

South East Beverley Development Brief Schedule of Consultation Responses

Organisation/Respondent	Summary of Comments	Response	Amendments to Development Brief
Historic England	<p>HE originally expressed concerns about the site allocations in early consultations of the local plan but are content with the provisions of Policy BEVK. However HE has concerns that the development brief is not in accordance with criterion b of policy BEVK.</p>	<p>HE evidently have concerns about the principle of the allocation due to the sensitivities of the Minster.</p>	<p>Following meetings with HE, the masterplan has been revised to increase the amount of open space within the centre of the site to assist in the provision of views to the Minster. The Brief also makes more reference throughout to protecting views of the Minster.</p>
	<p>Figure 10 implies that there is only one key view of the Minster. However, there are 2 key areas/zones where the Minster is prominent: 1. Public Footpath that runs along Spark Mill Lane; 2. Views from By-pass, especially where it is elevated across the railway. Figure 10 should be amended.</p>	<p>The setting and views of the Minster was considered in the drafting of the masterplan and the development brief. However, it is accepted that more reference could be made to the preserving the views of the Minster in the document.</p>	<p>In the Introduction section an additional objective of the development has been added which states: "protect and enhance long distance views of the Minster" (Page 2). Section 4 'Opportunities and Constraints' expands further on the Historic Environment and Built Heritage.</p>
	<p>Minster is the Unique Selling Point for the site page 20 should have a picture of the Minster from its southern façade.</p>	<p>The key principles diagram is intending to illustrate schematically the general</p>	<p>Section 5 Design Requirements also includes "protect and</p>

Organisation/Respondent	Summary of Comments	Response	Amendments to Development Brief
	<p>Should include an objective on page 2 regarding the protection of the key view of the Minster.</p>	<p>design concepts of the masterplan. Clearly the Minster will be visible from a number of vantage points in and around the development.</p>	<p>enhance long distance views of the Minster" as a key objective of the design considerations (Page 21). More open space has been provided in the centre of the development area to facilitate views of the Minster.</p>
	<p>The scheme should have a large area of open space at the heart of the development to safeguard views on the Minster. Residential area to the south of the playing fields and north-east of the access road should be deleted because it would result in the loss of a key view of the Minster and could create the southern equivalent of Westwood.</p>	<p>The proposed scheme does include a significant amount of interlinking green space throughout the development. However, as requested by EH a large area of open space has been provided in the heart of the development area. It is considered more appropriate to vary densities on site having regard to the proximity of the Minster.</p>	<p>The open space at the heart of the development has been increased in size. The need to vary densities across the site has been addressed on page 27 "There is scope to vary the density across the site having regard to the setting of the Minster and proximity to open space. In terms of scale it is envisaged that the dwellings would not exceed 3 storeys in height to ensure that development blends with the existing urban fabric of Beverley and the views of the Minster are uninterrupted. The difference in building</p>

Organisation/Respondent	Summary of Comments	Response	Amendments to Development Brief
			heights will add interest to the development especially when viewed from the elevated section of the bypass."
	There is no justification for increasing the number of houses from 761 to 1,000 homes if this scale of development cannot be accommodated without harming the setting of the Minster.	This figure has been reviewed and it considered that the site can more reasonably accommodate in the region of 800 new homes having regard to site characteristics and range of uses.	Reference to 1,000 new homes has been deleted. In addition page 29 states "Reducing site density and residential development in this central area will also help preserve views of Beverley Minster." The approximate dwelling capacity of the site of 813 has been referred to instead consistent with the Local Plan.
	Focusing the main arterial route on the principal view is a wasted opportunity. Pedestrian will not enjoy it if they have to walk alongside busy thoroughfare.	Main route has a dual purpose for the housing development and the Park and Ride. This will not be the only view of the Minster but is illustrated simplistically on the key principles diagram to illustrate design concepts. Pedestrians will be able to utilise more desire line routes through the development such as	Masterplan amended so main route deviates around central open space and alternative pedestrian routes provided.

Organisation/Respondent	Summary of Comments	Response	Amendments to Development Brief
		Spark Mill Lane.	
	Central housing block and central spine road serving the development should be deleted. Instead there should be two smaller access roads. One to the eastern housing and one to the western housing area.	Central housing block deleted and spine road reconfigured.	Masterplan amended to remove central housing block and reconfigure the spine road so that there is an east-west as well as a north-south route
	Existing important tree groups should be specifically identified in the brief with a requirement that they should be retained.	Other than the trees to the eastern part of the site, there are only has a scattering of trees mostly amongst hedging as part of field boundaries. Vegetation along field boundaries has now been identified for retention including trees.	Vegetation along field boundaries has been identified for retention including trees.
	Views from the new by-pass need to be taken into consideration, the roofscape of the development is an important consideration.	It is acknowledged that there will be view from the bypass across the development towards to Minster. This matter can be addressed in the text.	Amendments to text in page 27 addresses this matter.
Environment Agency	Proposals generally acceptable from a flood risk perspective. Layout shows a sequential approach has been considered 'less vulnerable' employment areas have been located in the highest risk areas.	Can confirm that the masterplan proposes only commercial land and open spaces in the flood zone 2 and 3 areas.	No change required.

