

# EAST LINDSEY CORE STRATEGY

## SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

NOVEMBER 2016

Supporting Economic Growth for the Future





## **Table of Contents**

<b>NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1 INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>2 THE APPRAISAL METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>3 RELEVANT PLANS AND PROGRAMMES</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>4 BASELINE INFORMATION</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>5 THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL FRAMEWORK</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>6 OBJECTIVES COMPATIBILITY ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>7 POLICY ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>8 CUMULATIVE, SYNERGISTIC AND INDIRECT EFFECTS</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>9 MITIGATION</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>10 MONITORING</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>11 CONCLUSION</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>12 REFERENCES</b>	<b>75</b>

# NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY

## Introduction

1. This document provides a non-technical summary of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report of the East Lindsey Core Strategy 2016. The Core Strategy sets out the strategic priorities for its area and policies for the growth and development across the District up to 2031. The accompanying appendices are available on the Councils website at [www.e-lindsey.gov.uk/localplan](http://www.e-lindsey.gov.uk/localplan)

2. The main SA report contains the baseline characteristics in East Lindsey, sets out the SA methodology, outlines the findings of the SA and explains the issues which require mitigation and how this will be addressed.

3. A Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) is required for Local Plans, along with a Sustainability Appraisal (SA). The purpose of Sustainability Appraisal is to promote sustainable development through the integration of social, economic and environmental considerations in the preparation of plans and programmes. The process will assess how the objectives and policies of the plan meet and contribute towards the sustainability objectives for East Lindsey and, where there are any conflicts, what mitigation can be introduced to minimise them. The purpose of SEA is to consider the likely significant effects of implementing the Plan on the environment, specifically on the issues of: population, human health; biodiversity; soil and water; air; climate; cultural heritage and landscape.

4. All parts of the local plan will need to be subject to SA/ SEA. Legislation also requires the carrying out of a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) to assess the impact on site protected, at a European level, for their nature conservation importance. This will be carried out and published separately to this appraisal.

## Methodology

5. Below are the stages that are involved in preparing the SEA/SA.

### Stages of Strategic Environmental Assessment/Sustainability Appraisal

#### **Stage A**

The first stage is to prepare a Scoping Report which identifies plans, programmes and objectives that may influence the SA, sets the baseline characteristics of the District and key sustainability issues. From this, sustainability objectives are developed to appraise the Plan.

#### **Stage B**

As the Plan's objectives are developed, they are tested against the SA objectives to ensure that they are broadly compatible, with changes

made where necessary to bring these into closer alignment. As options for policies and/or site allocations emerge, these are tested against the SA objectives and amended, where possible, to better meet the objectives. The final policies or combination of policies is appraised to predict the combined effects; any necessary mitigation is suggested.

### **Stage C**

Once all the different elements of Stage B have been concluded, this is brought together in the SA report; that is the main report.

### **Stage D**

Consultation then takes place on the SA report, alongside the Plan. If changes are made to the Plan, through the consultation, the appraisal will be carried out on those changes and the SA report amended.

### **Stage E**

The final stage is to set into place the mechanisms for monitoring, identified under task B6, and to keep the Plan and its impacts under review.

## **Scoping**

6. The Scoping Report (see the Council’s website for the full document) sets out the baseline characteristics of the District and develops objectives, targets and indicators. It was consulted on and from these, 13 Sustainability Objectives were developed, which are:

	SA Objective
1.	Protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the areas' biodiversity (native plants and animals) and geodiversity.
2.	Protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the areas' landscapes, townscapes and historic environment.
3.	Protect natural resources from avoidable losses and pollution and minimise the impacts of unavoidable losses and pollution.
4.	Avoid the risk of flooding (where possible) and fully mitigate against the impact of unavoidable losses and pollution.
5.	Promote viable and diverse economic growth that supports communities within the district.
6.	Prioritise appropriate re-use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of the best agricultural land and greenfield sites.
7.	Improve accessibility to key services, facilities, amenities and green infrastructure including the promotion of sustainable modes of access.
8.	Increase reuse and recycling rates and minimise the production of waste.
9.	Support inclusive, safe and vibrant communities.
10.	Ensure that local housing needs are met.
11.	Increase energy efficiency and ensure appropriate sustainable design, construction and operation of new development.
12.	Encourage and provide the facilities and infrastructure for healthy lifestyles.
13.	Positively plan for, and minimise the effects of, climate change.

## **Sustainability of the draft Core Strategy**

### **Objectives**

7. The starting point in considering the overall sustainability of the Core Strategy is an assessment of its objectives against the SA objectives. The majority of the plan's objectives are assessed to be positive or neutral in respect of the SA objectives. However, there are a number of uncertain impacts, which largely relate to the identification of sites and these will be resolved through the Settlement Proposals stage of the plan. In relation to farm and rural diversification objective, potential negative impacts have been identified in terms of landscape and loss of greenfield land; but these could be made positive if suitable mitigation is in place through locational criteria and design. There is also one negative impact, in respect of catering for the needs of gypsies and travellers for the SA objective for sustainable design and construction. There is an inevitable tension between the preferred accommodation of these groups and the requirements for development to meet certain energy standards more appropriate to bricks and mortar accommodation. No mitigation is available to address this issue.

### **Policies**

8. Sustainability Appraisal has been carried out on the each of the policies throughout their evolution. Appraisals of earlier versions of the policies were subject to public consultation. This assessment considers the current version of the policies (2016). The full appraisal tables for the policies can be seen in Appendix 2 to the main report and a summary table, discussing the potential impacts of each policy, is set out in paragraph 7.13 of the main report. Below is a summary of the findings:

*Policy SP1 – A Sustainable Pattern of Places* – Many of the impacts are neutral, however, there are positive outcomes for access to services and facilities and inclusive safe and vibrant communities.

*Policy SP1A – Sustainable Development* – impacts are all positive or neutral.

*Policy SP2 – Housing Growth and the Location of Inland Growth* – There are a number of uncertain outcomes as the location of sites is unknown at this stage. These will be resolved through the Settlement Proposals. There are potential negative outcomes against landscape impact; minimising use of greenfield land; and local housing need. With positive outcomes for supporting safe and vibrant communities; encouraging infrastructure for healthy lifestyles; and positively planning for climate change. The objective for improving access to services has possibilities for both positive and negative outcomes.

