

East Lindsey Local Plan
Issues and Options Paper
June 2021

Sustainability Appraisal

1 Introduction

What is a Sustainability Appraisal?

1.1 Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is a tool used to promote sustainable development when assessing plans and proposals. There are many definitions of what sustainable development is but the most widely used is:

'Development which meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs'

1.2 Legislation requires that certain plans and programmes must undergo Strategic Environmental Appraisal (SEA). This includes land use or spatial plans. The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 broadened the scope of this to require a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for all spatial plans.

1.3 The purpose of SA is to promote sustainable development through the integration of social, economic and environmental considerations in the preparation of planning policy documents. The purpose of SEA is to consider the likely significant effects of implementing the Plan on the environment, specifically on the issues of:

- Population and human health;
- Flora, Fauna and biodiversity;
- Soil;
- Water;
- Air;
- Climatic factors; and
- Cultural heritage and landscape.

1.4 The Sustainability Appraisal brings both of these processes together in one document covering both processes.

Stages in Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment

Table 1

	Plan Preparation Stage	SA Process	SEA Process
Pre-production	Evidence Gathering	Stage A : Setting the context, the baseline and deciding on the scope	Stage A : Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding on the scope
Production	Prepare Issues and Options	Stage B : Developing and refining options and assessing the effects	Stage B : Developing and refining alternatives and assessing effects
		Stage C : Prepare SA report	Stage C : Prepare the Environmental Report
	Public Participation on draft Plan		Stage D : Consulting on the draft plan or

	Representations on Preferred Options	Stage D : Consulting on the draft SA and SA report	programme and the Environmental Report
	Prepare Submission Plan		
	Submit Plan to Secretary of State		
Examination	Independent Examination	↓	↓
	Inspectors Report		
Adoption	Adoption		
Monitoring	Implementation, Monitoring and Review	Stage E : Monitoring the significant effects of implementing the SPD	Stage E : Monitoring the significant effects of implementing the plan or programme on the environment

East Lindsey Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal

1.5 The East Lindsey Local Plan, which was adopted in July 2018, was subject to SA throughout its preparation. That Plan is now undergoing a partial review and the various stages of that review will also be subject to SA.

1.6 Table 1 above sets out the stages in carrying out SA and SEA. As this is a partial review of the Local Plan it is appropriate to use the same SA objectives as were used for the SA of the original plan so that there is consistency across the Plan's assessment. Therefore, there is no need to carry out stage A.

1.7 Stage B of the Sustainability Appraisal is divided into 5 stages:

- B1 - Testing the Plan's Objectives;
- B2 - Developing Strategic Alternatives;
- B3 and B4 - Predicting and Evaluating the Effects of the Preferred Options;
- B5 – Considering Ways of Mitigating Adverse Effects and Maximising Beneficial Effects; and
- B6 – Proposing Measures to Monitor the Significant Effects of Implementing the Local Plan.

Purpose of this Report

1.8 Again, as this is a partial review, and the overall objectives of the Plan are not being changed, stage B1 is not being carried out. Therefore, this report covers Stage B2 of the Sustainability Appraisal and appraises the options that are being put forward as part of the partial review of the Local Plan.

2 The Appraisal Methodology

2.1 The SA guidance requires that options are put forward and tested to see how they perform, relative to each other and against the sustainability objectives. The 15 options in the Issues and Options Paper have been assessed against the 13 SA objectives which are set out below in Table 2. The table also shows how these SA objectives relate to the SEA issues.

Table 2 – Sustainability Objectives

Sustainability Appraisal Objective		SEA Issues
1	Protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the areas' biodiversity (native plants and animals) and geodiversity.	Flora, Fauna and Biodiversity
2	Protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the areas' landscapes, townscapes and historic environment	Landscape and Cultural Heritage
3	Protect natural resources from avoidable losses and pollution and minimise the impacts of unavoidable losses and pollution	Air; Climatic Factors; Water; Flora, Fauna and Biodiversity; Population and Human Health
4	Avoid the risk of flooding (where possible) and fully mitigate against the impacts of flooding where it cannot be avoided	Cultural Heritage; Water; Climatic Factors; Population and Human Health
5	Promote viable and diverse economic growth that supports communities within the district	Population and Human Health
6	Prioritise appropriate re-use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of the best agricultural land and greenfield sites.	Flora, Fauna, Biodiversity; and Soil
7	Improve accessibility to key services, facilities, amenities and green infrastructure including the promotion of sustainable modes of access.	Population and Human Health; and Climatic Factors
8	Increase reuse and recycling rates and minimise the production of waste	Population and Human Health; and Landscape
9	Support inclusive, safe and vibrant communities	Population and Human Health
10	Ensure that local housing needs are met	Population and Human Health
11	Increase energy efficiency and ensure appropriate sustainable design, construction and operation of new development.	Population and Human Health
12	Encourage and provide the facilities and infrastructure for healthy lifestyles	Population and Human Health
13	Positively plan for, and minimise the effects of, climate change	All SEA topics

2.3 The impacts of the options have to be expressed in a manner that allows comparison. For consistency, the same reporting mechanism has been used as for the original Issues and Options SA testing for the 2018 Local Plan. So the tables in appendix 1 express the potential impact in the following way:

Table 3

Option accords with the objective
Options would have a negative effect without mitigation or a neutral effect with mitigation
Option has no link to objective
Option has impact on the objective that cannot be quantified
Option does not accord with the objective

2.4 Within each box in the table in appendix 1 there is a commentary explaining what has led to the potential impact identified.

3 Relevant Plans and Programmes

International, national and local plans and policies

3.1 The Scoping Report includes a comprehensive list of legislation, plans and programmes at international, national and local levels which have informed the content of the Plan and the appraisal process. It is not intended to repeat that list in this document; it can be found in table B1 at appendix B of the Scoping Report. The original Scoping Report was updated to reflect changes to these plans, policies and programmes to ensure that the document retains its relevance.

Relevant Social, Environmental and Economic Priorities

3.2 The analysis of the identified plans, policies and programmes has helped to shape the social, environmental and economic priorities that have influenced the preparation of the East Lindsey Local Plan. Table 4 below provides a summary of the key priorities.

Table 4 – Relevant Social, Environmental and Economic Priorities

Topic	Key Priority
Society	To promote good public health, reduce inequality and encourage healthy lifestyles
	To create social inclusion and reduce rural isolation
	To reduce crime and the fear of crime
	To reduce fuel poverty through low energy use and energy efficiency
	To improve access to sustainable modes of transport
	To direct development to the areas of lowest flood risk and reduce the risk of flooding
	To improve access to affordable housing
	To encourage high quality design and engender a sense of place and community
Environment	To protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity assets
	To adapt to and manage the effects of climate change
	To protect groundwater, air quality and soil quality
	To preserve and enhance the historic environment
	To reduce the production of waste and increase recycling
	To increase the production of energy from renewable sources
	To protect and enhance landscape quality
Economy	To create the right environment for a growing economy
	To proactively support economic development
	To increase skill levels to increase aspirations and support the local economy
	To facilitate, promote and deliver tourism in a sustainable way
	To support towns to enhance their vitality and viability

3.3 These priorities do not represent the whole list of issues that shape the future of East Lindsey district, but they represent the key areas that have shaped the Local Plan and which reflect the priorities of international, national and local plans and programmes to which the Local Plan should have observance.

3.4 The Sustainability Appraisal of the 2018 Local Plan establishes the Sustainability Framework. This is not repeated here but can be viewed in that document. In the Framework, for each objective, a series of sub-objectives are identified that help to relate the higher level, strategic objectives to the more locally developed policies and help to illustrate the nature of the indicators needed to monitor the plan. It also sets indicators to enable the effects of the plan to be monitored.

4 Summary of Options Testing

The first spatial options in the Issues and Options Paper relate to whether or not the Plan continues with its current strategy of separate policies for the coastal area or brings the policies together with one strategy for the District.

Option C1 - Have two distinct housing areas – one inland and one coastal

There are a lot of uncertain outcomes for both options C1 and C2 as the options do not set out the detail of the strategy which will be followed if either of these options are chosen. Consequently, for C1, there is uncertainty for the effects on biodiversity; landscape; access to services and facilities; energy efficiency; and infrastructure for healthy lifestyles as much will depend on where development is forthcoming. Impacts on objectives for flood risk; inclusive, safe and vibrant communities; and positively planning for climate change are identified as having a negative effect without mitigation or a neutral effect with mitigation. This is as a result of the option allowing for some housing development along the coast beyond that allowed under the current Plan. Use of brownfield land also has the same outcome as the option is silent on how this issue will be dealt with and without policies to encourage the use of previously developed land, this could be a negative outcome. However, this is a common issue across the district due to the low levels of previously developed land in East Lindsey. Different approaches to housing in the two areas will allow the differing affordable housing needs to be addressed and so this is identified as a positive outcome.

Option C2 - Do not have a split and have a single housing strategy and set of policies that cover the whole District

There are some similarities in the outcomes for options C2 and C1, however, there are a number of important differences. The outcomes for biodiversity are more significant. Option C2 is likely to result in a greater amount of development in the coastal area and the East Lindsey coastline is protected along its length by a number of internationally designated sites for biodiversity. The potential for negative outcomes to those sites from increased development on the coast is high without suitable mitigation being introduced and this will need to be taken into account if this option is pursued. The other difference from C1 is that the increase in development along the coast will be taking place in an area of significant flood risk. Unlike option C1, C2 makes no reference to flood risk so it is currently identified as a negative outcome for avoiding flood risk, as well as supporting inclusive, safe and vibrant communities and planning positively for climate change. Again, if this option were to be pursued mitigation would be needed.

If there is a split between coastal and inland, how will housing be distributed in the coastal areas?

Option D1 - A strong focus on the main urban centres of Mablethorpe and Skegness, with restraint on housing elsewhere

Option D1 would see the coastal growth focused primarily in Mablethorpe and Skegness. As the East Lindsey coastline is protected along its length by a number of internationally designated sites for biodiversity, the potential for negative outcomes to those sites from increased development on the coast is high without suitable mitigation being introduced and this will need to be taken into account if this option is pursued. Similarly, this option is likely to result in significant urban

extension at the two towns with subsequent localised impact on landscape. This will require mitigation in the form of strategic landscaping and the creation of Green Infrastructure. Any development has the potential to impact on natural resources in respect of water, air, and loss of productive agricultural land. It is difficult to distinguish between the options in terms of natural resources as the overall level of development is not affected, only the location. Loss of agricultural land is likely to be an issue with all options, although the degree to which this happens will need to be assessed through the individual site assessments. The effects of development in these two towns did not form part of the previous Water Cycle Study as they were not areas of growth in the 2018 Plan. It is therefore uncertain what level of capacity there is to accommodate additional housing in these locations.

Mablethorpe and Skegness are in areas of significant flood risk. The option mentions that development may take place in flood risk areas but makes no mention of the need for mitigation, therefore, focusing development on these two towns would conflict with this objective and consequently the SA objectives for flood risk and supporting inclusive, safe and vibrant communities. This has a negative impact on the SA objective of planning positively for climate change. However, this objective covers a wide range of issues, some of which are more positively affected by this option and there could be some positive benefits to other aspects of planning for climate change. Therefore the assessment records an outcome of a negative effect without mitigation or a neutral effect with mitigation.

Positive outcomes are identified for promoting viable and diverse economic growth; improving accessibility to services and facilities; ensuring local housing needs are met; increasing energy efficiency and ensure appropriate sustainable design, construction; and infrastructure for health lifestyles.

