. It would also put the proposed school nearer to eastern side pupils (with the provision of a railway crossing suitable for both pedestrians and pushchairs), and help integrate the elderly accommodation into the activity area.	The Council has met with the Civic Society to discuss its concerns in more detail since consultation on the masterplan finished. Amendments have been made to the masterplan to accommodate a central activities area concept including locating both the neighbourhood centre and the new primary school adjacent to one another. This area also has good access to long lane via foot and cycle and sits adjacent to the main area of open space on the site.
	We would also hope that the housing layout reflects the need to create an atmosphere of belonging, identity and a unit which is self contained whilst having effective links to Beverley Town. This philosophy requires the highest quality urban design input. Also we would hope that all detailed submissions are carefully considered,	The masterplan has a very strong emphasis on connectivity to the rest of the town. This includes links up and down from Minster Way, potential pedestrian footbridge across the rail line, and linking in with existing foot and cycle path networks. Further detail has now been added to the design requirements

	<p>and the subject of detailed consultation, particularly with the existing local residents who will be affected long term by the proposals.</p>	<p>section of the document to firm up what is expected from prospective applicants for planning permission on the site. Detailed planning applications are subject to the same advertising and consultation as any other development, which gives local residents and specific consultation bodies such as Historic Engand opportunities to comment.</p>
	<p>We would advocate that the Authority takes the initiative in encouraging the developers to raise their aspirations to produce a distinctive quality scheme, building to the highest environmental and design standards, taking account of other successful developments around the UK, for example the Accordia development in Cambridge and Poundbury in Dorset. This development is an opportunity for the East Riding to show what could be achieved, maybe by holding a national competition for the design.</p>	<p>Significant additional detail has been added to the design requirements section of the document. This includes, a review of Beverley's Townscape and how new development should fit into this, design principles for use of materials and street design, and guidance on key spaces. It should now be clear to all the Council is aiming to achieve a high standard of design in new development on the site.</p>
	<p>We would hope that the green spaces would be designed so as to be integrated into the overall design and throughout the area for easy accessibility for residents, and especially children and the elderly, and linking to existing residential areas so as not to be solely appendages on the periphery.</p>	<p>This is the approach of the masterplan. Children's play areas will be spread around the site, whilst a significant central area of open space has been located to maximise pedestrian, cycle, and vehicle accessibility.</p>
	<p>It is of some concern that extensive road improvements are envisaged to accommodate the addition traffic accessing the Woodmansey Mile which will be added to the existing mixed traffic.</p>	<p>The highway improvements required are not extensive. A spine road through the will be provided alongside the provision of minor junction improvements and two new roundabouts.</p>
	<p>Disappointed to read that the document refers to this area as 'being of not of the highest scenic quality' although recognising the importance of preserving views of the Minster and respecting existing field boundaries. The Society has supported the concept of creating a 'Southwood' for many years, and this area of arable land together with its continuation beyond the SRR contributes substantially to the rural approach to the ancient Beverley settlement.</p>	<p>The assessment of scenic quality has been carried out by landscape architects appointed by the Council. The 'Southwood' concept is something that the Council had in mind when designating a central area in the site as open space, although it must be borne in mind there is a limitation to the amount of open space developers can viably provide for.</p>
	<p>Welcome the reference to that due care and investigation will need to be undertaken relating to the Archaeology of the area.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
	<p>Concerned, and rather amused, that the Minster seems to have acquired 'steeple' to replace its lovely towers</p>	<p>Reference to towers added.</p>

Christine Harrod	Object to the proposed development to the South of Beverley. This proposed development would see the permanent loss of this open aspect.	
	The most detailed parts of this plan are in the drainage section which seek to reassure that all the excess water from this notoriously flood prone land will be diverted away towards Beverley Beck and the River Hull. Water does not go away and will be merely diverted to create higher flooding risks along the river.	The water already transfers to the River Hull from the site. The aim is to ensure that peak volumes of water draining from the site do not exceed those currently experienced.
	Whereas the drainage 'solutions' are minutely detailed, further amenities that would benefit residents are decidedly vague. Added to this is a loophole in the Town and Country Planning Act, already exploited by builders in the South of England, which removes the obligation to provide affordable housing if they can prove they will be financially disadvantaged by doing so.	Where appropriate, changes to the wording of the masterplan have been made to add greater certainty to the delivery of infrastructure including school and open space provision. It has always been the position that developers can negotiate the provision of affordable housing they provide based on whether its provision would render the development unviable- not whether developers would be disadvantaged.
	A new population of 4000 people tacked on to the outskirts of Beverley, supposedly the jewel in the East Riding Crown, creating a densely packed suburb with few amenities and a flood plain to relax in. There is a potential neighbourhood centre, which with its shop, restaurant or fast food takeaway is supposed to prevent social isolation. These 4000 people are supposed to walk or cycle to work as there is 'reasonable' access to the town centre and no mention is given to the new employment they are supposed to be travelling to.	The masterplan makes provision for substantial open space, new school, neighbourhood centre, as well as good accessibility to the Leisure Centre, Town Centre, and Wingfield Way and Grovehill Retail/Industrial areas. They will enjoy the same, if not better accessibility to services and amenities that the residents of Lincoln Way enjoy.
	The East Riding of Yorkshire is one of very few councils that have submitted a local plan to cope with the current housing shortage. By the time the other councils have fulfilled this requirement it is highly likely that central government will have realised that the housing shortage is in the South-East of the country and reversed this ruling. Beverley has three major new housing developments currently under construction with a local builder promising the next one at the Gallows Lane site. Is it not time to look at brownfill construction and the use of uninhabited buildings in the town. The former Minster Towers building has remained empty	The Council has carried out a Local Housing Study to determine what level of housing need exists in the East Riding in conjunction with its Strategic Housing Market Assessment. Whilst brownfield sites have also been prioritised for development in the Local Plan, there was not sufficient land to accommodate the level of housing need without looking at large scale greenfield sites such as this.

	<p>for many years along with the house behind it. The former DIY superstore on Annie Reed road remains unused and, although not a major issue, there are many empty houses around the town.</p>	
	<p>One of the chief planning officers has admitted that ERYC pays little heed to the requirement to provide open, public space in new developments as 'we have the Westwood'. The Westwood is a wonderful amenity but no other town relies on one open space to serve a whole community. This common land best serves the West of the town and is virtually unusable for those in wheelchairs or pushchairs. Is it not time that the residents of Beverley had an alternative with parkland provided to the South of the town creating a lasting legacy, rather than tiny pockets of green space dotted around it. A lack of planning permission on this area would make the land affordable for a usable amenity for all of Beverley residents.</p>	<p>A substantial area of open space will be provided for on-site for a range of uses. Although the existing five common lands of Hurn, Westwood, Swinemoor, Figham, and Lund provide very large areas of semi-natural greenspace to enjoy.</p>
	<p>A matter of great concern is how the overriding wishes of the residents of Beverley have been ignored. There are numerous groups advocating the use of this land as mainly parkland with minimal housing including The Beverley Renaissance Partnership, the Civic Society, SOLD (Stop outrageous land development) and an online petition that has reached over 1000 signatures in the short time since it was set up. There were over 8600 objections received in the last consultation period and there appear to be no residents in favour of this development. At the latest consultation, the plans were covered in post-it notes, supplied by the planning officers in attendance, that expressed resident's concerns and objections, yet as only one was signed (there were no instructions to do so) it is highly likely that these will be disregarded as objections. It appears that this whole proposed development is propelled by groups of developers who do not reside in Beverley and have no connection with the town apart from owning land they are seeking to build on to the overall detriment of Beverley and all its residents.</p>	<p>A substantial area of open space will be provided for on-site for a range of uses. This will cater for the open space needs generated by the development in a comprehensive fashion. Any further open space over and above this would require further funding not currently available</p> <p>The principle of the site being used for housing development is considered through the East Riding Local Plan, including all of the representations and objections made during the plan's production. This masterplan adds detail to the Local Plan and does not revisit the issue of whether the site should be a housing allocation in the first place.</p>
<p>Claire Bennett</p>	<p>The housing density is too high and not in keeping with the current housing density in the neighbouring Lincoln Way development. There is not enough green space in the development</p>	<p>Including proposed areas of open space the proposed density of housing development within the masterplan area is very comparable to that within the Lincoln Way estate. Densities are</p>

	<p>proposals and what little there is is too scattered and discontinuous. The public green space area should be extended and amalgamated into a contiguous block: the Beverley Renaissance Partnership proposal of a new common, Southwood, should be resurrected. This would be in keeping with the aims of the Making Space for Nature white paper which explained that, in order to preserve wildlife, such areas should be 'bigger, better and more joined-up.'</p>	<p>likely to be higher as development takes place due to changes to national and local policy to make the most efficient use of land in housing delivery.</p> <p>A substantial area of open space will be provided for on-site for a range of uses. This will cater for the open space needs generated by the development in a comprehensive fashion. Any further open space over and above this would require further funding not currently available</p>
	<p>All new development should, according to the National Planning Policy Framework, be sustainable. To ensure this no building should take place on Flood Zone 3a. Increased drainage is not an option in a pumped-drainage catchment as it is clearly not sustainable and land-raising on the floodplain only moves flooding problems downstream and, as a technique, has become discredited.</p>	<p>No built residential development is proposed within flood zone 3a. The masterplan is clear about this.</p>
<p>Dementia Action Alliance</p>	<p>Does not wish to comment on the masterplan as a whole but focus on one particular aspect of the new development. The proportion of those over 65 living in the East Riding is likely to be higher than many other Local Authorities into the future. There will be more people with dementia living in the East Riding in future. As recognised within the masterplan there is a need for extra care accommodation and assume this will take account of the needs of those with dementia and their carers. As part of becoming a dementia friendly town, we suggest that part of the open space provision on the site could be devoted as a dementia friendly park or garden. This would have seating and a possible picnic areas, year round colour, gardens of a sensory nature, and areas for carers to go. There are many way in which this could be developed and happy to discuss in further detail. Funding has become available for a project since the original response to the masterplan</p>	<p>Welcome the suggestion of the provision of specialist open space for those with dementia within the development. Some references to this as a potential project have been included within the open space sections of the masterplan.</p>
<p>Doug Jennings</p>	<p>I write on behalf of Kingsway Ltd who own the former Dales Garden Centre site on the west side of Long Lane. We are shortly to submit an outline planning application for its redevelopment for housing. I comment on the proposed Masterplan as follows:</p>	<p>The masterplan cannot elaborate further on timing and delivery of the different components of infrastructure alongside new development on the site. The Council does not have control over when developers are able to bring forward their proposals for each</p>

	<p>Our primary concern is one of phasing, timing and deliverability particularly in relation to the Masterplan’s emphasis on shared access and drainage arrangements for the various sites in different ownership. The ‘Delivering the Masterplan’ section is lacking in this regard. It does not contain any specific proposals as to how the shared infrastructure will actually be delivered in timely fashion for each parcel to be delivered but rather relies on each phase in turn to provide its share of infrastructure. If for whatever reason the sequence is broken the fall-back position appears to be resorting to compulsory purchase powers. This is by no means certain to prevail, nor will it be a quick process.</p> <p>Consequently we maintain that the Masterplan should have sufficient flexibility built into it to allow sites which are capable of separate access and drainage infrastructure (such as Kingsway’s), to be developed in isolation.</p>	<p>individual land parcel and takes a flexible approach to the delivery of new infrastructure alongside new development. For example, it is likely that the extension of Keldmarch Primary School will be delivered first by developments on the norther portion of the site prior to the new school being provided. Applications on individual land parcels are assessed on a case by case basis to ensure they will meet their own individual infrastructure eneds as well as provide for a commensurate proportion of the comprehensive infrastructure requirements of the site as a whole.</p>
	<p>Paragraph 2.2 – Reference is not made to Kingsway’s site. As this section describes the Masterplan area it ought to acknowledge this site and its lawful historic use as a garden centre with an access onto Long Lane. Reference is made to a garden centre but we assume this is the business on the east side of Long Lane. It is similarly omitted from the list uses in paragraph 4.16. This needs correcting.</p>	<p>It is not the role and purpose of this section to describe every individual parcel of land and historic uses in the masterplan area. It simply provides a general context as to what the area is like now prior to new development taking place.</p>
	<p>Paragraph 4.9 – The last sentence of this paragraph does not appear to cater for small individual sites such as Kingsway’s to make foul drainage connections except to the proposed 900mm diameter sewer. The Masterplan should make it explicit that if it can be demonstrated that an alternative connection to the sewer network is possible then such an alternative can be pursued in the interests of bringing readily available sites forward, rather than wait for each phase to be developed in turn.</p> <p>The cost of drainage infrastructure is not one of the items listed in the table in the ‘Delivering the Masterplan’ section.</p>	<p>The requirement is that development should not preclude a connection to the 900mm sewer for the masterplan area unless demonstrated an appropriate alternative connection for the whole development is available. There is nothing to proclue individual parcels of land from making their own sewer connections. Yorkshire Water will comment on how appropriate proposed arrangements are on a case by case basis as the site is developed. The cost of drainage infrastructure is provided for in the normal way on a case by case basis- ie not via legal agreements with the Council unless it is infrastructure adopted by the Council.</p>
	<p>Paragraph 4.29 – We have no objection to Long Lane becoming a traffic calmed cycle friendly shared route providing that</p>	<p>The masterplan acknowledges that there is a level of existing traffic on the lane which the masterplan is designed to avoiding adding to.</p>

	<p>acknowledgement is made of the existing vehicular traffic that is or (in the case of the Kingsway site) could be generated from existing uses along the lane and that no restrictions on that traffic or impediments to new uses of those sites that would generate comparable traffic are imposed. The planning application referred to above will be supported by a Transport Assessment that demonstrates the point.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.35 – Whilst the provisions of this paragraph relating to the use of Long Lane are appreciated for the bulk of the new housing, it fails to acknowledge the development of the Kingsway site would be acceptable as it would not result in substantially different traffic generation than the current lawful use. It should do so and for other sites along Long Lane that might come forward in the future for development with similar circumstances.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.31 – By implication this paragraph does acknowledge that Long Lane is satisfactory to cater for existing traffic. It needs to go further and acknowledge that redevelopment of those sites facing Long Lane is acceptable providing the traffic generation between existing and proposed development is comparable. This then would provide for the proposed housing development of the former Dales Garden Centre site.</p>	<p>The argument about existing or potential traffic generated from existing lawful uses is one which needs to be made on a case by case basis, bearing in mind the requirement for the site to be developed in a comprehensive fashion recognising that the area will be subject to very significant changes over the Local Plan period to 2029.</p> <p>Technically, the vast majority of the site ultimately takes its current access off Long Lane, though it cannot be argued that this would be appropriate into the future once development has taken place for the reason explained in the masterplan.</p>
Historic England	<p>Townscape Character</p> <p>Beverley's historic townscape character can be distinguished from the 20th century development of the town. The town centre comprises a fine grain of buildings located in a number of 'organic blocks' of development, which define a network of narrow streets and spaces; this is a typical feature of historic town centres, and are a positive urban characteristic of Beverley, facilitating good legibility by clearly defining public and private space. Moreover, a fine urban grain contains numerous building frontages enclosing the streets and spaces to create a visual richness to the streetscape. Much of the development along principle routes into the town</p>	<p>A detailed analysis of Beverley's townscape has been included within a new section of the document on design. Features distinctive to Beverley have been discussed including local materials and detailing, scale and massing and this discussion has informed design guidance included within the document.</p>

centre comprises back-edge-of-pavement terraces. Beverley Minster and St Mary's Church are dominant features in much of the town and on approaches to it, and both are fundamental to the character and perception of the town.

The town centre is relatively well connected with an extensive network of lanes / ginnels that riddle the town centre, alongside some opportunities for attractive small squares and public spaces. The Saturday Market is very much the focal point of the town, in terms of day-to-day activity and as a landmark space.

The areas to the west of the town centre developed in the 19th and early 20th century and, therefore, much of the street pattern is well integrated with the Town Centre, with connecting streets defined by Georgian and Victorian properties, which again provide a visual richness to the streetscape.

Domestic buildings are generally constructed in brick, often with distinctive details, with clay tiled or pantiled roofs, incorporating relatively high chimney stacks in some cases.

It is these areas, comprising the Minster Precinct, Flemgate and Kelgate which give Beverley much of its local distinctiveness, together with the "Strays", common pastures, which provide a unique landscape setting for the town.

The development of the land south west of the town should be informed by a detailed analysis of the component elements which contribute to the local distinctiveness of Beverley and should include an appreciation of local materials and detailing, scale and massing, plot width and size, relationship to the carriage, and the provision of public and private open space.

Similarly the component elements of the historic townscape and its morphology should be understood and incorporated into any new development, to provide safe and overlooked pedestrian routes

	<p>and small squares, to provide an enhanced setting for the new development.</p>	
	<p>In particular, the incorporation of a southern “stray” into the development will serve to enhance the character of Beverley, along with building development which recognises and utilises the identified elements of the local building vernacular and historic townscape morphology.</p>	<p>A substantial area of open space will be provided for on-site for a range of uses. This will cater for the open space needs generated by the development in a comprehensive fashion. Any further open space over and above this would require further funding not currently available, especially given the other infrastructure demands placed on new development in the area including education and highway improvements.</p>
	<p>Density The character of the new development will be critical to its success and sustainability, and the density of development on the site will have a fundamental impact upon this.</p> <p>It is important to recognise the site extends form close to the town centre, to the very edge of the settlement, and densities should therefore be deployed in an appropriate an graduated manner. Denser levels of development may be appropriate in the immediate vicinity of the town centre, provided that an appropriate built form and urban morphology is adopted. As development moves away from Beverley’s urban core, the density of development should reduce, and an appropriate built form and morphology should be employed.</p> <p>Gardens should be provide which are appropriate to the built form and not determined by the availability of space left over once the road network and parking provisions have been decided upon. If garden space becomes constrained, then the density of the development must be reduced.</p>	<p>A detailed analysis of Beverley’s townscape has informed guidance on density within the design guidelines of the document. This includes promoting higher densities closer to the town centre to the north of the site.</p>
	<p>Landscape Character</p> <p>The land rises gently to the south, such that from the northern part of the site, the bypass is not visible. It is sub-divided by hedge rows and surface drains which run from west-south-west to east-north</p>	<p>The masterplan reflects the need to conserve views of the Minster from a number of perspectives. From Minster Way, from the Spine Road, from public open space, and finally glimpses of the Minster from new development close to the town centre on the northern portion of the site.</p>

	<p>east. A rural lane, Long Lane, runs parallel to the railway line, in a north-north-westerly direction. Overall the landscape is not particularly distinctive.</p> <p>Beverley Minster is visible from within a wide vista, although hedge rows and trees belts interrupt these views in certain locations.</p> <p>It is important that viewpoints are identified in detail, in order to assist in define street layouts and the disposition of housing, in order to afford glimpsed views of the Minster. In particular, it is important to recognise that there is not a single viewpoint which must be protected, but a number of them, and a thorough understanding the site, and its relationship with Beverley Minster will need to be understood and demonstrated in the proposed site layout.</p> <p>It is also important to recognise that that it is not only the towers of the Minster which are visually prominent, but also the entire length of the roof line and occasionally elements of the south façade.</p>	<p>The masterplan recognises the importance of views to other parts of the Minster apart from the towers as well as the rest of the town centre.</p>
	<p>Landscape: trees and hedge rows</p> <p>Although the landscape does not have a particularly distinctive character, the subdivision of the area by line and stands of trees and hedge rows is important.</p> <p>As a new development in a formerly rural landscape, hedge rows and trees should be retained and field boundary line incorporated into the layout of the proposed development, to continue the organic nature of development of Beverley.</p>	<p>Vegetation to be retained in new development has been shown on the masterplan map. Much of this vegetation coincides with field boundaries that will be retained by vegetation within new development.</p>
	<p>Heritage Assets</p> <p>We welcome the acknowledgement that development of this site will have an impact upon both designated an undesigned heritage assets.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Heritage assets will be investigated as part of the development management process.</p>

	<p>A thorough assessment of all known and as yet undiscovered heritage assets will be required, which are directly or indirectly affect by the proposed development, setting out their significance, as defined by the National planning Policy Framework and Historic England’s “Conservation Principles”. The impact of any proposals will then need to be assessed, and any justification and mitigation described, where appropriate.</p>	
	<p>Buffer zones</p> <p>At this stage, it is not clear if any buffer zones are going to be incorporated into the development.</p> <p>If buffer zone are to be incorporated into the proposed development, these should be carefully deployed and be of sufficient size and quality to contribute positively to the overall character of the area, as well as making a positive contribution to the local ecology.</p> <p>Development in the vicinity of major noise sources such as the ring road and railway line should be set a generous distance from these noise sources and shielded with natural buffer areas, employing variety of indigenous trees, bushes and shrubs which are compatible with the local ecology.</p>	<p>Substantial landscaped buffers are required to the south of the site against Minter Way as well as against Lincoln Way. Much of this landscaping already exists and needs to be retained and added to where necessary.</p> <p>A buffer against the rail line has been added to the masterplan.</p>
	<p>Urban Frontages & Streets</p> <p>We note that the issue of urban frontages and streetscape has not been addressed in the draft Masterplan, and we consider this to be an omission. It is important that these elements of the proposed development are appropriately addressed, and informed by Beverley’s distinctive townscape character. This means that a design solution bespoke to Beverley will be required.</p>	<p>An expanded design section in the masterplan now provides guidance urban frontages and streetscape informed by the detailed analysis of Beverley’s townscape.</p>
	<p>Road access</p> <p>We welcome the proposal which routes in bound traffic onto Woodmansey Mile, which we consider will ease pressure on Beverley’s historic core, provide adequate parking management</p>	<p>Support noted. Access to/from new housing development will be from Woodmansey Mile and the proposed spine road through the site. Additional landscaping along Long Lane has been provided for that will provide for framed glimpses of the Minster.</p>

	<p>arrangements remain in place.</p> <p>The principle north-south routes should be sinuous to a degree, with a generous provision of landscaping either side of the carriageway, with a generous grassed verge with regularly spaced trees set between the carriageway and the footpaths, which should also have generous grassed verges on the outer edges. This will afford framed glimpsed views of the Minster, on the approach to the town.</p>	
	<p>Connectivity We welcome the commitment to incorporate or preserve and enhance public rights of way crossing the site, and to develop linkages with existing footpath networks. Where the opportunity presents itself, linkages to existing roads (even if currently cul-du-sacs) and footpaths should be exploited, particularly to encourage pedestrian access to the town centre.</p>	<p>Noted. This is broadly what the masterplan seeks to achieve.</p>
	<p>Parking & garaging Recent developments in Beverley have dealt with parking and garaging with varied degrees of success. The disposition of parking and garage areas must be carefully considered and integrated into the proposed development in an integrated manner. So that sterile, unwelcoming and characterless back areas are not created.</p>	<p>The Council's draft Sustainable Transport Supplementary Planning Document provides further guidance on design, layout and amount of parking.</p>
	<p>Public realm, lighting & street furniture The treatment of the public realm and associated elements is not considered in the draft Masterplan, which we consider this to be an omission which should be addressed. The proposed public realm and associated elements should reflect the urban quality and character of the area in terms of design and materials, which in turn should be informed by a thorough understanding of Beverley's historic character. More elaborate and decorative street furniture will be acceptable within squares or prominent sections of street.</p>	<p>Guidance on urban frontages, squares and landmarks has been provided within an expanded design section of the document. The masterplan does not go into ultra fine detail including street furniture as this can be dealt with during the development management process.</p>
	<p>Community facilities and Neighbourhood Centres</p>	<p>Advice noted. The neighbourhood centre has been located in an</p>

	<p>The inclusion of a defined Neighbourhood Centre with the site is welcomed, as It is important that Neighbourhood Centres are appropriately located, well connected, and integrated into the wider development. It will not be appropriate for example to locate a Neighbourhood Centre on, or close to the edge of the development.</p>	<p>area well accessible to foot and cycle links next to the proposed spine road in the middle of the site. It has been collocated with the large area of open space and proposed new primary school.</p>
<p>Humber Sites and Monuments Record</p>	<p>As you are aware we consulted on the relevant site allocations for the local Plan and on the Draft Development Brief for the land to the southeast of Beverley. Although our comments on each land allocation were limited, the letter on the Development Brief for the southeast of Beverley was able to provide more detail on the archaeological background for this area. I have put together information for the archaeological background for the area covered by this Draft Masterplan, but the comments are in general, similar to those supplied earlier for the area to the southeast of Beverley.</p> <p>The Archaeology Section of the Draft Masterplan is extremely brief and fails to mention that there are recorded archaeological remains within the allocated development areas. These cropmarks, recorded within the allocated development areas relate to early settlement. Whilst the document is correct that there is potential for unrecorded remains to be discovered within the area of the Draft masterplan, it fails to mention that such settlement remains are already known to exist within this area.</p> <p>The area of the Draft Masterplan lies within a major archaeological landscape. An extensive cropmarks complex representing the remains of ditches and enclosures have been identified that date from the Iron Age and/or Romano-British to the post-medieval period. The cropmarks include Iron Age/Romano-British field systems and occupation evidence, including enclosures and ring ditches.</p> <p>Archaeological work along the southern bypass, revealed a wealth of archaeological remains. Amongst the earliest structural remains found were a Bronze Age round barrow and a possible Bronze Age cremation. Iron Age remains included a small cemetery of at least four square barrows within the route of the bypass – there</p>	<p>Archaeology section has been amended with further detail as advised.</p>

were probably more beyond the limits of the road – and at least two separate Late Iron Age settlement sites, one of which had at least four roundhouses within the excavated area; there were also associated animal pens, enclosures, ovens, pits and fence-lines. Both of these settlement sites, once established, continued in use into the Romano-British period.