*Policy SP2A – Housing in Medium and Small Villages*

Outcomes are largely positive or neutral. However, there is uncertainty about impacts on biodiversity as it is not known where these sites will come forward and brownfield sites can have a biodiversity aspect if vacant for some time. Negative outcomes are identified from access to services and facilities and green infrastructure and for minimising the effects of climate change. Development arising through this policy will be located in villages, however, the policy is specifically for the medium and small villages and these do not, generally, possess many services and facilities, so this will not increase accessibility to such services.

#### *SP2a – Neighbourhood Planning*

This policy directly affects little in the sustainability appraisal as it is more a statement of the Council's support for and approach to NDPs. The only positive outcome against the SA objectives is for vibrant communities.

*SP 3, 4 and 5 – Affordable Housing* – There are a number of positive impacts, with one negative impact as a result of possible building in flood risk areas. To a degree, this impact could be identified as uncertain, as it is not yet known exactly where these sites will emerge. However, as some of the areas of greatest need appear along the Coast, in flood risk areas, it is likely that there will be a degree of conflict to be addressed. As with SP2, there are some uncertainties that will be resolved when the location of development is known.

*SP6 – Design* – Largely positive and neutral impacts. Changes to the policy have helped to resolve previous tensions..

*Strategic Policy 7 – Historic Environment* - impacts are all positive or neutral.

*SP8 – Gypsies, Travellers and Show People* - There are a number of positive impacts from the policy and one negative impact in relation energy efficiency. It is considered that this impact is unavoidable and difficult to mitigate due to the inherent nature of the preferred accommodation of gypsies and travellers. There are also two areas of uncertainty, in respect of flood risk; and prioritising brownfield land as sites are currently unknown.

*SP9 – Inland Employment* – Identified impacts are all positive or neutral with two uncertainties for biodiversity and geodiversity, and landscape as, beyond the allocated sites, locations are currently unknown.

*SP10 – Town/Village Centres and Shopping* – Again identified impacts are all positive or neutral. There is one uncertainty natural resources.

*SP11 – Widening the Tourism and Leisure Economy* - Again identified impacts are all positive or neutral, changes to the policy have resolved any previous uncertainties..

*SP12 – Inland Flood Risk* – impacts are largely neutral or positive, but with uncertainties for biodiversity and landscape, as work on flood

defences may impact on biodiversity and heritage assets. In respect of natural resources it is unclear what the impact will be at this stage. There is a negative impact on flood risk, as the policy does allow some development in these locations, and safe communities (for the same reason).

*SP13 – Coastal East Lindsey* – Similar outcomes to the inland flood risk policy however, there is an additional negative for access to services and facilities as the holiday accommodation part of the policy does not have a spatial aspect so the location of development is not clear in these terms.

*SP14 – Transport and Accessibility* - Identified impacts are all positive or neutral but with uncertainties for biodiversity and geodiversity and landscape, as locations of development under this policy are unknown.

*SP 15 – Landscape, SP16 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity and SP17 – Green Infrastructure* - impacts are all positive or neutral.

*SP18 – Open Space, Sport and Recreation* - impacts are largely positive or neutral, with uncertain outcomes for biodiversity and geodiversity, landscape, flood risk and greenfield land. The first three of these are due to the unknown location of development and the latter as outdoor recreation often require the use of greenfield land.

*SP19 – Renewable Energy* - impacts are all positive or neutral.

*SP20 – Infrastructure and Section 106 Obligations* - - impacts are largely positive or neutral with one uncertainty for biodiversity.

## **Conclusion**

9. The majority of policies that comprise the East Lindsey Local Plan are predicted to have a positive effect on the Sustainability Objectives, and therefore the long term sustainable development of the District.

10. Uncertain outcomes are identified, particularly in respect of biodiversity, landscape and townscape, stem from the fact that many of the outcomes of these policies will depend on the ensuing site allocations and planning applications. The policies themselves can be applied in a way that has a positive outcome, especially when used in conjunction with other specific policies of the plan. However, the sites selected through the site allocations document will have a significant bearing on whether or not those positive outcomes are achieved and this cannot be predicted at this stage.

11. There remain a number of negative outcomes. Almost half of these come from the housing growth policy. Any locally significant growth will have an impact on landscape, although this can be mitigated through positive design and landscaping. East Lindsey does not have a bank of brownfield sites on which to build new housing, it is inevitable that there will be loss of greenfield land, as extensions to settlements are the only way to accommodate growth in the majority of settlements. Focusing

growth on the larger settlements will provide greater access to services and facilities and meet housing need for those residents but could mean other areas of the district continue to be reliant on travel to access services, and the ability to meet affordable and market housing needs in these areas will reduce; although policies for affordable housing on exceptions sites and single plot exceptions, and housing on brownfield sites that will offset some of this.

12. The policies for flood risk (inland and coastal) allow for some development in areas of flood risk including, in very specific circumstances, an element of housing. This automatically generates a negative outcome against the SA objective. Although mitigation can take place, development in these areas could be avoided, so there is still an underlying tension; as there is with the objective for safe communities.

13. The potential negative impacts of these policies will be monitored to enable appropriate alteration or adjustments, through the policies or their implementation, to take place.

14. The Core Strategy will be subject to further consultation prior to the submission of the document. Only minor amendments can be made to the policies without additional consultation. Any amendments will be considered against the SA Objectives.



## **1 Introduction**

1.1 This document is the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report of the East Lindsey Core Strategy 2016, which forms part of the Local Plan for East Lindsey. The report contains the baseline characteristics in East Lindsey and sets out the SA methodology. It goes on to outline the findings of the SA and explains the issues which require mitigation and how this will be addressed. The findings of earlier stages of the SA have been used to refine the Core Strategy, which is subject to public consultation alongside this report. SA is intended to be applied in an iterative way during the preparation of documents, so not all of the tweaks and minor amendments will show up through the SA report, although the appraisal process will have helped to shape the final plan in subtle ways as well as more obvious ways.

1.2 This report has been set out to follow advice from Government in the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister's guidance "Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents" 2005; which is still relevant and useful guidance in the preparation of Sustainability Appraisal for these purposes.

### **Local Planning Policy History**

1.3 Before explaining how the Sustainability Appraisal has been carried out, it is useful to explain the background to the preparation of the Core Strategy; which has been rather complex.