Option D2 - Settlement Hierarchy led by the two main towns of Mablethorpe and Skegness

Option D2 identifies the same outcomes as D1. The difference between the two options will come in the magnitude. Some of the positive benefits of strategic growth may be diluted as development is spread over a wider area, although there may be some positive benefits for some of the larger villages. Similarly, some of the negative outcomes may be experienced by a large number of settlements.

Option D3 - Unrestrained dispersal of development throughout all settlements in the coastal area

D3 presents more negative outcomes than the two previous options. D3 shares the negative outcomes in respect of flood risk and loss of greenfield sites, however, it does not bring with the other positive benefits identified. The potential impacts on biodiversity will be magnified if development comes forward in an unplanned way, with the cumulative impact of widespread development not mitigated for and the potential for impacts will be spread along a greater length of the coast. Similarly the impact on landscape and townscape will be exacerbated with the risk of more infill development taking place on open spaces in the smaller villages in addition to edge of settlement development. The distribution of development across the coast may exacerbate issues of isolation and access to facilities, and infrastructure for healthy lifestyles, as more development will be

taking place in smaller settlements. This will limit the opportunities to support community infrastructure through development and may reduce the ability to create the economies of scale to support such facilities elsewhere. Opportunities to provide for local housing need will also be limited by this option, both in terms of bringing forward development through section 106 agreements and in terms of the range of market housing being developed. Opportunities for community scale energy efficiency will be limited.

Option D3 is not clear in its approach to economic growth away from the smaller villages. The scenario refers to increased opportunities for small businesses in the rural areas, but does not outline a strategy for the rest of the coast in terms of promoting diverse economic growth, this will need addressing.

Option D4 - Restrained housing growth to meet natural population growth needs

There are a lot of uncertain outcomes with option D4. This is due to the fact that the size and location of new sites coming forward is not currently known. Without knowing where development would come forward, it is difficult to assess what the impact will be. If the prevalence of affordable need and previously developed sites is in the larger settlements, there could be some positive outcomes in areas such as access to services and facilities, supporting inclusive communities, infrastructure for energy efficiency and sustainable design and construction, and infrastructure for healthy lifestyles. However, a wider distribution of smaller sites will make it harder for such issues to be addressed.

The lack of detail in respect of the location of development means that it is not possible to assess the impact on biodiversity and landscape. These could be negative if development comes forward in amounts and locations that are sensitive to development. Although this option looks to restrain housing growth in the coast, the numbers of properties within the coastal will still be increasing, and so the number of properties at risk of flooding and requiring evacuation. The option suggests that there would be opportunities to promote innovative housing types to mitigate flood risk, however, this is only part of the objective; the first being to avoid the risk of flooding where possible. Therefore this outcome is negative.

There are some positive outcomes to the option, in terms of prioritising previously developed land and ensuring local housing needs are met.

Option D5 - Creating a New Town

There are a lot of uncertain outcomes for the option of creating a new town as so many of the outcomes will depend on the scale and location of the proposal. Impacts on biodiversity will depend on the site chosen. Landscape impact may also be mitigated through site selection and appropriate strategic landscaping. The option is silent on how economic growth will be addressed so cannot be assessed, although it is assumed that a new town will come with a strategy to provide employment for residents. Similarly access to services and facilities; supporting inclusive, safe and vibrant communities; ensuring local housing needs; and planning for climate change have uncertain outcomes. Until the strategies behind these aspects are outlined, they cannot be properly assessed. Focusing much of new investment in one location may have knock on effects for investment in other parts of the coast but this cannot be clearly assessed without further data.

Negative impacts include the loss of agricultural land as it is unlikely that a sufficiently large brownfield site could be found within the coast to accommodate the new town due to the low level of such land. Without an indication of the location of any potential New Town, it is difficult to assess the impact on flood risk. However, unless a significant, suitable, site can be found outside the hazard mapping areas, any development is likely to in (or partially within the flood hazard areas would be contrary to the objective as flood risk could be avoided by being located elsewhere. On the other hand, developing a new town would lend itself to increasing energy efficiency and sustainable design and construction.

If there is a split between coastal and inland, how will housing be distributed in the inland areas?

Option E1 - A strong focus on the main urban centres of Louth, Alford, Spilsby and Horncastle, with restraint on housing elsewhere

Focusing inland development on a number of towns would bring about positive benefits for promoting viable and diverse economic growth; improving accessibility to facilities and Green Infrastructure; inclusive, safe and vibrant communities; ensuring that local housing needs are met; increasing energy efficiency and appropriate sustainable design, construction; infrastructure for healthy lifestyles; and planning for climate change.

The issues that will require mitigation are biodiversity as the size of urban extension required to accommodate growth in these towns is likely to impact on biodiversity without suitable mitigation. Again, the urban extensions required will bring landscape impacts and all of the towns are close the Lincolnshire Wolds AONB so are particularly sensitive. The towns also all contain conservation areas, groups of listed building and other heritage assets which will need mitigation. There is a negative outcome for the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land and greenfield sites.

Option E2 - Settlement hierarchy led by the towns

Option E2 identifies the same outcomes as E1. The difference between the two options will come in the magnitude. Some of the positive benefits of strategic growth may be diluted as development is spread over a wider area, although there may be some positive benefits for some of the larger villages. Similarly, some of the negative outcomes may be experienced by a large number of settlements.

Option E3 - Unrestrained dispersal of development throughout all settlements in the inland area

Option E3 presents more negative outcomes than the two previous options. E3 shares the negative outcome in respect loss of agricultural land and greenfield sites with options E1 and E2, although the nature of these impacts will differ. The dispersed nature of development also brings about other negative impacts. The concerns about the impact on biodiversity will be magnified if development comes forward in an unplanned way, with the cumulative impact of widespread development not mitigated for. Similarly the impact on landscape and townscape will be exacerbated with the risk of more infill development taking place on open spaces in the smaller villages in addition to edge of settlement development. The

distribution of development may exacerbate problems of isolation and access to facilities and Green Infrastructure; supporting inclusive, safe and vibrant communities; and in infrastructure for healthy lifestyles. As more development will be taking place in smaller settlements, this will limit the opportunities to support community infrastructure through development and may reduce the ability to create the economies of scale to support such facilities elsewhere. Opportunities to provide for local housing need will also be limited by this option, both in term of bringing forward development through section 106 agreements and in terms of the range of market housing being developed. Opportunities for community scale energy efficiency will be limited.

Option E3 is not clear in its approach to economic growth away from the smaller villages. The scenario refers to increased opportunities for small businesses in the rural areas, but does not outline a strategy for the rest of the district in terms of promoting diverse economic growth, this will need addressing. Impacts on flood risk will also need mitigating. Although there are areas of flood risk in the inland part of the District, most communities have opportunities for development outside of flood risk areas and Option E3 will need to address this.

Option E4 - Creating a New Town

There are a lot of uncertain outcomes for the option of creating a new town as so many of the outcomes will depend on the scale and location of the proposal. Impacts on biodiversity will depend on the site chosen. Landscape impact may also be mitigated through site selection and appropriate strategic landscaping, but much will depend on the location. Similarly access to services and facilities; supporting inclusive, safe and vibrant communities; infrastructure for healthy lifestyles; and planning for climate change are uncertain until the strategies behind these aspects are outlined.

Negative impacts include the loss of agricultural land as it is unlikely that a sufficiently large brownfield site could be found to accommodate the new town due to the low prevalence of such land. Also, the focus of development, and inward investment, would be in one location so limiting the potential to help grow and diversify the wider district's economy.

There are flood risk areas inland but these are in the minority and a site could be selected that was outside of flood risk areas but care will have to be taken to ensure that the development of a new site does not create or add to drainage issues. This option will be accompanied by a strategy for the development of affordable homes (provider led and market) but the strategy will have to provide suitable mitigation to ensure this does not lead to the need for affordable housing not being met in other settlements.

On a positive note, developing a new town would lend itself to increasing energy efficiency and sustainable design and construction.

How will housing be distributed if there is a single housing strategy for the whole District?

Option F1 - A strong focus on the main urban centres, with restraint on housing elsewhere

Focusing development in the towns will bring forward urban extensions in these locations. There may be need for mitigation in all locations but Mablethorpe and Skegness, which abut sites of international importance for biodiversity will require particular attention in this area. Again, the urban extensions required will bring landscape impacts around all of the towns. A number of the inland towns are also close the Lincolnshire Wolds AONB so are particularly sensitive to the impact of development and suitable mitigation will be needed or the impact of this objective will be negative. The challenge of flood risk varies across the different parts of the district. Mitigation through seeking lower risk areas and flood resilient design will be needed, otherwise this option would have a negative impact on this objective, and similarly on the objective of supporting inclusive, safe and vibrant communities. Although the focus of development will help inclusivity and vibrancy in communities, if flood risk is not addressed, there will be safety concerns. The SA objective of planning positively for climate change covers a wide range of issues, some of which are more positive affected by this option and there could be some positive benefits to other aspects of planning for climate change. Therefore the assessment records an outcome of a negative effect without mitigation or a neutral effect with mitigation due to the flood risk issues.

In common with most other options, there are negative outcomes for minimising the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land and greenfield sites as, even with the promotion of previously developed land, there is unlikely to be sufficient coming forward in these locations.

There are positive benefits in terms of promoting viable and diverse economic growth; ensuring local housing needs are met; increasing energy efficiency and sustainable design and construction; and infrastructure for healthy lifestyles.

Option F2 - Settlement hierarchy led by the towns

Outcomes for option F2 are similar to those for option F1 albeit there will be differences in magnitude between the two options. Some of the positive benefits may be diluted as development is spread over a wider area and, similarly, some of the negative outcomes may be experienced by a large number of settlements. There is a difference in relation to viable and diverse economic growth. The text of option F2 refers to significant scale of development and growth opportunities in four towns (in addition to the development led regeneration in Mablethorpe and Skegness) but however, there is no reference to the promotion of economic growth in the other towns. Development of the option would need to be clear about how economic growth would be delivered across the inland towns or it would conflict with this objective.

Option F3 - Settlement hierarchy with coastal regeneration

The outcomes for option F3 are very similar to F1, due to the focus of development on the coast. The difference being in respect of the SA objective for promoting

viable and diverse economic growth. Whereas the scenario for option F1 includes the promotion of new employment opportunities in the towns, this is missing from option F3 and emphasis is on economic growth in Mablethorpe and Skegness. Without some mitigation through ensuing policies, this will lead to a negative outcome for the rest of the district.

Option F4 - Unrestrained dispersal of development throughout all settlements

Option F4 produces a number of negative outcomes. It shares the negative outcome in respect loss of agricultural land and greenfield sites with other options due the low level of previously used land in the district. However, the dispersed nature of development under this option also brings about other negative impacts. The concerns about the impact on biodiversity will be magnified if development comes forward in an unplanned way, with the cumulative impact of widespread development not mitigated for. As this option will allow for development throughout the coast, these impacts are potential wider spread in an area which contains sites protected for biodiversity at an international level. Similarly the impact on landscape and townscape will be exacerbated with the risk of more infill development taking place on open spaces in the smaller villages in addition to edge of settlement development. The distribution of development may exacerbate problems of isolation and access to facilities and Green Infrastructure; supporting inclusive, safe and vibrant communities; and in infrastructure for healthy lifestyles, as more development will be taking place in smaller settlements. This will limit the opportunities to support community infrastructure, through development and may reduce the ability to create the economies of scale to support such facilities elsewhere. Opportunities to provide for local housing need will also be limited by this option, both in term of bringing forward development through section 106 agreements and in terms of the range of market housing being developed. Opportunities for community scale energy efficiency and sustainable design will be limited.