Organisation/Respondent	Summary of Comments	Response	Amendments to Development Brief
	<p>Majority of site is within flood zone 1 although there are small areas of flood zone 2 and 3 and page 12 of the development brief should be updated to reflect this. Site layout should be done in a sequential manner with all built development in flood zone 1 and outside flood zone 2 and 3. If this is not possible, more vulnerable elements of development should be located in areas at lowest risk of flooding.</p>	<p>Figure 7 on page 12 shows the extent of flood zone 2 and 3 but further clarification can be provided.</p>	<p>Text on page 12 has been amended to make reference to flood zone 3 and key added to Figure 7.</p>
	<p>A small percentage of the site has experienced surface water flooding (most notably in 2007). Careful design of the whole site and surface water drainage system to ensure that all sources of flood risk have been considered and managed effectively.</p>	<p>The Brief sets out that the site would be drained using a Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SuDS) techniques, including attenuation by surface storage, such as swales and ponds.</p>	<p>No change required</p>
	<p>Advice regarding parameters for Flood Risk Assessment which should include the surface water drainage scheme and use of SUDs.</p>	<p>Comments noted - Precise details of SuDs system would be included in the planning application as part of the FRA report.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>
	<p>Use of SUDs for surface water drainage is first preference provided that these are demonstrated to be feasible. Development brief suggests that there could be a 30% reduction in greenfield run-off which could be technically challenging to reduce rate. It may be more feasible to restrict run-off to the</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>Drainage section of report amended so that it no longer refers to the 1.4l/s/ha rate and 30% reduction (page 14).</p>

Organisation/Respondent	Summary of Comments	Response	Amendments to Development Brief
	greenfield run-off of 1.4l/s/ha and provide additional attenuation and long term storage to take account of 30% climate change.		
	You must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change.	Comments noted -Detail will be addressed in Drainage Strategy of FRA.	No change required as matter is too detailed to be addressed in the masterplan.
	EA require details of ownership and maintenance arrangements for the lifetime of the development. This should include details of any SUDs, outfall etc to ensure continued efficiency.	Comments noted -Detail will be addressed in Drainage Strategy of FRA.	No change required as matter is too detailed to be addressed in the masterplan.
	The site is located within a Source Protection Zone (SPZ) 2 and 3 for public drinking water supply sourced from groundwater.	Comments noted.	Groundwater section updated to refer to SPZ (Page 13)
	A Phase 1 land contamination study should be undertaken to assess possible contamination of ground and/or groundwater and to establish whether a phase 2 survey would be required.	A land contamination survey will be undertaken to support the planning application.	No change required as matter is too detailed to be addressed in the masterplan.
	Brief states that there is insufficient capacity within the YW sewer to accept	Comments noted - situation will be fully	No change required - see comments from YW.

Organisation/Respondent	Summary of Comments	Response	Amendments to Development Brief
	<p>surface water from the development and it proposed to be discharged to watercourse. There is potential for existing quality of watercourses to be adversely impacted due to the potential for cross connections (misconnected appliances etc.) from residential developments and trade effluents from commercial developments to enter the surface water drainage systems.</p>	<p>explored as part of planning application due diligence and further discussion will take place with Yorkshire Water.</p>	
	<p>There is no mention of the Water Framework Direction (WFD). The WFD should be included in the list of considerations in Section 4. Applicants have obligations under the WFD to ensure that the proposed development does not cause deterioration of local surface water and to consider the need for any mitigation measures to meet their obligations.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>Groundwater section updated to refer to WFD (Page 13).</p>
<p>Highways England</p>	<p>Whilst the site would have little impact on the Strategic Road Network in particular junctions M62/A63 and A1033, there will be residual commuting trips which when aggregated with other development in the plan, may have a combined detrimental effect on capacity and operation.</p>	<p>Comments noted - planning application will be supported by a comprehensive Transport Assessment which will have been prepared in discussions with the ERYC Highways & Transportation department and the Highways Agency. Assessment of the</p>	<p>No change required as matter is too detailed to be addressed in the masterplan.</p>

Organisation/Respondent	Summary of Comments	Response	Amendments to Development Brief
		cumulative impact on Local Plan developments on the trunk road network have been completed as part of the Local Plan Infrastructure Study. Improvements are planned for accordingly within the Local Plan.	
	Planning application would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment. Local Plan work identifies impact on number of junctions of the SRN, the Council's plans for mitigating the impact include direct contributions/CiL/Sustainable Transport measures.	As above.	No change required.
Humber Archaeology	NPPF requires the Historic Environment to be considered as a whole and not just as archaeology. Brief needs to show how you propose to avoid substantial harm being inflicted upon designated heritage assets as required by NPPF.	Comments noted.	Historic Environment and Archaeology section expanded to incorporate Humber Archaeology comments (page 14).
	The development site lies within a classic wetland archaeological landscape (as part of the middle reaches of the Hull Valley) which is rich in crop marks of later prehistoric and Romano-British monuments.	Comments noted.	Historic Environment and Archaeology section expanded to incorporate Humber Archaeology comments (page 14).