1.4 There was some delay in the early stages of preparing the draft Core Strategy, due to uncertainties over the preparation of the East Midlands Regional Plan. The Panel Report into the East Midlands Regional Plan (confirmed in the adopted Plan of March 2009) proposed that future housing development in East Lindsey should be comprised only of existing commitments (i.e. Houses under construction, or with planning permission and allocated sites without permission) pending the findings of a Coastal Study to assess the implications of climate change for the coast. The Council had prepared an Issues and Options document in 2007 and that document had been subject to public consultation. With the uncertainty over the Coastal Study, the Council took the decision to prepare an interim Core Strategy (2009), which could not contain new housing growth but which would set a broad strategy moving forward and present policies for other topic areas.

1.5 A draft Coastal Study was prepared, although not formally adopted by the participating Authorities. The Localism Act 2011 brought about the abolition of Regional Plans, meaning there was no longer the opportunity to review the policies of the East Midlands Regional Plan, so it was left to the Local Planning Authorities affected by the Coastal Study to move forward with the findings. The Council was then in a position to develop its

own housing figures and start to move forward with a Core Strategy that plans positively for the future.

1.6 Work on the 2009 draft Core Strategy was carried forward into the 2012 draft Core Strategy, where possible. However, the opportunity was taken to reflect changes in national planning policy and changes to the planning system, as well as develop the growth aspects of the Plan.

1.7 Consultation took place on that document in late 2012/ early 2013. The Core Strategy was revised and ready for submission, when the national Government announced it was to release revised household projections, which would have implications for the figures in the Core Strategy. Consequently, the Core Strategy was again put on hold to reflect the revised figures. Delays in the release of the national figures added further delay into the process.

1.8 The Core Strategy was then subject to consultation from 27<sup>th</sup> June to 8<sup>th</sup> August 2016.

## **Local Plan Development and Assessment Process to Date**

### When the SA Was Carried Out, Who Carried Out, Who Was Consulted, When and How

1.9 Due to the complex background to the Plan, some of the stages in the SA/SEA have been carried out more than once. Table 1.1 – Appraisal Timeline, set out below, summarises the different stages, including who prepared the various reports and when.

### Scoping Report

1.10 The Scoping Report was prepared in 2007 by consultants Faber Maunsell. Consultation was carried out with the relevant statutory bodies English Heritage (now Historic England); Environment Agency; Natural England (or Countryside Agency and English Nature at the time). A workshop was held with elected Members on 19<sup>th</sup> January 2007 to help develop the Sustainability Objectives. Further informal consultation was also carried out with elected members and thirty two statutory and local consultees in the summer of 2007. Formal consultation on the report took place in autumn 2007.

1.11 Due to the delays in preparing the Core Strategy (see paragraphs 1.3 – 1.7 above) the initial Scoping Report was prepared some time ago. However, the methodology behind it is sound and it would seem unnecessary to prepare a new report. However, the document has been refreshed to reflect changes in legislation and baseline data.

### 2007 Issues and Options

1.12 The first stage of Plan preparation was the Issues and Options document. This was subject to SA by Faber Maunsell and consultation on the SA was carried out alongside the Issues and Options consultation in November/ December 2007. The SA appeared on the Council's website for comment; hard copies were deposited in local libraries and area offices; everyone on the Council's consultation list (including statutory and non-

statutory consultees, landowners and interested parties) were invited to comment, as well as people attending consultation events.

#### 2009 Draft Core Strategy

1.13 The 2009 Draft Core Strategy was subject to SA by AECOM (the new name for Faber Maunsell). The Sustainability Appraisal was published for consultation purposes alongside the Draft Core Strategy from 19<sup>th</sup> October – 18<sup>th</sup> December 2009. The consultation process for the 2009 SA followed that for the 2007 Issues and Options paper.

#### 2012 Draft Core Strategy

1.14 From the 2012 Draft Core Strategy onwards, the SA has been carried out in-house. Initially, each option or policy is appraised by the officer writing it, as part of an iterative approach to policy writing. The appraisal is then peer reviewed and amended as necessary by the officer overseeing the SA. Where any negative impacts are highlighted, and mitigation recommended, this is drawn out in the Sustainability Appraisal Report. Consultation on the 2012 Draft SA took place alongside the Draft Core Strategy from 19<sup>th</sup> November 2012 – 19<sup>th</sup> January 2013. The consultation process followed that for the previous stages.

#### June 2016 Core Strategy

1.15 The SA Report, for the June 2016 Core Strategy, was also carried out in-house by staff of East Lindsey District Council following the same approach as taken for the 2012 SA. Consultation took place alongside the Core Strategy consultation and the opportunity to comment on the SA was extended to everyone on the Council's consultation list. Copies were made available on line and at the Council's Access Points and at local libraries.

#### November 2016 Core Strategy

1.16 This SA report, assessing the November 2016 pre-submission Core Strategy against the Sustainability Objectives, was again carried out in-house by staff of East Lindsey District Council. The same approach was taken as for previous iterations. Consultation on the SA Report is taking place alongside the Core Strategy consultation and following the same consultation processes.

1.17 At all stages in the SA process, consultation has met the statutory requirements. The SEA regulations require that Natural England, Historic England and the Environment Agency are consulted. The Council uses a mailing list to notify people that the Plan and SA are available for consultation. This contains a wide range of national and local organisations that cover the economic, social and environmental aspects of the district; voluntary groups; and neighbouring local authorities; including various departments of Lincolnshire County Council which, among other services, provides highway, education and social care services in East Lindsey. The list also includes local residents and landowners who have asked to be kept informed. Statutory public notices are placed, all documents relating to the preparation of the plan are available online and paper copies of the Plan and SA are made available at the Council's access points and public libraries in the District.