Also, there were extensive remains of early field systems, of both late prehistoric and Romano-British date.

The occupation of this landscape extended into the medieval and post-medieval periods, with the remains of the medieval field system recorded within the Draft Masterplan area, as ridge and furrow. As such, I feel that this part of the document should be expanded to reflect both the known archaeological remains that exist within the area of the Draft Masterplan, as well as the high potential for development to disturb archaeological remains that currently remain unrecorded.

The Archaeology paragraph (4.14) in the Draft Masterplan goes on to state that geophysical surveys should take place prior to the determination of planning applications for the allocation. I would support this recommendation, so the nature and extent of any archaeological remains could be understood, prior to the development being agreed within this area. To support this recommendation it would be useful to add an objective to deal with the archaeological remains to Section 5.3. Such an objective could be part a separate objective or maybe added to number 3. Such an objective should aim to achieve in situ preservation or preservation by record of any significant archaeological remains, which could be agreed through suitable mitigation. Such an objective could be along the lines of ‘to preserve heritage assets, including below-ground and landscape features, a programme of suitable mitigation will be agreed’.

The results of a pre-determination geophysical survey of all the greenfield areas which lie within the area covered by the Draft Masterplan would be the start of a staged archaeological scheme. Geophysical survey is a reasonably rapid, non-intrusive

	<p>investigative technique. As a technique, it has proved to be successful at identifying more deeply ditched features on the route of the adjacent Beverley Southern Relief Road; however, there may be some parts of the Draft Masterplan area which may not be suitable for its application (e.g. where there are extant hard surfaces, scatters of ferrous debris or building rubble, or dense undergrowth). Should this prove to be the case, then the use of other forms of investigation may need to be considered.</p>	
<p>Humberside Police</p>	<p>My comments are intended to guide architects, developers and individuals in the public and private sectors in achieving best design practice with the aim of reducing crime, anti-social behaviour and fear of crime. This guidance promotes and encourages good quality design and addresses these aims by establishing principles for the design, layout and landscaping which creates a safer and more secure environment, increases the risk of detection of criminal and anti-social activity and makes crime more difficult to commit.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 58 and 69, states that planning policies and decisions should aim to ensure that developments create safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion</p> <p>Designing out Crime Objective To minimise crime</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimise crime by the use of Secured by Design methods and ensuring that open spaces and pedestrians/cycle routes are overlooked, are well lit and well maintained. • All developments must follow the Safer Places*2 national guidance and Secured by Design ‘Section 1’ principles should be incorporated in the design of the development <p>A protocol and interactive design guidance is in place between East Riding of Yorkshire Council and Humberside Police to ensure</p>	<p>Comments noted. A designing out crime section of the expanded design chapter of the document has been included. This sets out the principles referred to in the response plus links to further information in ‘Secured by Design’ and ‘Safer Places’.</p>

	<p>planning applications seek to design out crime effectively and to provide support for applicants wanting to achieve the ‘Secured by Design’ Developers Award. The Secured by Design ‘Section 1’ standard applies to the layout of development as opposed to ‘Section 2’ which applies to buildings themselves.</p> <p>Please note: The protocol and design guidance and trifold leaflet are attached, these are the generic documents that have been consulted on across Humberside Planning Authorities. Ideally these should be displayed on the planning website and if used for the purpose of this Supplementary Planning Document, a hyperlink to these documents could be included.</p>	
Ian Metcalfe	<p>I strongly feel that the proposed development in SW Beverley is far too big for a small market town the size of Beverley and will adversely affect the existing character of the town. I feel that brownfield sites in Hull and other areas should be developed instead, rather than using greenfield farmland.</p> <p>This will be an overdevelopment of the site and town which will have an impact on generations to come. Where are these new residents going to have doctors, dentists, hospitals, primary and secondary school places, employment, leisure facilities, parking?</p> <p>Infrastructure has not been thought out. There are no planned community or leisure facilities for children and no sports facilities other than at the existing Leisure Centre, which is a car journey away from this development.</p>	<p>The amount of housing proposed for Beverley at 3,300 contributes towards the overall housing provision needed for the East Riding as a whole to meet its needs. Beverley will accommodate this number of homes due to its role and function it performs as a Principal Town serving a large rural catchment of the East Riding.</p> <p>Various sites in an around the town have been examined as to their suitability for future development. The area to the South West of the town was determined as being suitable for development due to its proximity to the town centre, as well as its transport links and relative lack of constraints such as common land and high flood risks.</p> <p>The Council has completed an infrastructure study supporting the Local Plan, which assessed the new infrastructure requirements of proposed development and investigates funding streams and delivery mechanisms for this. The site itself will deliver a new school, extension to existing school and substantial areas of open space to accommodate new development.</p> <p>In terms of the infrastructure assessment an Infrastructure Study has been completed.</p> <p>A large area of open space is to be provided alongside new</p>

	<p>Contrast this with the local facilities (Village Hall, Doctors Surgery, Shops, Sports facilities) which were provided by the builders at Molescroft and the lack of any facilities which were provided to the Lincoln Way estate. There are now no Public Houses in the SE of Beverley, and none have been proposed in the draft masterplan.</p> <p>A school is planned but like Keldmarsh Prumary School this will be built 20 years after the estates and will be built at the Council's own expense and will not cope with the 5000 children in the planned 2500 houses. Not to mention the secondary schools – Beverley Grammar and Beverley High Schools are already vastly over subscribed and cannot be expanded any more.</p>	<p>development.</p> <p>The development is providing for the necessary school places.</p> <p>The three secondary schools in Beverley are able to accommodate expected pupils from the overall amount of development proposed for the town and surrounding area.</p>
	<p>Drainage has not been considered in enough detail, and seems to be relying on existing land drains. Whole fields in SW Beverley are invariably covered in lakes of surface water in the winter, and this does not drain away for months.</p> <p>Existing sewage pipes were not built to cope with this capacity of housing development.</p>	<p>Drainage has been considered in line with the provisions of national and local policy to restrict run of from new development to existing rates or less.</p> <p>Yorkshire Water have indicated that, subject to investment from the developer, the sewers will be able to cope with anticipated foul water flows from new development.</p>
	<p>Traffic flow along Lincoln Way and the A1079 at Jock's Lodge has not been given any consideration. There are queues at these locations now at rush hours, which will become major blockages if the proposed development is put in place.(5000 EXTRA cars!)</p> <p>There is no alternate route available.</p> <p>If the planning is the same as happened at the Swinemoor roundabout, I fear for the consequences.</p>	<p>These junctions have been assessed as part of the Local Plan process and whilst being close to capacity with queuing they are still able to accommodate future development.</p>
	<p>Currently Council workers predominantly, and others, do not use car parks where they have to pay, and instead park throughout the Lincoln Way estate and walk in to their place of work. This problem has been exacerbated by the restriction placed in Figham Mile resulting in cars along Newton Drive, Ripon Avenue, Lincoln Way, Shepherds Lea and other streets. People working in Beverley will not pay any charges to use the proposed park and ride service and will continue to park on residential streets.</p> <p>This problem can only get worse if this development is allowed.</p>	<p>The need for controlled parking zones to resolve issues caused by on-street parking is something that is reviewed frequently by the Council. New development within Beverley is unlikely to exacerbate the situation given the housing will already be located within reasonable proximity of the town centre.</p>
	<p>The types of housing have not been stated and seem to be at the will of the builders. I strongly suspect that high density housing</p>	<p>The mix of housing proposed will reflect the latest evidence of need at the time in conjunction with advice from our Housing</p>

	<p>will be put in place, so that the SW of Beverley will resemble the featureless estates at Kingswood with no consideration of the characteristics of the existing town of Beverley.</p> <p>When the southern relief was planned Councillors (– famously Councillor Parnaby!) assured residents that this road would not open the floodgates to builders wishing to build houses.</p> <p>This promise has been reneged to the detriment of all Beverlonians.</p> <p>The southern relief road is not used as much as was anticipated – the clear purpose of this road was to build a small city within the perimeters. For a council to request a bypass within sight of another bypass (A1079) was shortsighted.</p>	<p>Strategy and Development Team.</p> <p>The proposed density is little different to that already in existence within the Lincoln Way housing area.</p> <p>The adopted Local Plan at the time did not proposed any further housing development in the areas now proposed within the East Riding Local Plan.</p>
Kieran Sheehan	<p>I would like to register my objection to the proposals in the above draft plan.</p> <p>The housing density is too high and not in keeping with the current housing density in the neighbouring Lincoln Way development. There is not enough green space in the development proposals and what little there is is too scattered and discontinuous. The public green space area should be extended and amalgamated into a contiguous block: the Beverley Renaissance Partnership proposal of a new common, Southwood, should be resurrected.</p>	<p>Including proposed areas of open space the density of development within allocation BEV-J would be around 24 dwellings per hectare, which is not massively inconsistent with densities within the Lincoln Way housing area.</p> <p>The masterplan does proposed an amalgamated area of open space.</p>
	<p>All new development should, according to the National Planning Policy Framework, be sustainable. I understand that a Sustainability Appraisal has been carried out for the Local Development Plan Allocation Document (Atkins 2014) and that this masterplan has been screened against this to ensure that the findings remain constant. I do not believe that this has been done accurately and I also do not agree with the reasoning behind the Relevance/Impact scores in Table 1 (ERYC 2015 pp.6-7).</p> <p>Specifically under SAO6 Table 1 assesses the plan as having ‘Mixed effects’, however, Atkins (2014 p.138) assessed this as having a</p>	<p>With regards to SA Objective 6 to improve air quality. There is no suggestion that the masterplan will prevent negative impacts against this objective but rather, the negative impacts would be reduced as a result of provisions in the masterplan to encourage people to make journeys via cycle/walking/public transport as opposed to using the car.</p> <p>With regards to SA Objective 7 to reduce the growth of road traffic. Again, there is no suggestion that the masterplan will prevent negative impacts against this objective but rather, the negative impacts would be reduced as a result of provisions in the</p>

	<p>negative effect due to increased car use. The change is because the masterplan provides detailed guidance as to how non-car modes of transport are to be integrated into the new development. (ERYC 2015 p.8) This guidance is wishful thinking at best and disingenuous at worst: it has no basis in fact and is unenforceable in practice. The question needs to be asked, where will all the people that will live in this new development area work? It is unlikely to be in Beverley.</p> <p>Road traffic is also a consideration in SA07 in Table 1(ERYC 2015 pp.6-7) and, again Atkins (2014 p.139) state that development in BEV-J will have a negative impact on this sustainability indicator. However, ERYC (2015 pp.8-9) have toned this down, using the same wording as SA06 above, so that it becomes ‘Mixed effects’ in Table 1 (ERYC 205 pp.6-7). Once again there is no evidence to back this new assessment up: it is merely wishful thinking, no more, no less.</p> <p>SA08, to ensure more efficient use of land, is assessed by Atkins as negatively impacted by the proposed development at BEV-J (Atkins 2014 p.139). However, in their assessment, ERYC have decided that this should be changed to ‘Positive effects’ in Table 1 (ERYC 2015 p.6). The reasoning behind this is entirely spurious and implies that ERYC are the best people to decide on how this area of land should be managed. In terms of sustainability this is unfounded. The building of a large housing estate on a Greenfield site will not ensure a more efficient use of land, unless your re-define what is meant by efficiency.</p> <p>SA011 – To minimise the impacts of climate change by developing in a way that reduces the risk from flooding and coastal erosion – also does not stand up to any kind of scrutiny. Atkins (2014 p.140) believe that the effects of development here will be neutral or not direct (does this include indirect effects?). However, in their masterplan for the area, ERYC say that the plan will help to reduce surface water flood risk (ERYC 2015 p.9) and have categorised it</p>	<p>masterplan.</p> <p>With regards to SA Objective 8 to encourage more efficient use of land. Again, there is no suggestion that the masterplan will prevent negative impacts but rather, the negative impacts would be reduced as a result of provisions in the masterplan.</p> <p>With regards to SA Objective 11 to minimise the impacts of climate change by developing in a way that reduces risk from flooding and coastal erosion, the masterplan includes further detail on potential SuDS solutions for the site. The main element is this is to hold water in Mill Dam Drain and release it at a controlled rate not exceeding the existing greenfield run off rate. The masterplan also contains more details as to what uses would be suitable for the portion of the site in a higher level of flood risk from rivers, hence helping to avoid placing specific types of development in areas where it would be vulnerable to flooding in the first place.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>as having ‘Positive effects’ (ERYC 2015 p.6). This is incredulous. At the moment most of this area is Greenfield and any surface water flooding will only affect agricultural land. Once it is built on, it will decrease the land permeability dramatically meaning that, in order to ensure surface water run-off does not increase, detention basins will be required, i.e. SuDS. However, what this assessment does not mention is that BEV-J is within a pump-drained catchment and water will not flow out of these detention basins unless it is pumped into the River Hull, creating a head. Following development, therefore, less infiltration and evapotranspiration will take place, meaning there will be an increased demand for pumping and, therefore, fossil fuel consumption. How this can ever be deemed sustainable is beyond me and to describe it as having ‘Positive effects’ is little more than a semantics.</p>	
	<p>Whilst this is not in the current published masterplan, there is a strong rumour that land-raising on the floodplain is being considered to allow development to encroach onto the functional floodplain. However, doing this only moves flooding problems downstream and, as a technique, has become discredited in recent years as it does not allow the floodplain to store water, increasing the steepness and peak amplitude of flood events on hydrographs.</p>	<p>We are not aware of this rumour. From a technical point of view there isn’t any areas of functional floodplain within the masterplan area.</p>
<p>Petition signed by 1,017 people:</p>	<p>We ask ERYC to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - take steps to ensure that future consultations with residents are meaningful; - considerably reduce the proposed new housing allocation for Beverley; - reduce the number of proposed houses in the Draft Masterplan for the South West of Beverley to 900; - retain Southwood, Beverley's proposed new area of common land; - include further green spaces within all proposed developments. 	<p>Extensive consultation has taken place on the Local Plan, which considers the principle of housing development on the site. An extended consultation on the masterplan that elaborates on the layout and design of housing development on the site took place including two drop in sessions.</p> <p>The amount of housing proposed for both Beverley and the site is something extensively consulted on and considered through the East Riding Local Plan.</p> <p>A substantial area of open space will be provided for on-site for a range of uses. This will cater for the open space needs generated by the development in a comprehensive fashion. Any further open space over and above this would require further funding not currently available, especially given the other infrastructure demands placed on new development in the area including education and highway improvements.</p>

Marine Management Organisation	Provided information on the role and function of the MMO, but did not comment directly on the masterplan.	
Michael Glover LLP	Act on behalf of the Beverley South Western Collaboration landowners identified on the submitted plan. The collaboration is committed to bringing forward the release of land and are working jointly with Persimmon Homes to do this. Wish to bring forward the scheme within the context of a cohesive masterplan and therefore welcome the publication of the masterplan.	Comments noted
	BSWC has commissioned Mason Clark Associates Ltd and Storm Geomatics Ltd. to carry out a hydraulic study to define accurately the correct extent of each category of flood zone. The results of the study will be made available to ERYC and the Environment Agency and will be used to inform the preparation of the masterplan required to accompany the planning application.	Comments noted
	It is suggested a sentence be added at the end of para 3.9: “The extent of the flood zone area will be subject to revision following detail study and agreement of the Environment Agency. This will be taken into account in developing the masterplan for the allocation.”	To date no evidence has been received regarding flood risk from the collaboration, so the masterplan cannot take this into account.
	BSWC agrees the area needs to be planned comprehensively. The paragraph 3.14 refers to the BEV-J requirement for the submission of a masterplan for the whole site. It needs to state whether this is for the BEV-J area alone or whether it includes BEV-L and/or BEV-Q. It can be understood that BEV-L can be dealt with as a stand alone site. The situation needs to be clarified to avoid later confusion.	Clarity has been added to explain that although a masterplan was not required for allocations BEV-L and BEV-Q, they have been included within the masterplan’s provisions as logical extensions to the masterplan area.
	The Draft Masterplan needs to provide the location of the foul water connection point. There needs to be some reference to line and level of the foul sewer as well as its discharge point. It is of limited benefit if the outfall position is set but sewers are laid too shallow for it to be of use to the remainder of the development.	This is a level of detail that will need to be established through the development management process in consultation with Yorkshire Water as the statutory sewage undertaker. Yorkshire Water have responded to the masterplan and are broadly supportive of its contents from their perspective.
	The Draft Masterplan states no public open space requirement for BEV-Q. It is assumed BEV-Q has made a payment for off-site provision. The Draft Masterplan should confirm the payment will be transferred to BEV-J which in practice will be providing BEV-	BEV-Q is allocated for the extension of Keldmarsh Primary School and therefore does not contribute towards open space within allocation BEV-J.

	Q's proportion of open space.	
	Para 3.11 states a new primary school is needed to serve Beverley. Para 4.38 repeats a new primary school is needed to serve new development. As it is a town-wide requirement it is considered the provision of the new primary school should be delivered by the CIL	The primary school is required to provide for anticipated pupils within the masterplan area.
	The paragraphs 4.44/46 need be re-written to achieve consistency. It is clear the highest need is not for rented 2 bedroom properties. The paragraph needs to be amended to reflect figure 3.	Modifications have been made to achieve clarity.
	It is suggested paragraph 4.47 be removed and added to paragraph 6.42 so that the Council's approach to affordable housing provision is clear.	Change made.
	Somewhere the document should clarify the relationship of BEV-J to BEV-L and to BEV-Q so everyone is sure what elements of the draft masterplan refer to each site individually and severally.	Clearly this does vary, however in terms of infrastructure requirements. Section 8 in the document now explicitly clarifies which allocation is contributing to what.
	While there is no objection to the incremental development of BEV-J the masterplan needs to make it clear individual proposals are developed in accordance with an approved masterplan and its delivery strategy.	Section 8 of the masterplan already clarifies this.
	<p>It is noted funding of a bridleway and footbridge crossing may be done by others. However, in order to achieve the necessary height and gradient there is a significant land use implication within the masterplan area as well as a need for such a potential off-site linkage to be shown on the masterplan. It is suggested this requirement be deleted unless there is a reasonable likelihood of the rail crossing being funded.</p> <p>It is noted similar provision is not made in the 2014 masterplan for South East Beverley.</p>	<p>There is a reasonable likelihood of this coming forward as it enhances accessibility to/from new development and has the prospect of some funding from Network Rail.</p> <p>Similar provision has been made in the final Development Brief for South East Beverley.</p>
	<p>Reference is made to an access strategy for the site. The Draft Masterplan needs to state if an access strategy is required for the site and, if so, define the site.</p> <p>If it is intended access to Keldmarsh School will be provided from anywhere else other than Woodmansey Mile in the future this needs to be stated in the Draft Masterplan. The present wording</p>	This relates to additional manoeuvring space on the school site in light of additional traffic using Woodmansey Mile in future. Access to the school is not proposed from BEV-J.

	suggests there is an aspiration to access the school from within BEV-J which conflicts with the masterplan diagram.	
	The diagram should make it clear BEV-Q will need to make provision for highway access to the remainder of the site. At present it is unclear, and the diagram suggests the central spine road could be a cul-de-sac. If a northern link is not provided, the Draft Masterplan should state what alternatives will be needed or whether the spine road can be a cul-de-sac in this instance.	BEV-Q is allocated for the expansion of Keldmarsh School which already has an access. The arrows on the map clarify the spine road is not anticipated to be a cul-de-sac at these locations, but have connections to the existing road network via a roundabout.
	The Draft Masterplan should state the area of land that will be required to accommodate a one and a half form entry primary school to avoid any misunderstandings at a later date.	Noted
	Paragraph 4.6 does not say there is particular shortage of two and one bedroom properties, it says the greatest single shortage is with three bedroom houses. Para 6.40 differs from this. The Draft Masterplan needs to be consistent.	Modifications have been made to achieve clarity.
	The Draft Masterplan needs to make it clear provision of Extra Care Housing is a joint responsibility of all three South West Beverley allocations, not just BEV-J.	The specific requirement has only been made from allocation BEV-J. Although all developments have a requirement to provide and appropriate mix of housing to meet needs, including for older people (policy H1 of the Strategy Document).
	<p>All maps/diagrams should have a title.</p> <p>Where is access for BEV-L?</p> <p>What happens to the spine road north of Willow Lane? It needs to connect with Woodmansey Mile.</p> <p>Footbridge needs sufficient landing area on west side of railway.</p> <p>Footbridge needs to be linked into a footpath/cycleway network.</p> <p>The neighbourhood centre needs to be located on the main north/south spine road if it is to stand a chance of being successful; at the junction of the two spine roads adjacent the school. The masterplan diagram indicates a backwater location.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Lincoln WAY</p> <p>Potential connections shown by arrows via a roundabout.</p> <p>This matter can be addressed closer to the time as it is not a definitive requirement of the plan If provided, it will link into the bridleway at England Spings or nearby.</p> <p>Indicative locations shows this on the spine road- now collocated with the new school.</p>

	<p>Is the access up and down the bypass embankment approved by the highway authority?</p>	<p>The Council is the highway authority.</p>
	<p>BSWC understands the draft masterplan includes BEV-J, BEV-L and BEV-Q rather than just BEV-J. If this is not the case the draft masterplan needs to be re-written. If this is the case the draft masterplan needs to be thoroughly checked to ensure it is clear when the whole site is referred to and when it is one of the constituent allocations.</p>	<p>Noted. Clarity is provided where a requirement is only applicable to certain allocations.</p>
	<p>At end of paragraph 7.2 add: “This requirement will be part of the relevant legal agreement required to be entered into between the landowner, developer and District Council before a planning consent for development is granted.”</p>	<p>Proposals will be required to demonstrate how they have ensured that the form of development proposed is in compliance with the guidance set out in the masterplan. A legal requirement would not always be necessary to do this.</p>
	<p>The schedule at 7.3 needs amendment. Delivery of allocations BEV-J, BEV-I and BEV-Q will involve infrastructure provision: 1. shared by the three allocations 2. that benefits development beyond the three allocations</p> <p>Item 1 Cannot be fair and reasonable when all costs are imposed on BEV-J. These costs should be shared across the three allocations.</p> <p>Item 2 Is unreasonable. Provision of the school should be included in the CIL, and development across the district make a financial contribution. The schedule suggests BEV-J alone should bear a total education cost of £7,565,000. This is inequitable.</p> <p>BSWC therefore objects strongly to the proposed distribution of infrastructure costs in the schedule.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above the schedule needs to acknowledge there may be other relevant costs that need to be taken into account.</p>	<p>The schedule has been amended to define what allocations will contribute to which infrastructure.</p> <p>The straight on signal junctions are needed to facilitate provision of the spine road through BEV-J.</p> <p>Pupils from both BEV-J and BEV-L allocations will attend the school and contributions needed towards this have now been apportioned to both allocations as site specific requirements.</p> <p>It goes without saying that other material considerations may result in further site specific costs detailed proposals are worked up and considered.</p>
<p>Mr M & Mrs S L Inglis</p>	<p>We would like to register our objection to the proposals in the above draft plan.</p>	<p>Including proposed open space, densities are likely to be comparable to that already in the Lincoln Way area.</p>