Option F4 is not clear in its approach to economic growth away from the smaller villages. The scenario refers to increased opportunities for small businesses in the rural areas, but does not outline a strategy for the rest of the district in terms of promoting diverse economic growth, this will need addressing. Impacts on flood risk will also need mitigating. The challenge of flood risk varies across the different parts of the district. Mitigation through seeking lower risk areas and flood resilient design will be needed, otherwise this option would have a negative impact on this objective, similarly the objective of supporting inclusive, safe and vibrant communities. Although some development will help inclusivity and vibrancy in communities, if flood risk is not addressed, there will be safety concerns. The SA objective of planning positively for climate change covers a wide range of issues, some of which are more positive affected by this option and there could be some positive benefits to other aspects of planning for climate change. Therefore the assessment records an outcome of a negative effect without mitigation or a neutral effect with mitigation due to the flood risk issues.

Option F5 - Creating a New Town

Outcomes between option D4 and F5 are quite similar. There are a lot of uncertain outcomes for the option of creating a new town as so many of the outcomes will depend on the scale and location of the proposal. Impacts on biodiversity will

depend on the site chosen. Landscape impact may also be mitigated through site selection and appropriate strategic landscaping. The option is silent on how economic growth will be addressed so cannot be assessed, although it is assumed that a new town will come with a strategy to provide employment for residents. Similarly access to services and facilities; supporting inclusive, safe and vibrant communities; and planning for climate change are uncertain until the strategies behind these aspects are outlined. Focusing much of new investment in one location may have knock on effects for investment in other parts of the coast but this cannot be clearly assessed without further data. Negative impacts include the loss of agricultural land as it is unlikely that a sufficiently large brownfield site could be found to accommodate the new town due to the low prevalence of such land. On the other hand, developing a new town would lend itself to increasing energy efficiency and sustainable design and construction.

The outcome for flood risk differs as option F5 covers the whole district and the new town could be sited in a location away from flood risk or other drainage issues, however, this is not explicit in the option. The SA objective for viable and diverse economic growth has a negative outcome as this growth will be focused in one location, with the implication that economic development elsewhere will not be forthcoming. The SA objective for ensuring local housing needs are met is also negative as the option focuses all affordable housing in this location and has no strategy for meeting housing need elsewhere.

5 Next Steps

5.1 This document will form part of the consultation on the Issues and Options paper and is subject to comment as part of the consultation. Once the responses to the consultation on the Issues and Options paper and accompanying documents have been received, they will be used to help inform the drawing up of the Council's Preferred Options. The SA will also form part of this exercise. As new policies emerge, they will be subject to sustainability appraisal, to try to seek the best balance for a sustainable future planning policy strategy for East Lindsey. The final Sustainability Report will show how the appraisal has been used to inform and influence policy choices and any mitigation that may have been introduced to ameliorate the potential impacts of the policies.

Appendix

Option	Option C1 - have two distinct housing areas – one inland and one coastal	Option C2 – do not have a split and have a single housing strategy and set of policies that cover the whole District	Split - Coastal Housing	Option D1 – a strong focus on the main urban centres of Mablethorpe and Skegness, with restraint on housing elsewhere	Option D2 – Settlement Hierarchy led by the two main towns of Mablethorpe and Skegness	Option D3 – Unrestrained dispersal of development throughout all settlements in the coastal area	Option D4 Restrained housing growth to meet natural population growth needs	Option D5 - Creating a New Town
1. Biodiversity	Having two distinct housing areas will mean that there may be some increase in housing development coming forward on the Coast which was not assessed at the time of the 2018 Plan. Although the policy requirements will place some limitations on the amount of development coming forward, sites will be close to some of the sites protected at the highest level for biodiversity. The nature and degree of the impact will depend on the volume of development and location of development and so effects are uncertain.	A single housing strategy across the District means that there is likely to be a significant increase in housing development coming forward on the coast, which was not assessed in the 2018 Plan. This development will be close to some of the sites protected at the highest level for biodiversity. The nature and degree of the impact will depend on the volume of development and location of sites and without appropriate mitigation, there is the potential for negative impacts to take place.		Focusing growth on Mablethorpe and Skegness is likely to lead to an increase in housing development coming forward close to some of the sites protected at the highest level for biodiversity. The nature and degree of the impact will depend on the volume and location of development. However, if the entire focus of coastal development is on Mablethorpe and Skegness, which abut sites of international importance for biodiversity, it is likely that there will be negative impact without appropriate mitigation. Placing all the coastal development in these locations could create opportunities for biodiversity net	Establishing a hierarchy for the coast, albeit with a large focus on growth in Mablethorpe and Skegness, will spread pressure on the internationally designated sites across a larger area of coast. Some of the settlements in the coastal area are inland from the protected sites and, although these still have potential to create impacts, they may reduce some of the direct impacts. How the growth is distributed will affect the impact of development. Without knowing the volume of development and location of sites the effects cannot be quantified but they will be negative without suitable mitigation.	Unlike situations where the location and scale of development is shaped by a strategy which has been assessed, if development is unrestrained applications will be coming forward in an unplanned manner. Although each application will be judged against the biodiversity policy in the Plan, there will not be the opportunity to manage the cumulative effects of development on the protection sites along the coast.	This option does not make any allocations for housing. Instead housing will be brought forward through affordable housing and redevelopment of brownfield land; and through existing commitments. There is currently no indication of the amount of previously developed land that may come forward under this option and any development would come forward in an unplanned way. Its impacts on the sites protected for biodiversity along the coast are unknown. Previously developed sites are more likely to come forward in the towns, due to historic development, but there is no certainty that this will happen. Similarly, with affordable housing as the numbers requiring such housing is likely to be in the towns	Without an indication of the location of any potential New Town, the options has to be identified as unquantifiable. The impacts will vary considerably dependent upon its scale and location: e.g. is the site previously used land or greenfield land, how close is it to any sites for protected for their biodiversity. There are likely to impacts on biodiversity wherever such development is located, although the scale and degree of impact will vary between sites. Impacts could be mitigated though choice of site, net gain measures, creation of green infrastructure and other methods of mitigation.

				gain and habitat creation/ expansion, but this has to be countered by any harm caused.			and the economies of scale to provide it are more likely in larger settlements. However, this is not certain and the impacts on biodiversity not know at this time. The reason this option is identified as uncertain, as opposed to the negative for option D3, is that the quantum of development is likely to be less given the criteria to be met for windfall sites.	
2. Landscapes, townscapes and historic environment	Having two distinct housing areas may mean that are differences in the way housing is brought forward in different parts of the district with regard to impacts on this objective. However, until the detail of the policies are known the nature and degree of the impacts on landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment are uncertain.	Option C2 will see housing development distributed across the District in a single strategy which will be consistent. However, the nature and degree of impact on landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment will depend on the volume of development and location of sites and so effects are uncertain.		Focusing any coastal housing growth on two locations (Mablethorpe and Skegness) will lead to a greater impact on landscape, townscape and historic environment in these locations but little impact elsewhere on the coast. The nature and scale of the impact will depend on the volume and location of development. Large scale urban extension may create opportunities for the creation of Green Infrastructure at a landscape scale	A wider distribution of housing development in the coast will mean that impacts will be spread over a wider area but the impact on Mablethorpe and Skegness will be reduced as there will be commensurately less housing coming forward in these towns. The impact on landscape, townscape and historic environment will depend on the volume, location and design of development. There would be opportunities to create new Green Infrastructure across the district and improve connectivity	Whilst unrestrained housing dispersal may be shaped by design and landscape policies it is likely that development will occur at many locations across the coast that are less able to absorb additional development. Impacts may be most noticeable in the smaller villages and more rural locations and may have longer term cumulative impacts (e.g. loss of open space, through infill development, changes in local character, and loss of setting of historic assets etc).	Similar to the impacts on biodiversity, impacts on landscape are difficult to predict as the location of sites remain unknown. The option makes no reference to which settlements development would be permitted in. Therefore, should suitable previously developed sites become available, or need for affordable housing be identified, this may be permissible in any settlement. There will be landscape impacts at the locations where development takes place and what this impact is will depend on how they are mitigated; and the	While there will be significant impact from the creation of a New Town, the impacts are difficult to quantify without additional information such as scale and location, e.g. is the site previously used land, is it close to heritage assets or significant landscape features. While the impact of locating the majority of the District's growth in one location will have significant impacts this has to be balanced with the fact that wider impacts across the district will be minimised.

				which may help to offset some of these impacts.	between such assets but these are unlikely to be at a landscape scale due to the size of the development sites coming forward. There will be local impacts at the locations where development takes place and what this impact is will depend on how they are mitigated.		magnitude of that impact will depend on the size and location. The reason this option is identified as uncertain, as opposed to the negative for option D3, is that the amount of development is likely to be less given the criteria to be met for windfall sites.	
3. Protect natural resources	All new housing development will have an impact on natural resources – use of land, air, water, soil, raw materials. Option C1 indicates a split in approach to development in the District but does not affect the quantum of development coming forward. It does suggest that less housing development will come forward in the coastal areas than inland. The choice of option will not have an overall effect on natural resources across the District but may lead to localised impacts dependant on where	Similarly, option C2 does not affect the quantum of development but would distribute development across the District using one strategy. Again, localised impacts may occur but these are largely not dependent on whether or not there is a split but on the ensuing policy approach taken.		Any development has the potential to impact on natural resources in respect of water, air, and loss of productive agricultural land. It is difficult to distinguish between the options in terms of natural resources as the overall level of development is not affected, only the location. Given the low level of previously developed land available in the District, loss of agricultural land is likely to be an issue with all options, although the degree to which this happens will need to be assessed through the individual site assessments. Option D1 will focus coastal housing	Very similar to D1 with the focus of housing on Mablethorpe and Skegness but with development elsewhere within the hierarchy. Impacts again depend on the amount of housing, the locations it will come forward and the ability of previously unassessed locations to absorb additional development. Therefore, the impact cannot be quantified at this time. However, should resources be constrained within a geographical area, solutions to mitigate impacts maybe more forthcoming if development is focused in fewer areas.	This option allows unrestrained dispersal across the coastal area. There may be more opportunities for use of previously developed land if a range of locations are selected, but there are no guarantees that this will be available in smaller villages and there is likely be a loss of agricultural land and greenspace in rural communities. Again, the coastal area was not included in the previous Water Cycle Study as it was not an area for growth. Therefore the ability of the smaller villages to cope with the additional development is not known. A number	This option could see small amounts of development coming forward across the coast, if sites are available to meet the criteria. One of these is that sites are previously used land, so this would limit the amount of greenfield and productive agricultural land being lost to development. This option would see less new development coming forward than other options but, with existing commitments, there would still be significant amount so development with the potential to add to impact on natural resources such as air and water. The potential of a wider distribution of development, albeit at a low level, brings	The creation of a New Town will inevitably impact on resources, as with other large scale development. Loss of agricultural land/soil degradation will depend on the site and the role previously developed land plays in this. Impacts on air, water quality, etc may be greater as the site is likely to be creating new impact rather than adding to existing ones. However, this has to be balanced by the fact that a new project can embed mitigation and new technology from the outset. Without more information on the nature of the option the

	development comes forward.			development in Mablethorpe and Skegness. These locations were not included in the previous Water Cycle Study as they were not areas of growth in the 2018 Plan. It is therefore uncertain what level of capacity there is to accommodate additional housing in these locations. However, should resources be constrained within a geographical area, economies of scale to create solutions to mitigate impacts maybe more forthcoming if development is focused in fewer areas.		of smaller communities may not have access to mains drainage. Where development is widely distributed this does not create the economies of scale to resolve infrastructure deficiencies.	uncertainty as to current infrastructure capacity and does not create economies of scale to address current issues.	impacts are uncertain.
4. Avoid the risk of flooding (where possible) and fully mitigate against the impacts of flooding where it cannot	Option C1 splits the district and creates housing policies unique to the coast and inland. Both sets of policies should reflect flood risk in these respective areas. This option allows for some housing development in the coast while taking into account the issues faced there such as flood risk.	Option C2 suggests a single strategy for housing development across the District and makes no reference to the flood risk issues, especially those particular to the coast, or the need for mitigation. It therefore conflicts with this objective.		Option D1 does not indicate how much housing development would be located in Mablethorpe and Skegness under a split policy (option C1) approach but if it is decided that growth is to take place in the two towns, opportunities will have to be sought where flood risk is minimised and mitigated. The	Similar to option D1, this approach would be seeking a hierarchy of settlements in which to develop within the coast. Some of the settlements on the edge of the coastal area may have opportunities for development outside of the flood hazard zones, and this would form part of the mitigation, along with any necessary design features. The option	Unrestrained housing development in the coastal area may increase the opportunities for finding sites outside of the flood hazard zones. However, with unrestrained development, this will be dealt with on a case by case basis and there would be no strategy of allocation and directing housing to	Although this option looks to restrain housing growth in the coast, the numbers of properties within the coastal will still be increasing, and so the number of properties at risk of flooding and requiring evacuation. As with option D3, there may be opportunities to find sites outside of the flood hazard zones for affordable housing site. However, the previously used sites	Without an indication of the location of any potential New Town, it is difficult to assess the impact. However, unless a large enough area can be found outside the hazard areas, any development is likely to be within (or partially within) the flood hazard areas. The scale of development proposed for a New

