

East Riding Local Plan Scoping Consultation

Would you like to read more about our proposed approach to the Spatial Strategy?
Selecting 'Yes' will also allow you to make any comments you may have on this theme.

Yes

Have we identified the key matters for a spatial strategy? Please explain your answer.

A critical flaw is the absence of any limit on the number of sites accepted from a single landowner. In the example of Lockington, 7 out of 9 sites originate from one estate, resulting in future change being driven by landowner willingness to sell rather than defined housing need.

The timing of the Call for Sites—before meaningful community engagement—allowed landowner submissions to shape spatial options without residents being aware of the implications. This is alarming for many and will naturally drive the response focus towards specific sites

The emerging spatial strategy proposes nine development sites delivering 339 dwellings in Lockington—more than doubling the village's population. This scale of growth is wholly disproportionate to the settlement's size, role and function, and conflicts with the draft NPPF requirement to respect rural character and settlement hierarchy.

Conclusion

The spatial strategy, using Lockington as an example, is unsound, disproportionate, and not evidence led.

Are there any other reports, studies or assessments we should be aware of when preparing the new local plan?

Proposals for Improvement

Introduce a cap on the number of sites accepted from any single landowner.

Require early community notification before spatial options are formed.

Implement a settlement capacity threshold to ensure rural villages receive only proportionate growth.

Require cumulative impact screening before sites are accepted for assessment.

Do you want to read more about delivering a sufficient supply of homes?
Selecting 'Yes' will also allow you to make any comments you may have on this theme.

Yes

Have we identified the key matters relating to delivering a sufficient supply of housing? Please explain your answer.

The Parish Council supports proportionate rural housing, including affordable homes. However, in the case of Lockington, no evidence has been presented to justify 340 new homes in a village of 250 existing dwellings. The distribution appears landowner driven rather than need driven. Existing small infill opportunities already exist and would meet local need without overwhelming the settlement.

Conclusion

The proposed housing supply is not justified, not proportionate, and not aligned with local need.

Are there any other reports, studies or assessment we should be aware of when preparing the new local plan?

Proposals for Improvement

Require a settlement specific housing needs assessment before allocating sites.

Prioritise small scale infill and brownfield opportunities over large greenfield expansion.

Introduce a rural proportionality test to ensure housing numbers reflect settlement size and infrastructure capacity.

Would you like to read more about creating high quality, sustainable places?

Selecting 'Yes' will allow you to make any comments you may have on this theme.

Yes

Have we identified the key matters for creating high quality, sustainable places? Please explain your answer.

In the example of Lockington, it lacks the infrastructure required to support large scale development: no shop, no street lighting, limited public transport, narrow roads, limited school capacity, and inadequate sewage capacity.

The sewage system serving Lockington and Beswick already struggles, with controlled releases into Bryan Mills Beck during high water. No infrastructure strategy has been provided.

Conclusion

The scale of this proposed development cannot deliver a sustainable place.

Are there any other studies, reports or assessments we should be aware of when preparing the new local plan?

Proposals for Improvement

Require a village level infrastructure audit before allocating sites.

Introduce mandatory infrastructure phasing plans for rural settlements.

Require transport and safety assessments for all rural allocations.

Would you like to read more about ensuring the vitality of town centres?

Selecting 'Yes' will also allow you to make any comments you may have on this theme.

Yes

Have we identified the key matters for ensuring the vitality of town centres? Please explain your answer.

Lockington has no town centre. Large scale housing here would not support a service centre and would increase car dependency.

Conclusion

The proposals do not contribute to town centre vitality.

Are there any other studies, reports or assessments we should be aware of when preparing the new local plan?

Proposals for Improvement
Direct growth to settlements with existing service centres.
Require rural allocations to demonstrate reduced car dependency.

Would you like to read more about building a strong, effective economy?
Selecting 'Yes' will also allow you to make any comments you may have on this theme.

Yes

Have we identified the key matters for building a strong, effective economy? Please explain your answer.

Several proposed sites in the Lockington example are working farms, paddocks, equestrian businesses, or tenant farmer land. Removing these undermines rural economic activity.
Conclusion
The proposals conflict with NPPF paragraph 83 and would harm the rural economy.

Are there any other studies, reports or assessments we should be aware of when preparing the new local plan?

Proposals for Improvement
Require agricultural land impact assessments for rural sites.
Protect tenant farmer land from speculative development.
Prioritise sites that do not displace rural employment.

Would you like to read more about promoting sustainable transport?
Selecting 'Yes' will also allow you to make any comments you may have on this theme.