	<p>The housing density is too high and not in keeping with the current housing density in the neighbouring Lincoln Way development. There is not enough green space in the development proposals and what little there is, it is too scattered and discontinuous. The public green space area should be extended and amalgamated into a contiguous block: the Beverley Renaissance Partnership proposal of a new common, Southwood, should be resurrected. This would be in keeping with the aims of the Making Space for Nature white paper which explained that, in order to preserve wildlife, such areas should be ‘bigger, better and more joined-up.’</p> <p>All new development should, according to the National Planning Policy Framework, be sustainable. To ensure this no building should take place on Flood Zone 3a. Increased drainage is not an option in a pumped-drainage catchment as it is clearly not sustainable and land-raising on the floodplain only moves flooding problems downstream and, as a technique, has become discredited.</p> <p>For this reason we would request that you revisit your proposals and consult meaningfully on any new ones going forward. Until this happens, we will maintain our objection to the Draft Masterplan for South West Beverley.</p>	<p>The masterplan already proposes open space in the area to be located into a continuous block.</p> <p>No built development that would not be in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework will be permitted in flood zone 3a.</p> <p>The area of land covered by the masterplan is not a ‘pumped out’ catchment.</p>
<p>N M Oldridge and N Oldridge</p>	<p>I wish to submit my formal objection to the proposed use of the Lincoln Way end of Shepherd Lane to form part of the spine road to the planned housing development on Keldmarsh, which would result in yet another roundabout on Lincoln Way.</p> <p>As one of your Planning Officers admitted, the congestion caused by Jock's Lodge traffic lodge already creates tail backs from Morrisons Roundabout to the new Lincoln Way/Southern Relief Roundabout, which in turn causes tailbacks at the roundabout at the end of Thyme Way. To create another roundabout between Thyme Way and the recently built roundabout so that there are four roundabouts to contend with for all Lincoln Way estate traffic would cause yet further traffic jams and congestion in this area.</p>	<p>Shepherd Lane is included as an access option to provide flexibility of access options to the South of the site. Access directly from the by-pass remains an option in the masterplan.</p> <p>The impact of additional traffic has been assessed and relevant junctions can cope, albeit with an impact on queue lengths.</p>

	<p>There would appear to be no logical reason not to create a roundabout from the spine road to join the Southern Relief Road at the pedestrian crossing end of Shepherd Lane as new traffic from the Keldmarsh Estate would have the opportunity to travel East or West at this new roundabout along the Southern Relief Road, thus effectively halving the Keldmarsh Estate traffic before it arrived at the new Lincoln Way roundabout.</p>	
P Oldridge (Mrs)	<p>I wish to submit my formal objection to the proposed use of the Lincoln Way end of Shepherd Lane to form part of the spine road to the planned housing development on Keldmarsh, which would result in yet another roundabout on Lincoln Way.</p> <p>As one of your Planning Officers admitted, the congestion caused by Jock's Lodge traffic lodge already creates tail backs from Morrisons Roundabout to the new Lincoln Way/Southern Relief Roundabout, which in turn causes tailbacks at the roundabout at the end of Thyme Way. To create another roundabout between Thyme Way and the recently built roundabout so that there are four roundabouts to contend with for all Lincoln Way estate traffic would cause yet further traffic jams and congestion in this area.</p> <p>There would appear to be no logical reason not to create a roundabout from the spine road to join the Southern Relief Road at the pedestrian crossing end of Shepherd Lane as new traffic from the Keldmarsh Estate would have the opportunity to travel East or West at this new roundabout along the Southern Relief Road, thus effectively halving the Keldmarsh Estate traffic before it arrived at the new Lincoln Way roundabout.</p>	<p>Shepherd Lane is included as an access option to provide flexibility of access options to the South of the site. Access directly from the by-pass remains an option in the masterplan.</p> <p>The impact of additional traffic has been assessed and relevant junctions can cope, albeit with an impact on queue lengths.</p>
National Grid	<p>High Pressure Gas Pipeline – FM29 located within close proximity to development site. National Grid previously commented in response to the various consultation stages of the Local Plan Allocations Document advising of the presence of the high pressure gas pipeline - FM29 Ganstead to Asselby in relation to the land allocation for land to the south west of Beverley.</p>	<p>The presence of the pipeline as well as advice from the Health and safety Executive regarding it has not been flagged up within the opportunities and constraints section of the masterplan.</p>

	<p>A section of the southern relief road is proposed in close proximity to the route of the pipeline and therefore National Grid would expect some commentary on this constraint and the proposed approach to dealing with this to appear in the draft masterplan document. From a review of the consultation document however, no assessment of the opportunities / constraints associated with the presence of this gas transmission pipeline has taken place. We understand that the Council has liaised with the HSE regarding this matter, the outcome of this should be reflected in the draft masterplan document. The following advice has been provided for your information.</p> <p>Our underground pipelines are protected by permanent agreements with landowners or have been laid in the public highway under our licence. These grant us legal rights that enable us to achieve efficient and reliable operation, maintenance, repair and refurbishment of our gas transmission network. Hence we require that no permanent structures are built over or under pipelines or within the zone specified in the agreements, materials or soil are not stacked or stored on top of the pipeline route and that unrestricted and safe access to any of our pipeline(s) must be maintained at all times. Local authorities have a statutory duty to consider applications for development in the vicinity of high pressure (above 7 bar) pipelines and to advise the developer on whether the development should be allowed on safety grounds on rules provided by HSE. This advice is provided by the HSE Planning Advice for Development near to Hazardous Installations (PADHI) process. The relevant HSE guidance can be accessed via the following link:</p> <p>http://www.hse.gov.uk/landuseplanning/padhi.pdf</p>	
Natural England	<p>Statutory nature conservation sites</p> <p>Based upon the information provided within the draft masterplan and supporting Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA), Natural England advises the</p>	Comments noted.

	<p>Council that the masterplan is unlikely to affect any statutorily protected sites or landscapes.</p> <p>Natural England has assessed this masterplan using the Impact Risk Zones data (IRZs). Natural England advises your authority that the development proposed is not likely to have a significant effect on the interest features for which Humber Estuary SAC, SPA and Ramsar site has been classified. Natural England therefore concurs with the HRA screening – that your Authority is not required to undertake an Appropriate Assessment to assess the implications of this proposal on the site’s conservation objectives.</p> <p>In addition, Natural England is satisfied that the proposed masterplan will not damage or destroy the interest features for which Burton Bushes and the Humber Estuary SSSIs have been notified. We therefore advise your authority that these SSSIs do not represent a constraint on the masterplan.</p>	
	<p>Biodiversity enhancements</p> <p>The masterplan provides significant opportunities to incorporate features into the development of allocations BEV-J, BEV-Q and BEV-L which are beneficial to wildlife and achieve net-gains in biodiversity. Whilst objective 8 (paragraph 5.3) refers to linear green corridors and new ecological habitats this is not progressed within the SPD, the masterplan should explicitly refer to the creation of multifunctional green infrastructure (delivering flood water management (SUDs), recreational space, non-car based travel and biodiversity enhancement). The draft masterplan focuses on formal open spaces (playing pitches, amenity space and ornamental gardens).</p> <p>In accordance with the requirements of the NPPF paragraphs 58, 114, 117, and 118, and Environment White Paper The Natural Choice: securing the value of nature, the master plan should also ensure networks of priority habitats and wildlife corridors which link open spaces with the open countryside are created alongside</p>	<p>Amendments to the masterplan have been made to the masterplan to define and develop green infrastructure corridors shown on the masterplan map. These consist of existing and proposed open space, sustainable transport links and retained vegetation. Together with SuDS and watercourses on site these will ensure networks of habitat creating wildlife corridors.</p> <p>Priority habitats have now been referred to.</p>

	<p>more formal elements of GI. These could complement SUDs measures set out in paragraphs 6.3 to 6.7.</p> <p>The masterplan's ecology requirements (paragraphs 6.23 to 6.25) only refers to existing areas of ecological value (Keldmarsh LNR, ditches, hedgerows and trees) and their protection. Although welcomed this section should be more proactive and ensure opportunities to deliver net-gains in biodiversity at a strategic and local level are taken (see advice above). The SA's assessment that the masterplan will have a neutral effect (rather than a positive) on biodiversity reflects the absence of proactive encouragement of habitat creation and enhancement.</p> <p>We would be happy to comment further should the need arise but if in the meantime you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>	
Patrick Snowden & April Roberts	<p>On a personal note I feel very disappointed by the proposed plans. When the Bypass was in the planning stages we were told on several occasions that there would be no infilling by building of properties once the Bypass was completed and that Shepherd Lane would become a Bridleway.</p>	<p>At the time the current Local Plan did not include any proposed housing development within the masterplan area.</p>
	<p>My property faces the New Bypass and is approximately 100 metres from it. I now face having other Road 10 (Yes 10) metres away from the rear elevation of my property causing severe distress and reduction in the quality of life for my family</p>	<p>Although Shepherds Lane is a possible access option. This is unlikely to be significantly more busy than Lincoln Way is today</p>
	<p>I wish to add my objections to the Draft Strategies plan for New Housing in Beverley on the basis that it is vast overdevelopment of the Southern Area of Beverley, which will drastically change the Unique character of Beverley and harm the Tourism trade rather than add to it, and severely damage the Benefits of existing residents on the following issues.</p> <p>Development covers massive flood area which allows the Rainfall settlement for all properties in the southern area of Beverley- proposed area regularly floods as it is significantly lower than properties in the SW.</p>	<p>No housing is proposed on the most flood prone land and sustainable drainage systems will be employed to limit run off.</p> <p>The impact of the development on the road network has been assessed and can cope with additional traffic albeit with some additional queuing.</p> <p>Long Lane is to be retained much as it is today and there will be an increase in accessible open space resulting from development.</p> <p>Infrastructure has been assessed and improvements planned for</p>

	<p>Drainage in Beverley cannot cope with existing properties and the smells are harming tourist trade adding 2000 new properties with around thousands of additional residents cannot cope.</p> <p>Once Beverley loses its 'uniqueness' and becomes a sprawl like other towns, tourist trade will drop.</p> <p>Proposed properties will add around 4000 cars to the local roads around Beverley-In excess and would result in Gridlock at Peak times. This will massively increase CO2 levels in the Beverley area. Given that 2000 properties might introduce 5000 or so residents of working age, these residents are unlikely to find employment in Beverley and will end up commuting to Hull, York Leeds etc putting massive strain on roads in the region and will possibly drive employers and tourists away from Beverley.</p> <p>Pollution resulting from new properties and vehicles will be harmful to existing residents.</p> <p>Loss of local leisure land and encroachment into 'Green Belt' land will harm the Health of residents and put pressure on the Health service. At present Long Lane is used on a Daily basis for walkers, Cyclists, Runners and Horse riders- promoting Health lifestyles – Existing residents in the Lincoln Way are will be enveloped in an Urban Sprawl of Buildings</p> <p>Infrastructure unable to cope with massive population increase from the proposed development with pressure on the Hospital, Doctors, Schools and Road Network.</p> <p>Loss of tourism trade to Beverley due to over development and loss of USP. I travel the country and many customers that I visit comment on how nice Beverley is because it is unique.</p> <p>I would propose a much reduced level of development for the</p>	<p>accordingly. For example a new school is to be provided with development.</p> <p>Tourist attractions within the town will remain unaffected by development. There is no evidence to suggest additional housing will reduce the town's attractiveness to tourists.</p> <p>A large consolidated area of open space is proposed alongside new development as part of the plans.</p>
--	--	---

	southern area, and allow for the existing areas between Shepherd Lane and the New Bypass to be created into leisure trails. Creation of walking areas, Nature reserve, picnic areas and ponds and a local forest would all encourage good health and fitness reducing pressure on the Health service.	
Peter Ayling	Our overall comment is that a planned development of over 1800 dwellings on this site within view of the Minster is far too large. As the document states, this would be the single largest site for housing development in the East Riding Local Plan up to 2029. We urge the council to reduce this number substantially, to about a half, perhaps by restricting development to the northern half of the site at least for the present. The attractiveness of Beverley is in part due to the way it has grown gradually over the past six or seven centuries, but this development would change the character of south west Beverley in ten to twenty years.	To meet Beverleys housing needs a number of sites have been assessed. This site scored well in terms of access to the town centre and a relative lack of other constraints. All of this has been consulted upon extensively through the Local Plan process.
	We welcome the statement that most of the natural features could be retained, namely trees, hedgerows or areas of ancient woodland not subject to statutory protection , and the ditch running along Long Lane. Dr D Boatman of Cottingham, formerly Reader in the Botany Department University of Hull, has a list of many ancient hedgerows in this area based on floristic composition that might be of assistance for this work .	Comments noted, would welcome Dr Boatman's input.
	We welcome the reference to the East Riding Local Plan Strategy Document policy E 4 that encourages sustainable traffic options , especially cycling and walking, as a way to reduce dependency on motor transport. Likewise we welcome this reference to preserving and enhancing public rights of way within the site.	
Sport England	Sport England welcomes the inclusion of these sport facilities. It is important that consideration is given to the design and layout of the proposed new playing field so that it can accommodate the appropriate range of pitches. In Sport England's comments of 4 July 2014 on the Beverley Development Brief, it was noted at the	Noted. Detailed design of the pitches including the intended sports they are to be used for will be considered once sufficient developer contributions have been received to enable delivery. Again detailed design will consider changing facilities and access.

	<p>time that the Playing Pitch Strategy recognised a shortage for junior and mini football pitches, cricket, rugby league and rugby union for Beverley. However there was an oversupply of adult football pitches.</p> <p>The South West of Beverley Draft Master Plan provides the opportunity to meet the recognised shortage of pitches. This way, playing field can be constructed that will meet an identified demand.</p> <p>The Draft Masterplan should also consider how these new sport facilities will be served, including car parking and changing accommodation. The area of open space proposed adjacent to the Southern Relief Road is isolated, so will need services such as changing rooms as there is no opportunity to share any existing ones adjacent to the site. There may be the opportunity to incorporate changing into the proposed primary school which could be made available through community use to serve the new area of playing field.</p>	<p>Both the school and open space has been collocated on the developments spine road.</p>
<p>Yorkshire Wildlife Trust</p>	<p>Keldmarsh Nature Reserve</p> <p>In our previous response for the East Riding Local Plan and allocations we highlighted our concern about the proposed allocation on our Keldmarsh reserve:</p> <p>‘We are very concerned that the proposed development would isolate our Keldmarsh Nature Reserve (please see http://www.ywt.org.uk/reserves/keldmarsh-nature-reserve for more information). If this site is taken forward then robust GI/habitat corridors should be included within any development to link the reserve to the wider countryside. We are aware that water vole, great crested newt and grass snake are present in the area and appropriate surveys and mitigation will be required.’</p> <p>The proposed masterplan includes the provision of built infrastructure adjacent to the proposed greenspace adjacent to Keldmarsh Primary School and on the opposite side of Willow</p>	<p>The masterplan has been modified to explicitly include a green infrastructure corridor along existing open space to the east of Lincoln Way, which then links to the countryside.</p> <p>The masterplan already makes reference to opportunities for providing for greater accessibility to the nature reserve and an appropriate buffer of additional open space adjacent to the reserve.</p> <p>With regards to the increased population. Around 2000 additional homes will generate around 4400 additional people living in the area rather than 8000, although it is still recognised that this is a very significant population increase. Additional text has been included to highlight some of the issues referred to and flag up some further potential solutions.</p>

	<p>Lane from our reserve. Given the large scale of the allocation (‘the largest single site for housing development within the emerging East Riding Local Plan to 2029’) we are concerned not only about the ecological isolation of our reserve from the wider landscape but also the potential for recreational disturbance and anti-social behaviour to our reserve due to the much increased number of people that will be living in the area. The site is already subject to littering, vandalism and fires due to its location in a built up area and we are concerned that the addition of up to 8000 more people in the area could worsen this problem.</p> <p>Yorkshire Wildlife Trust welcomes the retention of the existing greenspace along the western boundary of the allocation site. We are however concerned that there does not appear to be an ecological buffer between the vast majority of the allocation site and our site (i.e. the area to the south of Willow Lane). Whilst we acknowledge that the presence of Willow Lane will prevent houses backing immediately onto the nature reserve, and therefore prevent the possibility of gardens encroaching onto the reserve, there is still very much the high possibility of recreational disturbance due to dog walkers and increased visitors to our reserve, which may lead to the increase of anti-social activities such as fires, fly tipping and littering, which is an issue in all of our urban/ sub-urban nature reserves. There is also the impact for wildlife such as water voles, reptile and great crested newts (for which we have records of being present in the area) to be impacted further due to increased predation by cats and dogs. The proposed master plan does not reference any of these issues or propose any potential mitigation for such issues. Yorkshire Wildlife Trust therefore advises that the Council contacts us in order to discuss such impacts and potential mitigation options. One option could be the inclusion of a more substantial ecological buffer adjacent to Willow Lane, which could then branch out across the entire allocation site and join up the areas of proposed greenspace and provide a rich wildlife corridor across the site.</p>	
	Impact on biodiversity and protected species	There are no proposals to culvert watercourses as this would be

	<p>Yorkshire Wildlife Trust is also concerned about the impact that the allocation site will have on wildlife outside of our reserve. The proposed allocation site contains a number of water courses, including Mill Dam Drain. The culverting and development around such features therefore has the potential to impact wetland habitats and fauna, such as water voles and great crested newts, which are present in the area.</p>	<p>against local planning policy. The masterplan suggests that the Mill Dam Drain could be incorporated as part of a comprehensive SuDS system for the site. This may create opportunities for wildlife enhancement.</p>
	<p>Public open space</p> <p>Yorkshire Wildlife Trust has noted that the proposed areas of public open space are within flood zone 3. Such areas are therefore at high risk to flooding and the habitats there are likely to be wet in nature. Such areas of open space can be difficult to manage effectively for both people and wildlife and may require specialist contractors. Such areas however can provide the opportunities to create ecological enhancements, helping to achieve the enhancement objectives of Paragraph 118 of the NPPF ('opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments should be encouraged'). The SuDS to be utilised onsite should also be managed for biodiversity in order to mitigate for habitat loss impacts. Yorkshire wildlife Trust would be happy to discuss management and design options for such areas and potentially be involved in the long term ecological management of the site, which could also tie into the management of our Keldmarsh reserve and mitigate for the recreational disturbance issues.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Council intends to collect developer contributions for a consolidated central area of open space. The potential of YWT's involvement in delivery is noted.</p>
<p>Andrew Bateson</p>	<p>At what point would you consider Beverley has grown enough? Or is there no limit to how much you are happy to see it grow in the name of economic prosperity?</p> <p>Society, of which Beverley is a part seems locked into growth, fundamentally population growth, economic growth, growth in size, growth in number of retail units growth in businesses etc. etc. None of which has any long term sustainability.</p> <p>There is no vision for a long term sustainable way of life and an environment in which to live it.</p>	<p>The amount and location of new development to 2029 has been considered and consulted upon extensively through the production of the East Riding Local Plan. This includes the accompanying sustainability appraisal that considers the balance of social, environmental, and economic factors.</p>

<p>Anna Galais</p>	<p>I feel compelled to write to you reference the above proposal for 1800 new houses. We have recently moved to Beverley from the South of England and chose it for its size and infrastructure.</p> <p>We feel 1800 houses are too many for the town to assimilate and that the infrastructure in place will not be able to absorb approx. 1400 extra people along with all the extra traffic, pressure on schools (primary already full), and health services.</p> <p>Above all the character of the town will change and become more impersonal and less attractive to residents and tourists.</p> <p>In addition, the land in question for the development is subject to flooding .</p> <p>I am not against building more houses but not on such a scale even over a 15 year period.</p>	<p>The amount and location of new development to 2029 has been considered and consulted upon extensively through the production of the East Riding Local Plan.</p> <p>The Council has assessed infrastructure needs to 2029 within the Infrastructure Study and has planned for the necessary infrastructure accordingly.</p> <p>As the masterplan sets out, residential development will be avoided in the areas of the site subject to high flood risks.</p>
<p>Barbara Johnson</p>	<p>Whoever decide that the land is not of the highest scenic quality has no soul</p> <p>As a long term resident of Lincoln Way I have long believed that the proposed building area is one of the most interesting and scenic areas of Beverley.</p> <p>Allowing a Co-op store on Lincoln Way is bad enough, but his amount of housing will destroy the landscape and ultimately Beverley.</p>	<p>The landscape quality was assessed by professional landscape architects.</p> <p>The amount and location of new development to 2029 has been considered and consulted upon extensively through the production of the East Riding Local Plan. This includes development to the south of Beverley. Assessments show that infrastructure can cope and that fundamentally the basic character of the town will be preserved.</p>
<p>Beate Willar</p>	<p>The housing density is too high in general, and in particular when compared with the current housing density in the neighbouring Lincoln Way development. Beverley needs more housing, specifically smaller starter and retirement homes. However, there is no reason why these less expensive houses should not be given the same environment and neighbourhood that more expensive houses are generally built in – other than the builders’ desire to maximise profits. Beverley has a real chance here to break the mould, and to</p>	<p>Including proposed areas of open space the proposed density of housing development within the masterplan area is very comparable to that within the Lincoln Way estate. Densities are likely to be higher as development takes place due to changes to national and local policy to make the most efficient use of land in housing delivery.</p> <p>The ‘Southwood’ concept is something that the Council had in</p>

	<p>provide housing for people wanting to get onto the housing ladder or to downsize, but in a highly attractive development that offers substantial public green space; I wish to lend my fullest support to the Beverley Renaissance Partnership's proposal of a new common, Southwood, as it would make for a wonderful community space for many generations to come, and also provide a much-needed green belt in this part of Beverley.</p>	<p>mind when designating a central area in the site as open space, although it must be borne in mind there is a limitation to the amount of open space developers can viably provide for.</p>
	<p>Furthermore, this would also be in keeping with the aims of the Making Space for Nature white paper which explained that, in order to preserve wildlife, such areas should be 'bigger, better and more joined-up.'</p> <p>All new development should, according to the National Planning Policy Framework, be sustainable. To ensure this, no building should take place on Flood Zone 3a. Increased drainage is not an option in a pumped-drainage catchment, as it is clearly not sustainable. Land-raising on the floodplain only moves flooding problems downstream and, as a technique, has become discredited.</p>	<p>The masterplan has been revised to include green infrastructure corridors providing multifunctional benefits in terms of open space, wildlife corridors, and sustainable transport.</p> <p>No housing development is proposed on flood zone 3a. The masterplan area does not sit within a pump drained catchment.</p>
	<p>Finally, I have to express my severe disappointment at the manner in which the consultation on this plan has been undertaken. Not only was the timing far from ideal, with much of it being in the school summer holidays, I also consider it disingenuous when residents are invited to comment, but then also told by council officers as well as elected councillors (the latter in the local press, no less) that this consultation was only about "tweaking design details" and "it's a done deal". This questions the whole rationale of a consultation, and irrespective of whether these comments were made intentionally in order to discourage people from offering objections, if they had this outcome, then this not only warrants investigation, but makes a new consultation a necessity.</p> <p>For this reason I would request that you revisit your proposals and consult meaningfully (!) on any new ones going forward. Until this happens, I will maintain my objection to the Draft Masterplan for South West Beverley.</p>	<p>Development to the south of Beverley has been subject to extensive consultation both through the production of the East Riding Local Plan- in terms of the principle of developing the site, then the masterplan- in terms of detailed guidelines as to how the site should be developed.</p> <p>This has included drop-in sessions, sending out hundreds of emails/letters notifying people of the consultation and the issuing of press releases.</p> <p>The masterplan was out to consultation between 13th July and 14th September, 2015, which covered 9 weeks where people had a chance to respond. Two drop in events at the Treasure House were held. As a result, over 100 responses have been received to the masterplan consultation. The Council is therefore satisfied that the consultation process has been more than adequate.</p>
Brantingham Parish	No comments on masterplan	Noted