Organisation/Respondent	Summary of Comments	Response	Amendments to Development Brief
	<p>Archaeological remains discovered during the construction of the bypass include: a Bronze Age round barrow and a possible Bronze Age cremation. Iron Age remains include a small cemetery of at least four square barrows within the route of the bypass and at least two separate Late Iron Age settlement sites. Lastly, there were extensive remains of early field systems (late prehistoric and Romano-British)</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>Historic Environment and Archaeology section expanded to incorporate Humber Archaeology comments (page 14).</p>
	<p>Huge potential for unrecorded archaeology and potential for groundworks to impact upon previously unknown heritage assets. HAP consider an EIA is required.</p>	<p>ERYC have formally confirmed that the development does not constitute EIS development.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>
	<p>Staged archaeological scheme of works should be carried out:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Desk based assessment, accompanied by a walkover survey 2. Geophysical survey of entire area of the Development Brief; 3. Gridded field-walking 4. Evaluation by Trial trenching 5. More extensive open area excavation (where appropriate) 6. Archaeological continuous monitoring of the topsoil strips <p>Watching briefs during the cutting of the major services (e.g. trenches, ducts</p>	<p>Acknowledge requirement for archaeological investigations and recommend that programme of work is conditioned as part of planning application.</p>	<p>Programme of archaeological works referred to in the archaeology section (page 14).</p>

Organisation/Respondent	Summary of Comments	Response	Amendments to Development Brief
	and chambers for sewers and water)		
National Grid c/o Amec	Site is within close proximity to National Grid's high pressure gas pipeline FM29 Ganstead to Asselby. NG require that no permanent structures are built over or under pipelines or within the zone specified in the agreements. We require unrestricted access.	Comments noted and matter will need to be considered as part of planning application.	No change required as matter is too detailed to be addressed in the masterplan.
Natural England	Advise that Ecology section of the report is updated in line with para 118 of the NPPF (any loss of biodiversity should be avoided, adequately mitigated or as last resort compensated). It may be helpful to refer to ecology work of southern bypass, although the surveys may be out of date.	Appreciate the significance of para 118 of NPPF and the need to avoid, then mitigate any loss of habitats. The brief makes it clear that any ecological impacts would be mitigated and opportunity for further ecological enhancements would be explored.	Opportunities for ecology enhancement have been re-emphasised in section 4 (pages 14-16) and Section 6 (page 29)
	Welcome the recognition of the opportunity to create wildlife habitats and green corridors and advise that	Comments noted.	No change required.

Organisation/Respondent	Summary of Comments	Response	Amendments to Development Brief
	multi-functional green infrastructure can perform a range of functions including improved flood risk management, provision of accessible green space, climate change adaption and biodiversity enhancement.		
	Development brief should take opportunities to incorporate features that benefit wildlife (e.g. bat roosts or bird boxes within built structure)	This matter is section 6 address on Page 29.	No change required.
	Development Brief should emphasis local community benefits through green space provision and access to and contact with nature.	This matter is section 6 address on Page 30.	No change required.
	Welcome the proposal to include landscape buffering for the site and advise that you take into consideration the Local Landscape Character Assessment for Beverley and the Holderness National Characters Area (NCA) profile	Comments noted.	No change required.
Network Rail	1. Landscaping - the buffer along the railway line would be acceptable provided that there is a permanent 1.8m fence along the length of the site adj to the railway line. Careful choice of tree species.	Comments noted and will consider matter in the design process in preparation of the planning application.	No change required.
	2. Drainage - Dyke beneath the railway	Comments noted and will	No change required.