**Table 1.1 – Appraisal Timeline**

Stage	When	How
Identifying other relevant plans and programmes, and sustainability objectives (A1)	Included in the Scoping Report 2007	Scoping Report produced by Faber Maunsell
	Refreshed 2013	Refresh carried out by East Lindsey District Council
Collecting Baseline Information (A2)	Included in the Scoping Report 2007	Scoping Report produced by Faber Maunsell
	Refreshed 2013	Refresh carried out by East Lindsey District Council
Identifying sustainability issues and problems (A3)	Included in the Scoping Report 2007	Scoping Report produced by Faber Maunsell
	Refreshed 2013	Refresh carried out by East Lindsey District Council
Developing the SA framework (A4)	Included in the Scoping Report 2007	Scoping Report produced by Faber Maunsell
	Refreshed 2013	Refresh carried out by East Lindsey District Council
Consulting on the scope of the SA (A5)	January to August 2007	Consultation during the preparation of the Scoping Report, with elected members and stakeholders, to help shape the draft SA. Changes were included in the final Scoping Report 2007. The refresh of the document did not change the appraisal framework, but only updated legislation and monitoring indicators, so additional consultation was not carried out.
Testing the Core Strategy objectives against the SA Framework (B1)	Plan objectives tested August 2009	The objectives were tested, by AECOM, against the sustainability objectives and overall likely impacts.
	Revised objectives tested August 2012	Revised objectives were assessed in house at ELDC, with a commentary expanding on the likely effects of the objective.
	Revised Objectives were tested December 2013	Revised vision and objectives were assessed using the previous



		approach.
Appraising the options (B2)	<p>First suite of Options tested October 2007</p> <p>No options were presented in the 2009 Core Strategy</p> <p>Growth Options Tested August 2012</p>	<p>Options for issue were tested, by AECOM</p> <p>Carried out in-house by East Lindsey District Council.</p>
<p>Predicting the effects of the Core Strategy (B3)</p> <p>Evaluating the effects of the Core Strategy (B4)</p> <p>Considering ways of mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects (B5)</p>	<p>Preferred options (policies) tested August - September 2009</p> <p>Revised Preferred Options and new Growth Options (see above) August - September 2012</p> <p>June 2016 Plan</p> <p>November 2016 Plan</p>	<p>SA produced by AECOM. Tables show the likely impact (positive negative etc) with a commentary on effects. Also includes a section on mitigation.</p> <p>Carried out in house by ELDC. Policies tested against sustainability objectives in terms of likely impact, degree, likelihood, scale, permanence and duration of the impact. Commentary expanded on impacts, how these may be mitigated or where areas of tension remain.</p> <p>Carried out in house by ELDC (see above).</p> <p>Carried out in house by ELDC (see above).</p>
Proposing measures to monitor the significant effects of the Core Strategy (B6)	<p>Preferred options (policies) August - September 2009</p> <p>Revised Preferred Options and new Growth Options (see above) August - September 2012</p> <p>June 2016 Plan</p> <p>November 2016 Plan</p>	<p>SA report by AECOM included Monitoring Framework.</p> <p>Carried out in house by ELDC. Revised Monitoring Framework focused monitoring on that within the gift of ELDC, as the Council were not in a position to obtain or require the production of data from other sources.</p> <p>Carried out in house by ELDC</p> <p>Carried out in house by</p>

		ELDC (see above).
Preparing the SA Report (C1)	Issus and Options Report October 2007	Produced by Faber Maunsell (later AECOM)
	Preferred options (policies) September 2009	Produced by AECOM
	Revised Preferred Options and new Growth Options (see above) October 2012	Produced in house by ELDC
	June 2016 Plan November 2016 Plan	Produced in house by ELDC
		Produced in house by ELDC
Consultation on the SA Report and the draft Core Strategy (D1)	Public Consultation on 2009 SA Report, 19 <sup>th</sup> October – 18 <sup>th</sup> December 2009.	Consultation alongside Core Strategy.
	Public Consultation on Revised Preferred Options and new Growth Options (see above) SA report 19 <sup>th</sup> October 2012 – 19 <sup>th</sup> January 2013	Consultation alongside Core Strategy
	June 2016 Plan SA report November 2016 Report	Consultation alongside Core Strategy Consultation alongside Core Strategy
Appraising significant changes (D2)	Changes to the Plan following consultation in June – August 2016 have been assessed and are included in appendix 2 to this report.	Produced in house by ELDC

### Assessing Sustainability

1.18The European Directive 2001/42/EC, known as the Strategic Environmental Assessment or SEA Directive, requires that certain plans

and programmes must undergo an 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.

### Sustainability Appraisal

1.19 The purpose of Sustainability Appraisal is to promote sustainable development through the integration of social, economic and environmental considerations in the preparation of planning policy documents. The process will assess how the objectives of the policies meet and contribute towards the sustainability objectives for East Lindsey, how the criteria and guidance in the policy will help deliver the sustainability objectives and, where there are any conflicts, what mitigation can be introduced to minimise them.

### Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

1.20 The purpose of SEA is to consider the likely significant effects of implementing the Plan on the environment, specifically on the issues of:

- population, human health;
- biodiversity;
- soil and water;
- air;
- climate;
- cultural heritage and landscape.

1.21 The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 provides greater detail on what is required in respect of SEA of plans and programmes and the "Practical Guide to the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive" published by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister in 2005 also provides more guidance.

1.22 The different stages of SEA are similar to the stages in an SA; more detail is given in the Methodology section. It is now standard practice for the requirements of SEA to be incorporated into the SA. To comply with the Directive, authorities are required to report on the environmental impacts of various alternatives before the plan is adopted. The table below sets out the requirements of the SEA regulations and indicates which parts of the SA report fulfil this requirement.

### Habitats Regulations Assessment

1.23 Another requirement of the appraisal of planning documents is to carry out a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) to protect the integrity of sites protected, at a European level, for their nature conservation importance. The Habitats Regulations 1994, as amended in 2006, require that all land use plans are subject to an assessment. There are four main stages to HRA. The first is to consider the likely impacts of the plan or programme on these important sites (screening). If there are any likely significant effects, the second stage is to carry out an appropriate assessment; this involves fine tuning the plan to ensure any adverse effects are avoided. If there is still an adverse effect, stage three

considers alternative approaches (or sites in the case of site specific documents). The final stage will only happen if no alternative solutions remain but there is still an adverse impact. In this case it has to be demonstrated that there are no "Imperative Reasons of Overriding Public Interest" (IROPI test) that should require the plan to go ahead. This is a very stringent test and is difficult to pass. Stage four should only be reached in limited and extreme cases.

1.24 Due to the specialist knowledge needed to undertake this assessment, stage one of the process is being carried out for the Council by Royal Haskoning, who bring necessary expertise to the process. According to the legislation, it is for the Council to judge, based on the evidence before it, - 'in combination' with other plans and projects - would have an adverse effect on the integrity of a site or sites. This process is also commonly referred to as 'appropriate assessment' (stage two). The HRA of the Core Strategy was carried out and concluded that it is unlikely that any measurable effect would be incurred at the internationally designated sites along the coast. The Plan has been judged as not having an adverse impact on the relevant sites and so the plan can proceed.