Council		
Cheryl Murphy	<p>I am writing to object to the Beverley masterplan and local plan.</p> <p>I have lived in Beverley for over fifty years and have seen many changes over this period.</p> <p>However, none of these developments have been as badly planned as this one. The proposed development will further expand the boundary of this town and destroy its rural boundaries forever. The density of the development will create a soulless suburb with no community facilities firmly provided for and will exacerbate the traffic and parking problems in the town, despite the assurance that the Northern end of the development is ‘within reasonable walking distance’ of Beverley’s centre. The building of 35 houses per hectare, compared to the 20 per hectare on the neighbouring Lincoln Way estate, will increase the isolation of this proposed community with no communal meeting places and adding to social isolation amongst the residents.</p> <p>I have seen the flooding on this area after prolonged rainfall and despite the carefully detailed drainage plans, as has been shown numerous times before, water will not go away it will just emerge elsewhere.</p> <p>The comment that water voles and bats have been spotted in the area vastly underestimates the rich variety of species that abound in this marshy land . The preservation of indigenous wildlife seems a more sensible solution than leaving future generations the task of attempting to reintroduce lost species.</p> <p>The feeling amongst Beverley residents is that this development is too dense and unwelcome with most people calling for some form of parkland that would provide a lasting legacy for the people of the town. Calls have been made by the Civic Society and the Beverley Renaissance Society, amongst others for this amenity which is prioritised amongst most leading towns from York, Harrogate and Hull.</p> <p>It appears that this proposed development is spearheaded by developers who have no connection with Beverley, do not reside</p>	<p>Fundamentally, the site is clearly allocated for housing use and will extend the built up area of the town, however there are several elements of community infrastructure included in the plans. Tghis includes the new school and a large area of open space provision.</p> <p>Including proposed areas of open space the proposed density of housing development within the masterplan area is very comparable to that within the Lincoln Way estate. Densities are likely to be higher as development takes place due to changes to national and local policy to make the most efficient use of land in housing delivery.</p> <p>Housing development will be avoided in the areas of highest flood risk and sustainable drainage systems will be employed to limit run off.</p> <p>The masterplan preserves substantial existing vegetation and makes provision for a network of green infrastructure, which should help preserve wildlife on the site. Ecological assessments will be needed in detail with future planning applications on the site.</p> <p>The ‘Southwood’ concept of open space in the area is something that the Council had in mind when designating a central area in the site as open space, although it must be borne in mind there is a limitation to the amount of open space developers can viably provide for.</p>

	here and only have a quick and substantial profit in mind.	
Chris Saunders	<p>I have serious concerns that the addition of 1900 homes will cause a catastrophic failure of the existing infrastructure of Beverley.</p> <p>Roads, parking, and leisure facilities are highly contested and schools and medical facilities are nearing capacity.</p> <p>It is my opinion that a park and ride service is long over due, and would be critical to the success of the expansion of Beverley if gridlock is to be avoided on it's historic road system.</p> <p>It is already difficult to get children onto swimming courses, which leave little space for non-lesson activities in the pool, especially as a family, as the remaining space in the pool is laned swimming, which is unsuitable for families with young children.</p> <p>I also wonder how the existing secondary schools and college would cope with additional intake, as well as the doctors practices and neighbouring hospitals; especially A&E facilities.</p> <p>Finally, where are the jobs for these people? Surely some space should be given to quaternary business development, so that professionals, who are attracted to this housing development, do not complete for the few existing positions and existing inhabitants have careers to which they may aspire and remain in the area.</p> <p>In short, I do not oppose the proposed increase in housing, but only if the infrastructure is expanded accordingly.</p>	<p>Infrastructure has been assessed and planned for accordingly, including a requirement for a new school with the development.</p> <p>A new park and ride is to be delivered alongside new development at the other side of the rail line.</p> <p>Additional jobs are being created in the town centre, including Flemingate development, expansion of existing industrial areas and further afield along the A63 corridor.</p>
Christine and David Strawhorn	<p>Whilst we accept that more houses (particularly affordable homes) are needed in Beverley we are concerned that the scale of the proposed housing development is disproportionate to the current size of the town and will have an adverse impact on the historic character of the town, the environment of people already living on the south side and also the traffic and congestion in the town and surrounding area. If this scale of development is absolutely</p>	<p>The housing for Beverley has been directed to suitable locations according to a number of factors including transport, heritage impact, landscape character etc. This has included a degree of spreading between the north and south of the town.</p> <p>Detailed transport assessments will be completed for relevant junctions as detailed proposals are submitted by developers.</p>

	<p>necessary then the housing should be more evenly distributed around the town rather than concentrated within one area.</p> <p>Also a specific point in relation to road access 6.30/6.33 in your proposals that we would like to raise is as follows: As the expected volume of traffic from the new development will be substantial at peak times there will be difficulty in gaining access to Woodmansey Mile from Newton Drive and the northern end of Lincoln Way. There does not appear to be any traffic control proposals for this junction. Could this please be considered.</p>	
Cicely Boddice	<p>I Object to the massive proposed housing development. The land to either side of long lane is rural, many people enjoy walking their dogs, riding their bikes or horses along the peaceful Long Lane. This gives a wonderful view of the Minster as you walk along. All this will be destroyed by the building of such a large amount of housing.</p> <p>At the moment Woodmansey mile is used as a parking lot by many people who work in the town, I am concerned that if the road is being opened up to more traffic, so where will these cars park? Not in the herb estate , marsh drive is too narrow and we already have cars parking there all day.</p> <p>The Keldmarsh school is a busy school, and parents struggle to park there, with many more houses proposed this problem will get worse. The proposed houses will all have two cars, so that adds to the problem of more traffic.</p> <p>You will spoil the wonderful town of Beverley, it will just become a massive sprawl of housing with no identity.</p>	<p>The proposal is to maintain Long Lane largely as it is today.</p> <p>Additional access improvements are proposed for the school to allow safe drop off and pick up of Children.</p>
D L Learoyd	<p>Suggest the open space allocation shown at the north west end of the S E Beverley site should extend across the rail line in order to protect as far as possible, views of the south side of the Minster.</p>	<p>The majority of the open space has been directed toward the south of the site due to high flood risks and need to avoid residential development in this area. Open space in this areas also acts to preserve views of the Minster.</p>
Daniel Sellers	<p>Please allow me to give consultation response to the “South East Beverley” and “South West Beverley” SPDs.</p> <p>Although I feel the redevelopment of Brownfield land should be prioritised, I am aware that the East Riding is short of such sites as</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

	<p>it is mainly agricultural land outside the existing built-up areas.</p> <p>I feel it is important that Beverley does not become commuter overspill for Hull, Leeds and York.</p> <p>I agree that it is important that long-distance views towards Beverley Minster are maintained.</p> <p>I agree with Planning Policy BEV-J: Protect and enhance the landscape setting of the town and key views towards the Minster from the south. I feel there should be no further expansion of Beverley to the south of the Southern Relief Road.</p> <p>I feel it is important that no building takes place on the flood zone land. The East Riding and York / North Yorkshire have historically been prone to flooding due to the low-lying nature and rain / snow on higher ground causing rivers to flood.</p>	
Dave Monk	<p>Traffic The Plan purports to promote sustainable transport ..methods of travel other than single car use (para 5.3).</p> <p>The masterplan suggests that up to 1900 new houses will eventually be built - This will generate a significant level of traffic - thousands of cars per day if one assumes each house will have 2 cars.</p> <p>The Plan appears to be proposing vehicle traffic from the housing development is to flow directly onto Woodmansey Mile. Why?</p> <p>Millions of pounds have recently been spent on the Southern Relief Road. Traffic from the new development needs to flow onto the relief road rather than onto Woodmansey Mile.</p>	<p>Woodmansey Mile is the access option from the South. Access options from the North are via Shephers Lane and/or Minster Way.</p> <p>Provision for access improvements for Keldmarsh School have been made in the plan. Restrictions to parking have recently been put in place on Woodmansey Mile.</p>

	<p>I agree with the Masterplan (p.16) that pedestrian and cycle provision should be improved to enable access from the new development and into Beverley safely</p> <p>Woodmansey Mile is currently restricted in its width by the vehicles parking to both sides of Woodmansey Mile. The "cycle lanes" have also been lost.</p> <p>If significant amounts of traffic are directed onto Woodmansey Mile, there are safety concerns for children crossing Woodmansey Mile close to Keldmarsh School. Also, the High School pupils need to cross Woodmansey Mile in order to get into Beverley from Lincoln Way.</p> <p>Community Facilities Appropriate community facilities need to be provided and retained. Lincoln Way has just lost its last pub (both Victoria and Lincoln Arms)</p> <p>Green, Open, Play Space Appropriate levels of open space need to be provided</p> <p>Green corridors need to be enhanced and retained - Shepherd Lane is an existing natural green corridor connecting to Keldmarsh Nature Reserve and to Long Lane. This needs to be retained as a natural corridor/barrier (footpath?) between the proposed housing estates.</p>	
David and Tracy Curtis	<p>I am contacting you regarding the proposed development of Housing near the Beverley Parklands, next to the new By pass road off Hull Road. I am writing to strongly object to these proposals. As a local resident living on Bielby Drive in Beverley i feel the amount of building is getting out of control for the following reasons:</p> <p>I strongly oppose to building on Greenfield sites. I understand the need for housing but the majority of housing been built in</p>	<p>The amount and location of new development for the Town has been extensively considered and consulted upon through the East Riding Local Plan. This is a masterplan as to how some of the sites are to be developed in detail.</p>

	<p>Beverley has been built not for first time buyers who are local to the area but for retired people moving here from out of the area, expensive housing over 125,000 pounds. This therefore doesn't actually address the housing need. Not much of this building is built for young families it seems more apartments are built. There is already enough pressure on Town services such as GP, Parking, heavy traffic, you can never get parked when doing errands in town or for appointments. Spoiling the aesthetic of the Town, people live here for a semi rural community not a sprawling metropolis. I hope you will take my issues and concerns seriously and hope to hear from you in the near future.</p>	
David Welburn	<p>Having recently seen the masterplan at the Treasure House and listened to some of the explanations given to questions raised I am still not convinced that the following points have been fully covered and I would like to register my objection to the plan in its current format:</p> <p>1) With a proposed housing density of 50% greater than that already on the adjacent site of Lincoln Way, the area allowed for gardens must be greatly reduced and one assumes that a great deal of hard standing will be used in place of gardens. One of the major contributing factors to recent urban flooding has been the increase of such hard standing. As this area is already prone to flooding - drive down Long Lane on any day after several days of rain and you cannot see the fields for water - this density of housing must put the area at major risk of flooding.</p> <p>2) We were told at the presentation that Yorkshire Water were aware of the plans and were working hand in hand with the ERYC. Yorkshire Water are, today, not capable of providing a sewage treatment which does not regularly cause extremely offensive smells to the residents in the south of Beverley. What guarantees can you give that this can be remedied once the new houses are built.</p> <p>3) 1900 new homes implies at least 1900 more vehicles using the</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The density of the site will be comparable to that already in the Lincoln Way Estate. 2. The smell from the works is an operational issue rather than one of capacity. 3. People do walk and cycle as evidenced by travel to work surveys. Assessments of impact of development on the road network show that it can cope albeit with increased queuing. 4. Impacts on infrastructure are acknowledged and provision made in the plan for sufficient facilities to cope. 5. Paved areas will be provided alongside new development. 6. Access options include onto Minster Way. No access is proposed onto Long Lane.

	<p>streets of Beverley. As vmost homes now seem to have more than one car this figure could be much higher . When I vasked the question about where all these people would park when they came into town the vreply I received was " we HOPE that the majority of people living in this development will either walk of cycle into Beverley. This is a serious pipe dream on behalf of the council . No-one hardly walks or cycles in from the Lincoln Way development so I dont see how you can assume people living further away will not use cars. The only people who seem to walk into town are out-of town workers who park on Woodmansy Mile or Minster Avenue , causing disruption to the locals.</p> <p>4) The local NHS and schools will be put under extra stress , as will the police service which may be soon reduced in Beverley. The Health Centre, although recently enlarged, will also struggle to cope with extra visitors - again parking at this site will be a problem – not everyone will park on the new multi-storey park on Flemingate.</p> <p>5) What provision has been made for somewhere for children to play ? Unless I missed it on the plan I cannot see any.</p> <p>6) On the plan we were shown the Spine road at the Woodmansey Mile end seemed not to have a defined end " we're not sure where it may finish". Is there a guarantee that it will not finish up coming out onto Long Lane , making a busy and dangerous junction with Keldgate even more so? Why was no provision made for a direct access onto the southern relief road - as this is being greatly underused it could easily accomodate some extra traffic.</p> <p>Beverley is a wonderful market town full of character, attracting visitors from all over the UK and overseas. DO NOT LET THIS DEVELOPMENT SPOIL THIS FOR THE FUTURE.</p>	
Dr Anthony Hedges	I wish to register my strong objection to the southwest development plan as a whole. This is a development there is no	The amount and location of new development for the Town has been extensively considered and consulted upon through the East

	<p>justifiably reason to contemplate, other than to satisfy the greed of potential developers. I know of no resident or resident's group within the town who have asked for such a development to take place. If there has been no demand from the residents, then the plan must have originated from the council who supposedly exist to serve the residents, not to foist unwanted schemes onto them.</p> <p>In para 5.2 of the plan it talks of "preserving and enhancing" the character of Beverley. This is arrant nonsense. The essential character of Beverley – already absurdly compromised by the Flemmingate development - used to be that it was a small market town of historic significance. It has already largely lost that essential character with all the surrounding new estates of recent years. All the talk in the Plan of how to make the new development attractive is irrelevant to the basic issue.</p> <p>If the southwest development goes ahead Beverley will have been transformed into a characterless urban sprawl (how long before that is joined to Hull?) with a town centre that is minute in comparison to its urban surroundings. Far from preserving and enhancing the character of Beverley, that character will be completely destroyed by a process of urban vandalism. The destruction of historic sites by Islamic State comes to mind!</p>	<p>Riding Local Plan. This is a masterplan as to how some of the sites are to be developed in detail.</p>
<p>Dr K Williams</p>	<p>I am writing to voice my concerns about the proposed development for the South Side of Beverley. I feel too many houses are being proposed for the sites and in fact the sites are too big. It must be ensured that there is sufficient green space left for the residents to enjoy. I support the idea of a public space similar to the Westwood on the South side of Beverley.</p> <p>With the current proposals Beverley is in danger of becoming flooded with un-affordable housing stock. The developments that are currently being built to the North of the town in the Molescroft area contain housing that is , in my opinion,</p>	<p>The amount and location of new development for the Town has been extensively considered and consulted upon through the East Riding Local Plan. This is a masterplan as to how some of the sites are to be developed in detail.</p> <p>There are requirements that 25% of the housing build here should be 'affordable'.</p>

ridiculously priced - £500,000 for a 4 bed detached house!! Where do the developers get their prices from . They just seem to be in it to make as much money as possible and have no respect for the current residents of the town with regards to the impact all the housing will have on current amenities.. If the housing on the South of Beverley goes ahead the developers must be kept in check with their prices - there is no way £500,000 is affordable... We were told when the housing was proposed for the North of the town that the problem in Beverley was the lack of affordable housing and it seems that the developers promised to provide affordable housing to get their plans passed but are now not providing any .. This must not happen on the South of Beverley too..

There needs to be more starter homes and retirement properties in the plans for the South of Beverley.

Also, it must be ensured that there is sufficient doctor and school provision . I know it is proposed that Keldmarsh school will be expanded but will this be enough ? On the North of Beverley no extra primary school provision has been made so now there are an extra 600 homes that are trying to get their children into Molescroft primary which is already over-subscribed... We all said this when the proposals for the North of Beverley were put forward but nothing has been done to address this we need re - assurances that these concerns will be addressed prior to planning being granted and also followed through to ensure any promises made are actually done e.g. affordable housing built. I feel the level of development in Beverley is too much and will destroy the character of the town and other areas in the East Riding should take some of the allocation from Beverley - we are taking a disproportionately high percentage. I know Beverley is a desirable place to live so it seems that Beverley is taking more of the housing allocation than other places because it will be easier to persuade building firms to build here (because they can build big unaffordable homes and make a fat profit) - this shouldn't be the reason for building more houses in Beverley. Please re-consider the amount of housing that is

	going to be built in Beverley. I love this place and the charm of the town and really do not want it to be destroyed by over -zealous development..	
Eric & Liz Lauritzen	I have been living in Beverley for 27 years, and have seen one plan after another add estate after estate to the town. I don't know the actual figures, but it seems the population must have doubled in that time. However wonderful your plans may look on paper, the truth of the matter is that 2000 homes (I thought it was 1900) will add probably 3000 cars to the towns roads. With each new plan has come an increased level of traffic queues, for cars coming into the town for shopping, and the new Flemingate centre will draw ever many more. With another 3000 cars the expectation has to be that the town will grind to a standstill at peak times. The roads near the centre of town have not been altered to any extent during this time. So please don't build at all.	The amount and location of new development for the Town has been extensively considered and consulted upon through the East Riding Local Plan. This is a masterplan as to how some of the sites are to be developed in detail.
Fiona Joy	<p>I am writing to object in the strongest possible terms to your plans to build on greenfield land to the South West of Beverley.</p> <p>In the proposal document, you state, "The landscape is not of the highest scenic quality."</p> <p>Firstly, countryside does not exist solely for our pleasure. It is there to sustain nature, which we have a duty to protect.</p> <p>Secondly, that is what the landscape is like around here. It may not be on everyone's bucket list, but it's pretty enough for East Yorkshire folk and we are proud of it.</p> <p>There are plenty of other arguments for why you should not build so many houses in such an inappropriate spot. However, I think there is only one main reason you cannot do it.</p> <p>It's greenfield land - it belongs to nature. Hands off.</p>	<p>The amount and location of new development for the Town has been extensively considered and consulted upon through the East Riding Local Plan. This is a masterplan as to how some of the sites are to be developed in detail.</p> <p>The landscape quality was assessed by professional landscape architects.</p>
Geoff Donkin	Page 7 Section 3.15 Allocation BEV-L – Access to this area of land should be from Victoria Road and not from Lincoln Way. With the re-classification of Victoria Road to a C-road and the expected	Victoria Road has already been downgraded in classification but is still a major route into the town centre. As a result, access is more appropriately located along Lincoln Way for BEV-L.

	<p>increase in traffic along Minster Way , development on this land should not add to the traffic problems on Lincoln Way given there's already access to the land from Victoria Road.</p> <p>Page 16 Section 4.29 – Refers to “traffic calmed cycle friendly shared routes” and Lincoln Way. We don't need additional calming on Lincoln Way and I'd object to speed bumps and the like such as they have through the centre of Walkington .</p> <p>Page 19 Section 4.42 – Need to be explicit about affordable homes . What are they? Affordability is surely a subjective thing, but in principle I agree, per sections 4.46, 6.40 and 6.42, that we need more smaller 2 and 3 bed homes in the town rather than more 4+ bedroom ones, but that shouldn't result in housing density greatly at odds with that on the Lincoln Way estate which I believe is circa 20 house per hectare.</p> <p>Page 31 Section 6.30 / 6.33 – Bringing the spine road out onto Lincoln Way is undesirable from the perspective of existing residents of that estate . We'd have 3 roundabouts on Lincoln Way within 200 yards of each other which would significantly change the nature of access to the estate, traffic levels and congestion. Noting the suggestion of a roundabout on the by-pass as part of the South-Eastern Master Plan, the developers should be strongly encouraged to bring the spine road out onto Minster Way and a new roundabout , thereby keeping Lincoln Way estate separate at the southern end , noting that it would be connected into Woodmansey Mile and hence the spine road at the northern end . This form of access seems to work well for the housing inside the north -eastern by-pass near the Hayride pub.</p> <p>In summary, I've reviewed the plan from the perspective that some form of development of the land is going to take place and as such those of who will carry on living in the town long after the developers have packed up need what they leave us behind to be as good as it can be. We need infrastructure and green space to</p>	<p>No hard engineering is proposed currently to calm traffic on Lincoln Way.</p> <p>Affordable homes are defined by government and we have emailed separately about this.</p> <p>We need to be open about access options to allow delivery of the development in a timely fashion. Access onto the end of Lincoln Way is unlikely to result in further rat running since the Spine Road will have a connection to Woodmansey Mile at its southern end.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>complement a low density development that doesn't create more problems than it solves . Your document at least touches on the issues that matter to me and many others but it's far from the finished article and I trust the council will act in the best interests of residents when the pressure comes from developers to shift that balance in favour of their profit motive .</p>	
G. Powell	<p>I would like to register my objection to the proposals in the above draft plan.</p> <p>The housing density is too high and not in keeping with the current housing density in the neighbouring Lincoln Way development. There is not enough green space in the development proposals and what little there is is too scattered and discontinuous. The public green space area should be extended and amalgamated into a contiguous block: the Beverley Renaissance Partnership proposal of a new common, Southwood, should be resurrected. This would be in keeping with the aims of the Making Space for Nature white paper which explained that, in order to preserve wildlife, such areas should be 'bigger, better and more joined - up.'</p> <p>All new development should, according to the National Planning Policy Framework, be sustainable. To ensure this no building should take place on Flood Zone 3a. Increased drainage is not an option in a pumped – drainage catchment as it is clearly not sustainable and land - raising on the floodplain only moves flooding problems downstream and, as a technique, has become discredited.</p> <p>For this reason I would request that you revisit your proposals and consult meaningfully on any new ones going forward. Until this happens, I will maintain my objection to the Draft Masterplan for South West Beverley.</p>	<p>Including proposed areas of open space the proposed density of housing development within the masterplan area is very comparable to that within the Lincoln Way estate. Densities are likely to be higher as development takes place due to changes to national and local policy to make the most efficient use of land in housing delivery.</p> <p>The 'Southwood' concept of open space in the area is something that the Council had in mind when designating a central area in the site as open space, although it must be borne in mind there is a limitation to the amount of open space developers can viably provide for.</p> <p>No housing is proposed on flood zone 3a. The masterplan area is not a 'pumped out' catchment.</p>
Georgina Richardson	<p>My concerns regarding the developments plans for the South West of Beverley mainly focus on the increase of properties and</p>	<p>The exact proposal within the Beverley Borough Local Plan is that 'consideration will be given to the closure to motor vehicles of a</p>

	<p>development along the first part of Long Lane of which I am a resident.</p> <p>When we first looked at purchasing our current home (in 2007) I telephoned the planning office to raise concerns about the proposed opening of Woodmansey Mile onto Long Lane. I was informed that, as part of the original local plan, it was proposed that Long Lane was shut off for vehicle access from the bend after the row of semi-detached houses. This formed part of our decision into buying this house as we were moving to escape the traffic of another busy Beverley road and we intended to stay in this house until our boys had finished Grammar School. This idea was since been dropped without any resident consultation, along with the proposed closure of the Flemingate crossings.</p> <p>I have concerns regarding access from Woodmansey Mile onto Long Lane and how that would be restricted to “no turn” would work. This was mentioned to me at a recent briefing event I attended at the Treasure House. This would need to be demonstrated as a efficient method of traffic restriction as I believe this will be challenged by car drivers avoiding the double mini roundabouts on Queensgate therefore endangering other road users.</p> <p>Other questions I have would be how you would ensure that users of the children’s play area (on Woodmansey Mile) are kept safe from the busy road which will be developed round them – I would also like clarification of how the money which is allocated for play areas would be spent, for example on a planning application (13/03454/OUT) submitted and approved in 2014 it allows for a sum of money to be paid for Outdoor Play Space. The play facilities on Woodmansey Mile playground are very limited and very dated. Rather than ploughing any funds into new spaces could the existing provisions be looked at and improved? Also the fencing surrounding the park would need to be adequate to stop any younger children going onto the busy road. There would also need to be some additional planting the stop the noise and provide an environmental buffering</p>	<p>short section of Long Lane north of the proposed Figham Link' (Policy T5, my underlining). This was not set out as something definitely proposed within this plan, just that consideration would be given to to it.</p> <p>Very extensive consultation has occurred on the new East Riding Local Plan, which will replace the existing Beverley Borough Plan. The new plan did not include the previous 'Figham Link' (extension of Woodmansey Mile), but instead includes the now completed Southern Relief Road as the alternative. There has therefore been opportunities for people to feed into the preparation of the new plan with regards to the omission of the Figham Link proposal.</p> <p>The masterplan proposes to prevent access from Woodmansey Mile (and the proposed spine road through new housing development) to/from Long Lane. This will be achieved through the provision of signal junctions where the Spine Road/Woodmansey Mile crosses Long Lane.</p> <p>The signals, plus the tight layout of the junctions will act to prevent vehicles turning left or right. An example of a similar junction exists in Royal Leamington Spa at the junction of Parade and Warwick Street.</p> <p>The allocation of off-site contributions towards public open space is made on a case by case basis as and when funds get paid. These decisions are made on the basis of the most up to date information on where the money is most needed according information within the Council's Open Space Review and other available information at the time.</p> <p>It should be borne in mind that although some additional traffic is anticipated along Woodmansey Mile once development has taken Place, it will not become a 'main road' as such but rather a distributor road in a similar fashion to how Lincoln Way operates today.</p> <p>It is important to realise that the principle of development taking place on allocations BEV-J, BEV-L, and BEV-Q has already been consulted upon as part of the consultation process for the</p>
--	--	--

for health reasons.