Organisation/Respondent	Summary of Comments	Response	Amendments to Development Brief
	line - NR require confirmation that the capacity of the culvert would not be exceeded by the run-off from the development and necessary scour protection works are put in place.	consider matter in the design process in preparation of the planning application.	
	3. No School or children's play area located next to the railway.	Comments noted.	No change required.
	4. Flemingate Level Crossing: any Transport Assessment should indicate the likely level of increase of traffic over the crossing with any increased safety measures provided commensurate with the risk increase.	Comments noted and will consider matter in the TA to support the planning application.	No change required.
	5. Armstrong Way crossing - same concerns as Flemingate.	Comments noted and will consider matter in the TA to support the planning application.	No change required.
	6. England Springs - This is a bridleway with private vehicular rights over the crossing. Brief should explore the potential closure of this crossing (extinguishment or diversion) but crossing not mentioned. NR policy to seek closure of level crossings wherever possible on safety grounds. A Transport Assessment will have to carry out a risk assessment of the crossing and provide a solution to the problem.	Appreciate Health and Safety concerns about level crossings. Further discussions with ERYC regarding future of railway crossing in the preparation of the planning application.	No change required.
	7. Level Crossing at 7miles 700 yards is an unprotected foot crossing. Ideally	Diversion of footpaths over the by-pass and closure of	Diversion of footpaths over the by-pass and

Organisation/Respondent	Summary of Comments	Response	Amendments to Development Brief
	<p>this should be diverted to cross the railway by means of the new by-pass bridge to the south. Risk Assessment would be required.</p>	<p>this crossing is now proposed.</p>	<p>closure of this crossing is now proposed.</p>
	<p>8. If Travel Plan promotes cycling additional cycle parking should be provided at the station.</p>	<p>Comments noted but Station is outside of the terms of the Development Brief.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>
	<p>9. Suggested S106 obligations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) financial contribution towards improvements to Flemingate and Armstrong Way level crossings b) financial contribution towards the elimination of England Springs crossing c) Diversion of footpath over the crossing at 7 miles 700 yards over the bypass bridge d) contributions towards public transport improvements include appropriate facilities at the railway station. 	<p>Planning Obligations will be discussed with ERYC as part of the application process. Opportunities to improve accessibility across, and to and from the site will be explored which may include upgrading public rights of way such as Spark Mill Lane.</p>	<p>Section 6 Access and Movement section reaffirms that opportunities to improve or enhance the public rights of way will also be explored (page 25)</p>
<p>Sport England</p>	<p>SE welcome the addition of a playing field and by being adj to the existing leisure centre & playing it has the potential to create a sporting hub for Beverley. The design and layout of new playing field should accommodate the appropriate range of pitches. The PPS recognises a shortfall for junior and mini football pitches, cricket, rugby</p>	<p>Comments noted. Further discussion will take place with ERYC to determine exact requirement for sports provision for future planning application.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>

Organisation/Respondent	Summary of Comments	Response	Amendments to Development Brief
	league and rugby union. There is an oversupply of adult pitches. The development brief should examine whether existing changing accommodation has the capacity to serve the new playing field.		
Yorkshire Water	Takes on board previous comments	Comments noted.	No change required.
NHS England	No comments received		
RSPB	No comments received		
Homes and Community Agency	No comments received		

Organisation/Respondent	Summary of Comments		
East Riding Access Forum	No comments from group forwarded comments from Peter Ayling Local Access Forum Member: 1. Lack of discussion about PROW - existing routes should be protected and the design plan fitted around them. Improving the connectivity of PROW would be consistent with the ERYC Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP).	Existing rights of way to be improved and additional linkages provided to employment area and the by-pass.	Development Brief amended.
	2. Not all statutory consultees were consulted. May not	Noted. Other consultees would be consulted following	No changes to the Development Brief

Organisation/Respondent	Summary of Comments		
	reach everyone who wants to comment on the development brief.	the submission of a Planning Application.	required.
	3. Further analysis of the landscape required. The significance and extent of the former Beverley Deer Park and Old Hall Farm of 1670 could have been enlarged upon.	Planning applications would need to deal with the details of landscaping showing those features to be retained and those to be removed.	Development Brief amended to provide additional landscape information.
	4. Page 22 - Common Lands surrounding the town will have been maintained and where possible enhanced - this is surely the responsibility of the Pasture Masters	Noted.	No changes to the Development Brief required.
	5. Too many dwellings, over 1,000 dwellings is too dense, with minimal supporting facilities. A figure of 300 would be more realistic and allow some of the existing landscape features to be maintained.	Noted and housing reduced to Local Plan requirements.	Housing figures amended to reflect Local Plan estimates.
	6. If this development goes ahead at anything like the proposed density, along with others under discussion for the south of Beverley, the boundary between Beverley	Noted - by-pass provides a defensible boundary to a development in South Beverley.	No change required.