	<p>There would be a corresponding reduction in housing inland. This option does not avoid the risk of flooding, as development could go into areas where there is no flood risk, however, it does acknowledge the need to address this issue.</p>			<p>option mentions that development may take place in flood risk areas but makes no mention of the need for mitigation, therefore, without that, focusing development on these two towns would conflict with this objective.</p>	<p>makes no mention of the need for mitigation, therefore, without this, the option would be in conflict with the objective.</p>	<p>the most suitable sites. The option makes no mention of the need for mitigation, therefore, without adherence to a policy framework that ensure this, the option conflicts with the objective.</p>	<p>are more likely to be located within the urban area and in the higher flood hazard zones; although this is not certain due to the unplanned nature of such sites. The option suggests that there would be opportunities to promote innovative housing types to mitigate flood risk, which is an appropriate response on new site, although existing sites will be built as granted permission. There may be viability issues for this on previously used sites, as site clearance costs will have to be factored in. However, this is only part of the objective; the first being to avoid the risk of flooding where possible.</p>	<p>Town would be contrary to the objective as it could be located elsewhere outside the flood area. Mitigation for development of the scale of a new town in terms of flood risk is likely to be very difficult.</p>
<p>5. Promote viable and diverse economic growth</p>	<p>Option C1 looks to a unique set of housing policies (only) for each part of the District; inland and coast. The option does not address employment. Although there will be some short term opportunities during the</p>	<p>Option C2 looks to create district wide housing policies. The option does not address employment. Although there will be some short term opportunities during the building of the housing and knock on benefits from spending of people in the houses, these do</p>		<p>Option D1 option refers to the promotion of new economic opportunities in the towns, along with business development in the more sustainable villages. Therefore it accords with this objective.</p>	<p>Option D2 establishes a settlement hierarchy for the distribution of the development, led by Mablethorpe and Skegness. The option refers to regeneration in the towns, along with business development in the more sustainable villages. Therefore it accords with this objective.</p>	<p>Option D3 is not clear in its approach to economic growth away from the smaller villages. The scenario refers to increased opportunities for small businesses in the rural areas, but does not outline a strategy for the rest of the coast. In terms of promoting</p>	<p>Option D4 does not refer to the approach to economic growth, so it is unclear how it will be affected. This will need addressing if this option is to be followed.</p>	<p>Option D4 is silent on the issue of employment opportunities with a new Town within the coast and therefore the outcome is uncertain.</p>

	building and knock on benefits from the spending of people in the houses, these do not directly promote economic growth.	not directly promote economic growth.				diverse economic growth, this will need addressing.		
6. Prioritise appropriate re-use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of the best agricultural land and greenfield sites	Option C1 is silent on the use of previously developed land. Without a policy approach to take advantage of available previously developed land, there will be a negative impact on this objective.	Option C2 is silent on the use of previously developed land. Without a policy approach to take advantage of available previously developed land, there will be a negative impact on this objective.		Due to the low level of previously developed land in the district, this option would require the use of significant urban extensions onto greenfield sites which would result in the loss of significant amounts of productive and potentially high quality agricultural land.	This option would allow growth within all larger coastal settlements. This would reduce the size of urban extensions needed in Mablethorpe and Skegness and the amount of productive (and possibly high quality) agricultural or greenfield sites needed there. However, extensions will be needed to the larger villages and potentially increase the number of infill sites brought forward which may also be open spaces within villages. In addition, in the longer term, as the availability of infill and previously developed sites decreases, additional greenfield extension will be needed.	Option D3 suggests that by distributing development over a wider area, there would be more development in the towns coming forward on previously developed land on windfall sites. However, this needs to be countered by the fact there more development would be coming forward in the villages where there is less prevalence of previously developed land. In addition, in the longer term, as the availability of infill and previously developed sites decreases additional greenfield extension will be needed.	Beyond existing consents, the redevelopment of previously developed land is one of the criteria for development under this option. Existing permission are on largely on greenfield sites, and there is no indication of the location of affordable housing sites. However, prioritising previously developed land is a key strand of this option.	It is unlikely that a site would be found on the coast to accommodate a New Town on previously developed land. Therefore there is likely to be a significant take up of greenfield land contrary to this objective.
7. Improve accessibility to key services, facilities,	Option C1 doesn't set out what the strategy will be for housing development, only that there	Option C2 doesn't set out what the strategy will be for housing development, only that there will be		Predominantly focusing development in the two main towns will help to enable services and	A settlement hierarchy led option will distribute development wider than option D1 but development will still	This option of growth across the coastal area may exacerbate problems of isolation and access	It is uncertain what the outcomes of this option will be. Existing sites, of any size, are largely in the towns and larger	The development of a new town would allow the planning of accessible facilities, services and green

amenities and GI	will be unique policies for the coast and inland.	one policy for the whole district.		facilities to be more accessible to those occupying new development. The economies of scale will also enable the creation of increased levels of GI and potentially facilitate other services.	be led by those areas with services and facilities to support it.	to facilities as more development will be taking place in smaller settlements where there are few village facilities and public transport is poor. There may be opportunities to retain local services and facilities, however, it is unlikely that these economies of scale would be sufficient. A small number of houses in a village wouldn't not bring this about. There would also not be the economies of scale to create GI and other amenities and it may dilute the ability to bring these forward elsewhere.	villages. However, the option does not set out a spatial approach to new development. There is a possibility that demand for affordable housing and economies of scale to bring in forward will be greater in the larger settlements. Similarly, previously used sites are more likely to be located within the larger settlements due to the type of development that has occurred previously; although this is by no means certain.	infrastructure from the outset as it includes re-prioritising the provision of infrastructure. There is also the potential for economies of scale to generate more specialised community services / facilities. However, this may be at the expense of the enhancement of services and facilities elsewhere and would take time to come on stream as they are more challenging to bring forward than housing development. The impacts of such a project are uncertain.
8. Increase reuse and recycling rates and minimise the production of waste	The opportunities to increase recycling is outside the scope of these options.	The opportunities to increase recycling is outside the scope of these options.		The opportunities to increase recycling is outside the scope of these options.	The opportunities to increase recycling is outside the scope of these options.	The opportunities to increase recycling is outside the scope of these options.	The opportunities to increase recycling is outside the scope of these options.	The opportunities to increase recycling is outside the scope of these options.
9. Support inclusive, safe and vibrant communities	Option C1 would allow unique policies for the coast and inland to reflect the situation in these parts of the District. This allows opportunities to	Option C2 would create one suite of policies across the District. Under this option policies would still need to reflect specific localised issues where necessary, such as flood risk,		This option would predominantly focus development in the Mablethorpe and Skegness so creating economies of scale to bring forward employment, facilities and	This option would set a settlement hierarchy led by Mablethorpe and Skegness. There would still be opportunities to create economies of scale to bring about employment	This option would encourage growth across the coastal area with small numbers coming forward in a range of villages. This scenario has the potential to generate high	As with objective on access to services and facilities, without knowing where development would come forward, it is difficult to assess what the impact will be. If the prevalence of affordable need	Without an indication of the location of any potential New Town, it is difficult to assess the impact. However, unless a large site can be found outside the hazard

	<p>reflect the needs of those communities in relation to affordable housing, so more inclusive communities. However, the flood risk issues mentioned in the text will need to be mitigated for communities to be safe.</p>	<p>or the differing situation with regard to affordable housing, if the approach was to meet this objective. The option makes no mention of the need for mitigation of flood risk, therefore, without that, conflicts with this objective.</p>		<p>amenities to support vibrancy in those communities. Inclusivity will be helped through the provision of affordable housing and the ability to bring forward a range of housing types to support the community, including older person's accommodation. However, there is conflict with this option in terms of flood risk and without suitable mitigation through site selection and design, this would be a negative outcome.</p>	<p>opportunities and support existing facilities and amenities to support vibrancy in those communities. Inclusivity will be helped through the provision of affordable housing in a wider spectrum of settlements. However, there is conflict with this option in terms of flood risk and without suitable mitigation through site selection and design, this would be a negative outcome.</p>	<p>house prices in those areas, social exclusion and less affordable housing coming forward. Development will also occur in settlements without the services to support them and reduce the opportunity to create economies of scale in larger settlements. Fragmented development can result in residents spending a higher proportion of their income on accessing services and facilities whether by private or public transport and create social exclusion. Similar to the previous two options, there is conflict with this option in terms of flood risk and without suitable mitigation through site selection and design, this would be a negative outcome.</p>	<p>and previously developed sites is in the larger settlements, this could support existing services and facilities, albeit at a reduced level due to the amount of development coming forward. However, there may be opportunities to meet affordable housing need in a range of settlements, thus supporting inclusivity. The option advocates flood mitigation for housing development on new sites.</p>	<p>areas, any development is likely to be within (or partially within) the flood hazard areas. The scale of development proposed for a New Town would be contrary to the objective as it could be located elsewhere outside the flood area. Mitigation for development of the scale of a new town in terms of flood risk is likely to be very difficult. The effects and implication of a new town on existing communities cannot, at this stage, be assessed. With the focus of development in one specific area and much of the rest of the district subject to limited development, the effects are largely unknown.</p>
<p>10. Ensure that local housing needs are met</p>	<p>Option C1 would allow unique policies for the coast and inland to reflect the situation in these parts of the District. This</p>	<p>Option C2 would create one suite of policies across the District. Under this option policies would still need to reflect specific localised issues</p>		<p>Focussing development in Mablethorpe and Skegness will enable the amount of affordable housing to be increased, through</p>	<p>The settlement pattern approach would be similar to option D1, except that the amount of affordable housing coming forward in the towns would be</p>	<p>This option would reduce the development coming forward in the coastal towns with more development coming forward in</p>	<p>Provision of affordable housing is one of the main strands of this option. The location where this development would come forward</p>	<p>The focus of the development would be in one specific area with much of the rest of the district subject to limited development. The</p>