At the consultation evening I was also surprised to hear that the first field (when approaching from the Minster end) was probably going to be accessed from a point along Long lane or the houses would front onto the Lane itself. There is a wide drain, with lots of wildlife including pea hens, ducks and water voles and I cannot see how this would be possible – also how would the construction traffic access this area during development – it is already stated that the road is not suitable for heavy transport. There is a small bridge across this drain, however on the above mentioned planning approval it was stated that “Access and egress onto and off the publicly maintained highway of Long Lane will be via a bridge that is not part of the public highway. This bridge should have its construction integrity verified due to the change in number and type of vehicles that could potentially use it to deliver to the new properties – such as furniture deliveries, shopping deliveries, construction vehicles, etc” and also it was noted that “due to the limited width it is likely oncoming vehicles would either wait on the site side or in the apron fronting the bridge on Long Lane either scenario would not have a detrimental effect on other road users” this is also very close to the bend in the road. I would not like to see large plant thundering past my home during this phase and the corner is already very dangerous due to the sharp bend which is a hazard for cars already.

Apart from that I feel that this green belt area what makes Beverley special, the area is used for recreational purposes (cycling, running, jogging, walking and horse riding) by many. The area is home to a variety of wildlife which would be destroyed if the development was allowed to proceed. The Minster is now home to breeding peregrine falcons and this area when undoubtedly be their hunting ground.

I feel that the information provided during this consultation phase does not provide enough firm details for local residents to be able to form any opinions based on facts – for example

emerging East Riding Local Plan. The masterplan has been written to provide further detail as to the broad form of development in the area. Very detailed matters relating to biodiversity will be considered within the relevant legislative and national policy context as well as policy ENV4 within the emerging Local Plan, which seeks to protect and enhance biodiversity concerns.

	<p>concerns regarding the number of houses proposed for each area, site access, transport issues and loss of wildlife have not been adequately addressed.</p> <p>I object to this massive development until residents are provided which more accurate proposals and the effect on the small market town of Beverley can be assessed.</p> <p>Residents of Beverley are already coping with the development of Flemingate and the impact of that on the town should be considered before any future developments are finalised.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing more from the planning department that may alleviate some of my concerns.</p>	
Graham Stamp	<p>I would like to voice my concern/objection to the above proposals Whilst I appreciate there is arguably a need for some further housing in the Beverley area, the size of the proposed development is totally out of proportion to this need and to me seems simply greed on behalf of all involved in the development, land owners, developers and council....</p> <p>There is a real risk of creating almost a separate "ghetto" on the edge of Beverley - rather than merging a reasonable sized development to fit within the nature and available amenities of the current town</p> <p>If this goes ahead it will change the whole nature and characteristics of Beverley and may result in many long term residents moving elsewhere</p> <p>I for one would seriously consider moving out of the area if another 2000 homes were thrown up adding further to the strain on infrastructure</p> <p>I ask that the size be scaled down to say 400 hundred mixed homes, all as close to the town itself as possible to try and ensure it integrates well without destroying the character of this beautiful town we currently call our home</p>	<p>The amount and location of new development for the Town has been extensively considered and consulted upon through the East Riding Local Plan. This is a masterplan as to how some of the sites are to be developed in detail.</p>
Graham Ward	<p>I would like to register my objection to the proposals in the above draft plan.</p> <p>The housing density is too high and not in keeping with the current housing density in the neighbouring Lincoln Way</p>	<p>Including proposed areas of open space the proposed density of housing development within the masterplan area is very comparable to that within the Lincoln Way estate. Densities are likely to be higher as development takes place due to changes to</p>

	<p>development. There is not enough green space in the development proposals and what little there is is too scattered and discontinuous. The public green space area should be extended and amalgamated into a contiguous block: the Beverley Renaissance Partnership proposal of a new common, Southwood, should be resurrected. This would be in keeping with the aims of the Making Space for Nature white paper which explained that, in order to preserve wildlife, such areas should be 'bigger, better and more joined-up.'</p> <p>All new development should, according to the National Planning Policy Framework, be sustainable. To ensure this no building should take place on Flood Zone 3a.</p> <p>Increased drainage is not an option in a pumped-drainage catchment as it is clearly not sustainable and land-raising on the floodplain only moves flooding problems downstream and, as a technique, has become discredited. For this reason I would request that you revisit your proposals and consult meaningfully on any new ones going forward. Until this happens, I will maintain my objection to the Draft Masterplan for South West Beverley.</p>	<p>national and local policy to make the most efficient use of land in housing delivery.</p> <p>The 'Southwood' concept of open space in the area is something that the Council had in mind when designating a central area in the site as open space, although it must be borne in mind there is a limitation to the amount of open space developers can viably provide for.</p> <p>No housing is proposed on flood zone 3a. The masterplan area is not a 'pumped out' catchment.</p>
Hilary Syrett	<p>Following a discussion about the above master plan for building houses on south west of the town, I would like to raise an objection.</p> <p>I am a true Beverlonian and feel there is no stop button for wanting to build houses on green areas.</p>	Noted
Health and Safety Executive	<p>We have concluded that we have no representation to make on this occasion. This is because your consultation request is not concerned with the potential encroachment of future development on the consultation zones of major hazard installations or MAHPs. As the request is not relevant for HSE's land-use planning policy, we do not need to be informed of the next stages in the adoption of the above document.</p>	Noted
Hull City Council	<p>We note that the location and numbers of housing and employment land proposed are as included in the recent East Riding Local Plan Proposed Submission Allocations Document, and are content with this. We also welcome your inclusion of our</p>	

	<p>previous consultation response where we wished for phasing to be done in a way which does not adversely impact on the delivery of housing and employment sites in Hull. I can confirm that Hull City Council does not wish to raise any other issues with regards to this SPD.</p>	
<p>Ian and Sue Slaney</p>	<p>We object to any access road onto Lincoln Way which widens Shepherds Lane. The residents of Thyme Way whose rear gardens back onto Shepherds Lane have had a few years of anxiety concerning the new relief road being built, and now immediately this road is opened we now have to contend with the possibility of another road immediately behind our homes. It is unacceptable and worrying. Please give this more thought and find another place for the spine road.</p> <p>Widening Shepherds Lane is an easy option as it is easier to widen an existing road than apply for consent to build a new one but please consider how this would affect us. We can't imagine how often we would hear a car going past our back fence. It would be extremely loud and extremely often. Not to mention street lighting, buses, late night revellers and the loss of our lovely birds which nest in the huge leylandi behind our homes and visit our gardens daily.</p> <p>Provision could have been made for a new estate to be accessed from the relief road. Lincoln Way is already busy with traffic, and the mini roundabout at the junction of Thyme Way is an accident waiting to happen as it is – nobody stops as we try to exit Thyme Way. We are always cautious when using it and still have had several near misses. It would only get worse.</p> <p>If it is worth retaining existing hedgerows and trees as stated in this paragraph of the plan then the leylandi and poplar trees on Shepherd's Lane which provide screening, shade, noise reduction to our gardens backing onto the lane, and a home for many garden birds should be preserved at all cost, not mown down because it's easier and quicker to widen Shepherd's Lane than find a more</p>	<p>Although Shepherds Lane is a possible access option. This is unlikely to be significantly more busy than Lincoln Way is today. Main access is likely to be from Minster Way.</p>

	suitable, long term solution.	
Ian Potter	<p>As a resident of Long Lane I am very concerned by the lack of clarity over a number of issues in your consultation document. My main concern is over the future status of `Long Lane` as its use seems to be uncertain. Many residents I know are in agreement with me in considering that it should be CLOSED TO MOTOR TRAFFIC at the Beverley end just beyond the existing residential development . (just beyond number 47.)</p> <p>In recent years it has become a `rat run` frequented by `boy racers` and `white vans`.</p> <p>As the new development is to be residential it would also seem appropriate to close it at the new bridge end to avoid the obvious problems of children and through traffic ; perhaps you should have thought of that before wasting money building the bridge . It is astonishing that anyone should consider building a residential estate around a known `rat run` . No amount of `traffic calming` or expensive `ahead only` traffic signage will deter civil disobedience and nothing short of closure will suffice .</p> <p>You could and must retain it as a walking and cycling route which ought to set the character for the whole development. You should be designing for a future where the car does not dictate the layout of dwellings and create a pedestrian friendly development with a remote car park.</p> <p>I am also concerned that you are not taking account of all the development that is taking place outside your designated area when catering for so called demand .</p> <p>I believe that ERYC is not doing its residents any favours by building in Beverley . There are plenty of houses on the market in this town and new estates are only filling up with people from Hull. You should be building in rural areas where the young people could enrich and enliven dying communities such as Hornsey and Bridlington and give a much needed economic boost.</p> <p>Unless you have not told us yet of your plans to merge hull and Beverley then I say “stop building badly designed poorly thought through estates that devalue and dilute what was once a desirable area.”</p>	<p>The masterplan proposes that Long Lane remains as it is without traffic from new development impacting upon it. There was support for this during the consultation. This does not stop residents from lobbying for changes to the Lane into the future as development takes place.</p>

<p>J. Russell</p>	<p>I have read the draft masterplan for SW Beverley and would like to submit the following comments: (I have commented previously, suggesting that Beverley is taking far too much of the 'burden' of new housing in East Yorkshire and detailing my specific concerns . I still do not accept that the area in question has to be built on at all but , as we objectors seem to have lost that argument - not that we were ever going to win it - I make my comments with that understanding).</p> <p>1. One of the main objections has always been about land drainage . I live very close to the proposed site (Norwich Court) and am concerned that building over 1800 homes on the site will inevitably lead to water drainage problems for existing homeowners . Norwich Court slopes eastward towards the site and the drain at the end of the Court has needed unblocking several times. There have been numerous recorded concerns about the drainage problem from current residents so, all I can say, is you'd better get it right or you may be facing legal challenges if and when things go wrong .</p> <p>2. Your "Overarching Requirements" section suggests that by 2029 Beverley will be even more of an "attractive, thriving and prosperous market town and visitor destination ." I would agree that it is currently all of those things but your plans put it at risk of becoming yet another sprawling, semi metropolis with vast housing estates and limited facilities . How you can equate that statement with the one that states the proposed site is only of "medium visual sensitivity" partly due to the existence of the southern relief road defies belief! You remember that hardly any of the local residents wanted that road ? What next? Obscure the view of the Minster with more building and then argue that since the view no longer exists, why not keep on building? Catch 22?</p> <p>3. Your proposed Nature Reserve area near the school is very small . Living near the proposed site, I often see bats flying around the</p>	<p>Drainage systems employed will be required not to adversely impact on existing properties.</p> <p>The amount and location of new development for the Town has been extensively considered and consulted upon through the East Riding Local Plan. This is a masterplan as to how some of the sites are to be developed in detail.</p> <p>Of course the Council doesn't have control over the commercial concerns of facilities such as the Post Office to locate in the masterplan area, however provision for the Neighbourhood Centre has been made to encourage such uses. There is more control over provision of open space and Schooling and transport which the Council can actively require from developers.</p>
-------------------	---	--

back garden at dusk . Your report states that there have been 'instances recorded' of bats, implying that they are rare. They are not. They are to be seen on most evenings, weather permitting. What are you going to do? Erect traffic signs "Bats: This way to the nature reserve"? I thought bats were a protected species?

4. I think your sections about various facilities for the increased population of the area are at best non specific and at worst flimsy. Whilst I appreciate that you cannot guarantee more doctors, dentists, transport providers etc will flock to the area, it does seem that you are in danger of "putting the cart before the horse" and assuming that 'if we build it, they will come'. These facilities do not just materialise and some effort should be put into attracting them to the new estate if it is to work . Quotes: "potential transport links" and "likely to support provision of a neighbourhood centre " are just not good enough. Oh, and really, a Post Office? You may remember a while ago us residents fighting to retain our own post office in the Lincoln Way newsagents? We failed! In addition, buses on Victoria Road will be quite a walk for a lot of the new residents , which brings me to one of my main concerns with your plans:-

5. The small cul de sacs adjacent to the proposed site are just that : cul de sacs with only pedestrian access at their eastern ends. The clues are in their names: Guildford Close , Norwich Court . We want them to remain quiet. I was pleased to see that your plans include the retention of the landscaped areas and trees running at the back of these cul de sac and hope you retain this promise in your final plans . However, it is a worry, that if the residents of over 1800 new homes are not given sufficient facilities of their own , they will be 'cutting through' our quiet residential roads to reach Lincoln Way for shops and Victoria Road for transport. If that smacks of NIMBYism, I hold my hand up. Most people bought their houses around here just because they're quiet and safe.

Thank you for reading the above. I hope this is a genuine attempt

	<p>to gain the opinions of people affected by the plans and not merely to enable the council to tick another consultation box.</p>	
<p>Jacky Kennington</p>	<p>I am concerned about the development of all of the area enclosed by the Southern Bypass. I have seen water voles in the water systems alongside Long Lane and in the drain to the back of Keldmarsh School. When I have read the reports they have been dismissed as an issue as it says they, according to your report, only use those areas on particularly successful years. These are an endangered species and so, if there are to be any more 'successful years' they need to have these waterways available to expand into . What worries me is that no provision or allowances appear to have been made for our wildlife .</p> <p>The extra pressure of 1900 houses invading the territory of an already endangered animal is awful!!</p> <p>The water vole is fully protected under Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and is a priority conservation species. Activities that can harm water voles include: destroying or disturbing their habitat destroying or disturbing places used for shelter or protection changing water quality</p> <p>Assess the harm this development would have on water voles if no mitigation measures were planned and submit it with your planning application. Include the potential effects of work to the watercourse itself and work nearby.</p> <p>From: Natural England and Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs</p> <p>We have also already have expressed concern about the skylarks that nest in the field next to Shepherds Lane. We are lucky in the Beverley area that they are also to be found on the Westwood, but skylarks are also at risk from reduced habitat. Nationally they are greatly reduced in number and their numbers are a cause for worry ! When we attended a meeting at Keldmarsh Primary School that revealed the plans , we were</p>	<p>Detailed wildlife surveys are needed before development is permitted to go ahead to establish more precisely what wildlife exists in and around new development.</p> <p>The masterplan doesn't however propose significant encroachment of development onto watercourses through the area.</p>

	<p>informed that a survey had been done that found none. Questioned further, the speaker said that it had been done in February! Hardly surprising that none were found. Add to all these problems the fact that the area is a flood plain that feeds Beverley Beck and its 'management' to allow for housing, could have far reaching implications.</p>	
Jane merrills	<p>I would like to express my concern and objections to the scale of development for Beverley. My concern are particularly regarding Roads and infrastructure. Sewerage management, NHS provision, Schools, Green spaces</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
Jeanette Rotchell	<p>My house is at the end of the cul-de-sac besides Woodmansey Mile road. At present me enjoy a quiet neighbourhood with quite low amounts of road traffic. I used to live in Brighton city centre and this is one of the most attractive things about quality of life in Beverley.</p> <p>Under the proposed plan Woodmansey Mile will become a much busier road and this is obviously of concern to us in terms of noise and in changing the quiet , relaxed environment we currently enjoy.</p> <p>The comment I would like to raise though is actually one about our resident bats. I feel we are very lucky to have bats living either in our roof rafters or in our garage . We see them every evening at sunset flying around our home. I gather that bats are protected species. I also gather, from published scientific literature, that bats are sensitive to changes in noise levels. I'm aware of studies looking at the impacts of creating new paths /walks on bats and negative impacts, so I'm fairly confident that increasing the volume of traffic , as planned if you open up the Mile, may well have a negative impacts on the resident bats too .</p> <p>I would like to know what Impact Assessments you have carried out regarding bats and whether the populations living in our houses alongside Woodmansey Mile have been considered fully. Certainly, if the noise levels increase due to traffic and the bats leave , I'll be relocating out of the area too.</p>	<p>Although Woodmansey Mile will become a busier Road, it will be far less busy than its original intended function as a bypass to the town.</p> <p>No impact assessments have been completed specifically in terms of traffic on bats along Woodmansey Mile.</p> <p>The draft masterplan outlines that as part of the site assessment, the ecological implications for the area were examined against the data held by the North and East Yorkshire Ecological Data Centre (NEYEDC). The NEYEDC collate, manage, and disseminate the species and habitat records for the East Riding in line with the standards of the National Biodiversity Network and the Association of Local Environmental Records Centres. It has a quality assurance policy to ensure all reasonable measures are taken to ensure the data it receives is both correct and fit for purpose.</p> <p>The closest designated nature conservation sites to the allocation are at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keldmarsh Local Nature Reserve adjacent to the north west of the site- a remnant of the kind of habitat that would have once covered this area managed by the Yorkshire Wildlife Trust. Clear chalk springs bubble up in pools and flow through a secluded wet woodland habitat important for birds and other wildlife. - Beverley Parks Local Nature Reserve lies around 800 metres south of the site managed by the Council's Countryside Access

		<p>Team. It is part of Old Hall Farm smallholding, lying within a former deer park that surrounded much of Beverley during Medieval times. It is also a site of local archaeological importance with earthworks and ridge and furrow still in evidence .</p> <p>The NEYEDC data also revealed that there are instances of Water Voles and Bats being recorded on or within 500 metres of the site. The potential impact of the allocation on natural features that are important for wildlife such as trees, hedgerows, or areas of ancient woodland not subject to statutory protection has also been examined as part of the site assessment process. The site has a ditch running alongside Long Lane, relatively sparse hedgerows, and trees. It has been judged that most of these features could be retained alongside new development.</p>
Jeff Kennington	<p>Am concerned about the development of all of the area enclosed by the Southern Bypass .</p> <p>The sewage works near Beverley Beck regularly emits a far from pleasant smell.</p> <p>If any new housing is developed what will be done with the additional human waste produced. It's treatment and disposal never seems to appear on any plans.</p>	<p>An upgrade to the Sewage Treatment has been factored into Yorkshire Water's investment plans.</p>
Jennifer Gladwell	<p>I would like to register my objection to any further housing being built in Beverley. Looking at the new development currently under construction off Woodhall Way I am concerned at the number of houses being built on a small amount of land . The houses look as though they have been squashed in with no thought to the overall appearance of the development .</p> <p>I thought they were supposed to reflect the housing already in the area which are well spaced and well designed, the new ones are nothing like this.</p> <p>I cannot imagine that the development planned for 1,900 houses south of Beverley will be of any architectural merit merely 'squashed' in and no doubt as the development gets under way the number of houses to be built will increase allowing even less space for each plot.</p> <p>I continue to be concerned about the number of developments</p>	<p>The amount and location of new development for the Town has been extensively considered and consulted upon through the East Riding Local Plan. This is a masterplan as to how some of the sites are to be developed in detail.</p>

	<p>planned for the area and feel that every time a brick is laid on a new house that Beverley becomes less attractive to visitors and for residents.</p> <p>The planning committee should look at what Beverley is now and the mess it is about to become with each new development they allow. The infrastructure of Beverley is currently under a great strain and this is not going to suddenly improve . Build the houses somewhere else or utilise he empty properties around the East Riding rather than build on green field sites. How soon will it be before Beverley is joined on to Cottingham then Hull!</p>	
Jennifer Miles	<p>In all these planning applications (which, computer illiterate me cannot find!) I hope EVERY building has built in solar panels. They are unobtrusive, do not cause expensive appeals and efficient. It is said the wind turbines have a limited life but I have not heard of that with panels. We are supposed to be caring for the environment – and making life less expensive – so why not? It amazes me this has not been done over the last few (or many!) years on public buildings at least, but I would like to see them on all new build. Could these be added to the planned buildings, which I would rather not have, but people must have homes I appreciate that. We soon will not grow enough food for ourselves – if we do now – and we are losing our precious countryside!!</p>	<p>There is currently no national or local requirements for houses to be built with solar panels as standard and therefore no basis upon which the masterplan can require this.</p>
Sunick Joha	<p>I wish to object to the above proposal on the following grounds; Beverley has already had a massive expansion of new homes straining the infrastructure of the town and adversely affecting the character of the town</p> <p>The council seems to want to cover the whole of the east riding with new houses creating a characterless conglomerate Increased development robs us of much needed farmland</p> <p>Such development increases the risk of flooding It is exceptionally ugly</p>	<p>The amount and location of new development for the Town has been extensively considered and consulted upon through the East Riding Local Plan. This is a masterplan as to how some of the sites are to be developed in detail.</p>
John Geekie	<p>I would like to ask you to consider a simple planning condition regarding the above development. As an observer of nature I have previously mentioned the significant population of water voles that inhabit the Mill Dam Stream and surrounding waterways in, and</p>	<p>Although the proposals will seek to conserve and enhance biodiversity, creating nests on homes for birds isn't necessarily appropriate unless future occupants of these new dwellings choose to do so.</p>

	<p>adjacent to, the proposed development. However, my concern now is the declining number of swifts. I have placed external swift boxes on my house and a neighbours house. Swifts are showing interest. New houses offer little chance for successful nest sites. Developers should be encouraged to include the easily available swift bricks into the new houses, especially the three storey buildings.</p> <p>The following is an extract from the swift conservation site, it includes a helpful fact sheet for planners and builders.</p> <p>Accommodation for Swifts built in to buildings is to be preferred to accommodation retrofitted on the outside. Planning departments are now conditioning new developments and renovations to provide space for wildlife in the interests of biodiversity: bats, House Sparrows, Starlings and Swifts. We have produced a downloadable pdf with all of the Swift bricks that we have found so far, with pictures, a table of dimensions and approximate prices. This has now been taken on by the RSPB and Swift-Conservation as a good way to promote Swift Bricks.</p> <p>I hope we can consider making Beverley a nationally important home for swifts.</p>	
John Geekie	<p>Will the extraction of flood / standing water / improved drainage to the proposed area of development affect the wooden raft foundations of Beverley Minster.</p> <p>I appreciate that many developments to the south of Beverley have been built, though not in the flood risk area. My fear is that we might be compromising the structural integrity of the Minster especially with the new Flemingate development being built.</p>	<p>Surface water drainage from the site will be to existing watercourses as it is now, so it is difficult to envisage this would have any adverse hydrological impacts on the Minster's foundations.</p>
John Nicholson	<p>The proposed developments south of Beverley incorporate a number of serious flaws which ERYC really must address. Beverley is moving away from being a "Small Market Town" to being a large suburban town, indeed even a major centre in its own right usurping the City off Hull or reversing roles as the latter</p>	<p>The amount and location of new development for the Town has been extensively considered and consulted upon through the East Riding Local Plan. This is a masterplan as to how some of the sites are to be developed in detail.</p>

	<p>declines, largely by the actions of ERYC.</p> <p>We have the huge expansions in the Molescroft area , the "Large Town / Small City" central development in Flemingate and now this.</p> <p>I am by no means supportive of this development or those which have gone before, but I will leave it to others to submit serious opposition to the concept in order to raise other issues though I will go on to make a few general comments in respect of and relative to the clearly cavalier attitude to land use and food production in such planning.</p> <p>I acknowledge that we do have increasing population which needs to be housed. On that issue however, there are countless houses for sale in Beverley and the surrounding area and the market is far from buoyant. There are huge areas of Hull where there are derelict houses which should first of all be brought back into habitable condition or demolished and new build replaced.</p> <p>Where any new build is promoted, in the area under discussion or elsewhere, there should be no more than three bedrooms per dwelling or move to multi-story apartments. Large numbers of multi story homes have in recent times been demolished in Hull. It might be that this is a result of building policies forcing LAs to deploy questionable construction techniques which have simply failed to meet the test of time. It is not enough however to say that the concept has failed. There are many places on earth where that concept works well, not least in London! Indeed also in towns of similar size to Beverley in continental Europe. Such construction enhances land use efficiency and high rise living surely is an exciting concept! But only if it is planned and designed properly and not simply as a way of stacking the poor and socially incompetent into piles.</p> <p>Beverley suffers badly from the motor car. I am not against the motor car, I own one and use it but I also use trains and buses</p>	<p>A network of bus services already exists in the town covering the destinations referred to. Part of this network.</p> <p>The housing types to be provided is guided by evidence of needs set out in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and the advice of the Council's Housing Strategy and Development Team.</p> <p>There is provision to close the at grade foot crossings of the rail line within the masterplan area.</p>
--	--	---

locally and beyond. I certainly do not contribute to jamming the town up with parked cars as is a widespread issue.

Therefore there must be a policy of providing for, and providing actual, transport facilities other than the motor car and persuasive actions to encourage such use and discourage car use and certainly multiple car ownership.