### **Purpose of this Report**

1.25 This report covers Stage C of the Sustainability Appraisal; the SA report. It brings together the previous stages of the plan's evolution through the SA process, along with the assessment of the most up to date policies presented for examination. The SA report should:

- Set out the methodology used, a description of the SA/SEA process and the tasks carried out;
- Review the relationship of other plans and programmes to the Core Strategy;
- Set out the environmental and sustainability context (known as the baseline information);
- Include a summary of the sustainability issues;
- Set the SA objectives for assessing the Core Strategy;
- Review of the objectives of the Core Strategy;
- Review of the options considered;
- Review of the preferred options previously considered; and
- Appraise the policies being submitted for examination.



## 2 The Appraisal Methodology

### Meeting the requirements of the SEA Directive

2.1 Table 2.1 below shows the stages that are involved in preparing the Plan and demonstrates how the requirements of SEA are accommodated in the SA process.

**Table 2.1 – SA/ SEA Process**

	Plan Preparation Stage	SA Process	SEA Process
Pre-production	Evidence Gathering	<b>Stage A</b> : Setting the context, the baseline and deciding on the scope	<b>Stage A</b> : Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding on the scope
Production	Prepare Issues and Options	<b>Stage B</b> : Developing and refining options and assessing the effects	<b>Stage B</b> : Developing and refining alternatives and assessing effects
	Public Participation on draft Plan	<b>Stage C</b> : Prepare SA report	<b>Stage C</b> : Prepare the Environmental Report
	Representations on Preferred Options		
	Prepare Submission Plan		
	Submit Plan to Secretary of State		
Examination	Independent Examination	↓	↓
	Inspectors Report		
Adoption	Adoption		
Monitoring	Implementation, Monitoring and Review	<b>Stage E</b> : Monitoring the significant effects of implementing the SPD	Stage E : Monitoring the significant effects of implementing the plan or programme on the environment

2.2 Table 2.2 below sets out the sections of this report that relate specifically to the SEA Directive.

**Table 2.2 – Incorporation of SEA Requirements**

Requirement	Where Met
a) An outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan or programme, and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes	Section 1 and Section 3
b) The relevant aspects of the current state of the	Section 4

environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme	
c) The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected	Section 4
d) Any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan or programme including, in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance, such as areas designated pursuant to Directives 79/409/EEC and 92/43/EEC	Section 4
e) The environmental protection objectives, established at international, community or national level, which are relevant to the plan or programme and the way those objectives and any environmental considerations have been taken into account during its preparation	Section 4
f) The likely significant effects on the environment, including on issues such as biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors. (Footnote: These effects should include secondary, cumulative, synergistic, short, medium and long-term permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects)	Section 7
g) The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme	Section 9 and Section 10
h) An outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with, and a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties (such as technical deficiencies or lack of know-how) encountered in compiling the required information	Section 7
i) a description of measures envisaged concerning monitoring in accordance with Article 10	Section 10
j) a non-technical summary of the information provided under the above headings	See separate document

## Appraisal Process

### Stage A : Setting the context, the baseline and deciding on the scope

2.3 The Scoping Report was prepared in 2007, by consultants Faber Maunsell, on behalf of the Council. It was informed by workshops with elected members and local stakeholders, a thorough review of the layers of policy that affect the relevant issues, and stakeholder and public

consultation. The Scoping Report developed the thirteen sustainability objectives (see table 4 below) which are used to assess the Plan. Further details of the Scoping Report can be found in the evidence base to the Local Plan at [www.e-lindsey.gov.uk](http://www.e-lindsey.gov.uk).

2.4 The content of the Scoping Report has been reviewed and refreshed. The change of national Government in 2010 brought with it a fundamental review of national policy (including the revocation of the regional tier). Changes were made to the Scoping Report to reflect revised legislation and alterations to data sources; which, particularly in respect of Government data, had undergone a significant overhaul with much data no longer collected. The changes have updated factual data and have not changed the process or the objectives against which future documents will be assessed. This work was carried out in-house at East Lindsey District Council, and involved a desk top assessment of the changes to legislation and guidance, and changes to baseline data and associated indicators. Due to their strategic nature, the sustainability objectives remain unchanged. These Sustainability Objectives cover a range of issues which are set out in full in the Scoping Report. The sustainability objectives remain unchanged, due to their strategic nature.

**Table 2.3 – 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	Population and Human Health

	appropriate sustainable design, construction and operation of new development.	
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

2.8 The baseline has been established using a desk based assessment of the most relevant data available to each SA objective. It is collected from a variety of sources, all of which are documented in the Scoping Report (Table C1 Appendix C). The key sustainability issues have also provided direction for sourcing baseline data. The development of sustainability objectives and collation of baseline data is closely linked and is considered to be an iterative process, as demonstrated by the updates that have taken place since the first Scoping Report was published.

## **Stage B : Developing and refining options and assessing the effects**

### B1 - Testing the Plan's Objectives

2.10 Stage B contains a number of sub-stages. The first, stage B1, requires the testing of the Plan's objectives against the sustainability objectives. This seeks to shape the vision and strategic actions to set a framework to enable a sustainable policy approach to emerge. The Plan's objectives are also tested against each other to ensure that they produce a cohesive strategy. Assessment of the early versions of the vision and objectives against the sustainability objectives produced largely neutral or positive outcomes; which is not unusual given the strategic and positive nature of the vision statement. The following scale was used when testing the Plans objectives in the 2009 Sustainability Appraisal.

<b>√ = SA/SEA objective compatible with Core Strategy Objective</b> i.e. has the potential for positive effects and / or to maximise opportunities and / or help to address current (and future) issues
<b>I = Compatibility of SA/SEA objective with Core Strategy Objective</b> depends upon implementation i.e. there is both the potential for positive and / or adverse effects
<b>X = SA/SEA objective potentially incompatible with Core Strategy Objective</b> i.e. has the potential for adverse effects on existing issues without appropriate measures in place
<b>0 = SA/SEA objective appears to have no clear link with Core Strategy Objective</b> i.e. no effects predicted
<b>? = Uncertainty between the SA/SEA objective and relationship with Core Strategy Objective</b> i.e. link exists but degree of positive / adverse effect is unclear

2.11 The results of that assessment can be seen in the 2009 SA Report at [www.e-lindsey.gov.uk](http://www.e-lindsey.gov.uk)

2.12 For the 2012 Core Strategy a slightly different scale was used, along with a commentary in each box explaining the projected impact. This is also used for the subsequent appraisal. The choice of more muted



colours followed representations that the use of darker colours overwritten with text was hard to read for people with visual difficulties. So, although less striking in colour, the decision was taken to soften the colours used.