Organisation/Respondent	Summary of Comments		
	and Cottingham to the south will be reduced to about 2.5-3kms		
Humberside Police	Provide general 'designing out crime' advice.	Already incorporated into the Development Brief.	No change required.
Beverley & District Civic Society	Civic Society still very concerned by the extent of the development to the south of the town. More detailed comprehensive planning required with site to west of the railway line to give some cohesion.	Comprehensive planning of the site and the details of development would be provided in planning application documentation. The site is divorced from West Beverley by the railway and there is limited connection between the two. The public have recently been given a chance to have their say on proposals within the draft Masterplan for the South West of Beverley (the other side of the rail line).	No change required.
	Concerned that the number of homes has increased from 761 to 1,000. agree greater density should be nearer town and along spine roads.	Noted and housing reduced to Local Plan requirements.	Development Brief amended to reduce housing numbers to Local Plan requirement.
	Support EH concerns re. protecting views on Minster and recognise current proposals go some way to	See comments above	Development Brief amended as set out above.

Organisation/Respondent	Summary of Comments		
	address these concerns.		
	Provision of drainage and sewerage needs to be addressed, sewage works under considerable strain.	Already included in the Development Brief. Individual planning applications would need to provide details of foul and surface water drainage.	No changes required.
	In the long term we would prefer access to be made from the edges of the site to the south and east and not off Flemingate. We are not sure that there is sufficient space between the Western side of the Sports Centre and the railway line to accommodate a two-way road, with P&R buses and a combines cycle and pedestrian path.	The main vehicular access to the site will now be from the Bypass and the access to Flemingate would be for buses, pedestrians and cyclists only.	Development Brief amended to make this clear.
	Entry off Hull Road into Parklands will need to be redesigned to avoid potential congestion and tailbacks	The access from Parklands would only be a secondary access or used for emergency only if required by the Highways Authority.	No changes required.
	Development could be phased from the eastern end, this would allow the construction of the road onto Flemingate for the P&R bus. Will the passage of time access could be allowed from the southern	Development would be phased from both the eastern and western sides of the site so as to ensure the early provision of the Park and Ride facility.	Development Brief amended to make this clear.

Organisation/Respondent	Summary of Comments		
	bypass but it would be necessary to restrict access so it wouldn't become an alternative entry to town.		
	P&R needs to be provided as soon as possible, therefore building of access roundabout on the southern relief road is a priority.	Noted and subject to finance it is the intention to provide the P&R early in the plan period.	Development Brief amended to make this clear.
	The brief should consider the capacity and land area for the P&R and include a contingency for future expansion	Enough land has been identified for the Park and Ride facilities including a contingency for future expansion. Details of the Park and Ride would be provided in the Planning Application documentation.	No changes required.
	More thought to design of the bus route into town, local plan refers to a 'dedicated bus route. However, the present proposals include provision for general traffic to access the site off Flemingate which is a point of concern.	Note the concern about access for general traffic to Flemingate. It is now the intention that the access to Flemingate will be for bus, pedestrians and cyclists only.	Development Brief amended to make this clear.
	The establishment of 'Southwood' has been a long-standing policy. The development provides an opportunity to provide a new	Noted and provision has been made within the draft Masterplan for land west of the railway for a significant area of open space. A	No changes required.

Organisation/Respondent	Summary of Comments		
	and distinctive 'common' which could include flood attenuation areas, green buffer to the railway and additional playing fields.	significant amount of land has been provided for as open space within this development brief.	
	There is a real need for affordable housing in Beverley. The developers should be made to enter into a S106 to build affordable housing at the correct percentage.	Noted. Affordable housing will be provided in accordance with the requirements of the Local Plan.	No changes required.
Beverley & District Civic Society cont.	Provision of education facilities needs to be addressed. Access to existing facilities will be problematic for parents and young children as the railway cuts off a direct route to Keldmarsh and route to St Nicholas School is difficult.	Noted and new footpath links proposed to Woodmansey Mile and the by-pass.	Development Brief amended by the addition of footpath links.
	We support proposal for employment but concerned that this may be reduced to 4 hectares.	Noted but the proposed employment area reflects the Local Plan policy.	No changes required.
	Civic Amenity should be provided in the designated employment area.	Noted but a location within the park and ride area is preferred by the Council as well as other consultees.	No changes required.
Cllr Kerri Harold (ERYC)	Overall a good proposal with the right mix of uses. Fully	Employment land has been incorporated as part of the	Recycling centre has been re-positioned to within the

Organisation/Respondent	Summary of Comments		
	<p>support P&R & extension to pitch space at Leisure Centre.</p> <p>The employment land should be office space & B1/retail only - no B2. The recycling site should be house within P&R element & sited alongside the overpass to hide from view.</p> <p>As ward councillor can only support if recycling centre was removed from current employment land position. It is too near the busy A1174 & could lead to traffic build up & other highway issues.</p>	<p>Concept Master Plan for the site in accordance with the requirements of the Local Plan. It is envisaged that this would be primarily B1 uses. The Household Recycling Facility (HRF) has been removed from the employment land allocation.</p>	<p>park and ride area.</p>
<p>Cllr David Elvidge (ERYC)</p>	<p>The opportunity to extend the Leisure Centre and provide a long awaited and much needed P&R. Also welcome the employment area and recycling centre.</p> <p>Would rather recycling centre was co-located with P&R away from existing residents (Parklands).</p>	<p>The Household Recycling Facility (HRF) has been removed from the employment land allocation.</p>	<p>Recycling centre has been re-positioned to within the park and ride area.</p>
<p>Cllr Jim Whitfield (Beverley Town Council)</p>	<p>Welcome good quality development in this area. Proper design, thoughtful retention of green area,</p>	<p>As detailed in Chapter 06 Concept Masterplan 'Access and Movement', the scheme has been designed to</p>	<p>No change required.</p>