Park and Ride is not an answer because it is a tool to encourage overall car use when it is essential to do the exact opposite.

The documentation promoting the new building scheme makes reference to current bus services and frequencies in a context of "Connectability" between those operations and homes in the new development. This is the wrong approach, not least when those services are wholly inadequate anyway.

There needs to be planning and implementation of an urban bus service appropriate for a major town. Such needs to be frequent, comprehensive in its coverage and equally convenient in through links.

To put that into context:

All residential areas need to be through linked with each of Flemingate, Rail Station, Saturday Market end of the town centre, hospital, the Swinemoor and Grovehill employment zones, the Morrisons shopping centre and the secondary schools.

Services need to run at 20 minutes frequency from 0600 to 2000; with connections from out of town routes and the rail station until after end of long distance service hours.

Plenty of well maintained bus shelters and an active real time running information system and on board vehicle stopping point announcements.

A simple zone based low cost fare system with free travel as an add on to those holding longer distance season tickets on either of longer distance bus or rail.

I am sure that EYMS and / or Stagecoach can well advise on this far better than I can!

On the same basis ERYC needs to work with Hull City council to ensure that Hull City Centre employment areas are well connected

	<p>to Hull Station by similar free add ons to encourage Beverley (And other area!) residents to not car commute between Beverley and Hull.</p> <p>These are NOT separate issues to proposals to build huge numbers of new houses, they are interlinked and MUST be seriously considered together.</p> <p>There are a number of proposals to replace rail level crossings with at least one footbridge. I welcome this but it does not go far enough. Level crossings are a serious threat to rail and crossing user safety, largely because of endemic carelessness amongst users. There MUST be a clear commitment to level crossing replacement and so far ERYC has proved oblivious to such. As an adjunct to huge developments in the area in question, there must be a total commitment to abolition of all level crossings between Flemingate and Beverley Parks Inclusive.</p>	
Jonathan Boden	<p>I am writing to submit my views on the draft masterplans for south Beverley as part of your public consultation. I have read both the S.E. and S.W. masterplan and have some comments which I would like you to take into consideration.</p> <p>What do I like about the proposals?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The fact that the need to retain views of Beverley minster have been taken into close consideration throughout the planning documents. 2. I accept the need for some proportionate housing development in these areas of southern Beverley - although I do not think the number of houses proposed is proportionate (see below) 3. I am pleased to see that consideration has been given to the increasing need for primary school places via the extension of Keldmarsh school and the provision for a new primary school as part of the development. 4. I am pleased to see that some green spaces have been planned into the development proposal, although I think more such areas are needed (see below) 5. The increased playing fields and play areas planned for the 	<p>The amount and location of new development for the Town has been extensively considered and consulted upon through the East Riding Local Plan. This is a masterplan as to how some of the sites are to be developed in detail.</p> <p>The 'Southwood' concept is something that the Council had in mind when designating a central area in the site as open space, although it must be borne in mind there is a limitation to the amount of open space developers can viably provide for.</p>

leisure centre are a good idea.

6. I am pleased to see that Keldmarsh nature reserve and existing vegetation separating Lincoln Way and Butterfly meadows estates are being retained and protected.

7. I am glad that the development will be phased over a 15 year period as that will hopefully encourage a range of house designs and layouts that will add variety to the overall project and mean that the housing is not all of an identical 'Barratt home' appearance.

What do I not like about the proposals?

1. Presentation of the information. It would be a lot easier for the public to consider the overall impact of the proposed masterplans if the documentation and maps were presented as a single document rather than two separate ones. It is harder to envisage how the two schemes would fit together on either side of the railway line when they are presented separately.

2. Scale of the proposed development. I feel that the number of houses proposed - nearly 2700 in the two combined schemes and as many as 3,300 in total according to local press reports - is disproportionate in terms of the overall need to provide new housing across the East Riding. Beverley will be providing far more than its 'fair share' - around 14% - of the anticipated 24,000 new houses needed across the entire county even though Beverley's population is less than 10% of the county total. The scale of the development risks having a negative impact on the character and charm of Beverley as a market town and will exacerbate the difficulties faced in regenerating Hull. I worry that the poor relations between Hull CC and ERYC mean that there is a lack of joined up planning in what is best for this region as a whole and that it is in the wider interests of the East Riding that Hull is a prosperous and successful city with (amongst other things) a viable housing market. Therefore I feel that a reduction by around 700 in the number of proposed houses would be more proportionate and fair.

3. Need for more green space/common land. I strongly support calls from the Beverley Civic Society and others for a larger area of

	<p>new common land - possibly to be known as 'Southwood' - to be created in the zone. Such an area could be landscaped to have the pastoral feel of the Westwood and would provide a beautiful communal space and 'green lung' amidst the rapid urbanisation of Southern Beverley. I note that green spaces are envisaged as part of the Masterplan but these seem to be limited to narrow strips to separate the different housing developments rather than providing a focal core to the entire development. I think that if such an area were safe-guarded in the cone-shaped zone recognised in the plans for being important for protecting views of Beverley Minster then this would also serve that purpose admirably as well providing wider benefits for walkers, joggers, ramblers, dog-walkers, children, etc.</p> <p>4. Existing public rights of way/paths. I notice that there are a few references in the documentation to the fact that the landscape in the masterplan area is not particularly special. Whilst I accept that it is not an area of spectacular scenery, it does have a rural character and peace that attract many walkers to use the public rights of way in the area. I would very much like these footpaths to be retained together with the vegetation alongside them.</p> <p>5. Nature reserve. Also, as your reports recognise, there is important wildlife in the area (bats, newts, small mammals etc) and it seems reasonable to me that in such a large-scale development it ought to be possible to designate at least one nature reserve to offset the large-scale destruction of natural habitat that will occur with the proposed building programme.</p> <p>6. Park and ride. I am unconvinced that the case for this facility is at all clear. Are there any other market towns of Beverley's size that have a park and ride facility? Surely most visitors will either try and park in the new Flemingate multi-storey or in the town centre?</p>	
Kate O'Mara	<p>I would like to register my objection to the proposals in the above draft plan.</p> <p>The housing density is too high and not in keeping with the current housing density in the neighbouring Lincoln Way</p>	<p>Including proposed open space, densities are likely to be comparable to that already in the Lincoln Way area.</p> <p>The masterplan already proposes open space in the area to be</p>

	<p>development. There is not enough green space in the development proposals and what little there is is too scattered and discontinuous. The public green space area should be extended and amalgamated into a contiguous block: the Beverley Renaissance Partnership proposal of a new common, Southwood, should be resurrected. This would be in keeping with the aims of the Making Space for Nature white paper which explained that, in order to preserve wildlife, such areas should be ‘bigger, better and more joined-up.’</p> <p>All new development should, according to the National Planning Policy Framework, be sustainable. To ensure this no building should take place on Flood Zone 3a. Increased drainage is not an option in a pumped-drainage catchment as it is clearly not sustainable and land-raising on the floodplain only moves flooding problems downstream and, as a technique, has become discredited.</p> <p>For this reason I would request that you revisit your proposals and consult meaningfully on any new ones going forward. Until this happens, I will maintain my objection to the Draft Masterplan for South West Beverley.</p>	<p>located into a continuous block.</p> <p>No built development that would not be in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework will be permitted in flood zone 3a.</p> <p>The area of land covered by the masterplan is not a ‘pumped out’ catchment.</p>
Kathryn Mccune	<p>I would like to state my significant concerns regarding the master plan for the area and notably would like to see the following points addressed.</p> <p>Importantly the plan will pose a significant risk for flooding in the area and requires far greater detail on how this will be mitigated. Figham springs has its name for a reason.</p> <p>To meet the green space quota the plan is simply utilising the areas that cannot be built on due to the heightened flood risk, these areas should not be included in the quota which is a minimum not a target and a new plan should be drafted with green spaces that would enhance any development and provide central community facilities.</p> <p>The plan lacks a coherent transport structure including public transport, simply stating bus stops are 1200 meters away etc is not providing a real choice.</p> <p>Junctions and routing of the new link roads appears very vague, of</p>	<p>Built housing development will be avoided in the area of highest flood risk on the site.</p> <p>Open space will be required as per standards of provision set out in the Local Plan Strategy Document. The amounts expected are set out in the masterplan and much of this will be consolidated in to a large central area.</p> <p>The masterplan outlines the bus services available close by and highlights the potential to divert a local service through the site. Whether or not this would be successful would ultimately depend on usage.</p> <p>Residents currently accessing the town via Woodmansey Mile will continue to do in the same way once the new development is completed.</p>

	<p>specific interest is woodmansey mile, how will the cars that currently park there be accommodated within the town? How will home owners who live off woodmansey mile and figham springs have access to the town? I'd like a full description and plans of this junction as the master plan lacks important detail, will the playground at the end of woodmansey mile be effected? The council states that we need smaller houses, what is the evidence that people want to live on a high density estate with little infrastructure and with flood risks?</p>	
Mrs K Coates	<p>I have read the plan and visited the exhibition at Beverley Treasure House and as a long term resident of Beverley wish to object to the plan: At the exhibition it was apparent that the plan is fully expected to be approved before has been put in place before real answers to problems have been thought through , eg: - Beverley already struggles to cope with increasing demands on the sewage system - how will it cope with all the new build (answer: it will be down to the developers to put in new sewage systems:this a) leaves a vital issue at the whim of the developers, then and b) ignores the obvious 'where will all this sewage be treated' question); -How will flooding problems be dealt with (answer: it will be ok because the open public areas will be allowed to flood: Not good enough: why should public areas be forfeited whenever it rains?) -How will you recruit GP's to support the new community when there is a shortage now (answer - 'well let's hope more have been trained by then!' I work in the NHS and can tell you that is a facile answer) -How will the thousands of extra cars trying to join the queue to get onto Victoria Road in the morning be dealt with (answer: well actually there was no answer given which just points to the view that neither the planners or councillors have ever sat in the existing nightmare jam that occurs most term- time mornings, even with current residency levels.) One planner had the temerity to suggest that the new road is not an irrelevancy in terms of relieving traffic because the lack of cars on it is "an optical illusion". Really? - it is,</p>	<p>The amount and location of new development for the Town has been extensively considered and consulted upon through the East Riding Local Plan. This is a masterplan as to how some of the sites are to be developed in detail.</p> <p>The amount and type of infrastructure required to support new development has been assessed within the Council's Infrastructure Study and provided for within the Local Plan accordingly.</p>

	<p>in fact, just an expensive boundary so Beverley could have yet more new build forced upon it.</p> <p>It is clear from the consultants report that it is predicated on the idea that the build will go ahead as decisions have already been made. It makes light of issues such as the value of the current landscape: the council should be protecting the views of the local community, not swallowing the facile views of a paid company. None of the visitors I spoke to wanted yet more development. There is plenty of scope for smaller developments in smaller towns and villages in the East Riding, which need more occupancy to guarantee the survival of schools, pubs, shops etc</p> <p>The new build should be on these sites or only allowed on brownfield sites. Beverley is not a NIMBY community: it has absorbed more than its fair share of building already and should have no more.</p>	
<p>Kelvin Appleton</p>	<p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>In commenting on this Masterplan, I wish to make it clear that I disagree with the overall strategic plan for the expansion of Beverley, because it has been growing rapidly for the last four decades. Clearly there is a demand for houses in and around Beverley, but is there a genuine need? I believe that the character of Beverley is being changed from rural market town to dormitory suburb. Therefore my comments are made on the assumption that the strategic plan for Beverley as a whole is forced through.</p> <p>My comments are those of a concerned resident. I have lived for 44 years on the town boundary with Woodmansey parish, that is since the time when Butt Lane really was the southern limit of the built up area of Beverley, apart from the separate enclave of Normandy Avenue. Throughout this time I have walked the footpaths and lanes involved in the Masterplan, and for over 30 years jogged on them. I have witnessed the changes to the landscape of Beverley Parks from house building and intensive farming.</p> <p>1. SUMMARY OF MAIN CHANGES PROPOSED.</p> <p>The spine road and junctions with existing roads must be located</p>	<p>In terms of green corridors, these have now been included as 'green infrastructure' in the masterplan. Open space has been directed alongside most of the length of long lane.</p> <p>Junctions along the spine road have deliberately been left for detailed proposals to establish in order to provide some flexibility for a range of access options to be considered and brought forward.</p> <p>The principle of access up and down Minster Way to join the existing rights of way network is included within the plan.</p> <p>The school has been moved further east in a revision to the masterplan and what should help preserve some of the existing vegetation/ditch referred to.</p> <p>The intention is to preserve Long Lane as it is currently. Provision of further open space along it as amended in the final masterplan should help achieve this even more.</p> <p>The role of Shepherd Lane will be maintained as a walking/cycling</p>

	<p>before the Masterplan is finalised.</p> <p>Too much emphasis has been placed on views of the Minster in the suggested road layout and not enough on the need to maintain and create green corridors running roughly north to south and connecting with the landscape buffer on the Southern Relief Road. These green corridors can be achieved by enhancing existing public footpaths and Long Lane. The outer (eastern) spine road should be routed further east next to the green corridor by the railway , and the inner (eastern) spine road altered to run along the western border of the Public Open Space to join the outer spine road at a point near the south eastern corner of the potential primary school. The combined spine road should continue south to a new roundabout on the Southern Relief Road.</p> <p>The aim appears to be to maximise the land available for housing. A small reduction in the total area to be developed by excluding the narrow strip to the west of Long Lane and north of the outer loop of the spine road, would improve the green corridor along Long Lane. The Public Open Space would thus border Long Lane from the Mill Dam Drain south to the Southern Relief Road.</p> <p>2. GREEN CORRIDORS.</p> <p>Rather than leave it to individual developers to include small plots of lawns and shrubberies, the Masterplan should define three green corridors running roughly north to south, to improve both biodiversity and the appearance of the whole estate.</p> <p>2.1. WEST OF THE RAILWAY.</p> <p>Public right-of-way (PRW) Woodmansey Footpath No 13 runs along the edge of the railway as far as a crossing near Black House Farm. Incidentally this footpath does not cross the field diagonally near the England Springs Level Crossing as shown on the various maps in the Masterplan. It was diverted some years ago to run around the field boundary. Where it crosses the railway to the south, a footpath continues south (another Woodmansey PRW) along the west side of the railway and then via Black House Farm to Long Lane. This footpath was also diverted</p>	<p>access however it would be difficult to require further vegetation in this area as access across the lane within future housing will be required.</p> <p>Detailed arrangements for the adoption and maintenance of retained vegetation will need to be established by the developer. Adoption by the Council is one of a few options here.</p> <p>Interpretation of the straight on only junctions is correct.</p> <p>Other minor corrections and comments noted and auctioned where necessary.</p>
--	--	--

to run along the field boundary from Black House Farm to the railway, and not diagonally across the field as shown on the maps in the Masterplan. Thus there is a continuous footpath from near England Springs Cottage to a point on the west side of the railway east of Black House Farm.. I recommend that a new right of way footpath is created to complete this route as far as the Southern Relief Road where it crosses the railway. A ramp should join the new footpath to the track on the side of the road. The green corridor should be an irregular strip of land west of the railway to include the footpaths defined above.

Note that a number of trees have been planted along the railway fence next to the footpaths, but they have not been included in the Environment topic masterplan as "existing vegetation to be preserved".

2.2. ALONG PRW WOODMANSEY NO. 2 (PART OF BEVERLEY 20 WALK).

This footpath already runs through a green corridor from where it starts at the junction of Kitchen Lane and Butt Lane south to a point on the plans on the north west corner of the "potential primary school" where there is a pond. This existing green zone, mainly trees, shrubs and some grassland, should be extended south-south-easterly to the Southern Relief Road mainly through areas designated as Public Open Space. The ditch to the east of this footpath is fed by land drains and should be preserved.

Unfortunately both the inner and outer spine roads are shown crossing this path, the inner one at an angle. See below (Section 3) for a suggested change of route to avoid this.

2.3. LONG LANE.

The loss of Long Lane as a country lane into the heart of Beverley is one of the most undesirable features of the overall scheme. This can be mitigated by making it a green corridor as far as the Southern Relief Road embankment and bridge, particularly if the

small housing blocks are removed as suggested above.

2.4. EAST/WEST GREEN CORRIDORS.

It is noted that Willow Lane and the Mill Dam Drain are to be retained connecting Long Lane with the Footpath No.2 green corridor. The Environment topic masterplan shows other field boundary hedges to be retained, which will increase the ecological value of the whole area. However Shepherd Lane needs to be improved by hedge and tree planting, replacing those destroyed for farming. It should be recognised that Shepherd Lane provides the walker's link with Victoria Road and the only footpath (PRW) route up to Beverley Westwood. Also see comment below (Section 5) on boundaries, preservation and planting of vegetation.

3. ROUTES OF SPINE ROADS.

The routes of the two new spine roads should be defined in the Masterplan rather than be left to the developers. The importance of views of the Minster towers has been exaggerated. From the south the view is much inferior to that from the west, and in any case it is more important for pedestrians to enjoy this view than road users. Thus such views are desirable in the layout of houses, footpaths and open spaces, but should not decide the routes of roads.

Intermittent views are often more interesting than continuous "lines of sight".

It is proposed that the outer (eastern) spine road should be moved to the east forming the edge of the proposed green corridor near the railway. It could be curved to provide intermittent views of the Minster.

In the Masterplan the route of the inner (western) spine road ignores old field edges in order to provide views of the Minster towers. Instead it should be routed along the western edge of the Public Open

Space - where the red star is on the map - and join the eastern spine road near the south-east corner of the potential primary school. This junction and the one at the north end of the western spine road with Woodmansey Mile surely do not need full roundabouts. If necessary mini-roundabouts could be provided.

The combined spine road at the south end should cross Footpath No.2 and its green corridor at 90 degrees and then turn south to a new roundabout on the Southern Relief Road. As you know this road is underutilised. Access to houses south of Shepherd Lane should be from Lincoln Way.

Shepherd Lane must not be widened to be part of the main spine roads, and it would be wrong for the spine roads to add directly to the traffic on Lincoln Way.

4. REDUCTION OF HOUSING IN LONG LANE.

This is explained in the Summary above. It would result in a reduction of about 40 houses.

5. BOUNDARIES AND RETENTION AND PLANTING OF VEGETATION.

The Masterplan should include guidelines for developers on the arrangements for strips of land between and behind buildings, particularly where existing vegetation is to be preserved or new planted areas created, mostly on old field boundaries and in new green corridors. These arrangements should discourage encroachment by householders, as has happened at the north end of Footpath No.2, and allow adequate space for the creation of low maintenance semi-wild vegetation. A bad example is at the south end of Kitchen Lane on the west side, and a good example is the pocket of land between the Car Wash and the recently built houses between Queensgate and Victoria Road near the cemetery.

In practice it will be essential for the East Riding Council to own these strips and pockets of land, perhaps with the developers establishing and maintaining them for the first couple of years. The Council's ground maintenance policy seems to concentrate on

grass cutting, "weed" killing and trimming bushes and trees at minimum cost. If it is serious about ecology, the Council needs to be more ambitious in protecting green areas which are attractive to people, wild-life friendly but low maintenance.

6. STRAIGHT-ON ONLY JUNCTIONS ON LONG LANE.
It is not clear how these traffic light signal junctions will work. How does a resident who lives on Long Lane gain access to the spine roads? Is such a resident supposed to use Keldgate, Queensgate and the Woodmansey Mile?

7. PUBLIC OPEN SPACE.
The policy for the use of this land requires more definition in the Masterplan to ensure developers and landowners make adequate financial contributions. "Parks and ornamental gardens" (6.15) seem totally inappropriate. Some semi-wild areas, including woodland, should be included, and possibly a nature reserve like that of the Yorkshire Wildlife Trust next to Footpath No.2. The so called "low landscape value" is because of intensive farming with hedges and ditches removed. There should also be some pasture land and even hay fieds, similar to the Hallgarth Field next to the Minster.

8. POTENTIAL PRIMARY SCHOOL
The case for another primary school seems weak with only one and a half form entry.

9. RAILWAY FOOTBRIDGE.
The case for a new footbrige is not made in the Masterplan and it seems unlikely that Railtrack would fund it. Crossing the railway via the Southern Relief Road embankment should render a footbridge unnecessary if the new footpath proposed in 2.1 above is installed.

10. OTHER MINOR POINTS OF ACCURACY OR CLARIFICATION.

10.1. The Minster does not have "steeples".

10.2. On "Environment topic masterplan", extension is spelt "extention" (Keldmarsh School).

	<p>10.3. On the maps it would be helpful if all proposed housing areas were cross-hatched, with the two storey limit having a different cross-hatching.</p> <p>10.4. Footpaths (PRWs) east of the railway shown incorrectly on maps (see 2.1 above).</p> <p>10.5. The trees planted by the railway footpaths should be included as "vegetation to be preserved" on the Environment topic masterplan.</p>	
Laura Merrills	<p>Objections against this plan even though I'm sure it's already a done deal</p> <p>SEWERS, OBSCENE SMELL FROM WATER WORKS, ROADS, NHS/HEALTH CAR, SCHOOL, GREEN SPACE</p> <p>All of the above are issues Beverley encounters now which will only get worse with additional housing</p>	<p>Objection noted although these are all issues addressed by the masterplan where appropriate.</p>
Lee D'Arcy	<p>I do not believe that the Draft Masterplan for Land to the South West of Beverley should be implemented. It will take away beautiful open countryside which is enjoyed by many current residents of the town. It will forever remove the natural habitat of diverse wildlife including water voles and barn owls. No plan has been made for the provision of extra secondary school places or vital health services. The plan does not consider the overall impact that building so many new houses would have on existing residents . I see no reason for this plan to be implemented and completely oppose it .</p>	<p>The amount and location of new development for the Town has been extensively considered and consulted upon through the East Riding Local Plan including consideration of infrastructure. This is a masterplan as to how some of the sites are to be developed in detail.</p>
Ms. M. A. Godfrey	<p>As a result of the consultation display at the Treasure House on 28th July I would like to make the following comments. The so-called consultation was not well presented, there was insufficient explanation, picture boards with no captions or information, no hand-outs or addresses of how to find the information on your website, or how to comment or find more details. It was held only on one afternoon at times which prevented many people from attending. It all appeared to be an attempt to stifle comment. I have only just discovered that there was another consultation day on the 1st September and that the closing date for comments has been extended to 14th September - where was that advertised, I did not know about it?</p>	<p>In terms of where the additional drop-in session and response deadline extension was advertised.</p> <p>The Council issued a press release and there was an article in the Beverley Guardian and an interview with one of our officers on Radio Humberside. The Council has only ever sought to encourage people to feed in their comments to the masterplan- not stifle consultation, hence the extension of the deadline for comments and additional drop in event. The document has been publicised very widely, including sending emails and letters directly to all those on our database (those who responded to the Local Plan previously) in the local area. In addition to the publicity above there have been stories in the Yorkshire Post, Hull Daily</p>

	<p>This is an appalling over-development of what is a significant and important open space to the south of Beverley. We were assured, several years ago, by the Leader of the Council that this land would developed "only over his dead body".</p> <p>This area should be developed as Southwood to complement Westwood. Why is Beverley being asked to increase in size to a far greater percentage than any other historic market town in the country? Very few other councils in the country have submitted a new local plan with such excessive development. Why are we not developing the considerable amount of brown field land in Beverley, especially in the Grovehill and River Hull area, this would improve a very unattractive part of our town? The plan is for 1,900 homes, but says 4,000 residents. As the average family size is almost 4.0, how does that add up? Where is the supporting development of jobs for these people, where will they work?</p> <p>The access and internal roads are badly designed and not clearly delineated on the plan which I was given. Long Lane is already dangerously narrow, especially at the Keldgate end. Because the new by-pass does not feed directly into the ring road the build up of traffic at Morrisons roundabout and the Woodmansey Mile roundabout will be intolerable. The huge amount of extra traffic into the centre of Beverley will be a nightmare on the roads as shown.</p> <p>Much of it will pass the existing primary school. We were told that the "potential primary school" will not be built. Where are all the children - possibly up to 2,000 of them be educated? The density of housing is almost double that of the Lincoln Way development, this will be most unattractive and create social problems. Most of the available schools are a long way from the development, this will increase the already huge amount of school traffic throughout Beverley at peak times. Where are the local shops, surgeries and other amenities for the residents? Where will the the huge number of extra cars park when they go to the centre of Beverley?</p> <p>There does not appear to be any provision of shops and other</p>	<p>Mail, and several other media outlets.</p> <p>Beverley is not being asked to accommodate far more development than other market towns in the country. For example, around 3,730 new homes are proposed for Gainsborough in Lincolnshire (http://www.lincolnshire.gov.uk/central-lincolnshire/local-plan), which has a population of around 21,000 compared to Beverley's approx 30,000.</p> <p>The average household size in the East Riding is around 2.23 people- not 4 people. Additional employment areas are proposed in and around Beverley on the Flemingate site, at Grovehill Industrial area, and within the town centre. Further afield, there are large scale employment developments proposed along the A63 corridor, including those relating to the growth of the renewables industry in the area.</p> <p>A new Primary School is still proposed as well as an expansion to the existing Keldmarsh site to accommodate additional pupils.</p> <p>A Neighbourhood Centre is proposed within the development, which can contain local services and shops to serve the development.</p> <p>The Council has produced guidance on providing sufficient parking within new developments and requires expected car movements to be catered for. Many people do in fact cycle and walk to the town centre and guidance on how existing and proposed new footpath and cycle routes should link into the allocation is provided. This includes retaining existing public rights of way .</p> <p>The masterplan provides guidance as to how new development can fulfil a requirement to maintain or reduce existing surface water</p>
--	---	---