	allows opportunities to reflect the needs of those communities in relation to affordable housing.	where necessary, such the differing situation with regard to affordable housing, if the approach was to meet this objective.		section 106 agreements on large sites and provider led schemes, along with a small amount of such housing in the larger villages. Essential local needs housing will be enabled elsewhere through exceptions policies. It will also enable a variety of housing to come forward across the price spectrum for those on lower incomes or first time buyers.	reduced by the increase of development in larger villages. However, this is balanced by the fact that affordable housing could come forward in some of these villages and may help to address their local need.	smaller settlements. Development in these locations is characterised by larger properties and higher prices. This is unlikely to address the issues of affordable housing, housing for first time buyers and for those on low incomes. With more small sites coming forward, this also reduce the amount of housing coming forward through section 106 agreements.	would be led by housing need.	provision of affordable housing in the new settlement may have significant benefits as housing types can be factored into the planning of the new town. However, this could lead to a reduction in provider led affordable housing in other locations if the capacity of the provider to bring forward development is take up with the new town scheme.
11. Increase energy efficiency and ensure appropriate sustainable design, construction	Option C1 doesn't set out what the strategy will be for housing development, only that there will be unique policies for the coast and inland, so it is not possible to assess this option.	Option C2 doesn't set out what the strategy will be for development, only that there will be one policy for the whole district.		Energy efficiency in individual properties is governed by building regulations but focusing coastal development in Mablethorpe and Skegness will potentially enable larger scale development. With that there is scope to contribute to energy efficiency and sustainable design for the wider community. Large development can incorporate components such as SUDS, Green Infrastructure, opportunities for biodiversity,	This option would set a settlement hierarchy led by Mablethorpe and Skegness. Opportunities for sustainable urban extensions would be reduced as development is further distributed around the hierarchy. There will still be the opportunity for some of the principles of sustainable design to be incorporated into development. However, how comprehensively these principles can be incorporated will depend on the size of housing sites coming	Unrestrained dispersal will direct development away from towns and larger villages towards smaller settlements. There will be less opportunity to incorporate sustainable principles when development is dispersed and coming forward in small numbers. There may be opportunities within individual houses, to contribute to sustainable development (such as energy and water efficiency measures), but	As with some of the other objectives, without knowing where development would come forward, it is difficult to assess what the impact will be. If the prevalence of affordable need and previously developed sites is in the larger settlements, this could energy efficiency and sustainable principle. Similarly, the size of sites is unknown, while even individual properties can accommodate sustainable construction methods, it is easier to incorporate a	The focus of development would be in one specific area with much of the rest of the district subject to limited development. Developing a new town would lend itself to the concept of developing sustainable communities, with carbon neutral development.

				planned routes for cyclist and pedestrians to access services and facilities.	forward in the villages.	these are individual choices and will not add to community level sustainability.	broader range of principles in larger sites.	
12. Infrastructure for "healthy lifestyles"	Option C1 doesn't set out what the strategy will be for housing development, only that there will be unique policies for the coast and inland, so it is not possible to assess this option.	Option C2 doesn't set out what the strategy will be for development, only that there will be one policy for the whole district.		This option would focus the majority of coastal development on Mablethorpe and Skegness which may support the delivery infrastructure to promote healthy lifestyles (be that health infrastructure, opportunities for exercise) in these locations.	This option would set a settlement hierarchy led by Mablethorpe and Skegness and would distribute development within this hierarchy. This would support existing infrastructure for healthy lifestyles in these settlements and may allow some smaller scale infrastructure such as open space to take pace in the large villages, although this unlikely to bring forward strategic infrastructure.	This option would allow growth within all settlements across the coast. This may fail to achieve the economies of scale necessary to attract facilities such as those that promote healthy lifestyles and result in difficulties for those without private transport to access such facilities. Access to green infrastructure and the opportunities to create additional open space would be undermined by this option.	The existing permissions, which are largely within the larger settlements, have the opportunity to contribute to health infrastructure and the opportunities for health lifestyles through open space etc – within the constraints of what has already been consented on the sites. Without development where development would come forward, and the size of sites, it is difficult to assess what the impact will be. If the prevalence of affordable need and previously developed sites is in the larger settlements, this enable the support for and creation of infrastructure for healthy lifestyles. If development is more widely distributed, such opportunities will be reduced.	Development in a new town would allow the positioning and planning of facilities, services and green infrastructure in the best possible locations for accessibility for all within the community. However, as development would be limited elsewhere in the coast, this would prevent development helping bring forward additional facilities in these areas.
13. Positively plan for, and minimise the effects of, climate change	Option C1 splits the district and creates housing policies unique to the coast and inland. Both sets	Option C2 suggests a single strategy for housing development across the District and makes no reference		Focusing coastal development in Mablethorpe and Skegness may increase opportunities,	This option would set a settlement hierarchy led by Mablethorpe and Skegness and would distribute	Unrestrained dispersal will be mean that there is less development coming forward in the larger	The uncertainty about this options ability to plan for, and minimise the effects of climate change has been considered	The creation of a New Town offers the potential to plan for climate change from the outset. However,

	<p>of policies should reflect flood risk in these respective areas. The option is silent on how other climate change matters, such as water resources, impacts on biodiversity etc may be addressed, this would come out of subsequent policies.</p>	<p>to the flood risk issues, especially those particular to the coast, or the need for mitigation. It therefore conflicts with this objective. The option is silent on how other climate change matters, such as water resources, impacts on biodiversity etc may be addressed, this would come out of subsequent policies.</p>		<p>through sustainable urban extension, to reduce energy and utilise new forms of renewable energy. Such development may provide opportunities at a 'landscape scale' to enhance sites for biodiversity, along with new green infrastructure, as wildlife migrates in response to climate change. Focusing development in the towns would also assist in reducing carbon emissions, promoting sustainable modes of travel. However, flood risk issues in this area need robust mitigation and water resources need to be considered. Therefore, there are mixed outcomes for this option which will need addressing.</p>	<p>development within this hierarchy. Some of the opportunities presented under option D1 will not be available with option D2 as development will not be coming forward in strategic schemes but numbers will be more widely distributed. There will be some scope to create opportunities for wildlife and renewable energy on a smaller scale. Creating the infrastructure to address some of the results of climate change may be lost. However, a wider distribution of development may identify more sites that are outside flood risk. Again, there are mixed outcomes for this option which will need addressing through the policies.</p>	<p>settlements and more development likely in the medium and small villages. This means that there will not be the economies of scale to implement some of the opportunities for aspects of climate change mitigation, such as biodiversity net gain, green infrastructure and renewable energy. Opportunities for reducing carbon emissions through minimising the need to travel will be lost.</p>	<p>above. The existing permissions, which are largely within the larger settlements, have the opportunity to contribute to addressing climate change – within the constraints of what has already been consented on the sites. However, opportunities will be missed on some of these sites as some aspects of climate change mitigation still emerging (such as biodiversity net gain). Opportunities on affordable housing or previously developed sites will depend on the size and location of these sites and this is not currently known.</p>	<p>this has to be weighed against the impacts that building a new town, or expanding an existing settlement to form a new town will have on countryside and how connectivity with other settlement will be achieved. The detail of how climate change mitigation will be achieved will be key to outcomes under this option. Without more information, the outcomes of this option are uncertain.</p>
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	---	---

Option	Option E1 – a strong focus on the main urban centres of Louth, Alford, Spilsby and Horncastle, with restraint on housing elsewhere	Option E2 - Settlement hierarchy led by the towns	Option E3 – Unrestrained dispersal of development throughout all settlements in the inland area	Option E4 - Creating a New Town	No Spill	Option F1 – a strong focus on the main urban centres, with restraint on housing elsewhere	Option F2 - Settlement hierarchy led by the towns
1. Biodiversity	Whilst focusing the majority of inland growth on the four towns may have increased adverse effects for biodiversity (without mitigation) within the immediate geographical locations of these towns, much of the district will remain unaffected, particularly rural areas. There would be opportunities for biodiversity net gain at a landscape scale with the economies of scale presented by urban extensions, but this has to be countered by any harm caused.	Whilst option E2 may create adverse effects for biodiversity (without mitigation) at the areas of growth, many parts of the district will remain unaffected, particularly the rural areas. Reducing the size of urban extensions in the towns by distributing development amongst larger villages may reduce some impacts at the towns but will conversely increase the potential for impacts in other locations. There will be opportunities to add to Green Infrastructure and create space for biodiversity, however, these would not necessarily be at the landscape scale achieved by option E1 but, conversely, opportunities would be more widely spread.	This option may have significant adverse cumulative effects in the longer term through habitat loss, habitat isolation and fragmentation, increased disturbance, pollution, introduction of non-native species, etc. Although each application will be judged against the biodiversity policy in the Plan, there will not be the opportunity to manage the cumulative effects of development.	Similar to option D4. Without an indication of the location of any potential New Town, the options has to be identified as unquantifiable. The impacts will vary considerably dependent upon its scale and location: e.g. is the site previously used land or agricultural land, is in close to any sites protected for their biodiversity. There are likely to impacts on biodiversity wherever such development is located, although this could be mitigated through choice of site, net gain measures and other methods of mitigation.		This option will bring forward urban extension onto greenfield sites around the District's towns. Mablethorpe and Skegness about site protected at a national and level for biodiversity and this may have adverse effects without mitigation. There is the potential for adverse effects for biodiversity (without mitigation) around the other towns, although with this option much of the remainder of the district will be unaffected, particularly rural areas. There will be opportunities for biodiversity net gain at a landscape scale with the economies of scale presented by urban extensions which could offset any potential harm in	Establishing a hierarchy for the District, albeit with focus on growth in the towns, will spread pressure on biodiversity. The impacts for the coast where the highest level of biodiversity protection covers its extent, will differ from potential impacts inland where sites are more widely distributed. How growth is distributed along the coast will affect the impact of development. Without knowing the volume and location of development, the effects cannot be quantified but in all cases they are likely to be negative without mitigation; especially along the coast

					some areas, but this has to be countered by any harm caused.	
2. Landscapes, townscapes and historic environment	<p>This option would promote most inland development within Louth, Alford, Spilsby and Horncastle. The increased focus for development within towns, and the low level of previous developed land, may have implications for landscape effects on the edge of settlements; all of which are close to the Lincolnshire Wolds AONB. Resultant local changes in landscape or townscape character will need to be addressed. Landscaping and design will need to ensure that local distinctiveness and character are maintained and enhanced as a result of new development. These towns contain conservation areas, listed buildings and other heritage assets. The impacts on these, will need to be addressed. The effects on buried archaeological assets will also have to be considered. Large scale urban extension may create</p>	<p>Although the effects associated with the landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment would be reduced in the four towns of option E1, the impacts would be more widespread across the larger villages in the district. Any development of a reasonable scale will bring about landscape change and it is how this is managed that is key to the impacts. There would be opportunities to create new Green Infrastructure across the district and improve connectivity between such assets but these are unlikely to be at a landscape scale due to the size of the development sites coming forward. There will be local impacts at the locations where development takes place and what this impact is will depend on how they are mitigated.</p>	<p>This option may have adverse cumulative effects in the longer term. Although each application will be judged against the landscape/design policies in the Plan, there will not be the opportunity to manage the cumulative effects of development. Impacts are more likely to be felt in those communities deemed to be popular locations to live and it is highly likely that additional development will come forward within the smaller communities within the AONB. Important historic landscape and townscape features such as open spaces, may become more threatened. There may also be less scope to add to Green Infrastructure and other landscape features due to the wider distribution of smaller sites.</p>	<p>Under this option the majority of development would be in one location with much of the rest of the district subject to limited development. This would reduce the landscape impacts in other areas as little of no development would be brought forward elsewhere. However, the effects on the location surrounding the new town site could be significant and are wholly dependent on the landscape character and historic sensitivities associated with the proposed location.</p>	<p>Focusing development in the District's towns would help to protect the wider landscapes of the district. The increased focus for development within towns, and the low level of previous developed land, may have implications for landscape effects on the edge of settlements. Many of the inland towns are close to the Lincolnshire Wolds AONB. Resultant local changes in landscape or townscape character will need to be addressed. Design will need to ensure that local distinctiveness and character are maintained and enhanced as a result of new development. The inland towns contain conservation areas, listed buildings and other heritage assets. The impacts on these, will need to be addressed.</p>	<p>A wider distribution of housing development will mean that impacts on landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment will be reduced in the towns but spread over a wider area. There will be local impacts at the locations where development takes place. These impacts will depend on the volume, location and design of development. There would be opportunities to create new Green Infrastructure across the district and improve connectivity between such assets but these are unlikely to be at a landscape scale due to the size of the development sites coming forward.</p>