Organisation/Respondent	Summary of Comments		
	<p>provision of play areas, creation of pedestrian & cycle routes will enhance an important expansion of Beverley's / Woodmansey's population & housing mix.</p> <p>As was inevitable can't dislike them enough to oppose them. As offered they seem rational and reasonable though others may quibble about density, school / shop / amenity provision. The relocation of the recycling site will cause comment but could be done well.</p> <p>Uncertain how existing rights of way & access along existing bridleways will be incorporated into the plan. Sparkmill Lane is unadopted, unsurfaced and unlit. Improvements to it welcome. Countryside character will be affected / lost.</p>	<p>incorporate the existing public rights of way. Opportunities to improve or enhance the existing will be explored.</p>	
<p>Cllr DE Peacock (ERYC)</p>	<p>The P&R - but ... The recycling plant has to go where the P&R is, The light industrial has to be office / better a Hotel</p>	<p>The Household Recycling Facility (HRF) has been removed from the employment land allocation.</p>	<p>Recycling centre has been re-positioned to within the park and ride area.</p>
<p>Comments from the general public</p>	<p>Lack of cycle route on road No continuity shown to</p>	<p>The revised Concept Master Plan as shown in Figure 8 of</p>	<p>Revised development brief confirms that no general</p>

Organisation/Respondent	Summary of Comments		
	<p>connect to off site cycle routes. Potential for rat run from P&R roundabout to Flemingate & Beverley town centre.</p>	<p>the Development Brief, shows key pedestrian and cycle links providing connectivity throughout the site linking to the wider area. The Design Brief further specifies design guidelines to ensure that any development that takes place adds to the overall Master Plan principles and corresponds with policy EMV1 of the emerging Local Plan Strategy Document. In terms of the internal network of streets within the site, the road and building alignments will combine to achieve the appropriate design speeds for traffic. By incorporating various traffic calming measures into the scheme will prevent any potential rat run through the site.</p>	<p>vehicular access to Flemingate will be provided from the site (only access for buses, cyclists and pedestrians)</p>
	<p>It seems to be a logical use of available land to create the much needed P&R scheme for Beverley - plus housing & improved leisure facilities. There for a win win solution</p> <p>Will be interested to hear the view of other residents & listen to possible objections or counter proposals.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>

Organisation/Respondent	Summary of Comments		
	<p>Welcome mixed developments - employment, leisure as well as housing.</p> <p>Better pedestrian link to Figham Pasture would be advantageous. Employees worth discussing with adjoining land owners and especially ERYC. Possibly part of a round Beverley walk?</p>	<p>Comments acknowledged. The Site provides for suitable pedestrian and cycle access linking the green spaces and provide for connections beyond the Site.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>
	<p>Like the idea of having a park where I live as there isn't one near. A place to play when I don't have any where to go.</p> <p>Dislike no recycling place. Using too much fields/green land.</p>	<p>The Concept Master Plan of the Development Brief provides Children's play areas in the form of Neighbourhood Equipped Area of Play (NEAP) and x 2 Local Equipped Area of Play (LEAPs) evenly distributed across the site to ensure ease of access to all. In addition, the Development Brief specifies that local greens will be provided around the development providing informal play areas. Each green will be fronted by development providing a sense of enclosure and provide a greater sense of security for children at play.</p>	<p>Household Waste Recycling Centre Provided for in the brief.</p>
	<p>There is nothing other than the facility of the P&R but it is in wrong place.</p>	<p>The Household Recycling Facility (HRF) has now been removed from the</p>	<p>Recycling centre has been re-positioned to within the park and ride area.</p>