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

2.13 The tables showing the assessment of the current vision and objectives can be seen at Appendix 1 of this report.

### B2 - Developing Strategic Alternatives

2.14 Stage B2 of the SA guidance requires that options are put forward and tested to see how they perform, relative to each other, against the sustainability objectives. Options have been tested at a number of stages through the evolution of the Core Strategy.

2.15 The primary testing took place with the 2007 Issues and Options document, which set out options for a range of topic areas. The scale which was used for testing at this stage was:

<b><i>Option is likely to have a positive effect</i></b>
<b><i>Option would have a positive or neutral effect with additional measures / mitigation, negative effects without</i></b>
<b><i>Option is likely to have no effect / neutral effect</i></b>
<b><i>Option is likely to have a negative effect</i></b>
<b><i>Policy effect is uncertain at this stage (could be any of the above)</i></b>

2.16 The 2009 draft Core Strategy did not include options (see paragraph 1.4). However, once those issues were resolved, the 2012 Core Strategy focused on options for housing growth and put forward 4 options, along with policies for the various topic areas covered in the issues paper. For the 2012 options, and subsequent appraisals, the following appraisal format was used:

**Likely Impact** - commentary on the projected impact of the option, if any, on each objective.

### **Degree of Impact**

- √√ significant positive impact      The option or policy is likely to lead to a significant improvement or support in achieving or working towards the achievement of the objective.
- √ positive impact                      The option or policy is likely to lead to some improvement to the current baseline in respect of the objective being appraised.
- neutral impact                         That there are no effects upon the sustainability

	objective being appraised. This may mean that there is no relationship between the two or that there is no discernable harm caused to the objective.
<b>X</b> negative impact	The option or policy is likely to lead to moderate damage or loss, or other negative effects on the objective.
<b>XX</b> significant negative impact	The option or policy is likely to lead to significant or severe damage or permanent loss to the current baseline in respect of the objective.
<b>?</b> uncertain	Where there is no clarity in the likely impacts, there should be acknowledged, rather than guessed at in the assessment. The reasons for the uncertainty and the areas of uncertainty should be drawn out in the commentary in the "likely impact" box.
Mixed – a combination of the above symbols	Again, the "likely impact" commentary box should draw out the reasons why there is a need for a mixed outcome.

**Likelihood of Impact** - High – the identified impact is likely to occur; Medium – there is a strong possibility the identified impact will occur; or Low – there is only a small chance that the identified impact will occur.

**Scale** – the likely geographical scale of the impact, expressed as : Local; District Wide; or Beyond.

**Permanence** – expressed as temporary or permanent.

**Duration** - short term (first five years of the plan), medium term (5 – 10 years) or long term (10 years plus)

2.17 Professional judgement informed the prediction of likely effects of each option. This was largely a qualitative assessment, as quantitative assessment of likely impacts is not possible due to the nature of the sustainability objectives. Instead the degree of likely impact is assessed using the scale above. In the summary tables, a colour based system was used for ease of reference, using the colours set out in paragraph 2.12.

### B3 and B4 - Predicting and Evaluating the Effects of the Preferred Options

2.18 Stage B3 looks to predict the social, economic and environmental effects of the policies of the Plan. Stage B4 seeks to establish the significance of the effects, including the degree, likelihood, scale, permanence and duration of the impacts. These assessments have been incorporated into the approach outlined above, along with taking into account secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects, so everything is together in one table.

2.19 The SA report (see stage C) must document any uncertainties and limitations in the information underlying the predictions, and these are brought out in the commentary in the tables.

2.20 The appraisal sheets are attached at Appendix 2, along with a summary table of the predicted effects (positive, negative etc) for ease of reference.

### Secondary and Cumulative Effects Assessment

2.21 The SEA Directive requires the assessment to include secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects. Secondary effects are those not as a direct result of the plan but as an indirect effect of its policies and allocations. Cumulative effects arise where policies and proposals individually may not have a significant effect, but are likely to when viewed in combination with other policies or proposals. These associated effects have been included in the main assessment process. The commentary for the impact on each objective or policy draws out the wider potential impacts, it also cross refer to other policies of the plan that are more directly relevant if the policy being assessed is unlikely to have a direct impact.

### B5 – Considering Ways of Mitigating Adverse Effects and Maximising Beneficial Effects

2.22 Through the evolution of the plan, areas of tension or conflict do emerge and the policy has, where possible, been amended to address these. Often, where the impacts of the policy are of a more secondary nature, mitigation is provided through other policies of the plan which will set out a more detailed criteria for specific matters (such as design, biodiversity etc), and the plan should be read as a whole. Some mitigation may also be provided on a site by site basis when the plan is implemented. For example, where a high level policy identifies the amount of growth in specified settlements, and potential negative landscape impact is identified through the SA/SEA, there may be mitigation through the layout, design and landscaping of ensuing proposals. Similarly, adjacent sites can work together to provide more robust landscaping or services and facilities for the local community.

### B6 – Proposing Measures to Monitor the Significant Effects of Implementing the Core Strategy

2.23 SA monitoring seeks to identify the causal links between the plan and the receptors being monitored. These tie into the sustainability objectives and the baseline. The indicators chosen should be selected for their relevance to both SA objectives and the plan's policies and objectives. Monitoring should be proportionate and deliverable. Monitoring a large suite of indicators does not necessarily provide a better understanding of the impact of the plan; a more focused and targeted series can be just as effective. It is also important that there are easily accessible sources of data, and that data is not resource hungry to collect.

### **Stage C : Prepare SA report**

2.24 This document is the SA report accompanying the Core Strategy November 2016. It reports on the process and findings to date and enables wider understanding of and engagement with the overall approach and policies of the Plan.

### **Stage D : Consulting on the Draft Plan and Sustainability Appraisal Report**

2.25 Stage D1 requires public consultation on the SA Report alongside the plan it assesses. The Core Strategy and accompanying SA Report were subject to consultation in 2012; although that version of the plan did not contain the figures for growth. Consultation included Natural England, English Heritage (now Historic England) and the Environment Agency. Paragraph 1.15 above sets out who is consulted.

