

Questions and comments from members of the public.

1. It was asked how many parking spaces would be assigned to the houses on the site. There were local examples of where 4 bed dwellings had been provided with only one parking space. This was insufficient and there was already a lack of parking on the high street.

Response: the number of parking spaces would be in line with the District Council's policy.

2. 210 new houses were too many for the village. This would increase the population by around 700 and Sutton Bridge did not have the required infrastructure to cope. Examples were given of problems at current population levels with doctors, pharmacies, and schools.

Response: The site was allocated within the Adopted Local Plan for 210 dwellings and the District Council, as part of its own due diligence, would have considered the capacity of this site and Sutton Bridge's ability to accommodate this number of dwellings. Persimmon Homes had been in discussions with the NHS and County's Schools and Education, who had advised on likely S106 contributions that would be needed to mitigate the impact of the development.

3. It was said that Persimmon Homes had a poor reputation with specific instances of problems being mentioned. This was not as put forward in the promotional literature.

Response: The examples given did not fall within the East Midlands Region and Ms Dowling had no knowledge of the issues raised.

4. It was asked if there would be access from the current Falklands estate into the new development.

Response: there would be no access into the development from this estate.

5. An elector asked if anything could be done to improve access to the site, such as including a roundabout or traffic light system. There was concern about the number of cars that would be leaving the site onto Bridge Road, which was already overloaded with traffic.

Response: LCC highways had indicated that the proposed access was sufficient. Transport Consultants were looking into the matter and the planning application would be supported by a Transport Assessment.

6. It was asked if a pharmacy or supermarket had been planned for the development.

Response: this had never part of this development.

7. The Anchor Inn was concerned about potential noise disturbance from bands they have on Saturday nights and the implications for car parking on the frontage.

Response: Persimmon Homes would raise the issue of potential noise disturbance with its Noise Consultant so this matter could be considered. The existing car parking on the road frontage was on highway land and not Persimmon Homes land. These spaces were likely to be located within the visibility splays of the proposed access, so might not be usable in the future, this would be a matter for County Highways to consider.

8. The Anchor Inn suggested that the scheme needed two access roads in and out and be

Appendix 2: Persimmon Consultation Questions, Comments, & Developer Responses.

redesigned to provide for general parking to the front of the site and open space to increase the separation distance of dwellings from the pub. A speed camera was also needed to stop vehicles speeding.

Response: The company would consider this.

9. When would the development start and how long it will take to complete.

Response: The online public consultation event was to start later in the week with the planning application likely to be submitted before the summer. It then depended on how long it took for the District Council to determine the application, but it was hoped that this would be received before the end of this year, with building starting around the middle of 2024. The company expected to build 50 dwellings a year, so it would take approximately 4 years to complete.

10. Construction traffic should not be allowed to come through the village. There was also a school nearby:

Response: These comments were noted. Details of construction traffic routes would be included in the Construction Management Plan for the site which would need to be approved by the District Council. Jet wash facilities would also be provided on site to clean the vehicles before leaving.

Questions and comments from members of the Parish Council.

1. The figures laid out in the literature 'Investing in the Community Programme' did not add up.

Response: These were 'up to' figures.

2. The term 'SuDS' needed to be defined.

Response: 'Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems', which included ponds and swales on the site.

3. A definition of 'affordable housing' was required.

Response: affordable housing would comprise of a mix of first homes, affordable rent and shared ownership, in line with the National Planning Policy Framework and the Local Plan policy.

4. Would the affordable housing be 'pepper potted' and had a local provider been assigned for this housing?

Response: The affordable houses would be pepper potted as identified by the orange stars on the layout plan. No registered providers had yet been approached.

5. Concern was expressed at this being a 210-dwelling cul-de-sac with only one access onto Bridge Road. Had highways been involved with this decision?

Response: pre-application advice has been received from Lincolnshire County Council Highways who raised no objection in principle to the arrangement. The issue would be considered in detail in the Transport Assessment which would accompany the planning application.

6. As the area had been subject to past flooding, had South Holland Internal Drainage

Appendix 2: Persimmon Consultation Questions, Comments, & Developer Responses.

Board (SHIDB) been consulted?

Response: contact would be made with the Drainage Board if it had not already been done.

7. Concerns that the buildings would need to be raised to an extent that would be out of character with the areas. It was recommended that the application at Withington Street and the associated Environment Agency comments be looked at.

Response: tidal flooding was an issue but not fluvial flooding and the raising of site levels was not expected to be an issue. Site/floor levels would be included as part of the planning application. These were currently being investigated by the company's drainage consultant.

8. A guarantee was wanted that Persimmon Homes would not go back and argue viability and reduce the level of affordable housing provision.

Response: the company had undertaken due diligence in looking at the site and it was not its intention to do this, however it could not be guaranteed at this stage. The company had not done this at any of its other sites, including the recent development at Weston.

9. Would safety measures be put in place for the proposed pond.

Response: fencing could be erected around the pond to prevent public access. The pond would in the main be dry and would only likely hold water for short periods of time.

10. Would play equipment be installed on the planned open space and could this area be transferred over to the Parish Council care?

Response: the company was seeking views on what types of play equipment wanted as part of the development. The open space could be transferred to the Parish Council if this was desired.

11. Concerns were raised over the village's infrastructure capacity, including doctors, schools, and policing.

12. The access onto Bridge Roads needed to be filtered (as with Nightingales Way). Speeding vehicles along Bridge Road was a problem.

Response: These matters would be raised and considered by the company's Transport Consultant.

13. It was noted that the Parish Council would wish to be kept informed of the consultant's response to the perceived problem of access onto Bridge Road.

14. What pedestrian facilities will be provided?

Response: Emergency access proposed as part of the development could be used by pedestrians and footpaths along Bridge Street would be provided.

Following a previous request by a member of the public, the chair called a vote on who was in favour of the new development. A vote took place. There were twenty-three votes objecting to the development, with no votes in favour. There were two abstentions.