Organisation/Respondent	Summary of Comments		
	<p>Recycling Centre too close to current housing. Business park blocking views of minster. Wrong place for P&R. Increase of traffic down Holmechurch Lane/Grovehill /Swinemoor. No provision for current housing/residents play area.</p> <p>Blocking Long Lane will cause delays for Emergency vehicles. The area proposed is a drainage zone and tarmac/houses will cause more flooding. Put P&R on Grovehill Brownfield site. Turn area into tourist attraction. Environmentally aware.</p>	<p>employment land allocation. As detailed in Chapter 06 Concept Masterplan, there is scope to vary the density across the site having regard to the setting of the Minster, and through the creation of landscaping to the south will help to assimilate the build form with the surrounding countryside. The Concept Masterplan for the site provides two main spine roads through the development enabling good connectivity across the site. The positioning of these routes will assist to disperse traffic and minimise the impact on the existing local road networks such as Holmechurch Lane, Grovehill and Swinemoor. A NEAP and x 2 LEAPs is proposed and will be evenly distributed throughout the Site in accordance with the Concept Masterplan, alongside green/open spaces which will be available for new and existing residents.</p> <p>There are no proposals to block Long Lane currently.</p>	<p>Position of the Park and Ride has been made so as to intercept traffic from the busy A164 heading into Beverley as well as giving good access from the new by-pass.</p>

Organisation/Respondent	Summary of Comments		
	<p>Totally unsatisfactory. Access unsuitable. No access to bypass. Beverley Parkland access already unsafe for present, numbers no provision for present pathways. Too many people for present facilities & vehicles for roads.</p> <p>Previous statements by ERC Leader stated this area would remain farmland etc.</p>	<p>Access from the bypass has been incorporated into the concept masterplan. The principal access to the development is proposed from the P&R roundabout and the Figham roundabout as shown in Figure 9 of the Development Brief. In addition, the site has been designed to incorporate the existing public rights of way through the site.</p> <p>The current Local Plan at the time (Beverley Borough Local Plan) did not include any large scale proposals for this area.</p>	<p>Principal accesses to the site will be drawn from the by-pass with a possible secondary access from an improved length of Beverley Parklands.</p>
	<p>I believe insufficient thought has been given to traffic congestion on Swinemoor Lane. This will become a bottleneck as traffic exits from the new bypass.</p> <p>I think the Leisure Centre will need extra space for cricket / football/ hockey and other outdoor team facilities. P&R should have a railway station.</p>	<p>The Concept Masterplan for the site provides two main spine roads through the development enabling good connectivity across the site. The positioning of these routes will assist to disperse traffic and minimise the impact on the existing local road networks. Impact of additional traffic on the towns road network has been assessed and is acceptable.</p> <p>Due to the short distances</p>	<p>No change required.</p>

Organisation/Respondent	Summary of Comments		
		involved between the existing rail station and the proposed park and ride- the bus based park and ride option is considered to be the most cost effective and efficient solution to meet the town's needs.	
	<p>Beverley is in danger of becoming practically a new town. As a historic market town the charm & character is in danger of being lost. The bypass was needed to remove cars from Beverley. This plan simply adds to the problem.</p> <p>Have walked, run, cycled over this land for 25 years+ and to see it given to housing is a sin. Beverley should not be allowed to get any larger. How many houses will have parking available i.e. private parking. Will a tip be part of this housing estate.</p>	The site is in a sustainable location with good access to a range of public transport options and it is a short walk or cycle to local shops and services.	Principal accesses to the site will be drawn from the by-pass with a possible secondary access from an improved length of Beverley Parklands. No general traffic will now be directed towards Flemingate.
	Dislike development brief. Why did ERYC state that this area will not be developed	The current Local Plan at the time (Beverley Borough Local Plan) did not include any large scale proposals for this area.	No change required.
	The P&R - but ... Access to the P&R needs to be from the	The Park and Ride will be accessible directly from the	No change required.

Organisation/Respondent	Summary of Comments		
	<p>bypass so car traffic not leading back into town - defeating the purpose of the bypass</p> <p>It is essential that the housing includes the highest level of affordable housing regardless of the economic Advisors. We need to keep younger people in the town & offer them more employment.</p>	<p>Bypass via the Park and Ride Roundabout as shown in Figure 9 of the Development Brief. The development aims to provide a proportion of affordable housing as required by policy H2 to address local housing needs. The affordable housing provision would comprise a range of intermediate tenures such as affordable rent, low cost ownership, shared equity as well as social rented.</p>	
	<p>Good mix of types of development - essential that P&R is built & that access by bus along railway line edge and with roundabout on bypass from the start.</p> <p>Having the civic amenity / refuse unit at the point where bypass exits is a nightmare in terms of traffic - move it within the P&R</p> <p>If the replacement MUGA is not sorted on the Leisure Centre site part of the extended sports land must be for this. What types of employment on the site -</p>	<p>The Household Recycling Facility (HRF) has been removed from the employment land allocation.</p>	<p>Recycling centre has been re-positioned to within the park and ride area.</p>