	opportunities for the creation of Green Infrastructure at a landscape scale may help to offset some of these impacts. .					The effects on buried archaeological assets will also have to be considered. Large scale urban extension may create opportunities for the creation of Green Infrastructure at a landscape scale which may help to offset some of these impacts.	
3. Protect natural resources	All new housing development will have an impact on natural resources –land, air, water, soil, raw materials. Some natural resources are finite and mitigation not possible or very difficult. This option would promote most inland development within the towns of Louth, Alford, Spilsby and Horncastle. It would include urban extensions onto greenfield sites which will result in a loss of productive agricultural land, however, this cannot be mitigated. The grade of agricultural land chosen can mitigate to a certain degree and what grade the land is will depend on the location of the sites. Other factors such as	Similar to option E1. The amount of development coming forward will not change between the options, only the locations. The low levels of previously used land in the District means that it is likely that there will be a loss of productive, and possibly high quality, agricultural land in locations across the district. Unless the list of large villages changes from that in the current plan, the water implications of development have already been assessed, however, the amount of land in any given settlement may change so this may need to be revised.	Again, the location of development will influence the impacts. Unrestrained development cannot be assessed as part of a strategy as it will be becoming forward in an unpredictable manner so there may well be differences in how the impacts are experienced. There may be cumulative impact in respect of some settlements as resources, such as the availability of water resources/ sewage treatment, as this is unlikely to be constant across the district and this may increase pressure in certain locations. Again, these are difficult to predict without more information on where	This option could be developed to ensure that a new town is located (or and existing village expanded) where there is either (a) adequate resource capacity for sustained growth or (b) least impact across a range of natural resources). Given the low level of previously developed land, it is likely that this option will lead to a loss of agricultural land, although this should be no more than the cumulative loss for the other options as the amount of development will not increase. A site can also be chosen that avoids the best and most versatile agricultural land if it is not tied to a particular settlement. However,		All new housing development will have an impact on natural resources – land, air, water, soil, raw materials. Some natural resources are finite and mitigation not possible or very difficult. This option would promote most development within the district's towns. It would include urban extensions onto greenfield sites which will result in a loss of productive agricultural land, however, this cannot be mitigated. The grade of agricultural land can mitigate to a certain degree and what grade the land is will depend on	Similar to option F1. The amount of development coming forward will not change between the options, only the locations. The low levels of previously used land in the District means that it is likely that there will be a loss of productive and possibly high quality agricultural land in locations across the district. Water related issues will need reconsidering to take account of the inclusion of coastal towns and villages.

	water quality and water resources may be affected by large extensions in these areas and the Water Cycle Study would have to be revised to take account of these urban extensions.		development will come forward.	there is a high degree of uncertainty of potential effects with this option at present due to the lack of detail available.		the location of the sites. Other factors such as water quality and water resources may be affected by large extensions in these areas and the Water Cycle Study would have to be revised to take account of these urban extensions.	
4. Avoid the risk of flooding (where possible) and fully mitigate against the impacts of flooding where it cannot	Inland flooding can be the result of river flooding or drainage issues. There are potential flood risk issues in Louth, Alford and Horncastle, although these are localised within these towns and there are possibilities to build in areas that are not at flood risk. There are no fluvial issues in Spilsby. The localised drainage issues resulting from urban extensions to these settlement will need addressing through SUDS which take account of the site and the surrounding area.	Similar to E1, development opportunities will need to avoid areas of flood risk and ensure that SUDS are incorporated in order to address the potential for localised drainage issues.	The wider distribution of development will see, in addition to the issue identified under E1 and E2, the likelihood of more infill development in rural locations. Even if these avoid flood risk areas, this may result in developments increasing drainage issue both within new developments and surrounding areas. The existing infrastructure within some of the smaller villages may not be capable of providing effective drainage. There will also be less opportunity to address the cumulative effect of individual properties or small groups of dwellings coming forward and there will not be the economics of scale to facilitate improvements.	The focus of the development in one area with much of the rest of the district subject to limited development has the potential to bring a significant benefit in that it will avoid any further development in flood risk areas around the district, and SUDS will be incorporated from the outset. However, this is provided the 'new town' is not located in an area that is presently subject to flood risk from any sources, and is not at a high risk of creating flooding issues elsewhere that would be difficult to address.		Option F1 does not indicate how much housing development would be located in each of the towns. However, there are significant flood risk issues in Mablethorpe and Skegness and some flood risk issues in some of the inland towns. Opportunities will have to be sought to locate development where flood risk is minimised and mitigated.	Similar to option F1, this approach would be seeking a hierarchy of settlements in which to develop across the district. Some of these settlements are at risk of flooding and opportunities for development outside of the flood risk areas would need to be found, along with any necessary design features which would together form part of the mitigation. SUDS would also be necessary to address localised flood and drainage issues. Without this, the option would be in conflict with the objective.

<p>5. Promote viable and diverse economic growth</p>	<p>Option E1 option mentions the promotion of new economic opportunities in the towns, along with business development in the more sustainable villages. Therefore it accords with this objective.</p>	<p>Similarly for option E2, the additional distribution of inland development to the large villages will be supported by appropriate business opportunities in those villages to lessen the amount of commuting to the towns in the district and further afield.</p>	<p>Option E3 is not clear in its approach to economic growth. The scenario refers to increased opportunities for small businesses in the rural areas, but does not outline a strategy for the rest of the District. In terms of promoting diverse economic growth, this will need addressing.</p>	<p>The focus of development would be in one area with much of the rest of the district subject to limited development. This option may have limited potential to help grow and diversify the wider district's economy as opportunities are directed towards the new town. Any strategy to refocus inward investment into the new town location is likely to take a long time to come to fruition and, in the meantime commuting will increase significantly.</p>		<p>Option F1 option mentions the promotion of new economic opportunities in the towns, along with business development in the more sustainable villages. Therefore it accords with this objective.</p>	<p>The scenario for option F2 refers to development led regeneration in Mablethorpe and Skegness along with business development in the more sustainable villages. However, there is no reference to promoting economic growth in the other towns. There is mention of significant scale development and growth opportunities in four towns but not what form that development will take. This will need addressing otherwise the option would not accord with this objective.</p>
<p>6. Prioritise appropriate re-use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of the best agricultural land and greenfield sites</p>	<p>Due to the low level of previously developed land in the district, this option would require the use of significant urban extensions onto greenfield sites which would result in the loss of significant amounts of productive and possibly high quality agricultural land.</p>	<p>This option would promote urban extensions to Louth, Alford, Spilsby and Horncastle, along with development around the district's larger villages. Due to the low level of previously developed land in the district, this would require the use of greenfield sites resulting in the loss of productive and possibly high quality agricultural land.</p>	<p>This option would allow growth within all inland settlements. This would reduce the size of urban extensions needed in the towns and the amount of productive and high quality agricultural or greenfield sites needed there. However, this option potentially increases the number of infill sites being brought forward across the</p>	<p>Unless a significant previously development site can be found, the development of a new town will inevitable see a loss of a large amount of greenfield land. This may well be productive agricultural land, although loss of the highest quality land could be avoided by selecting a site which avoids such land.</p>		<p>Due to the low level of previously developed land in the district, this option would require the use of significant urban extensions onto greenfield sites which would result in the loss of significant amounts of productive and possibly high quality agricultural land.</p>	<p>This option would promote urban extensions to the towns, along with development around the district's larger villages. Due to the low level of previously developed land in the district, this would require the use of greenfield sites resulting in the loss of productive and</p>

			villages which may also be green field open spaces. However, in the longer term the availability of infill and previously developed sites will decrease and then more edge of settlement sites on greenfield land will be needed.			possibly high quality agricultural land.	
7. Improve accessibility to key services, facilities, amenities and GI	Focusing new development on the towns would maximise the number of residents with access to the widest range of community facilities, public transport and Green Infrastructure in the District, along with employment opportunities.	Putting less development in the towns will reduce the number of residents with easy access to the services and facilities of the towns. However, housing in the large villages could help to support local services and facilities, albeit still requiring travel to access larger services.	Distributing development across the district may exacerbate issues of poor access to services and facilities. Not only will development in the smaller settlements not have essential facilities close by, but opportunities to enhance services and facilities in larger settlements maybe lost as development there is reduced. The scale of development in smaller village is unlikely to be sufficient to attract or retain services and facilities and there would also not be the economies of scale to create GI and other amenities and it may dilute the ability to bring these forward elsewhere	The development of a new town would allow the planning of accessible facilities, services and green infrastructure from the outset as it would include re-prioritising the provision of infrastructure. There is also the potential for economies of scale to generate more specialised community services / facilities. However, this may be at the expense of the enhancement of services and facilities elsewhere and would take a long time to come on stream as they are more challenging to bring forward than housing development. The impacts of such a project are uncertain.		Focusing new development on the towns would maximise the number of residents with access to the widest range of community facilities, public transport and Green Infrastructure in the District, along with employment opportunities.	Putting less development in the towns will reduce the number of residents with easy access to the services and facilities of the towns. However, housing in the large villages could help to support local services and facilities, albeit still requiring travel to access larger services.
8. Increase reuse and recycling rates and	The opportunities to increase recycling is	The opportunities to increase recycling is	The opportunities to increase recycling is	The opportunities to increase recycling is		The opportunities to increase recycling is	The opportunities to increase recycling is outside

minimise the production of waste	outside the scope of these options	outside the scope of these options	outside the scope of these options	outside the scope of these options		outside the scope of these options	the scope of these options
9. Support inclusive, safe and vibrant communities	New housing, increased business development and associated job creation that the option is likely to bring to the areas will contribute to inclusive, safe and vibrant communities. Focusing housing in these areas will maximise opportunities to bring forward additional affordable housing and a range of housing types to support the community, including older person's accommodation. The increase in business development may also reduce the high outward migration of young adults who have been seeking opportunities for higher/skilled employment and/or education/training outside the district.	A wider distribution of development based on a hierarchy will spread some of the benefits for inclusive, safe and vibrant communities in option E1 to the larger villages. However, it may reduce the amount of affordable housing coming forward as a larger number of smaller sites, which are not required to provide affordable housing, will make up the housing provision. Expanding business opportunities in the larger villages may reduce the need to travel for residents of those communities.	This option would encourage growth across the district. There will be an increase in development, in small numbers, within villages. This has the potential to generate high house prices in those areas and a lack of affordable housing as smaller sites do not bring forward affordable housing. Fragmented development can result in residents spending a higher proportion of their income on accessing services and facilities whether by private or public transport. The low levels of public transport in many smaller villages may lead to social exclusion and inequality as the residents of these villages need a private car to access services and facilities. A wider distribution of smaller sites also limits the opportunity to bring forward green infrastructure or other social facilities through development.	The effects and implication of a new town on communities cannot, at this stage, be assessed. A lot will depend on the supporting strategies in terms of employment and, provision of services. Although the development of a new town can embed these from the outset they do take time to deliver on the ground but in time the new town should create an inclusive, safe and vibrant community. However, in the longer term this may deflect strategic infrastructure development away from other parts of the district. The effects of that cannot be predicted at this stage.		This option would predominantly focus development in the towns so creating economies of scale to bring forward employment, facilities and amenities to support vibrancy in those communities. Inclusivity will be helped through the provision of affordable housing and the ability to bring forward a range of housing types to support the community, including older person's accommodation. However, there is conflict with this option as a number of towns are in flood risk areas and without suitable mitigation through site selection and design, this would be a negative outcome.	With option F2 there would still be opportunities to create economies of scale to bring about employment opportunities and support existing facilities and amenities to support vibrant communities. Inclusivity will be helped through the provision of affordable housing in a wider spectrum of settlements. However, there is conflict with this option in terms of flood risk and without suitable mitigation through site selection and design, this would be a negative outcome.
10. Ensure that local housing needs are met	As inland development would be directed	Similar to E1. This is likely to encourage	This option would deflect development	With most new development in one		Directing development	Similar to F1. This is likely to

