

Cherry Burton

Total number of general responses logged against settlement in Draft Allocations Document: 20

Comment Ref(s)	Summary of comments	Officer Response
Highways Agency DA/6302	There are various sites proposed for development in the primary villages around the Beverley and Central sub area. Apart from one exception (in South Cave), all of these sites are either too small to concern the SRN, too far away from the SRN to impact upon it or have too many destination options which would disperse traffic and therefore minimise the impact on the SRN.	Noted
General	Object to development in Cherry Burton- the roads on Canada Drive cannot cope- emergency vehicles cannot access the cul-de-sacs off Canada Drive.	The one allocation requiring access off Canada Drive (CHER-B) has been reduced in size and a potential alternative access to Main Street to serve a small portion of the site made possible. Measures to reduce the impact of new development on the existing road network can be considered via a transport assessment/statement alongside future planning applications. Measures such as parking provision on site and traffic orders are available (yellow lines), may form suitable mitigation measures.
General and DA/6224 (Cherry Burton Parish Council)	The Cherry Burton crossroads on the B1248 cannot cope with further traffic from the village and there are safety concerns at the junction.	There isn't a recognised congestion issue at this junction although safety concerns have been noted. The site has been identified as one where the Council might introduce a small scale project with casualty reduction benefits.
General	Cycle and footpath networks are inadequate as the only footpath to Beverley means crossing the B1248 and hawthorn clippings means punctures for cyclists. (includes Parish Council View)	Comments noted. We will pass on concerns over the maintenance and quality of the footpath to the relevant Council department. It is impossible to have a cycle path to Beverley without the need to cross the B1248/A1035.
General and DA/6224 (Cherry Burton Parish Council)	Public transport is limited and not conducive to working hours (includes Parish Council View)	Although public transport is limited, there are opportunities to walk and cycle along the footpath/cycleway to Beverley. The amount of development proposed for the village (60 dwellings) is not large scale.
General	Detailed hydraulic study should take place and existing flooding issues resolved before any more development in the village. Specific flood assessments for each site is not adequate. Village has suffered flooding issues since the 1960s and if new	New development should not increase the risk of flooding in the village as surface water run off would be restricted to existing rates or less. Detailed study is ongoing but sites can still come forward safely before completion of this based on

	development causes further problems, the Council is liable.	existing knowledge and individual site assessments and mitigation.
General	The character of the village must be protected	Comment noted. Protecting good quality landscape and built character has been an important consideration during site assessment.
General	Insufficient services and facilities in the village to start promoting further development	It is necessary to promote some new development in order to meet housing needs. The village has a pub, village store, school, sports facilities, and footpath/cycle link to Beverley.
General	There are limited opportunities for work in the village and most people end up needing to commute out of the area to Beverley.	Accepted that opportunities for work are limited, hence only a relatively small number of new homes (60) are planned here to help meet housing needs.
Total number of general responses logged against settlement in Proposed Major Changes Document: 7		
General	I note that reasons for changes have been given for all sites except CHER1. Please can you state the reason that CHER1 no longer appears in the Local Plan or in the ongoing consultation.	Potential site CHER1 has never been included in the plan as a draft allocation
General	All drainage, sewerage, and flooding problems should be resolved before any development takes place on any site in the village.	New development should not increase the risk of flooding in the village as surface water run-off would be restricted to existing rates or less. Detailed hydraulic study is ongoing but sites can still come forward safely before completion of this based on existing knowledge and individual site assessments and mitigation.
PMC/497 (Cherry Burton Parish Council)	<p>Objections to the plan on Flooding, Village drainage system, Pumping station not coping, Sewage system, Increase in traffic volume, Parking and access issues, and increased volume of traffic at the B1248 crossroads.</p> <p>In favour of plan-_The promise to improve the drainage and sewage systems in the village before any development would mean benefits for the village as a whole, and maintaining a viable school, shop and pub</p> <p>In Summary- Cherry Burton Parish Council object to any new building developments in the village until the existing drainage and sewage systems are shown to be able to cope with the extra demands. In particular the North Drain out of the village needs to be more effective in getting water out of the village. There is</p>	<p>New development would not increase the risk of flooding in the village as surface water run-off would be restricted to existing rates or less. Yorkshire Water have not highlighted any issues with reasonably anticipated foul water flows being accommodated by the sewer network from the development proposed.</p> <p>There is no evidence suggesting the road network would not be able to cope with modest additional amount of traffic from the 60 additional homes proposed for the village. Allocation CHER-B has been reduced and the possibility of a modest access to Main Street provided for in order to reduce potential impacts on Canada Drive.</p>