	<p>services to support the development. Parking in the centre of town is already very limited and unlikely to be able to cope with the extra traffic. People living here will not walk into the centre as it is too far.</p> <p>No-one walks in from the Lincoln Way area, the nor will residents of the new houses. Most houses will have two cars, does every house have sufficient parking space?</p> <p>How will the infrastructure cope - the drainage and sewerage systems are already unable to cope.</p> <p>What bus services will be available to the residents? There are no cycle paths shown. Existing cycle paths are not used because they are often only lines painted on dangerously busy roads.</p> <p>The East Riding of Yorkshire Council makes no attempt to provide sufficient parking for its large numbers of employees, whose cars already clutter the streets of Beverley, especially Woodmansey Mile and are illegally parked on the Westwood, much to the annoyance of the residents who are unable to park outside their own houses. Where will they park if Woodmansey Mile is (it is to be hoped) no longer available for parking because it will have a great deal of traffic? Where is the park and ride provision which should be being used by town centre workers? It should be next where the bypass crosses the railway line with a railway station serving Beverley and Hull. The very limited bus services within and through Beverley do not pass the railway station, where the integrated transport system?</p> <p>The plan was presented as a fait accompli - it was implied that it could not be stopped, but this was advertised as a "consultation". A disgraceful travesty of local democracy.</p>	<p>run-off from the site, which includes the potential use of Mill Dam Drain to store water. Yorkshire Water have confirmed that subject to some straightforward upgrades to the sewer network, their network will be able to accommodate expected foul flows from the development.</p> <p>There are several inter-city bus services running along Victoria Road including the X46/47- several more run through the Town Centre nearby, clearly there is also the rail station too. There is a more local bus route running along Lincoln Way to the Town Centre with the potential to divert this through the proposed development.</p> <p>Parking- There have been some recent restrictions placed on parts of Woodmansey Mile. As part of the review of parking in the Queensgate area, we had also received a small number of concerns from residents of the estate roads off Woodmansey Mile and these residents were consulted on their thoughts on parking issues in their streets and consideration of parking restrictions/CPZ extension to their area. Parking surveys undertaken here and feedback from residents did not suggest there was a commuter parking problem and current support for new parking restrictions. Since the road layout here is more of a residential/home zone feel, commuters may not see it as a suitable area to migrate to. The proposed Park and Ride facility is located to the east side of the rail line outside of the masterplan area for South West Beverley, which only covers the area to the West of the rail line.</p>
M Oldridge	<p>Object to to the proposed use of Shepherd Lane to form part of the Spine Road through the site. The road network cannot cope including Jocks Lodge. The road would cause more tailbacks on Lincoln Way. Spine Road should connect to the Southern Relief Road near the existing pedestrian crossing.</p>	<p>Access to Shepherd Lane is included as an option as it broadens access options to the site alongside an option to connect directly to Minster Way to the South.</p> <p>Highway Study shows the roads can cope albeit with some additional queuing with such an arrangement</p>

<p>Marion Welburn</p>	<p>Having recently seen the masterplan at the Treasure House and listened to some of the explanations given to questions raised I am still not convinced that the following points have been fully covered and I would like to register my objection to the plan in its current format:</p> <p>1) With a proposed housing density of 50% greater than that already on the adjacent site of Lincoln Way, the area allowed for gardens must be greatly reduced and one assumes that a great deal of hard standing will be used in place of gardens . One of the major contributing factors to recent urban flooding has been the increase of such hard standing . As this area is already prone to flooding - drive down Long Lane on any day after several days of rain and you cannot see the fields for water - this density of housing must put the area at major risk of flooding.</p> <p>2) We were told at the presentation that Yorkshire Water were aware of the plans and were working hand in hand with the ERYC. Yorkshire Water are, today, not capable of providing a sewage treatment which does not regularly cause extremely offensive smells to the residents in the south of Beverley. What guarantees can you give that this can be remedied once the new houses are built.</p> <p>3) 1900 new homes implies at least 1900 more vehicles using the streets of Beverley. As most homes now seem to have more than one car this figure could be much higher . When I asked the question about where all these people would park when they came into town the reply I received was " we HOPE that the majority of people living in this development will either walk or cycle into Beverley. This is a serious pipe dream on behalf of the council . No-one hardly walks or cycles in from the Lincoln Way development so I don't see how you can assume people living further away will not use cars. The only people who seem to walk into town are out-of town workers who park on Woodmansy Mile or Minster Avenue , causing disruption to the locals.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The density of the site will be comparable to that already in the Lincoln Way Estate. 2. The smell from the works is an operational issue rather than one of capacity. 3. People do walk and cycle as evidenced by travel to work surveys. Assessments of impact of development on the road network show that it can cope albeit with increased queuing. 4. Impacts on infrastructure are acknowledged and provision made in the plan for sufficient facilities to cope. 5. Paved areas will be provided alongside new development. 6. Access options include onto Minster Way. No access is proposed onto Long Lane.
-----------------------	---	---

	<p>4) The local NHS and schools will be put under extra stress , as will the police service which may be soon reduced in Beverley. The Health Centre, although recently enlarged, will also struggle to cope with extra visitors - again parking at this site will be a problem – not everyone will park on the new multi-storey park on Flemingate.</p> <p>5) What provision has been made for somewhere for children to play ? Unless I missed it on the plan I cannot see any.</p> <p>6) On the plan we were shown the Spine road at the Woodmansey Mile end seemed not to have a defined end " we're not sure where it may finish". Is there a guarantee that it will not finish up coming out onto Long Lane , making a busy and dangerous junction with Keldgate even more so? Why was no provision made for a direct access onto the southern relief road - as this is being greatly underused it could easily accomodate some extra traffic.</p> <p>Beverley is a wonderful market town full of character, attracting visitors from all over the UK and overseas. DO NOT LET THIS DEVELOPMENT SPOIL THIS FOR THE FUTURE.</p>	
Marjorie Neaum	<p>I am very concerned that what is proposed is a dense area of housing, some of 3 storeys, which in no imaginable way will enhance the rural surroundings of Beverley. It will be hugely demanding of infrastructure space too, needing access roads to the bypass and the town, which in any case the current town access would find difficult to support, eg Keldgate, Eastgate, Flemingate. East Riding promised some time ago that Willow Lane would be protected, as its watercourse still contains water voles and the promise extended to the line of black poplars behind the current Lincoln Way development, and which lead to hedging and Keldmarsh Nature Reserve, both beautiful and essential for wildlife, such as Munjack deer, kingfishers, bullfinches, stoats among many hundreds of more common species. I support the idea of Councillor Beate Willar to create a 'Southwood' around</p>	<p>The density of new development, including open spaces is likely to be similar to that in Lincoln Way.</p> <p>A substantial area of open space will be provided for on-site for a range of uses. This will cater for the open space needs generated by the development in a comprehensive fashion. Any further open space over and above this would require further funding not currently available, especially given the other infrastructure demands placed on new development in the area including education and highway improvements</p>

	<p>Keldmarsh school and Willow Lane. I also beg the council to push for less dense housing in the area, consistent with the density of the current Lincoln Way development and to keep the houses to 2 storeys. Otherwise Beverley will be ruined for ever.</p>	
<p>Mark Fash</p>	<p>With reference to point 3.6, 6.29 and 7.3 Following the recent sessions at the Treasure House exhibiting the Masterplan for South West Beverley I was pleased to hear that consideration was being given for a junction on the Southern Relief Road to the spine road through the new development to the west of the railway line. This is exactly what I and others have been lobbying for since the consultation on the local plan began and it felt that finally the council was listening to what local residents wanted. However, I was extremely upset to find that the link to Lincoln Way using Shepherds Lane had not been abandoned. Also the council employees present could not justify its continued existence as part of the infrastructure which was extremely disconcerting and gives weight to the argument as to why this link should not be pursued . During previous consultation periods I & many others have argued against the adoption of such a link because of the detrimental effect upon the residents of the southern end of Lincoln Way especially those residing on Thyme Way. It would appear that these concerns of the very people the council exists to serve are being ignored and that this link is still seen as a cheap option to feeding the spine road onto the Southern Relief Road and is still a possibility . In the second round of public consultations 65% of the comments posted on the consultation website regarding this particular allocation raised concern over the route of the spine road and objected to the use of Shepherds Lane as part of this . Surely this percentage of comments reflecting public opinion should be taken into consideration and the idea of using Shepherds Lane abandoned as once the spine road connects to the Southern Relief Road in theory such a link should not be required . However leaving it in</p>	<p>Various access options have been included in the masterplan to ensure the timely deliverability of the site by not limiting access to one or two options. The Spine Road itself is unlikely to carry more traffic than Lincoln Way itself. Rat running along Lincoln Way from the site would be limited given the site will have its own connection to Woodmansey Mile to the South.</p>

place will only introduce a means of avoiding the Southern Relief Road junction and providing a rat run to the new roundabout at the bottom of Lincoln Way as a quicker means of access especially as it does not take a genius to recognise that the majority of traffic from the new development would access the site from this direction . As previously raised in earlier comments submitted using Shepherds Lane will have a detrimental effect upon the quality of life of those living at the southern end of Lincoln Way . Additional noise and pollution from more vehicles and the increased risk of accidents from not just the increased volume of traffic but the way in which traffic uses Lincoln Way and the mini -roundabout at Thyme Way will make life a misery for those residents. Using Shepherds Lane as part of the infrastructure of this development really is an insult to the residents . Point 7.3 indicates a cost of £121,400 to widen Shepherds Lane. This cost does not obviously include a provision for claims as mine alone will be quite substantial and then there are all the other houses that back onto Shepherds Lane as well . Where is all this money coming from? As a ratepayer I would like to see this money spent elsewhere and to where value for money would be obtained. I do not consider spending that amount of money on widening a road that is not needed or wanted value for money especially when council services are stretched and the money could definitely be better spent elsewhere and be better appreciated by those that benefit from the expenditure . Again it does not take a genius to understand that it is better to spend the money on where it is wanted rather than not where it is wanted and that £ 121,400 can go a long way in improving people's lives.

Nor, at the same exhibition, could the same employees inform me as to what would happen to the land north east of the Morrisons roundabout as this too could be accessed from Lincoln Way adding to the traffic problems created by the Shepherds Lane link . This site itself could hold 100 houses and the natural means of access would be from Victoria Road where such an entrance serving the houses already there

	<p>exists and as the Southern Relief Road has taken traffic off Victoria Road this should make it much easier to use this access point.</p> <p>I still believe it is far too many houses for Beverley and will have a detrimental effect upon the town as a whole stretching what limited the resources to the community the town has and having a negative influence upon the town's image as a tourist attraction as a 'quaint little market town'.</p> <p>Various concerns have also been raised over flooding and the use of a green field site and again these are valid arguments. Ultimately, to preserve Beverley, maybe the council should just stand up to central government and say no! But if it cannot then it should at least take into consideration its ratepayers and residents and not allow Shepherds Lane to be used as a link road.</p>	
<p>Maureen Kelham</p>	<p>I recently went to look through the plan for development south of Beverley and would like to make these comments:</p> <p>Good to see the provision for neighbourhood services - shops, surgery and school etc</p> <p>Good to see provision for open spaces and play spaces</p> <p>Good to see provision for extra care housing</p> <p>Good to maintain view of the Minster - though the current fencing and gaps in that fencing on Minster Way is strange - I presume to do with the views for residents (?)</p> <p>Good to include a park and ride scheme</p> <p>Good to include affordable housing</p> <p>Good to include environmental concerns and the Council's use of an outside professional organisation - paragraph 4.24</p> <p>Concerns about what appear to be the Council's weak resolve to ensure that enough affordable housing is on the site (4.47) and that the properties which will be transferred to a Registered Provider meet the standards set by the Homes and Communities Standards Agency. I would prefer to see the word ensure rather than prefer when it comes to meeting standards.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p>

	It was difficult to understand the flood plain areas from the map.	
Mrs. Megan Britt	<p>I would like to register my objection to the proposals in the above draft plan.</p> <p>The housing density is too high and not in keeping with the current housing density in the neighbouring Lincoln Way development. There is not enough green space in the development proposals and what little there is is too scattered and discontinuous. The public green space area should be extended and amalgamated into a contiguous block: the Beverley Renaissance Partnership proposal of a new common, Southwood, should be resurrected. This would be in keeping with the aims of the Making Space for Nature white paper which explained that, in order to preserve wildlife, such areas should be 'bigger, better and more joined-up.'</p> <p>All new development should, according to the National Planning Policy Framework, be sustainable. To ensure this no building should take place on Flood Zone 3a. Increased drainage is not an option in a pumped-drainage catchment as it is clearly not sustainable and land-raising on the floodplain only moves flooding problems downstream and, as a technique, has become discredited.</p> <p>For this reason I would request that you revisit your proposals and consult meaningfully on any new ones going forward. Until this happens, I will maintain my objection to the Draft Masterplan for South West Beverley</p>	<p>Including proposed open space, densities are likely to be comparable to that already in the Lincoln Way area.</p> <p>The masterplan already proposes open space in the area to be located into a continuous block.</p> <p>No built development that would not be in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework will be permitted in flood zone 3a.</p> <p>The area of land covered by the masterplan is not a 'pumped out' catchment.</p>
Tina and Cliff Reeder	<p>We moved to Beverley in 1988 as we wanted to live in a small town. Over the years, we have seen the council give the go ahead to too many expansions of housing, roads and retail sights and therefore reaping the rewards of more council rates and planning fees. We have the CITY of Hull up the road - let that expand.</p> <p>We are concerned about the infrastructure of the town and particularly the impact of the open land and countryside around Lincoln Way.</p>	<p>The amount and location of new development for the Town has been extensively considered and consulted upon through the East Riding Local Plan including consideration of infrastructure. This is a masterplan as to how some of the sites are to be developed in detail.</p>
Mr & Mrs Ashworth	<p>Further to the consultation at the treasure house, I should like to draw your attention to certain proposals that will directly affect me and my family personally.</p>	<p>The information on the various site specific concerns has been provided to Mr and Mrs Ashworth.</p>

	<p>As you are aware, we take our water from an underground spring which runs directly underneath the proposed building. This land was raised by rubble to combat the flooding of this area. It is my belief that a lot of this rubble is from old buildings and schools. I would like to express my concern that this rubble could contain tars and oils as well as asbestos and lead from old paints. Especially if old boilers and radiators are present.</p> <p>As well as this risk to our and perhaps Hulls drinking water(as this is a drinking water source). New development brings with it added pollution in the way of machinery which spills oils and diesel into the land(drip trays have been proved not to work). On top of this, is the added worry of pesticides and weed killers which may be used to clear the land, this will all run through in rainfall and contaminate our drinking water.</p> <p>Please could I have access to the ground investigations that have taken place, I believe this is my right.</p> <p>I also have existing livestock, which will cause noise disturbance for any housing. (emus).</p> <p>Added to all this we have light pollution, noise pollution, the soak off from our septic tank is in the neighbouring field, what happens to that?</p>	
Mr N Riggs	<p>I would like to register my strongest possible objection to the proposed 1900 new homes planned for Beverley.</p> <p>Beverley is one of the best affordable places to live in Britain and part of its charm is its size. Beverley is a traditional Yorkshire market town. The centre of town has many unique buildings and lots of historical features. The two market areas are improving all the time, and are developing a continental style café culture. Why then plan to surround this beautiful town with horrible modern housing.</p> <p>Go into any modern housing estate in Britain and you see the same thing: cheaply made buildings that are too close together with insufficient parking. Why would any town conceive of copying this. Developments around Beverley that have already realised completion have followed this pattern, much to the</p>	<p>The amount and location of new development for the Town has been extensively considered and consulted upon through the East Riding Local Plan including consideration of infrastructure. This is a masterplan as to how some of the sites are to be developed in detail.</p>

	<p>detriment of the town. We live in a rural area so let's keep it rural and not build on every available scrap of land.</p> <p>In summary my objects are these:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1, There is insufficient road infrastructure for more new housing 2, Building on feeds surrounding the town increases the risk of flooding 3, Beverley will end up like most other towns in Britain and will lose its unique appeal 4, There is plenty of housing in Britain: the problem is a vastly and ever-growing population. <p>This is what needs to be tackled at the root of the problem. It won't be solved by ruining beautiful countryside</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5, The areas earmarked for building on contain lots of wildlife. Go out early morning and you can see everything from deer to seals (yes, seals in the River Hull) in the immediate area around Beverley. 6, These developments are not about affordable housing, they are only concerned with developers making lots of money at any cost to the environment. 	
Network Rail	<p>Please find below comments in relation to the draft Masterplan for the development of land at SW Beverley.</p> <p>The main content of the Masterplan is noted. Our chief concerns are in relation to the protection of our rail infrastructure and in particular the increase in use over level crossings in the vicinity of the development.</p> <p>The protection of infrastructure would be covered by suitably worded and appropriate conditions attached to outline consents (e.g. appropriate lineside fencing, lighting, landscaping &c) and does not need further discussion here.</p> <p>There is one aspect of a possible effect of the development on railway drainage which a surface water drainage strategy should address, and does not appear to be mentioned in the draft document. This is in relation to any requirement for scour protection for the Mill Dam Drain culvert under the railway at NGR 503972/438889 as a result of the increased surface water</p>	<p>Comments noted. The position of the footbridge has been moved and it is noted that any funding to provide it from Netowrk Rail would be conditional on the at grade crossing closing.</p>

	<p>flow from the development.</p> <p>Our chief concern relates to the bridleway level crossing at England Springs (HBS 7 miles 1260 yards), NGR 503992/438762. It is clear that the development of both BEV-J and BEV-K sites will have an impact on the crossing itself; it will increase usage of the crossing which in turn increases risk. It is national policy of the Office Of Rail Regulation and Network Rail to reduce risk at our level crossings and, wherever possible, seek their elimination. This has been successfully employed at the Black House Farm crossing to the south (which will close upon completion of linkages to the relief road) so it is disappointing to note the issue is not identified in the “opportunities and constraints” chapter of the Draft Masterplan as a key consideration. The proposed developments represent a once in a lifetime opportunity to remove the crossing at England Springs. The crossing is currently assessed at C4 under the ALCRM assessment (an empirical basis for assessing risk at level crossings where the lower the letter and number the higher the risk) based on a survey carried out in 2013 so it is highly probable that this score would increase in view of the planned development either side of the railway, requiring improvement or alteration to reduce risk.</p> <p>We note the comment in 6.2.6 about the possibility of a further footbridge between England Springs and the relief road bridge, but that this would be reliant in part on funding from “Network Rai & alternative sources” . We must place an objection to the suggestion in that we would only be prepared to consider funding in part if it was in the context of a footbridge to replace England Springs, not for a new structure halfway between the bridleway and the relief road as identified.</p> <p>Furthermore reference should be made in 6.26 of the requirement for England Springs to be bridged and an item placed in table 7.3 accordingly. It is estimated that the cost of a fully compliant bridleway bridge (with ramps) would be in the region of £2 million.</p>	
	I would like to register my objection to the proposals in the above	Built housing development will be avoided in the area of highest

<p>Nicola Ashworth</p>	<p>draft plan. All new development should be sustainable, to build upon flood land, even if this is given over to green space is unsustainable, pumped drainage does not work as was discovered at Kingswood. Who,I believe are now in the process of building more housing to raise revenue for extra drainage defences! The proposed land has in the past been rubble filled to prevent flooding! This rubble is likely to contain oils, asbestos and lead in older paints. The amount of building proposed is totally unacceptable in an area used for the collection of drinking water. Why should people in smaller houses have to be crammed together in 35 houses per hectare, when people in larger houses enjoy 20 houses per hectare ? If this means that houses have to be proposed in other areas then that may be a fairer plan to follow. The roads around the Minster will once again be filled with the traffic that the relief road was supposed to relieve! " why get rid of one problem and replace it with another"! There doesn't seem to be any provision for nature? Surely some recompense as proposed in the" Making Space For Nature" white paper should be addressed?</p>	<p>flood risk. The area is not a pumped drainage catchment.</p>
<p>PJ Sullivan</p>	<p>AREA BEV-J On the west side of the area known as BEV-J where it borders the existing east boundary of the Lincoln Way development there is a pathway with a very small grassed strip and then as established tree line. These features run from Shepherd's Lane heading north until the School on Woodmansey Mile. Firstly I hope that the tree line will be protected during every stage on development and MUST be maintained. Also on the Western boundary of BEV-J a similar but MUCH WIDER grassed strip, possible with another path needed to be a MANDATORY requirements in any plans approved. Access into and exit from BEV-J, with the huge amount of houses proposed will be a massive problem, your plan states using Woodmansey Mile and Lincoln Way, does the mean an entrance onto the site from Shepard's Lane?? I can't see how such an increase in traffic will be able to use those routes without causing gridlock at certain times of the day. What</p>	<p>We can confirm that the landscaped open space to the east of Lincoln Way will be retained.</p>

	<p>that would mean is a massive increase of vehicles of all sizes going past the Nursery Schools on Shepherds Lane and Woodmansey Mile as well as the extended School.</p> <p>At the moment Woodmansey Mile is already used as a car park by people working in Beverley town centre and both sides of the road are blocked for much of its length, so much for the so called cycle lanes that can't be used as it is.</p>	
Paul Gilbert	<p>Wide green spaces are needed either side of Long Lane planted with trees to preserve the rural approach to Beverley and preserve views of the Minster.</p> <p>Similar landscaping should be applied along Willow Lane and the footpath that run SE and crosses the by-pass to Shepherd Lane, like that along the path parallel to Lincoln Way behind the present estate.</p> <p>Currently planned open spaces are dictated by flood risk. Environmental considerations should be primary. Then the number of houses should be reduced if necessary. Sensitive planning should allow development to be combined with with preserving the rural south Beverley.</p>	<p>The masterplan has provision for open spaces alongside Long Lane.</p> <p>Similar landscaping cannot be applied everywhere and needs to be included where of most benefit in terms of providing for green infrastructure corridors, views of the Minster, and maximising efficient use of the land.</p>
Philip Simmons	<p>We would like to register our objection to the proposals in the above draft plan.</p> <p>The housing density is too high and not in keeping with the current housing density in the neighbouring Lincoln Way development. There is not enough green space in the development proposals and what little there is, it is too scattered and discontinuous. The public green space area should be extended and amalgamated into a contiguous block: the Beverley Renaissance Partnership proposal of a new common, Southwood, should be resurrected. This would be in keeping with the aims of the Making Space for Nature white paper which explained that, in order to preserve wildlife, such areas should be 'bigger, better and more joined-up.'</p> <p>All new development should, according to the National Planning</p>	<p>Including proposed open space, densities are likely to be comparable to that already in the Lincoln Way area.</p> <p>The masterplan already proposes open space in the area to be located into a continuous block.</p> <p>No built development that would not be in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework will be permitted in flood zone 3a.</p> <p>The area of land covered by the masterplan is not a 'pumped out' catchment.</p>