Organisation/Respondent	Summary of Comments		
	<p>please no more retail or low level jobs. Offices or a hotel at least.</p>		
	<p>Affordable housing available</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt land between existing housing and new Bypass Road. Involvement in the closure of Flemingate rail crossing which will be very detrimental to people living in the south/east area of Beverley. It will cut off access from the western side of the railway line to people visiting the leisure centre and the new Flemingate development when completed.</p> <p>Can assurance that no Bridleway or footpaths as on Ordnance survey map 293 are diverted or closed.</p>	<p>The Flemingate crossing closure has not been included within the Development Brief as this is not related to the development of this site.</p> <p>The development of this Site will attempt to avoid closure of footpaths, however if their closure is required for enhancements this will be for a temporary period only. Permanent diversion of footpaths would be in the interest of improvements to safety or accessibility enhancements.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>
	<p>Not much. We were constantly told these plans were nothing like the final plan and to be honest there was very little important detail shown on them. Mislabelling the recycling area as a possible job zone was misleading</p> <p>Lack of access to area, poor use of new ring road. No link</p>	<p>As part of the preparation of the final Concept Masterplan, consultations are held to allow the local community and statutory consultees to make their comments and to help shape the final scheme. The most recent Concept Masterplan (Figure 8) in the Development Brief takes into account the various</p>	<p>Recycling centre has been re-positioned to within the park and ride area.</p>

Organisation/Respondent	Summary of Comments		
	<p>for pedestrians over railway line to new school, doctors etc. Will cause extra traffic in Beverley for school runs. The recycling depot should not be near housing. Road for park & ride not made clear. No detail about flood precautions.</p> <p>The exhibition should have shown how this development links to the other side of the railway lines. It should be planned as a whole, not in isolation to each other as the new infrastructure will be shared. Will the affordable housing be built this time?</p>	<p>comments made and provides further detail of the overall development i.e. land uses, access and movement, landscaping and Design. As part of the comments received a pedestrian/cycle link has been incorporated into the scheme and provides a connecting link across the rail line to an existing footpath.</p> <p>The development aims to provide a proportion of affordable housing as required by policy H2 to address local housing needs. The affordable housing provision would comprise a range of intermediate tenures such as affordable rent, low cost ownership, shared equity as well as social rented.</p> <p>The public have recently been given their chance to have their say on proposals within the draft Masterplan for the South West of Beverley (the other side of the rail line).</p>	
	We were constantly told these	As part of the preparation of	Recycling centre has been

Organisation/Respondent	Summary of Comments		
	<p>plans were nothing like the final plan and to be honest there was very little important detail shown on them. Mislabelling the recycling area as a possible job zone was misleading</p> <p>"Up to 25% affordable" could mean as little as as 1%. Should read "at least 25% affordable". All the extra cars form "executive" homes will worsen the already bad traffic situation which the new bypass will not improve.</p> <p>Where are all the extra doctors surgeries coming from? We already have to wait 2 weeks to see a doctor. The Drainage situation is bad in Beverley. How will local sewage system cope? How will you keep us informed? I do not have a computer</p>	<p>the final Concept Masterplan, consultations are held to allow the local community and statutory consultees to make their comments and to help shape the final scheme. The most recent Concept Masterplan (Figure 8) in the Development Brief takes into account the various comments made and provides further detail of the overall development i.e. land uses, access and movement, landscaping and Design.</p> <p>The development aims to provide a proportion of affordable housing as required by policy H2 to address local housing needs. The affordable housing provision would comprise a range of intermediate tenures such as affordable rent, low cost ownership, shared equity as well as social rented.</p> <p>In terms of drainage at the site, it has been considered as part of the Development Brief and any future development would be</p>	<p>re-positioned to within the park and ride area rather than within the employment area.</p>

Organisation/Respondent	Summary of Comments		
		<p>required to ensure the sufficient disposal of foul and surface water including the use of sustainable urban drainage systems to limit surface water run-off to the existing greenfield rate or less.</p> <p>Other infrastructure provision necessary to accommodate development proposed as part of the East Riding Local Plan has been assessed as part of the Council's Infrastructure Study. The Local Plan provides for infrastructure improvements accordingly.</p>	
	<p>From the detail available at this meeting, it is not possible to say what is likeable. Being told this will not be the final plan does not help</p> <p>Lack of detail no information regarding how this development will link with development on the other side of the railway line. The only other green area appears to be used for water storage in flood times</p>	<p>As part of the preparation of the final Concept Masterplan, consultations are held to allow the local community and statutory consultees to make their comments and to help shape the final scheme. The Concept Masterplan (Figure 8) in the Development Brief takes into account the various comments made and provides further detail of the overall development i.e. land uses, access and movement,</p>	<p>No change required.</p>

Organisation/Respondent	Summary of Comments		
		<p>landscaping and Design. As part of the comments received key pedestrian/cycle links have been incorporated into the scheme and provides a connecting link across the development and beyond.</p> <p>The public have recently been given their chance to have their say on proposals within the draft Masterplan for the South West of Beverley (the other side of the rail line).</p>	