	evidence to show that North Drain is partially blocked and there has been limited maintenance since before the previous flooding in 2007.	
DA/4877 (Yorkshire Water)	Recent issues around the foul water pumping station and local properties have been investigated and it appears that the underlying problem is high ground water levels rather than an issue with the sewerage system.	Comments noted.

CHER-A (CHER5/7)		
Total number of responses logged against site in Draft Allocations Document: n/a		
Comment Ref(s)	Summary of comments	Officer Response
Total number of responses logged against site in Proposed Major Changes Document: 28		
PMC/667 (Yorkshire Water)	There is adequate capacity in the public foul sewer network to take reasonably anticipated foul water flows from the proposal site.	Comment noted.
General	Sudden change in plans to allocate this site- all residents should have been notified.	We are unable to inform everyone specifically regarding each specific proposal within the Local Plan, however information regarding each of our consultations goes to every household in the East Riding via 'Your East Riding' magazine. Press releases are issued and we notify everyone who have responded to our plan previously about each consultation.
General	There will be a negative impact on traffic concerns along Highgate/Main Street which acts as a rat run from the A1079. There has already been a number of accidents in this area. Parked cars cause issues here too.	There is no evidence to suggest that the indicated 22 dwellings would exacerbate existing safety concerns along this stretch of road. Changes to the detailed road layout including traffic regulation orders such as parking restrictions and provision of parking can be considered via detailed planning applications for the site in a transport statement. This will give further consideration to road safety.
PMC/186 (Humber Archaeology Partnership)	We would support sympathetic development which included the retention and conversion of older traditional farm buildings at Manor Farm within the Conservation Area, as this might well give them a longer lease of life. This plot on the western edges of the existing village might well overlie earlier remains, but these are currently masked by the standing farm buildings; hence, we would suggest an archaeological response, but this could be done within the provisions of the NPPF.	Comment noted.
General	There will be a negative impact on the conservation area's	The policy for the site requires development to 'incorporate the retention and

	character, setting and appearance within which the site is located.	conversion of traditional buildings within the site'. With the retention of these buildings and the modest number of dwellings expected, significant impacts on the conservation area can be avoided. Detailed designs for the site will consider this issue further as specific proposals are developed for the site.
General (submission on behalf of landowner)	Welcome inclusion of the site as an allocation- expect that existing buildings on the site can be converted. Consider that the site could be extended to the north to provide certainty of deliverability and fund the relocation of farm facilities.	Comments noted. The site was not extended to the north due to the availability of an alternative more suitable site to accommodate the proposed number of dwellings for the village as assessed against the Site Assessment Methodology.
General	Would be an impact on wildlife which uses the site including nesting swallows and Barn Owls.	The potential impact on biodiversity of development has been assessed during site assessment against the Site Assessment Methodology. This will be considered in more detail as specific planning applications for the site are developed.
General	Development would protrude into the countryside impacting on landscape character. It would change a rural form to urban housing.	All of the available sites for development for the village would protrude into the countryside to a certain extent. This site to a lesser extent than the others and a site which already has built development on it.
General	Loss of working farm would change the rural nature of the village and lead to the loss of jobs.	The loss of the only working farm left in the village would change the character of the area to a degree but would also remove a source of noise for neighbouring residents.
General	No employment opportunities in the village apart from village store and pub, and insufficient bus service for people working elsewhere to use.	The modest amount of development proposed for the village reflects a requirement to meet housing needs whilst recognising the limited facilities in the village, including the school, shop, sports field and pub.
General	Why not use up other brownfield sites first before building on a working farm.	Every effort has been made to focus development on previously developed land, however there is not enough of this land to meet the area's housing needs to 2029.
General	The proposed development will also increase the strain on village drainage system, which I have been informed does not have capacity to cope with the new builds in the village, which will increase the risk of flooding both on Highgate and further into the village. The farmyard currently floods on a regular basis, causing a river down Highgate into the village center. This is from run off on mainly unbuilt land.	New development should not increase the risk of flooding in the village as surface water run-off would be restricted to existing rates or less. Detailed hydraulic study is ongoing but sites can still come forward safely before completion of this based on existing knowledge and individual site assessments and mitigation.
PMC/545 (English Heritage)	As the document notes, this site adjoins the boundary of Cherry Burton Conservation Area. Consequently we welcome the requirement in the Policy that the traditional buildings on the site should be retained.	Comments noted.
General	Can the school cope with the additional housing?	The Infrastructure Study has assessed the ability of the village primary school to accommodate the proposed development and it is able to accommodate the