2.26 Stage D2 is appraising significant changes. When plans or programmes go through several successive consultation exercises, it is important to ensure that the changes are remain consistent with the initial objectives of the plan and the sustainability objectives. Previous SAs assessed changes made to previous versions of the Core Strategy, following consultation, changes to Government legislation and work on the Plan's evidence base.

2.27 A further consultation then took place on the SA, prepared to assess the June 2016 Core Strategy. The consultation was carried out alongside the Core Strategy consultation, between the 27th June and 8th August 2016.

2.28 That consultation again prompted the need for changes to the plan, albeit none of them significant or changing the direction of policy. However, all those changes have been subject to SA in line with stage D2 and this report brings together that assessment, along with the assessment from previous stages, so that the evolution of the Plan and assessment can be seen.

### 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 has been updated to reflect changes to these plans, policies and programmes to ensure that the document retains its relevance.

3.2 The most significant change with respect to the Plan was the publication, in March 2012, of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which provides the primary guidance document for the planning system in England. The NPPF covers a wide range of topic areas, but central to this is the opening statement in the forward that “the purpose of planning is to promote sustainable development”. It sets a presumption in favour of sustainable development and goes on to explain how this can be delivered.

#### Relevant Social, Environmental and Economic Priorities

3.3 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 Core Strategy. Table 3.1 below provides a summary of the key priorities.

**Table 3.1 – 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

3.4 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 Core Strategy and which reflect the priorities of international, national and local plans and programmes to which the Core Strategy should have observance.

## **4 Baseline Information**

4.1 The SEA Directive requires that the Environmental Report should provide information on the state of the environment and its evolution, the environmental characteristics of the area and any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan.

4.2 In addition, the SA process requires the collection of information on the social and economic characteristics of the area. This baseline information was collected and presented as part of the Scoping Report and the full version can be seen in that document. However, below is a summary of the key characteristics (Table 4.1). Table 4.1 also references the sustainability objectives and the SEA topics relevant to each identified topic area.

**Table 4.1 Baseline Information**

<b>Baseline Information</b>		<b>SA Objective/SEA Topic</b>
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Implications</b>	
<b>Social (population and distribution)</b>		
<p>East Lindsey is the third largest district in the UK with a population of approximately 137,000 (2011 Census). No one urban centre dominates. Less than 5% of the district is classed as 'urban'. The rest is rural in character with more than 200 scattered settlements amongst land used for agriculture. This poses some key challenges, including physical isolation, poor access to public facilities and amenities and inadequate service provisions.</p> <p>The population has grown slowly over the past 20 years (approximately 1% per annum), with high outward migration of young adults (e.g. seeking employment and/or education opportunities outside the district) and inward migration of those in the 50 to 80 year age group.</p> <p>Rural isolation can be an issue but the area's rural charm and tranquillity is also a major strength that needs protecting in its own right, and as a characteristic that attracts people to move and/or visit the area.</p>	<p>The settlement pattern, which underpins the plan, is based on the level of services and facilities that each settlement possesses. This will help to direct development to those settlements best able to accommodate growth. Policies also seek to protect existing local services where possible.</p> <p>The employment policies seek to strengthen and diversify the economy to increase opportunities.</p> <p>Policies seek to protect the quality of the landscape and historic environment and provide a good standard of design.</p>	<p><b>Issues reflect SA objectives: 7 and 9</b></p> <p><b>SEA Issues : Population and Human Health</b></p>
<b>Society (health)</b>		
<p>The district is a fairly 'healthy' place to live. However, there are a relatively high number of households (25.95%, 2011 census) with one or more residents with a long-term limiting illness. Health characteristics are exacerbated by an aging population and poor or limited access to healthcare facilities (e.g. as a result of dispersed settlements, inadequate public transport facilities and physical isolation for those without private transport).</p> <p>Access to green infrastructure is also a challenge for the district. Green space has an important role to play in delivering health benefits and opportunities for leisure and recreation.</p>	<p>Many of the issue connected to health are beyond the scope of the Plan. However, the Plan will seek and protect green infrastructure for health benefits. A high quality local environment can also encourage people to be more active. Policies supporting community facilities can reduce isolation and promote better health.</p>	<p><b>Issues reflect SA objectives: 12</b></p> <p><b>SEA Topics : Population and Human Health</b></p>
<b>Society (quality of life)</b>		

<p>East Lindsey does not suffer from large scale social deprivation. However, there are localised 'pockets' where this is an issue and impacts on the quality of life.</p> <p>Incomes within East Lindsey are relatively low, with gross weekly pay below the national level. Unemployment rates are similar to those nationally. A dispersed geography, and decline and poor access to services and facilities, can result in a higher proportion of income being spent on travel, by private or public modes of transport; and higher dependence on the private car.</p> <p>Access to quality green infrastructure is an issue. Facilities for children and young people such as play parks and sports pitches are particular issues in smaller settlements.</p> <p>Crime is relatively low, although there are pockets where this is slightly higher. Vandalism and anti-social behaviour are key issues within the district and may be associated with a low police presence in some areas.</p>	<p>Policies supporting economic development and community projects and initiatives can help areas suffering from deprivation. Even policies for good design can help to stimulate investment and improve quality of life in such areas. Similarly, the protection of and delivery of additional green infrastructure</p> <p>Employment policies that support economic development across a wider geographical and sector base can help physical access to employment.</p>	<p><b>Issues reflect SA objectives: 7, 9, 12</b></p> <p><b>SEA Topics : Population and Human Health</b></p>	
<p><b>Society (housing)</b></p>		<p>The plan will address affordable housing need through percentage requirement on larger market housing sites, and exceptions sites to enable local need be addressed in more rural communities.</p> <p>Development sites should also provide for a mix of housing types.</p> <p>The issue of brownfield land is difficult to address, given the low level of supply, but the plan will continue to seek housing allocations and proposals, where this is the best use for the site.</p>	<p><b>Issues reflect SA objectives: 4, 6, 10, 11 and 13</b></p> <p><b>SEA Topics : Population and Human Health</b></p>
<p>Meeting the housing needs of present and future generations throughout the district is a long term challenge. Housing growth has been driven by in-migration of those at retirement age. The lack of affordable housing and in some instances, the lack of 'appropriate' housing (e.g. the mix of housing types) has made it increasingly difficult for first time-buyers. The average ratio for house price to annual earnings is 4.6x, more than the 3.5x advocated by Government, meaning the average house price is unaffordable for residents of the District.</p> <p>The national target of 60% of developments on brownfield sites is an issue as the quantity of brownfield sites do not exist. There are a lot of farm buildings and yards within settlements that are clearly 'previously used' and in sustainable locations but cannot be classed as brownfield land because agricultural buildings do not meet the definition in the NPPF.</p>			