	<p>towards Louth, Alford, Spilsby and Horncastle with restrained development elsewhere. This will enable the amount of affordable housing to be increased, through section 106 agreements, on large sites and provider led schemes, along with a small amount of such housing in the larger villages. Essential local needs housing will be enabled elsewhere through exceptions policies. It will also enable a variety of market housing to come forward across the price spectrum for those on lower incomes or first time buyers.</p>	<p>suitable levels of affordable housing for the locations where the development comes forward, although this will depend on the size of housing sites coming forward in the large villages. Essential local needs housing will be enabled elsewhere through exceptions policies.</p>	<p>away from the towns and increase the development coming forward in smaller settlements across the district. This may reduce the variety of housing products that come forward; it may result in growth in the more expensive parts of the district, thus affecting affordability; and will reduce the amount of housing coming forward through section 106 agreements.</p>	<p>location the provision of affordable housing would be concentrated in the new town, apart from a few exceptions schemes. While this could lead to a variety of housing products coming forward in the new town, this may lead to a difficulty in people finding affordable homes in other settlements where they may work and carry out their social life. Without suitable mitigation to make sure this does not happen, this could lead to the need for affordable housing not being met in other sustainable locations.</p>		<p>towards the towns will enable the amount of affordable housing to be increased, through section 106 agreements on large sites and provider led schemes, along with a small amount of such housing in the larger villages. Essential local needs housing will be enabled elsewhere through exceptions policies. It will also enable a variety of housing to come forward across the price spectrum for those on lower incomes or first time buyers.</p>	<p>encourage suitable levels of affordable housing for the locations where the development comes forward, although this will depend on the size of housing sites coming forward in the large villages. Essential local needs housing will be enabled elsewhere through exceptions policies</p>
<p>11. Increase energy efficiency and ensure appropriate sustainable design, construction</p>	<p>Energy efficiency in individual properties is governed by building regulations but with a focus on large scale development in Louth, Alford, Spilsby and Horncastle there is scope to contribute to energy efficiency and sustainable design for the wider community. Large development can incorporate components such as SUDS, Green Infrastructure, opportunities for biodiversity, planned routes for cyclist and</p>	<p>A wider distribution of development, which includes the larger villages, will still allow for some of the principles of sustainable design to be incorporated in to development. However, how comprehensively these principles can be incorporated will depend on the size of housing sites coming forward in the villages.</p>	<p>Unrestrained dispersal will direct development away from towns and larger villages towards smaller settlements. There will be less opportunity to incorporate sustainable principles when development is dispersed and coming forward in small numbers. There may be opportunities within individual houses, to contribute to sustainable development (such as energy and water</p>	<p>The development of a new town lends itself to the concept of developing 'sustainable communities' from the outset. With a focus on large scale development in an area, there is scope to contribute to entire communities that are carbon neutral. However, without these measures being embedded in the proposal, opportunities could be missed to maximise</p>		<p>Energy efficiency in individual properties is governed by building regulations but with a focus on large scale development in the towns there is scope to contribute to energy efficiency and sustainable design for the wider community. Large development can incorporate components such as SUDS, Green Infrastructure, opportunities for</p>	<p>A wider distribution of development, which includes the larger villages, will still allow for some of the principles of sustainable design to be incorporated into development. However, how comprehensively these principles can be incorporated will depend on the size of housing sites coming forward in the villages.</p>

	pedestrians to access services and facilities.		saving efficiency measures), but these are individual choices and will not add to community level sustainability.	energy efficient design and layout.		biodiversity, planned routes for cyclist and pedestrians to access services and facilities.	
12. Infrastructure for "healthy lifestyles	This option has the potential create economies of scale necessary to generate the facilities and infrastructure needed for healthy lifestyles; including green infrastructure and sport and recreation facilities. This option can also help to facilitate walking and cycling through the layout of development providing attractive and safe ways of connecting to services, facilities and employment opportunities. There will also be opportunities to support health facilities through development and section 106 agreements on larger sites.	Although the economies of scale created by this option would not provide the same level of infrastructure for healthy lifestyles and E1, there would still be opportunities to support and increase health facilities, green infrastructure and sport and recreation facilities in the towns and large villages.	By distributing development over a wide areas, opportunities may be lost to contribute to areas of particular need, for example community health facilities, due to lack of economies of scale necessary to attract facilities. It would also increase physical isolation from existing facilities. Opportunities to increase access to green infrastructure and sport and recreation would be lost as development would be coming forward on smaller sites with no requirement to provide this or to provide meaningful spaces for the development or wider community.	Development of a new town enables green infrastructure, sport and recreations facilities and health infrastructure to be embedded from the outset. In most cases, this will be developed at a level to support the emerging community in the new town. However, care has to be taken to ensure that emerging strategies do not deflect investment from existing communities where health inequalities may already exist.		This option has the potential to create economies of scale necessary to generate the facilities and infrastructure needed for healthy lifestyles; including green infrastructure and sport and recreation facilities. This option can also help to facilitate walking and cycling through the layout of development providing attractive and safe ways of connecting to services, facilities and employment opportunities. There will also be opportunities to support health facilities through development and section 106 agreements on larger sites.	Although the economies of scale created by this option would not provide the same level of infrastructure for healthy lifestyles and F1, there would still be opportunities to support and increase health facilities, green infrastructure and sport and recreation facilities in the towns and large villages.
13. Positively plan for, and minimise the effects of, climate change	Focusing inland development in Louth, Alford, Spilsby and Horncastle may increase opportunities through sustainable urban extension, to reduce energy and utilise new forms of	This option would set a settlement hierarchy led by the inland towns and would distribute development within this hierarchy. Some of the opportunities presented under	Unrestrained dispersal will mean that there is less development coming forward in the larger settlements and more development likely in the medium and small villages. This	The creation of a New Town offers the potential to plan for climate change from the outset. However, this has to be weighed against the impacts that building a new town, or		Focusing development in the towns may increase opportunities through sustainable urban extension, to reduce energy and utilise new forms of renewable energy.	This option would set a settlement hierarchy led by the towns and would distribute development within this hierarchy. Some of the opportunities

	<p>renewable energy. Such development may also provide 'landscape scale' opportunities to plan for the maintenance and enhancement of sites for biodiversity, along with new green infrastructure, as wildlife migrates in response to climate change. Focusing development in the towns would also assist in reducing carbon emissions, promoting sustainable modes of travel.</p>	<p>option E1 will not be available with option E2 as development will not be coming forward in strategic schemes. Development will be more widely distributed. There will be some scope to create opportunities for wildlife and renewable energy on a smaller scale. Creating the infrastructure to address some of the results of climate change may be lost.</p>	<p>means that there will not be the economies of scale to implement some of the opportunities for aspects of climate change mitigation, such as biodiversity net gain, green infrastructure and renewable energy. Opportunities for reducing carbon emissions through minimising the need to travel will be lost</p>	<p>expanding an existing settlement to form a new town will have on countryside and how connectivity with other settlements will be achieved. The detail of how climate change mitigation will be achieved will be key to outcomes under this option. Without more information, the outcomes of this option are uncertain.</p>	<p>Such development may also provide 'landscape scale' opportunities to plan for the maintenance and enhancement of sites for biodiversity, along with and new green infrastructure, as wildlife migrates in response to climate change. Water resources will also need to be factored in. Development in Mablethorpe and Skegness was not assessed in the previous Water Cycle Study so will need consideration and appropriate mitigations. Similarly flood risk is an important consideration. Focusing development in the towns would also assist in reducing carbon emissions, promoting sustainable modes of travel. Therefore, there are mixed outcomes for this option which will need addressing through the policies.</p>	<p>presented under option F1 will not be available with option F2 as development will not be coming forward in strategic schemes but numbers will be more widely distributed. There will be some scope to create opportunities for wildlife and renewable energy on a smaller scale. Creating the infrastructure to address some of the results of climate change may be lost. The same issues relating to assessing water resources as option F1 also apply. However, a wider distribution of development may identify more sites that are outside flood risk. Again, there are mixed outcomes for this option which will need addressing through the policies.</p>
--	---	---	--	--	---	--

Option	Option F3 - Settlement hierarchy with coastal regeneration	Option F4 – Unrestrained dispersal of development throughout all settlements	Option F5 - Creating a New Town
1. Biodiversity	Very similar to option F1 but with more focus for growth in Mablethorpe and Skegness. This option may have increased adverse effects for biodiversity (without mitigation) within the immediate geographical locations of the towns, although much of the district will remain unaffected. The extent and location of development along the coast at Skegness and Mablethorpe which abut sites protected at a national and international level for biodiversity will be critical to outcomes. There would be opportunities for biodiversity net gain at a landscape scale with the economies of scale presented by urban extensions which could offset any potential harm in some areas.	Unlike situations where the location and scale of development is shaped by a strategy which has been assessed, if development is unrestrained, applications will be coming forward in an unplanned manner. Although each application will be judged against the biodiversity policy in the Plan, there will not be the opportunity to manage the cumulative effects of development and the opportunities.	Without an indication of the location of any potential New Town, the options has to be identified as unquantifiable. The impacts will vary considerably dependent upon its scale and location: e.g. is the site previously used land or agricultural land, is in close to any sites for protected for their biodiversity. There are likely to impacts on biodiversity wherever such development is located, although this could be mitigated though choice of site, net gain measures and other methods of mitigation.
2. Landscapes, townscapes and historic environment	Outcomes would be very similar to option F1 but with more focus for growth in Mablethorpe and Skegness. This will lead to a greater	Whilst unrestrained housing dispersal may be shaped by design and landscape policies it is likely that development may occur at many	Under this option the majority of development would be in one location with much of the rest of the district subject to limited

	<p>impact on landscape and townscape in these locations but potentially reducing the degree of impact elsewhere. The nature and scale of the impact will depend on the volume and location of development. Large scale urban extension may create opportunities for the creation of Green Infrastructure at a landscape scale may help to offset some of these impacts.</p>	<p>locations across the District that are less able to absorb additional development. Impacts may be most noticeable in the smaller villages and more rural locations and it is highly likely that additional development will come forward within the smaller communities within the AONB. There may be longer term cumulative impacts (e.g. loss of open space, through infill development, changes in local character, and loss of setting of historic assets etc). Important historic landscape and townscape features such as open spaces, may become more vulnerable to change. There may also be less scope to add to Green Infrastructure and other landscape features due to the wider distribution of smaller sites.</p>	<p>development. This would reduce the landscape impacts in other areas as little of no development would be brought forward elsewhere. However, the effects on the location surrounding the new town site could be significant and are wholly dependent on the landscape character and historic sensitivities associated with the proposed location.</p>
<p>3. Protect natural resources</p>	<p>Outcomes will be very similar to F1 but with more focus for growth in Mablethorpe and Skegness. This option will include urban extensions onto greenfield sites which</p>	<p>Again, the location of development will influence the impacts. Unrestrained development cannot be assessed as part of a strategy as it will be coming forward in</p>	<p>This option could be developed to ensure that a new town is located (or and existing village expanded) where there is either (a) adequate resource</p>