		expected additional pupils as a result of new development.
General	CHER5/7 is within the Conservation Area, which in this part is characterised by individual cottage style dwellings along the main road frontage. Development of 22 residential properties to the rear of these properties would be inappropriate, and detract from the Conservation's character, setting and appearance. Also, it is noted that the site is adjoined by open countryside on three sides - along its north west, south west and north east (part) boundaries. We do not consider that additional landscape planting will enable the development to be integrated into the surrounding landscape.	The allocations policy for the site requires the retention and conversion of the traditional buildings within the site. It is considered the modest number of dwellings expected from the site would not result in an unacceptable impact on the conservation area, particularly since the vast majority of the site is set back from the street frontage.

CHER-B (CHER3/6)		
Total number of responses logged against site in Draft Allocations Document: 17		
Comment Ref(s)	Summary of comments	Officer Response
DA/4505 (Humber Archaeology Partnership)	The allocation site CHER3 is likely to have archaeological implications, and here we would recommend pre-determination evaluations by geophysical survey.	Comment noted. Detailed planning applications for the site should address this.
General	CHER 3 sits partially within a high flood risk zone and the recent Canada Drive defences mean that more water runs into this field during times of heavy rainfall.	The area north of North drain affected by this has been removed from the proposed housing allocation.
General	There is already a defined edge to the village here and further development would close the buffer between the village and the B1248 harming the built character of the settlement. (CHER3)	The lack of available infill plots within the village means the development limit needs to be extended in order to accommodate development. Built and landscape character have been important considerations during site assessment.
General and DA/2341 (Cherry Burton Parish Council)	The cul-de-sac access to the development is completely inadequate. (CHER3)	The indicative capacity of the proposed allocation has been reduced from 41 to 37 dwellings with a change of extent of its area. An alternative minor access to the site may now be possible via Main Street reducing the potential impact on Canada Drive.
General	The drainage network along the proposed access cul-de-sac may not be able to take further flows. Site was the subject of a public enquiry in the mid 1990s and the site was taken out of the last Local Plan. (CHER3)	Yorkshire Water have not highlighted any issues with the sewer network being able to accommodate reasonably anticipated foul water flows from the proposed development.
General	Support from owners of the site. Access can partially be achieved via a private track in their ownership through to main street. It is claimed that a cycle connection to the Hudson Way disused rail	Comments noted.

	line can be achieved. (CHER3)	
General and DA/2341 (Cherry Burton Parish Council)	Would like to know how north drain would be dealt with within the allocation- would it be built over? (CHER3). Un-attenuated additional storm flow from the CHER 3 area would put further load on to the North Drain capacity, and thereby increase the risk of flooding within the village and particularly low lying areas of Elm Drive.	The extent of the proposed allocation has been changed to exclude North Drain.
General (representation on behalf of land owner)	Supportive of the Draft Allocation and servicing and infrastructure issues are already being pursued . Landowner has already been involved in the supply of requisite rights required by the East Riding of Yorkshire Council for works associated with flood risk protection to Canada Drive by the building of a bund on their land.	Comment noted.
DA/4889, & DA/5416 (Yorkshire Water)	There are various water mains within the site boundary and a legal easement along the southern boundary This site yields less than 50 dwellings where it is assumed the reasonably expected foul flows will be accommodated and any issues can be addressed when a planning application is submitted.	Comment noted.

