

Cottingham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group  
Notes of meeting held Monday 24th February 2025

Present: Cllrs Casson (Chairman), Jump, Marten & Longbottom, Doug Jennings, Geraldine Mathieson (note-taker) and Katrin McClure.

Apologies were received from Cllr Graves

1. The meeting had been called specifically to respond to two consultations for ERYC Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD).

## 2. Open Space SPD

Having read the draft document, the group's recommendations were:

a. That the Play equipment condition should be enacted at a percentage of occupation of the whole site, not the last dwelling, to avoid a loophole of non-completion of the whole development, as seen at some sites.

b. Where provision is via S106 contributions, the definition of recreation facilities should include village or church halls which are hired for indoor activities, to ensure that the facilities available are of an adequate standard. This is particularly relevant to encourage active lifestyles where there is a larger elderly population whose preferred activity is yoga/tai chi/social dance etc, and/or to facilitate toddler groups, soft play or similar indoor activities for infants.

Members noted that provision would also be determined by the Playing fields and sports policy, and therefore new provision would not automatically be triggered by new housing where existing facilities had sufficient capacity.

## 3. Housing Needs SPD

Having read the draft document, the group's recommendations were primarily to welcome changes to previous policy, including:

- Adoption of national space standards for bedroom and dwelling sizes
- Recommendations for adaptability of dwellings

Recommended changes to the draft were:

- P24 – traveller sites design. The policy should be not merely to retain the existing character of the area, but to “retain or enhance” it.
- Older people's bungalows need to be at least 2-bed to allow for visiting relatives, overnight carers and accumulated possessions.

Members noted that the recommended Affordable Housing mix for Cottingham is reduced from the previous blanket figure of 25%, to 20% for greenfield sites & 15% for brownfield. This was accepted as being more achievable.

Further to the meeting, and on checking the format for consultation responses, the following wording of comments (where applicable) is recommended to the Parish Council, reflecting the discussions during the meeting.

### Open Space SPD Consultation

[https://www.eastriding.gov.uk/council/consultations/?entry=draft\\_open\\_space\\_supplementary\\_planning\\_document\\_consultation\\_2025](https://www.eastriding.gov.uk/council/consultations/?entry=draft_open_space_supplementary_planning_document_consultation_2025)

*Do you support the approach taken in Sections 1-4 (Introduction, What is Open Space?, Planning Policy Context, Local Evidence Base & Supporting Documents)?*

**Yes**

Partially

No

*Do you support the approach taken in Section 5 (Open Space Provision)?*

Yes

**Partially**

No

*Comment:* In reference to the types of open spaces required (5.24 et seq.), Cottingham Parish Council would prefer 'other types' of provision to be at a higher level of priority, such that where provision is via S106 contributions, the definition of recreation should include indoor provision at village or church halls. This is particularly relevant to encourage active lifestyles where there is a larger elderly population whose preferred activity is yoga/tai chi/social dance etc., and/and to facilitate toddler groups, soft play or similar indoor activities for infants.

*Do you support the approach taken in Section 6 (What should Open Space look like?)?*

**Yes**

Partially

No

*Do you support the approach taken in the Appendices?*

**Yes**

Partially

No

*Comment:* With regard to Appendix D, whilst the wording is appropriate in seeking a scheme of provision including "a timetable for its provision", ERYC needs to be mindful in discharging this condition of the loophole currently exploited by some developers. Where the timetable is in reference to completion or occupation of the final dwelling, a developer may find it financially advantageous to leaving the development incomplete and so avoid delivery of conditioned facilities. Such a loophole leaves residents at a disadvantage and the council with no means of enforcement.

## Housing Needs SPD Consultation

<https://consultation.eastriding.gov.uk/s/DraftHousingNeedsSupplementaryPlanningDocumentConsultation2025/>

*Do you support the approach taken in Sections 1-2 (Introduction, National Planning Policy and Evidence Base)?*

**Yes**

Partially

No

*Do you support the approach taken in Section 3 (Providing a Mix of Housing)?*

**Yes**

Partially

No

*Comment:* We welcome the range of housing types proposed for each area of the county, and very much welcome the adoption of Nationally Described Space Standards. Within Table 1, we query the 2-bed recommendation for Hull Borders, and wonder whether the 35-35% quoted should be a wider range, eg 30-35% as for Affordable Houses in Table 10.

*Do you support the approach taken in Section 4 (Meeting the Needs of Specific Groups)?*

**Yes**

Partially

No

*Comment:* Cottingham Parish Council particularly welcomes the proposal to specifically include bungalows into the housing mix to support downsizing by older residents, and welcomes high quality accessible/adaptable developments (4.7 to 4.10). However, we do not accept that one-bedroomed dwellings are suitable as older residents are very likely to require a second bedroom to accommodate visiting relatives, overnight carers, and space for treasured items accumulated over a lifetime. Moving to a smaller property becomes unattractive if the properties available are too small to meet residents' needs, with the consequence that larger family homes are not released to the market. At paragraph 4.37, we consider that developments should seek not only to retain the existing character of the site, but where appropriate could provide improvements. We therefore suggest that the wording be changed from "retain" to "retain or enhance".

*Do you support the approach taken in Section 5 (Housing Standards)?*

**Yes**

Partially

No

*Comment:* We fully support adoption of these standards.

*Do you support the approach taken in Section 6 (Affordable Housing)?*

**Yes**

Partially

No

*Comment:* We note that the requirements for Cottingham are lower than the previous blanket figure of 25% but accept that in the present market economy, this is probably more achievable, and support redevelopment of brownfield land.

*Do you support the approach taken in Section 7 (Rural Exception Sites)?*

**Yes**

Partially

No

*Do you support the approach taken in Section 8 (Community Led Housing)?*

**Yes**

Partially

No

*Do you support the approach taken in Sections 9-10 and the Appendices?*

**Yes**

Partially

No