Yes

Have we identified the key matters for promoting sustainable transport? Please explain your answer.

Lockington's roads are narrow, rural, and often single track. They cannot safely accommodate hundreds of additional vehicles. Specific concerns include congestion near the school, dangerous junctions, and inadequate passing places.
The cumulative transport impact of nine development sites has not been assessed.
Conclusion
The village transport network cannot support the proposed scale of development.

Are there any other studies, reports or assessments we should be aware of when preparing the new local plan?

Proposals for Improvement
Require rural road capacity assessments before site acceptance.
Introduce a traffic impact threshold for rural settlements.
Mandate safe access design standards for all rural sites.

Would you like to read more about sustainable development and climate change?
Selecting 'Yes' will also allow you to make any comments you may have on this theme.

Yes

Have we identified the key matters for sustainable development and climate change? Please explain your answer.

Bryan Mills Beck is prone to overflow and has flooded previously. Several sites lie adjacent to flood sensitive land. Development would increase runoff and heighten flood risk.
Conclusion
The proposals are not climate resilient.

Are there any other studies, reports or assessments we should be aware of when preparing the new local plan?

Proposals for Improvement
Require climate resilience scoring for all rural sites.
Exclude sites adjacent to known flood sensitive watercourses.
Mandate natural flood management assessments

Would you like to read more about facilitating the sustainable use of minerals?
Selecting 'Yes' will also allow you to make any comments you may have on this theme.

Yes

Have we identified the key matters for facilitating the sustainable use of minerals? Please explain your answer.

Response
No mineral safeguarding issues identified.
Conclusion
No immediate concerns.

Are there any other studies, reports or assessments we should be aware of when preparing the new local plan?

Proposals for Improvement
Maintain mineral safeguarding mapping for rural areas.

Would you like to read more about managing waste?
Selecting 'Yes' will also allow you to make any comments you may have on this theme.

Yes

Have we identified the key matters for managing waste? Please explain your answer.

The sewage system is already at capacity and requires controlled discharges into the Bryan Mills Beck.
No waste infrastructure plan has been provided.
Conclusion
Waste infrastructure cannot support large scale development.

Are there any other studies, reports or assessments we should be aware of when preparing the new local plan?

Proposals for Improvement
Require wastewater capacity assessments before site acceptance.
Mandate upgrade commitments for any rural allocation exceeding 20 dwellings.

Would you like to read more about securing clean energy and water?
Selecting 'Yes' will also allow you to make any comments you may have on this theme.

Yes

Have we identified the key matters for securing clean energy and water? Please explain your answer.

Water supply and wastewater treatment capacity have not been assessed.
Conclusion
The proposals lack essential water infrastructure evidence.

Are there any other studies, reports or assessments we should be aware of when preparing the new local plan?

Proposals for Improvement
Require water supply capacity studies for rural settlements.
Mandate drainage impact modelling for all sites.

Would you like to read more about managing flood risk and coastal change?
Selecting 'Yes' will also allow you to make any comments you may have on this theme.

Yes

Have we identified the key matters for managing flood risk and coastal change? Please explain your answer.

Using the Call for Sites proposals , several Lockington sites lie within or adjacent to functional floodplain or drainage dykes. Plot 740 is particularly sensitive due to proximity to Bryan Mills Beck and ancient ridge and furrow land.
Conclusion
Flood risk is not being adequately assessed.

Are there any other studies, reports or assessments we should be aware of when preparing the new local plan?

Proposals for Improvement
Exclude sites within 100m of flood sensitive watercourses.
Require cumulative flood modelling for multi site villages.
Mandate independent flood risk verification.

Would you like to read more about pollution, public protection and security?
Selecting 'Yes' will also allow you to make any comments you may have on this theme.

Yes

Have we identified the key matters for pollution, public protection and security? Please explain your answer.

Concerns include sewage pollution into the Bryan Mills Beck, increased vehicle emissions, and loss of wildlife habitat.
Conclusion
The proposals increase pollution risk and reduce public protection.

Are there any other studies, reports or assessments we should be aware of when preparing the new local plan?

Proposals for Improvement
Require pollution risk scoring for rural sites.
Mandate air quality assessments for developments over 50 dwellings.

Would you like to read more about conserving and enhancing the natural environment?
Selecting 'Yes' will also allow you to make any comments you may have on this theme.

Yes

Have we identified the key matters for conserving and enhancing the natural environment? Please explain your answer.

Many sites contain rare and protected species, wildlife corridors, and ancient ridge and furrow land. No ecological surveys have recorded these species.
Conclusion
Ecological harm has not been assessed and is likely to be severe.

