



Sutton Bridge

Main Service Centre

- Proposed Settlement Boundary
- Existing Main Employment Area
- Proposed Main Employment Area
- Local Employment Site
- Specific Occupier Site
- New Specific Occupier Site
- Existing Restricted Use Site
- Proposed Restricted Use Site
- Town Centre Boundary
- Primary Shopping Area
- Potential Housing Site
- Housing Commitment
- Recreational Open Space
- Green Infrastructure

Identifying potential housing sites in Sutton Bridge

The Requirement - the emerging Local Plan seeks the development of approximately 250 dwellings at Sutton Bridge between 2011 and 2036.

Completions - 19 new homes were built in Sutton Bridge between 1st April 2011 and 31st March 2015.

Commitments – as at 31st March 2015, planning permission was outstanding for the construction of 28 dwellings in Sutton Bridge, including the following sites which are assessed in the South East Lincolnshire Land Availability Assessment (SELLAA):

- Sub022 Wharf Street 12 dwellings

The SELLAA identifies that sites and are expected to be completed during the Plan period, and there is no evidence to suggest that any of the other planning permissions will not be implemented in the next five years.

Residual requirement - thus, the identification of land to accommodate approximately 203 dwellings is required.

Education - the County Education Department has been consulted and has commented that Sutton Bridge has a lack of capacity at both primary and secondary levels but there may be some ability to expand both.

Flood Risk - the Environment Agency has been consulted in relation to the submitted sites for Sutton Bridge and has made the following comments:

- Allocations in areas of hazard would need to ensure that finished floor levels are raised to the appropriate level with additional flood resilient construction incorporated into proposals. Developers would need to confirm that they can achieve required mitigation and proposal would still be deliverable. Although predominant source of risk is from tidal source, we also recommend consulting IDB to complete the picture of risk.
- Flood Risk Mitigation Policy to ensure 'safe' development. Finished floor levels (FFL) should be informed by the predicted flood depth maps and set as required below:
 - depths of >1.6m It is unlikely that mitigation measures would prevent flood water from entering the building at ground floor level. Therefore, proposals must be a minimum 2 storey with no ground floor habitable accommodation. The first floor living accommodation shall be above the highest predicted flood depth.
 - depths of 1-1.6m Proposals must be a minimum 2 storey, with FFL set a minimum of 1m above ground level, flood resilient construction shall be

used to a height 300mm above the predicted flood level, demountable defences to 600mm above FFL.

- depths 0.5 - 1m FFL to be set 1m above ground level, flood resilient construction shall be used to a height 300mm above the predicted flood level, (single storey proposals must consider the 0.1% +climate change event for setting FFL).

South Holland IDB have advised their target standards of protection are; water levels 0.6m below land level for a 1 in 10 year event for agriculture and 0.3m below land level for a 1 in 100 year event for development. They are undertaking flood modelling which is not yet complete.

Anglian Water has commented that the surface water network capacity has major constraints and all sites should seek to reduce flood risk and incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems.

Sewage Treatment – the Environment Agency has commented that Sutton Bridge water recycling centre has capacity for 3780 dwellings. Anglian water has commented that the water recycling centre has sufficient capacity for all 4 sites. The foul sewage network would require upgrading for 3 of the 4 sites.

Water Supply – Anglian Water has commented that there is adequate water capacity to meet the proposed development but the supply network would require upgrading for 3 of the 4 sites.

Deliverable and developable sites

The South East Lincolnshire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment identifies the following sites at Sutton Bridge which:

- Do not have a residential planning permission (or are not subject to a Committee resolution to grant permission);
- Are assessed as deliverable or developable, or are undevelopable only as a consequence of availability issues; and
- Will deliver 10 or more dwellings.

Sequentially preferable sites

Site	Flood Zone	Flood Hazard (2115)	Flood depth (2115)	Capacity	Notes
Sub013	3a	Danger for Most	0.5-1.0m	186	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lowest flood depth• There are no bad neighbour uses• It would extend the town towards the A17 like the Falklands estate has and therefore is in character

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waste water has sufficient capacity for this site • The foul sewage network requires upgrading for this site • Sewers cross the site • No developer involved
Sub016	3a	Danger for All	1-2m	62	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no bad neighbour uses. • It would extend the town to the north in character with its current form • Waste water has sufficient capacity for this site • The foul sewage network requires upgrading for this site • Worst flood depth
Sub018	3a	Danger for All	1-2m	109	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no bad neighbour uses • If developed with Sub024 the access could be shared between a number of roads, but some have issues which may not be easily solved • Waste water has sufficient capacity for this site • The foul sewage network requires upgrading for this site • Sewers cross the site and a pumping station is nearby • Worst flood depth
Sub024	3a	Danger for All	1-2m	74	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no bad neighbour uses • If developed with Sub018 the access could be shared between a number of roads, but some have issues which may not be easily solved • The waste water and foul sewage network has sufficient capacity for this site • Water mains and sewers cross the site • Worst flood depth

Options

The inclusion of all the sites as potential options would seem appropriate, although they would collectively accommodate some 431 dwellings.