Total number of responses logged against site in Proposed Major Changes Document: 13

General	Concerned about the impact of development on neighbouring properties	This is a detailed matter to be dealt with once a detail planning application is developed and submitted for the site, where issues of scale, sunlight and overlooking will be considered.
General and PMC/548 (Cherry Burton Parish Council)	CHER6 - aware of at least one previous application for development that was declined on the basis of access. There is no indication of where access to CHER6 might be achieved, though I assume this could be via CHER3 and Canada Drive. Whatever, there is insignificant development gain in including CHER6 and it would be better retained as a 'buffer' zone between established properties and any new development on CHER3. if any access is planned past Rectory Barn it will be a serious hazard as there is little opportunity to make a safe entrance there because of wall height and the bend in the road. The residents of Rectory Barn would suffer too much of a change to their aspect to be reasonable.	Access option for the site are left open for consideration at the application stage, where detailed matters including road safety and visibility will need to be justified and agreed through a transport statement. It is not anticipated that there will be access to the majority of the site this way. The main access to the site is likely to be from Canada Drive

	Driveway too narrow.	
General	CHER3 - I agree with the proposal to remove CHER3r on the grounds of being in a high flood-risk area. However, the proposal does not go far enough, and more of CHER3 should be removed for the same reason. Proposals should also be required to deal with: traffic issues and public safety at existing road junctions,	Access option for the site are left open for consideration at the application stage, where detailed matters including road safety and visibility will need to be justified and agreed through a transport statement. The policy for the allocation required the public open space element of any proposal to be directed to the limited area of the site at high risk of flooding.
General	Sewerage and drainage capacity concerns with development of the site.	Yorkshire Water have not highlighted any issues with the sewer network being able to accommodate reasonably anticipated foul water flows from the proposed development. New development should not increase the risk of flooding in the village as surface water run off would be restricted to existing rates or less. Detailed study is ongoing but sites can still come forward safely before completion of this based on existing knowledge and individual site assessments and mitigation.
PMC/185 (Humber Archaeology Partnership)	Policy CHER3/6: this is an area adjoining the eastern end of the village. Whilst we see no reason to object to development here, based on current levels of knowledge, we would strongly recommend that this area be subject to pre-determination geophysical survey, in order to inform subsequent planning decisions, as the settlement lies within a much older Wolds landscape.	Comment noted.
PMC/544 (English Heritage)	As the document notes, this site adjoins the boundary of Cherry Burton Conservation Area. Consequently we welcome the requirement in Paragraph 8.2 that any scheme will need to have regard to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and its setting.	Comments noted.
PMC/667 (Yorkshire Water)	There is adequate capacity in the public foul sewer network to take reasonably anticipated foul water flows from the proposal site.	Comment noted.

CHER1

Total number of responses logged against site in Draft Allocations Document: 33

General	If CHER1 is developed this will lead to an increased run off of water into a drainage system that is already overloaded. The soakaway in the Meadows Estate cannot cope with more water.	New development would need to ensure that run-off is maintained at the greenfield rate or less through the use of sustainable drainage systems. Development should therefore not increase the risk of flooding outside the site.
---------	--	--

	The area is prone to rising springs.	Any springs would be an issue regardless of whether development took place on the site or not. This site has been rejected as an allocation.
General	I believe access to CHER1 is also inadequate. If access to the site is via the road leading to the playing fields, then all of this new traffic will enter the village via Bishop Burton Road which again is inadequate and not suitable for goods vehicles. The Meadows would be an unsuitable access for this development as it is narrow, on a bend, and congested with parked cars (including vehicles visiting the sports field).	Site remains rejected as an allocation.
General	There would be an impact on wildlife of developing this site CHER1 as there are many trees within the site. Impossible for development and access roads to and within the site to not damage the tree roots.	Site remains rejected as an allocation. Assessment of the impact on biodiversity formed an important part of the site assessment process. Impact on trees may be possible to mitigate but no details have been formally submitted to show this.
General	Claimed there is a restrictive covenant preventing access to CHER1 from the Meadows.	Noted
General	Access to CHER1 via the sports field driveway would be difficult to achieve as it would likely require the demolition of the sports pavilion and use of the current car park. Compensatory pavilion and sports field would be required.	Noted – access difficulties cited in reasons for rejection.
General	Development would spoil the attractiveness of this part of the village (CHER1)	Impact on built character and landscape have been important considerations during site assessment. Site remains rejected as an allocation.
General	Representations on behalf of Risby Homes and owners promoting the site state that access issues can be overcome by making use of the playing field access road, the tree preservation issues can also be overcome. Negotiations are taking place to achieve access to the sportsfield access road. We are aware of the covenant preventing access arrangements but this relates to time and money and doesn't prevent development from taking place. (CHER1)	No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that these issues have been or can actually be resolved.