Are there any other studies, reports or assessments we should be aware of when preparing the new local plan?

Proposals for Improvement
Require full ecological surveys before site acceptance.
Introduce a biodiversity sensitivity threshold for rural sites.
Protect ancient landscape features such as ridge and furrow.

Would you like to read more about conserving and enhancing the historic environment?
Selecting 'Yes' will also allow you to make any comments you may have on this theme.

Yes

Have we identified the key matters for conserving and enhancing the historic environment? Please explain your answer.

Lockington is entirely a Conservation Area (Lockington Conservation Area Appraisal 2009). The call for sites selections threaten listed buildings, historic landscape, and rural character.

Conclusion

Using Lockington as an example, the proposals conflict with NPPF paragraphs 199–202 and would cause substantial heritage harm.

Are there any other studies, reports or assessments we should be aware of when preparing the new local plan?

Proposals for Improvement

Exclude sites within Conservation Areas unless exceptional justification is provided.

Require heritage setting assessments for all rural sites.

Introduce a heritage impact threshold preventing cumulative harm.

Would you like to read more about the approach to sites?
Selecting 'Yes' will also allow you to make any comments you may have on this theme.

Yes

Do you have any comments on our approach to site assessment and selection as set out in the draft methodology? Please explain your answer.

The Parish Council identifies failures in biodiversity, landscape, heritage, flood risk, safety, accessibility, and infrastructure factors. The methodology did not limit submissions from single landowners, did not require cumulative impact information, and did not include early community engagement.

The Parish Council requests removal of sites within Conservation Areas, reconsideration of all Lockington allocations in particular and requests an explanation of why these sites were accepted and published.

Conclusion

The methodology is incomplete, inconsistent, and insufficiently robust for rural settlements.

Proposals for Improvement

Introduce a single landowner submission cap.

Require cumulative impact assessments at submission stage.

Mandate community notification before site acceptance.

Require independent verification of site constraints.

Would you like to read more about environmental assessment?
Selecting 'Yes' will also allow you to make any comments you may have on this theme.

Yes

Do you have any comments on the approach to Environmental Assessment? Please explain your answer.

The Scoping Document does not assess cumulative impacts on ecology, heritage, transport, flood risk, or infrastructure.

Conclusion

The Environmental Assessment process is incomplete.

Proposals for Improvement

Require village-wide cumulative impact modelling.

Mandate multi-topic environmental scoring for rural sites.

Introduce sensitivity mapping for rural settlements.

Would you like to read more about the Infrastructure Delivery Plan Baseline?

Selecting 'Yes' will also allow you to make any comments you may have on this theme.

Yes

Do you have any comments on the draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan Baseline?

Do you agree with the proposed approach to assessing infrastructure requirements?

No evidence based justification has been provided for the scale of growth proposed. Infrastructure capacity is inadequate in the example of Lockington.

Conclusion

The IDP baseline does not support the proposed level of development.

Are there any additional infrastructure issues or evidence that we need to take into account in preparing the local plan?

Proposals for Improvement

Require settlement specific IDP chapters for rural villages.

Mandate infrastructure phasing tied to housing delivery.

Introduce minimum infrastructure standards for rural allocations.

Would you like to read more about our proposed approach to engagement and consultation?

Selecting 'Yes' will also allow you to make comments you may have on this theme.

Yes

Do you agree with our approach to engagement set out in the draft Local Plan Consultation and Engagement Plan? Please explain your answer.

The timing and methodology of the Call for Sites and Scoping Consultation isolated many residents most affected by the proposals. Reliance on online access, lack of local engagement events, and insufficient advance notice prevented meaningful participation. Publishing the Call for Sites map and then preventing residents from commenting on it specifically is unrealistic. The timing of the consultation(July and August) and the prohibitive complexity of the response categories and methodology works against inclusive engagement.

Conclusion

The consultation process did not meet the principles of early, inclusive engagement.

Proposals for Improvement

Require in village engagement events for rural communities.

Provide advance notification of consultations to Parish Councils.

Do you agree with our approach to engagement set out in the draft Local Plan Consultation and Engagement Plan? Please explain your answer.

Offer non digital consultation routes for digitally isolated residents.
Mandate community briefings when multiple sites are proposed in one village.

Please enter your name.

Title Mr

Forename Gareth

Surname Rees

Please enter your email address, so we can maintain a record of consultation responses in our contact database. We will keep you informed of progress on the East Riding Local Plan, in line with our privacy notice. *

clerk@lockingtonparishcouncil.gov.uk

Please provide the below details, where applicable.

Job title Clerk

Organisation Lockington Parish Council