	<p>will result in a loss of productive agricultural land, however, this cannot be mitigated. The grade of agricultural land can mitigate to a certain degree and what grade the land is will depend on the location of the sites. Other factors such as water quality and water resources may be affected by large extensions in these areas and the Water Cycle Study would have to be revised to take account of these urban extensions.</p>	<p>an unpredictable and unregulated manner so there may be disparity in how the impacts are experienced. There may be cumulative impact in respect of some settlements as resources, such as water resources/ sewage treatment, as this is unlikely to be constant across the district and this may increase pressure in certain locations. Again, these are difficult to predict without more information on where development will come forward</p>	<p>capacity for sustained growth or (b) least impact across a range of natural resources). Given the limited amount of previously developed land, it is likely that this option will lead to a loss of agricultural land, although this should be no more than the cumulative loss for the other options as the amount of development will not increase. A site can also be chosen that avoids the best and most versatile agricultural land if it is not tied to a particular settlement. However, there is a high degree of uncertainty of potential effects with this option at present due to the lack of detail available.</p>
<p>4. Avoid the risk of flooding (where possible) and fully mitigate against the impacts of flooding where it cannot</p>	<p>Outcomes will be very similar to F1 but with more focus for growth in Mablethorpe and Skegness. However there are significant flood risk issues in Mablethorpe and Skegness and some inland flood risk issues in some of the towns. If it is decided to place a greater focus on development in the coastal towns, opportunities will have</p>	<p>Unrestrained housing development may increase the opportunities for finding sites outside of the flood risk areas. However, with unrestrained development, this will be dealt with on a case by case basis and there would be no strategy directing housing to the most suitable sites. Without a policy</p>	<p>The focus of the development in one area with much of the rest of the district subject to limited development has the potential to bring a significant benefit in that it will avoid any further development in flood risk areas around the district, and SUDS will be incorporated from the outset. However, this is provided the</p>

	<p>to be sought to locate development where flood risk is minimised and mitigated. Without that, focusing development on these two towns would conflict with this objective. Similarly the strategy for the remainder of the housing distribution should seek opportunities which minimised the risk of flooding and SUDS will be necessary to address localised flood and drainage issues.</p>	<p>framework that ensures this, this option risks being in conflict with the objective. Even if development avoids flood risk areas, existing infrastructure within some of the smaller villages may not be capable of absorbing the additional development thought effective drainage. There will also be less opportunity to address the cumulative effect of individual properties or small groups of dwellings coming forward and there will not be the economics of scale to facilitate improvements.</p>	<p>mitigation of locating a 'new town' in an area that is not presently subject to flood risk from any sources, and is not at a high risk of creating flooding issues elsewhere that would be difficult to address.</p>
<p>5. Promote viable and diverse economic growth</p>	<p>Option F3 establishes a settlement hierarchy for the distribution of the development, led regeneration on Mablethorpe and Skegness along with business development in the more sustainable villages. However, there is no reference to the promotion of economic growth in the other towns. This will need addressing otherwise the option would not accord with this objective.</p>	<p>Option F4 is not clear in its approach to economic growth. The scenario refers to increased opportunities for small businesses in the rural areas, but does not outline a strategy for the rest of the District. In terms of promoting diverse economic growth, this will need addressing.</p>	<p>The focus of development would be in one specific area with much of the rest of the district subject to limited development. This option may have limited potential to help grow and diversify the district's economy. Any strategy to refocus inward investment into the new town location is likely to take a long time to come to fruition and, in the meantime</p>

			commuting will increase significantly.
6. Prioritise appropriate re-use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of the best agricultural land and greenfield sites	This option will look to promote urban extensions to the towns, with particular focus on Mablethorpe and Skegness, along with development around the district's larger villages. Due to the low level of previously developed land in the district, this would require the use of greenfield sites resulting in the loss of productive and possibly high quality agricultural land.	This option would allow growth within a large number of the district's settlements. This would reduce the size of urban extensions needed in the towns and the amount of productive agricultural or greenfield sites needed there. However, this potentially increases the number of infill sites being brought forward across the villages which may also be green field open spaces. However, in the longer term the availability of infill and previously developed sites will decrease and then more edge of settlement sites on greenfield land will be needed.	Unless a significant previously development site can be found, the development of a new town will inevitable see a loss of a large amount of greenfield land. This may well be productive agricultural land, although loss of the highest quality land could be avoided by selecting a site which avoids such land.
7. Improve accessibility to key services, facilities, amenities and GI	Similar to option F2. With less development in the towns this will reduce the number of residents with easy access to the services and facilities of the towns; although greater focus on regeneration in Mablethorpe and Skegness will benefit accessibility to services and facilities.	Distributing development across the district may exacerbate the issues of poor access to services and facilities. Not only will development in the smaller settlements not have essential facilities close by, but the opportunities to enhance services and facilities in larger	The development of a new town would allow the planning of accessible facilities, services and green infrastructure from the outset as it would include re-prioritising the provision of infrastructure. There is also the potential for new economies of scale to generate more specialised

	However, housing in the larger villages could help to support local services and facilities, albeit still requiring travel to access larger services.	settlements maybe lost as development there is reduced. The scale of development in smaller villages is unlikely to be sufficient to attract or retain services and facilities. There would also not be the economies of scale to create GI and other amenities and it may dilute the ability to bring these forward elsewhere	community services / facilities. However, this may be at the expense of the enhancement of services and facilities elsewhere and would take a long time to come on stream as they are more challenging to bring forward than housing development. The impacts of such a project are uncertain.
8. Increase reuse and recycling rates and minimise the production of waste	The opportunities to increase recycling is outside the scope of these options	The opportunities to increase recycling is outside the scope of these options	The opportunities to increase recycling is outside the scope of these options
9. Support inclusive, safe and vibrant communities	This option would predominantly focus development in the towns so creating economies of scale to bring forward employment, facilities and amenities to support vibrancy in those communities. Inclusivity will be helped through the provision of affordable housing and the ability to bring forward a range of housing types to support the community, including older person's accommodation. However, there is conflict with this option as it places greater emphasis is on Mablethorpe and Skegness which have	This option would encourage growth across the district, most likely in small numbers within villages. This has the potential to generate high house prices in those areas and a lack of affordable housing as smaller sites do not bring forward affordable housing. Fragmented development can result in residents spending a higher proportion of their income on accessing services and facilities whether by private or public transport. With low levels of public transport in many smaller villages this may lead to social	The effects and implication of a new town on communities cannot, at this stage, be assessed. A lot will depend on the supporting strategies in terms of employment and, provision of services. Although the development of a new town can embed these from the outset they do take time to deliver on the ground so in the longer term the new community should create an inclusive, safe and vibrant community. However, in the longer term this may deflect strategic infrastructure development away

	significant issues with flood risk and without suitable mitigation through site selection and design, this would be a negative outcome. Some of the other towns have flood risk areas in the centre but there are opportunities to develop away from this.	exclusion and inequality as the residents of these villages need a private car to access services and facilities. A wider distribution of smaller sites also limits the opportunity to bring forward green infrastructure or other social facilities through development.	from other parts of the district. The effects of that cannot be predicted at this stage.
10. Ensure that local housing needs are met	Similar to F2, but with more emphasis on development for regeneration in Mablethorpe and Skegness. This is likely to encourage suitable levels of affordable housing for the locations where the development comes forward, although this will depend on the size of housing sites coming forward in the large villages. Essential local needs housing will be enabled elsewhere through exceptions policies.	This option would deflect development away from the towns and increase the development coming forward in smaller settlements across the district. This may reduce the variety of housing products that come forward; it may result in growth in the more expensive parts of the district, thus affecting affordability; and will reduce the amount of housing coming forward through section 106 agreements.	With most new development in one location the provision of affordable housing would be concentrated in the new town, apart from a few exceptions schemes. While this could lead to a variety of housing products coming forward in the new town, this may lead to a difficulty in people finding affordable homes in other settlements where they may work and carry out their social life. Without suitable mitigation to make sure this does not happen, this could lead to the need for affordable housing not being met in other sustainable locations.
11. Increase energy efficiency and ensure appropriate sustainable design, construction	A wider distribution of development, which includes the larger villages, will still allow	Unrestrained dispersal will direct development away from towns and	The development of a new town lends itself to the concept of developing

	<p>for some of the principles of sustainable design to be incorporated into development. However, how comprehensively these principles can be incorporated will depend on the size of housing sites coming forward in the villages. The focus on Mablethorpe and Skegness may bring forward larger projects in these towns and enable the principles of sustainable development to be incorporated.</p>	<p>larger villages towards smaller settlements. There will be less opportunity to incorporate sustainable principles when development is dispersed and coming forward in small numbers. There may be opportunities within individual houses, to contribute to sustainable development (such as energy and water saving efficiency measures), but these are individual choices and will not add to community level sustainability.</p>	<p>'sustainable communities' from the outset. With a focus on large scale development in an area, there is scope to contribute to entire communities that are carbon neutral. However, without these measures being embedded in the proposal, opportunities could be missed to maximise energy efficient design and layout.</p>
<p>12. Infrastructure for "healthy lifestyles"</p>	<p>Although the economies of scale created by this option would not provide the same level of infrastructure for healthy lifestyles as F1, there would still be opportunities to support and increase health facilities, green infrastructure and sport and recreation facilities in the towns and large villages.</p>	<p>By distributing development over a wide area, opportunities may be lost to contribute to areas of particular need, for example community health facilities, due to lack of economies of scale necessary to attract facilities. It would also increase physical isolation from existing facilities. Opportunities to increase access to green infrastructure and sport and recreation would be lost as development would be coming forward on smaller</p>	<p>Development of a new town enables green infrastructure, sport and recreations facilities and health infrastructure to be embedded from the outset. In most cases, this will be developed at a level to support the emerging community in the new town. However, care has to be taken to ensure that emerging strategies do not deflect investment from existing communities where health inequalities may already exist.</p>

		sites with no requirement to provide this or to provide meaningful spaces for the development or wider community.	
13. Positively plan for, and minimise the effects of, climate change	This option would set a settlement hierarchy led by the towns and with greater focus on Mablethorpe and Skegness for regeneration. Development would then be distributed within this hierarchy. Development may not be coming forward in strategic schemes, with the possible exception of Mablethorpe and Skegness. There will be some scope to create opportunities for wildlife and renewable energy on a smaller scale in other locations. Creating the infrastructure to address some of the results of climate change may be lost. Development in the coast was not assessed in the previous Water Cycle Study so will need consideration and appropriate mitigations. Similarly flood risk is an important consideration,	Unrestrained dispersal will be mean that there is less development coming forward in the larger settlements and more development likely in the medium and small villages. This means that there will not be the economies of scale to implement some of the opportunities for aspects of climate change mitigation, such as biodiversity net gain, green infrastructure and renewable energy. Opportunities for reducing carbon emissions through minimising the need to travel will be lost.	The creation of a New Town offers the potential to plan for climate change from the outset. However, this has to be weighed against the impacts that building a new town, or expanding an existing settlement to form a new town will have on countryside and how connectivity with other settlement will be achieved. The detail of how climate change mitigation will be achieved will be key to outcomes under this option. Without more information, the outcomes of this option are uncertain.

	<p>especially with the focus on Mablethorpe and Skegness. However, a wider distribution of development may identify more sites that are outside flood risk. Again, there are mixed outcomes for this option which will need addressing through the policies.</p>		
--	--	--	--