Total number of responses logged against site in Proposed Major Changes Document: See general responses above

CHER2

Total number of responses logged against site in Draft Allocations Document: 21		
General and DA/2340 (Cherry Burton Parish Council)	Water from three flow paths accumulates on site CHER2 and this must be taken into account in considering future development. At times the field has flooded at around three metres wide flow path which then flows into the surface water systems. (includes Parish Council View)	This site has now been rejected as an allocation.
General	Development would impact on the character of the village as it is located beyond the village limits on a greenfield site.	This site has now been rejected as an allocation.
General and DA/2340 (Cherry Burton Parish Council)	Access to CHER2 is inadequate due to proximity to a blind corner on Etton Road. (includes Parish Council View)	It is not now proposed to allocate this site. Our highways section have indicated that access onto Etton Road would be possible without endangering safety.
General	The sewer and tap water systems cannot cope, water pressure is low to the west of the village at certain times. There were issues last Christmas when pumping capacity needed to be brought in to the village to help.(CHER2)	It is not now proposed to allocate this site . Yorkshire Water has informed that recent flooding issues have been caused by high groundwater levels rather than insufficient sewer capacity. New development would not have made the situation any worse. Yorkshire Water has not raised any issue of water pressure in the Village.
General	Properties to the south are served by a septic tank on the site	It is not now proposed to allocate this site. New development may have created an opportunity for these dwellings to convert to using the sewer system.
DA/4505 (Humber Archaeology Partnership)	The allocation site CHER2 is likely to have archaeological implications, and here we would recommend pre-determination evaluations by geophysical survey.	Comment noted.
DA/4889, & DA/5416 (Yorkshire Water)	There is a surface water outlet into watercourse in centre of site. This site yields less than 50 dwellings where it is assumed the reasonably expected foul flows will be accommodated and any issues can be addressed when a planning application is submitted.	Comment noted.
Total number of responses logged against site in Proposed Major Changes Document: 5		
PMIC/183 (Humber Archaeology Partnership)	When we commented previously, we pointed out that CHER2 were likely to have archaeological implications because of its location. We are, therefore, happy to support the rejection of Site CHER2.	Comment noted.
General	Pleased that the Council has recognised that CHER2 is an unsuitable site for housing, and thus has removed it from Draft Allocations Document. The site is in a prominent location and	Comment noted.

	<p>any development would be intrusive into the landscape, it suffers from flooding and drainage problems, has poor access, and is beyond the existing boundary of the village.</p>	
General (on behalf of site owner)	<p>Do not consider the site is intrusive against the landscape as it is barely visible from anywhere other than the road between Cherry Burton and Etton and is viewed from the north and west against a backdrop of existing residential properties. The use of the land is very limited in terms of modern agricultural practices and it is not intensively managed. It adjoins existing residential development, is not identified as being at risk from flooding, has road frontage and satisfactory access and presents an infill opportunity which would not result in the northern development limit of the village being extended any further into the countryside than the existing northern limit created by Canada Drive. Additionally the site is available and deliverable.</p> <p>Note the comment that proposed site CHER5/7 is considered more suitable to help meet housing requirement for the village. Having due regard to the existing and ongoing issues with access and flood risk in respect of proposed site CHER3/6 we consider sites CHER2 and CHER5/7 represent the most appropriate and suitable sites for additional residential development in the village.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The principal reasons for rejection of the site are that it is in a prominent location and that sufficient capacity exists in other, more suitable, identified sites to meet the village's housing requirement.</p>