	<p>Policy Framework, be sustainable. To ensure this no building should take place on Flood Zone 3a. Increased drainage is not an option in a pumped-drainage catchment as it is clearly not sustainable and land-raising on the floodplain only moves flooding problems downstream and, as a technique, has become discredited.</p> <p>For this reason we would request that you revisit your proposals and consult meaningfully on any new ones going forward. Until this happens, we will maintain our objection to the Draft Masterplan for South West Beverley.</p>	
R H Davies	<p>Can I register my approval for the new homes master plan. Beverley and the Eastriding needs new homes for the current house buying generation and future generations. The grey haired anti-building lobby that seem to try and dominate this town have got their homes and in my opinion they should not be allowed to block future development. Houses are far too expensive and not building homes will only place further pressure on prices.</p>	Comments noted.
R Oldridge	<p>Object to to the proposed use of Shepherd Lane to form part of the Spine Road through the site. The road network cannot cope including Jocks Lodge. The road would cause more tailbacks on Lincoln Way. Spine Road should connect to the Southern Relief Road near the existing pedestrian crossing.</p>	<p>Access to Shepherd Lane is included as an option as it broadens access options to the site alongside an option to connect directly to Minster Way to the South.</p> <p>Highway Study shows the roads can cope albeit with some additional queuing with such an arrangement</p>
S.McGonegal	<p>The very thought of our beautiful market town being spoiled still further horrifies me.</p> <p>I appreciate people need homes but surely,over the last 25 years the number of estates that have been built is enough. Scrubwood lane, Lincoln way. Butterfly Meadows.& the huge development off Woodhall way. Where are the kids going to school? The need for more medical care will be necessary .</p> <p>Traffic at present is pretty horrendous-goodness knows what it would be like if this project gets off the ground. These days many house owners have 2 cars --again a big problem.</p> <p>Hopefully someone on the planning committee will have the gump & courage to stand up for the people of Beverley</p>	<p>The amount and location of new development for the Town has been extensively considered and consulted upon through the East Riding Local Plan including consideration of infrastructure. This is a masterplan as to how some of the sites are to be developed in detail.</p>
S.Bamford	<p>The map indicates two spine roads joining onto Woodmansey Mile, this will result in a considerable amount of additional traffic</p>	<p>Although pavements are missing from certain sides of Victoria Road and Woodmansey Mile, there are other safer pedestrian</p>

	<p>passing a nursery, primary school and playing field. An increase in pollution close to young children cannot be desirable.</p> <p>The increase in traffic along Woodmansey Mile, Lincoln Way and using the Victoria Road roundabouts will be great and yet the opavements are not adequate even now. There is no pavement on the south side of Woodmansey Mile except for a short length outside the school. Victoria Road is not accessible and there is no pavement on the east side of it.</p>	<p>routes, including thorough the Lincoln Way Estate and through Kitchen Lane/Butt Lane to get to Victoria Road and elsewhere.</p>
<p>Sally McIgish</p>	<p>I would like to see bungalows or houses more suited to the disabled and elderly than the more recent trend for three storey houses.</p> <p>Also it would be detrimental to Beverley if it were to end up like the rabbit warren at the Rowan Ave and Lockwood Estate.</p>	<p>The spine road through the site should allow it to be legible and accessible to people.</p> <p>Housing mix is to be determines through individual housing applications on the site in light of the latest evidence of need established in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and advice from the Housing Strategy and Development Team.</p>
<p>Sarah Humphries</p>	<p>I am concerned that in several places the phrase 'as far as possible' has been used, e.g. in Para 4.17 (avoid adversely impacting on landscape setting of the town and views of Beverley Minster as far as possible) and 6.12 (significant vegetation should be retained as far as possible). What safeguards are there that these guidelines will be followed , or will the developers just do what they want if it's easier / brings them a bigger profit?</p> <p>Para 6.12 says that shops and other developments can be located in flood zone 3. Surely one necessity is for there to be green areas which can absorb water , especially in view of the large new built-up area. It's not just a question of preventing houses etc being flooded . I do not think it is appropriate for there to be buildings of 3 or more storeys - it's out of character with the rest of Beverley.</p> <p>I hope that there are procedures in place for checking that the rules have been adhered to, and for penalties (such as removing anything that should not have been built) to be employed. I have heard that in other areas the affordable houses have been quietly dropped in favour of bigger ones which generate more profit.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

	<p>I am pleased to hear that affordable houses are so central to the plan , and they are to be distributed about the estate. I pass Woodhall Grange every day and the affordable houses are out of sight (I later saw that they were right at the back, by the ring road, as well as a few bungalows tucked in a corner), so I hope that won't happen here.</p> <p>Having said all that, I am pleased to read that such a lot of thought has been given to the infrastructure, and to providing plenty of green areas.</p>	
Sarah Jessop	<p>We would like to register our objection to the proposals in the above draft plan.</p> <p>The housing density is too high and not in keeping with the current housing density in the neighbouring Lincoln Way development. There is not enough green space in the development proposals and what little there is, it is too scattered and discontinuous. The public green space area should be extended and amalgamated into a contiguous block: the Beverley Renaissance Partnership proposal of a new common, Southwood, should be resurrected. This would be in keeping with the aims of the Making Space for Nature white paper which explained that, in order to preserve wildlife, such areas should be 'bigger, better and more joined-up.'</p> <p>All new development should, according to the National Planning Policy Framework, be sustainable. To ensure this no building should take place on Flood Zone 3a. Increased drainage is not an option in a pumped-drainage catchment as it is clearly not sustainable and land-raising on the floodplain only moves flooding problems downstream and, as a technique, has become discredited.</p> <p>For this reason we would request that you revisit your proposals and consult meaningfully on any new ones going forward. Until this happens, we will maintain our objection to the Draft Masterplan for South West Beverley.</p>	<p>Including proposed open space, densities are likely to be comparable to that already in the Lincoln Way area.</p> <p>The masterplan already proposes open space in the area to be located into a continuous block.</p> <p>No built development that would not be in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework will be permitted in flood zone 3a.</p> <p>The area of land covered by the masterplan is not a 'pumped out' catchment.</p>

<p>Sarah Thomsen</p>	<p>I would like to register my objection to the proposals in the above draft plan.</p> <p>The housing density is too high in general, and in particular when compared with the current housing density in the neighbouring Lincoln Way development. Beverley needs more housing, specifically smaller starter and retirement homes. However, there is no reason why these less expensive houses should not be given the same environment and neighbourhood that more expensive houses are generally built in – other than the builders’ desire to maximise profits. Beverley has a real chance here to break the mould, and to provide housing for people wanting to get onto the housing ladder or to downsize, but in a highly attractive development that offers substantial public green space; I wish to lend my fullest support to the Beverley Renaissance Partnership’s proposal of a new common, Southwood, as it would make for a wonderful community space for many generations to come, and also provide a much-needed green belt in this part of Beverley.</p> <p>As part of the planning application requirements should be in place for the funding of community facilities such as a community centre. There will be many more homes and therefore people and extra facilities should be provided especially for young people. The south side of Beverley is going to be heavily populated without so much as a pub or other community place. I urge you to ensure that this is provided by the developers or the ERYC.</p> <p>It is a must that Deer Park and the firs remains the public space it is.</p> <p>I also object to shepherds lane which runs behind rhyme way bring used as a spine road / link to Lincoln way as this will devalue houses already there and lower the quality of life due to further road noise pollution.</p>	<p>The density of new housing development would not be much different to that already present in the current Lincoln Way estate.</p> <p>25% of new housing on the site will be required to be ‘affordable’.</p> <p>The ‘Southwood’ concept of open space in the area is something that the Council had in mind when designating a central area in the site as open space, although it must be borne in mind there is a limitation to the amount of open space developers can viably provide for.</p> <p>The Spine Road itself is unlikely to carry more traffic than Lincoln Way along Shepherd Lane if this option eventually materialises.</p>
<p>Sharon D'Arcy</p>	<p>I am writing to register my opposition to the plans being proposed for south west Beverley. I cannot see ANY positive points for the</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

addition of this new housing . Surely destroying yet another beautiful area of Beverley in the name of affordable housing will lose the desirability of our market town. People use the area for walking, cycling, horse riding etc. As only a very small number of these homes are actually being built for affordable housing this is not a genuine reason for this build . The infra structure of Beverley cannot cope with the amount of traffic this would bring to the town . An estimate of two cars per household would mean approximately 4000 more cars struggling around in just the first wave of building alone as well as the families fighting for places within our already overloaded services such as doctors ,dentists and schools. (I have read the new school is no longer been proposed.) Also these children are not all primary age, where are the secondary school places for them?

The crossing at Flemingate was planned to be shut to protect the Minster from traffic and help direct traffic from town centre, since this has not happened the traffic from these new houses would also be free to drive this route . There is no way a straight on only junction could be policed. The traffic past Keldmarsh primary school would also increase dramatically, with cars parking for town all along the street the danger to children is increasing also. The park at the bottom of Woodmansey mile is not secure enough for a busy route past. It wouldn't take much for children to get over the fence after a ball.

Beverley has no jobs to offer these people so this means more commuters in a morning struggling to get out of town. as one of them it is set to increase the amount of standing traffic just trying to get to work on time.

One of my major concerns is the wildlife in this area . With water voles, kingfishers, bats, barn owls and now Peregrine falcons this would be obliterating their natural habitat and to lose these delightful animals would again be a massive blow to the desirability

	<p>of our beautiful market town. Once this precious countryside is lost it can never be replaced .</p> <p>There are plenty of brown sites to build on which access the new road and would suit affordable housing rather than another faceless housing estate.</p>	
Shaun Gilchrist	<p>I would like to register my objection to the proposals in the above draft plan. The housing density is too high and in particular when compared with the current housing density in the neighbouring Lincoln Way development.</p> <p>Beverley needs more housing, but specifically smaller starter and retirement homes.</p> <p>Beverley needs to provide housing for people wanting to get onto the housing ladder or to downsize, but in an attractive development that offers public green space.</p> <p>I wish to lend my fullest support to the Beverley Renaissance Partnership's proposal of a new common,</p>	<p>The density of new housing development would not be much different to that already present in the current Lincoln Way estate.</p> <p>The 'Southwood' concept of open space in the area is something that the Council had in mind when designating a central area in the site as open space, although it must be borne in mind there is a limitation to the amount of open space developers can viably provide for.</p>
Steph + Paul Walker	<p>We write to express our strong concern over the proposed building of 1900 homes on the south of Beverley. This number of new homes would vastly increase the strain on resources and the overcrowding of both the site and the town centre as a result.</p> <p>We are greatly concerned about flooding on the area and feel that the flooding/drainage measures proposed, fall far short to protect the development itself but also the surrounding areas - which are currently protected by this area being green. KeldMARSH is clearly a flood risk in itself, but I live on Figham Springs Way - which is also in a low flood risk zone – and which would be much greater at risk if the surrounding green fields were built upon.</p> <p>The footfall though our estate would greatly increase and the strain on Keldmarsh school expanding would change the small, quality feel of the school.</p> <p>The new Southern sites don't just need a new school, but also some local shops and a post office (as Beverley town centre PO is already at maximum capacity)</p> <p>Three storey housing is not consistent with the area and any</p>	<p>The amount and location of new development for the Town has been extensively considered and consulted upon through the East Riding Local Plan including consideration of infrastructure. This is a masterplan as to how some of the sites are to be developed in detail.</p>

	<p>density of housing above the Lincoln Way allocation of 20 houses per hectare is too much.</p> <p>There needs to be a much greater proportion of green space protected on this Southern site - not just a few walkways/views/playpark/sports areas - but real uninhibited open space – which is the glory of the current site and which could never be reclaimed once built over. Losing this great area of open space would spoil the beauty of the approach towards Beverley and the country feel of the outskirt estates. As you approach Beverley from Long Lane you see a view of the Minster that would essentially be the same as pilgrims saw over 1000 years ago, it would be a terrible loss to lose this uninterrupted view and gangway just are not the same at all. There needs to be much bigger wild/open fields to walk through and view.</p> <p>In summary, Beverley is a market town of unique character and charm, we feel this would be vastly diminished by the proposal, increase the risk of flooding and put unacceptable strain on the infrastructure that supports the town.</p> <p>We would respectfully ask you to hear the significant number of objectors to this proposal and reject the plans.</p>	
Steve Walford	<p>I would like to register my objection to the proposals in the above draft plan.</p> <p>The housing density is too high and not in keeping with the current housing density in the neighbouring Lincoln Way development. There is not enough green space in the development proposals and what little there is is too scattered and discontinuous. The public green space area should be extended and amalgamated into a contiguous block: the Beverley Renaissance Partnership proposal of a new common, Southwood, should be resurrected. This would be in keeping with the aims of the Making Space for Nature white paper which explained that, in order to preserve wildlife, such areas should be ‘bigger, better and more joined-up.’</p> <p>All new development should, according to the National Planning Policy Framework, be sustainable. To ensure this no building</p>	<p>Including proposed open space, densities are likely to be comparable to that already in the Lincoln Way area.</p> <p>The masterplan already proposes open space in the area to be located into a continuous block.</p> <p>No built development that would not be in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework will be permitted in flood zone 3a.</p> <p>The area of land covered by the masterplan is not a ‘pumped out’ catchment.</p>

	<p>should take place on Flood Zone 3a. Increased drainage is not an option in a pumped-drainage catchment as it is clearly not sustainable and land-raising on the floodplain only moves flooding problems downstream and, as a technique, has become discredited. For this reason I would request that you revisit your proposals and consult meaningfully on any new ones going forward. Until this happens, I will maintain my objection to the Draft Masterplan for South West Beverley.</p> <p>I would also like to register my objection to the proposal (s) by the developers to vary the conditions imposed by ERYC namely, the prior construction of the spine road, wider access to the development area (with no ransom strips) and the provision of childrens' play spaces, youth and adult provision. The removal of these conditions is a disbenefit to the community</p>	
Susan Pape	<p>I would like to register my objection to the proposals in the above draft plan.</p> <p>The housing density is too high in general, and in particular when compared with the current housing density in the neighbouring Lincoln Way development. Beverley needs more housing, specifically smaller starter and retirement homes. However, there is no reason why these less expensive houses should not be given the same environment and neighbourhood that more expensive houses are generally built in – other than the builders’ desire to maximise profits. Beverley has a real chance here to break the mould, and to provide housing for people wanting to get onto the housing ladder or to downsize, but in a highly attractive development that offers substantial public green space; I wish to lend my fullest support to the Beverley Renaissance Partnership’s proposal of a new common, Southwood, as it would make for a wonderful community space for many generations to come, and also provide a much-needed green belt in this part of Beverley.</p> <p>Finally, I have to express my severe disappointment at the manner in which the consultation on this plan has been undertaken. Not only was the timing far from ideal, with much of it being in the school summer holidays, I also consider it disingenuous when residents are invited to comment, but then also told by council</p>	<p>Including proposed areas of open space the proposed density of housing development within the masterplan area is very comparable to that within the Lincoln Way estate. Densities are likely to be higher as development takes place due to changes to national and local policy to make the most efficient use of land in housing delivery.</p> <p>The ‘Southwood’ concept is something that the Council had in mind when designating a central area in the site as open space, although it must be borne in mind there is a limitation to the amount of open space developers can viably provide for.</p> <p>Development to the south of Beverley has been subject to extensive consultation both through the production of the East Riding Local Plan- in terms of the principle of developing the site, then the masterplan- in terms of detailed guidelines as to how the site should be developed.</p> <p>This has included drop-in sessions, sending out hundreds of emails/letters notifying people of the consultation and the issuing of press releases.</p>

	<p>officers as well as elected councillors (the latter in the local press, no less) that this consultation was only about “tweaking design details” and “it’s a done deal”. This questions the whole rationale of a consultation, and irrespective of whether these comments were made intentionally in order to discourage people from offering objections, if they had this outcome, then this not only warrants investigation, but makes a new consultation a necessity.</p> <p>For this reason I would request that you revisit your proposals and consult meaningfully (!) on any new ones going forward. Until this happens, I will maintain my objection to the Draft Masterplan for South West Beverley.</p>	<p>The masterplan was out to consultation between 13th July and 14th September, 2015, which covered 9 weeks where people had a chance to respond. Two drop in events at the Treasure House were held. As a result, over 100 responses have been received to the masterplan consultation. The Council is therefore satisfied that the consultation process has been more than adequate.</p>
<p>Sustainable Development Team</p>	<p>Paras 4.24-4.27, Ecology - The ecology section recognises that some of the old pasture land has ecological value as semi-improved grassland priority BAP habitat which is unlikely to have been ploughed. (Vaughn Grantham, Biodiversity Officer)</p> <p>Para 5.3, Key objectives for site - Support requirement 7 to create a distinctive landscape, incorporating linear green corridors and new ecological habitats . (Vaughn Grantham, Biodiversity Officer)</p> <p>Paras 6.23-6.25, Ecology - The identification of features such as trees and hedgerows for retention is welcome. However, some of the pasture should be retained as permanent amenity grassland. The key areas are the public open space in the north of the site. (Vaughn Grantham, Biodiversity Officer)</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p>Sylvia & Stephen Pullen</p>	<p>We are writing in response to the Development Masterplan for South West Beverley. We have reviewed the online document and would like to lodge our comments on the proposal.</p> <p>When we initially moved to Beverley we were drawn to the size as a small market town. Since we have lived here a number of small developments have happened which have affected us but this most recent development is going to be the most significant and disruptive. It is not acceptable to impose a development of this size on the south side of Beverley.</p> <p>Firstly the effect on the roads will be very disruptive. There could</p>	<p>The amount and location of new development for the Town has been extensively considered and consulted upon through the East Riding Local Plan including consideration of infrastructure. This is a masterplan as to how some of the sites are to be developed in detail.</p>

	<p>potentially be in excess of 4,000 extra cars queuing to get into Beverley after work each night and leaving each morning. This will put untold pressure on the south end of Lincoln Way and Woodmansey Mile. The traffic jam to get in and out of Beverley each day is already bad and this development will surely make the road incredibly jammed.</p> <p>The residents of Lincoln Way have already suffered years of disruption whilst the Southern Relief Road was built and this development will surely impact on our daily lives more than the building of the road did. As I have already said, we moved to Beverley due to the nature of the town and constant development and disruption is not what we moved here for.</p> <p>Our grandson also goes to Keldmarsh Primary School which we chose to send him too due to the size of the school and the proposals to make the school twice as big does not fit with the area.</p> <p>If these houses are built, we will no longer live in a nice market town but in the middle of a large housing estate surrounded by houses, people and traffic.</p>	
Terry Jackson	<p>I keep reading that Beverley needs 1,900 new homes. Please could you let me know how this figure was calculated and by whom.</p> <p>I live behind Morrisons, and in the 4 years I have lived in Beverley have seen a number of houses come onto the market. These have often been up for sale for a number of months, in 1 case almost 4 years, so I'm at a loss to where the predicted demand for these 1,900 new homes will come from.</p>	<p>National planning policy seeks to increase the supply of housing across the country. Local Planning Authorities need to ensure that land is available to meet the identified housing requirement. Councils are encouraged to prepare a Local Plan which will provide the framework for managing development and address key planning issues in the area. The emerging East Riding Local Plan outlines the scale and distribution of future development and where this development will occur, it also allocates sites for development. The Allocations Document has identified a number of sites in Beverley for housing development, and includes the site which forms part of the South-West of Beverley Masterplan.</p> <p>Evidence prepared by the Council recognises that the East Riding is generally a high demand area with strong levels of in-migration from urban centres, particularly Hull, York and Leeds. There is also a strong need and demand for housing generated from within the East Riding as a consequence</p>

		<p>of changing household size and the difficulty in accessing affordable properties. Based on a review of the evidence, it supports the annual provision of at least 1,400 new dwellings across the East Riding, or a total of 23,800 dwellings between 2012 and 2029. It then distributes this number of dwellings across the plan's settlement network, including 3,300 to Beverley.</p> <p>In Beverley, the south of the town will be a key area of growth, as it offers the greatest opportunities to integrate new housing with the rest of the town and create strong connections with the town centre. Development proposals in this location are being informed by a masterplan, which forms part of the current South-West of Beverley Masterplan consultation.</p>
Tim Cowley	<p>I am concerned by the impact any plan could have on the town, its surrounding environment and population. I would therefore like to ask you not to allow an extension to Beverley. I have read in the local media that the Council proposes to increase the size of the town by c3,000 over 15-20 years, with 1,900 new homes planned as phase 1 of the project.</p> <p>In my opinion the town will be ruined if this proceeds . My wife was born in the area and I have been a homeowner here since 1992. One of the charms of Beverley in 1992 was its small town character, rather than a city; otherwise I would have bought a home in Hull. As a parent of two children educated in the town and a frequent shopper in the town , I have first hand experience of the problems regarding limited secondary education and town parking. These need to be addressed before any consideration and resolved before expanding the town.</p> <p>I am also a keen naturalist and I am concerned not only by the loss of green belt the development will cause, but also the environmental pressure that thousands of extra residents will have on the wildlife important areas close to the town , such as Swinemoor and Figham Common, by disturbance.</p>	<p>The amount and location of new development for the Town has been extensively considered and consulted upon through the East Riding Local Plan including consideration of infrastructure. This is a masterplan as to how some of the sites are to be developed in detail.</p>

	<p>This area (including nearby Hull) has high unemployment and therefore increasing the number of residents will only compound the employment problem for existing residents. This should be a serious concern for the town!</p> <p>In my opinion new housing shown be located near good communications and therefore the Council should seriously consider a substantial new development along the M 62/A63 rather than creating a conurbation in the Hull Valley.</p> <p>If homes have to be built close to the town then I agree with the Beverley and District Civic Society and the approach taken at Prince Charles' Poundbury development. But any plan must include recreational areas to reduce environmental disturbance. I would also like to see the Council resolve the monopoly of the Pasture Masters over Swinemoor and have the area designated as a nature reserve and provide protection for this fantastic flood meadow.</p> <p>I do not underestimate the problem faced by the Council but I do not think Beverley is the answer, I think a new location built from scratch would be the best solution for all concerned. If an extension has to be made in Beverley then the Council should consider doing this in small developments, including the Molescroft/Dog Kennel Lane area, but with much reduced numbers that Beverley's infrastructure can support.</p>	
Trevor Green	<p>I do not see any mention of a community building where community groups can meet. Will such a building be included? There is no such facility at all to the south of Beverley except for Keldmarsh School which is limited for community use. I would welcome your comments regarding this matter.</p>	<p>The draft masterplan specifies that a neighbourhood centre will be supported as part of the overall development. The draft masterplan supports small scale services and facilities to serve the daily needs of the local community. Such uses could include a small convenience grocery shop, doctors surgery, pharmacist, bakery or a pub.</p> <p>The draft masterplan does not specify that the neighbourhood centre may include a community building, although at this stage we cannot guarantee that there will be no community building, it will</p>

		<p>be dependant on the proposals set out by the developer.</p> <p>As you have expressed that there is a need for a community building, the Parish Council could submit a funding bid to develop a community building on this site.</p>
Woodmansey Parish Council	<p>Parish Council considers that East Riding Council should ensure that the proposal for a new school is not detrimental to the sustainability of other schools in the parish and that the Parish Council does not support the provision of a new school whilst there are spaces for pupils at existing schools in the Beverley cluster area and would want East Riding Council to enhance provision at the existing schools before building a new school in the area.</p> <p>The Parish Council would repeat its previous comments that there is a wish for some form of community facility provision in the development area.</p>	<p>The draft masterplan specifies that a neighbourhood centre will be supported as part of the overall development. The draft masterplan supports small scale services and facilities to serve the daily needs of the local community. Such uses could include a small convenience grocery shop, doctors surgery, pharmacist, bakery or a pub.</p> <p>The draft masterplan does not specify that the neighbourhood centre may include a community building, although at this stage we cannot guarantee that there will be no community building, it will be dependant on the proposals set out by the developer.</p> <p>As you have expressed that there is a need for a community building, the Parish Council could submit a funding bid to develop a community building on this site.</p>
Yorkshire Water	The Land South West of Beverley Draft Masterplan properly reflects Yorkshire Water's interest in the area with regard to disposal of foul and surface water.	Comments Noted.
Diana Randle	<p>Has the 'Southwood' been abandoned?</p> <p>Is the 'Green Corridor' to town [illegible word].</p>	<p>The 'Southwood' concept is something that the Council had in mind when designating a central area in the site as open space, although it must be borne in mind there is a limitation to the amount of open space developers can viably provide for.</p> <p>Provision for a green corridor through the development into the town centre has been included in the masterplan.</p>
	<p>Have the consultations with Yorkshire Water been formalised regarding the capacity for 3,500 xtra houses?</p> <p>Have Y.W. set any dates for works to commence?</p>	Yorkshire Water have responded to the draft Masterplan stating that "The Land South West of Beverley Draft Masterplan properly reflects Yorkshire Water's interest in the area with regard to disposal of foul and surface water."

		Additional works to the sewer network take place as development commences.
--	--	--