<p>Flood risk is an issue from both coastal and fluvial inundation. Whilst there are large areas of the District located in flood zone 2 and 3, a significant proportion is within Flood Zone 1. This will place constraints on development in some areas, including significant areas in come of the District's towns.</p>	<p>The Plan will set out a clear strategy for development in flood risk areas; this is particularly relevant for the coast where flood risk is a significant issue.</p>	
<p><b>Society (Public transport and access)</b></p>		
<p>Access to local and district wide services and facilities is one that cuts across many sustainability themes. Many areas are only served only by a pre-bookable bus service. Many therefore rely on private cars. For those without private transport, this can mean poor access to employment opportunities, health and leisure facilities, physical isolation etc. Less than 1.27% of commuters use public transport and 8.48% walk.</p> <p>The ability of the transport network to cope with evacuation in areas affected by flooding, and the capacity of the emergency services to evacuate occupants, is also an issue.</p>	<p>Policies to seek to retain or encourage services and facilities across community and to develop community clusters can assist.</p>	<p><b>Issues reflect SA objectives: 4, 7 and 13</b></p> <p><b>SEA Topics : Population and Human Health</b></p>
<p><b>Economy (employment, economic independence, economic growth and diversification)</b></p>		
<p>The district has low numbers of full time employees (compared to regional and national figures), a higher percentage of self employment than the nation average, and a high percentage of residents classed as non-economically active (39.24%), the largest group of which are retired.</p> <p>Key employed sectors are agriculture; wholesale &amp; retail; accommodation &amp; food services; public administration; education &amp; health; construction and manufacturing. There is significant reliance on seasonal work in the tourism industry. The coastal tourism industry itself faces challenges, including climate change (sea level rise) predictions. There are opportunities to encourage 'appropriate' tourism inland whilst considering the potential implications for landscape, increased disturbance (to wildlife and residents) and loss of tranquillity. To this end, 'green tourism' has a significant role to play in attracting visitors to the district.</p> <p>The economy needs to diversify by attracting investment and by diversification of existing sectors, for example, conversion of farm</p>	<p>Employment policies that support economic development across a wider geographical and sector base can help to address some of these issues. Also supporting initiatives for new training and skill based projects.</p>	<p><b>Issues reflect SA objectives: 4, 5 and 13</b></p> <p><b>SEA Topics : Population and Human Health</b></p>



<p>buildings to alternative uses. These present a number of sustainability issues including potential landscape impacts, impacts on other businesses and pressure on local services.</p> <p>Access to employment centres, more varied economic opportunities and good quality and diverse education/training are issues. A skills shortage is recognised, that in turn can result in low inward investment and lack of inviting/attractive premises/shared services.</p>		
<b>Environment (biodiversity, nature conservation and geodiversity)</b>		
<p>The district has a rich and diverse natural heritage including habitats with nature conservation and/or geological value (of international, national, regional and local importance). However, biodiversity in the district has a low baseline condition and coverage of protected sites (away from the coast) is below the national average. Development, where possible, should be located away from sensitive sites of local or regional importance (sites national or international designations are unlikely to be affected due to their high level of protection) or sites containing protected species. Habitat enhancement schemes should be integrated into the design of proposed developments and due consideration given to priority Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) habitats and species. The Biodiversity duty covers all development, not just that on or near sensitive sites.</p>	<p>Policies to address potential impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity, protected habitats and species will address these issues.</p>	<p><b>Issues reflect SA objectives: 1, 2</b></p> <p><b>SEA Topics : Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna</b></p>
<b>Environment (important landscapes)</b>		
<p>More than 95% of East Lindsey is rural and the predominant land use is agriculture. There are key areas of historic landscape which cover a significant proportion of the district, including the Lincolnshire Wolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The NPPF requires great weight is given to the conservation of the natural beauty of the landscape within AONBs. However, it is recognised that appropriate and sensitively designed small-scale developments can bring economic and social benefits to often isolated communities.</p> <p>Landscape change is most likely to be local but cumulative impacts should be taken into consideration. Farm diversification needs to</p>	<p>Landscape impact will be addressed through a discrete policy and as criteria within other development based policies. The weight to be given to the AONB will be important, but the value attributed to the wider landscape should be reflected.</p> <p>The renewable energy policy reflects landscape impact, including cumulative impact, as this is often a key consideration with this type of</p>	<p><b>Issues reflect SA objectives: 2</b></p> <p><b>SEA Topics : Cultural Heritage and Landscape; Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna</b></p>

<p>be carefully managed so as not to harm rural character.</p> <p>Renewable energy projects, particularly wind turbines, are a key issue. They can have significant impacts upon landscapes from considerable distances and they have the potential to impact upon the views both to and from the Lincolnshire Wolds AONB. Their impact, including cumulative impact, should be carefully considered against their benefits.</p> <p>Technology offers opportunities for socio-economic benefits, however, impacts upon the appearance and character of the area or local amenities through telecommunication developments should be minimised. Considerations include site selection, mast sharing, siting, design and appearance to minimise visual impact, including any ancillary buildings and services.</p>	<p>development.</p>	<p><b>Environment (historic built environment and archaeology)</b></p> <p>East Lindsey's important historic heritage is reflected in the number of Scheduled Monuments (151), listed buildings (1,428 - 91 Grade I, 114 Grade II*, 1223 Grade II), conservation areas (17), parks and gardens of special historic interest (6) and registered battlefields (1) (collectively referred to as Heritage Assets); along with thousands of registered sites of archaeological findings. There are also many unlisted Heritage Assets that are of local value. Protection of such buildings is a key issue, as is their restoration which also raises the issue of sustainable development.</p> <p>The Lincolnshire Wolds has a particularly high density of archaeological and historic features and have a rich legacy of prehistoric sites including a high density of deserted medieval villages, long and round barrows. The area's rich heritage resource and cultural associations, especially with Alfred, Lord Tennyson, was an important factor in its designation as an AONB.</p>	<p>Policies to protect and enhance the historic assets of the District will have benefits both in their own right and as part of the landscape/townscape quality of the District.</p>	<p><b>Issues reflect SA objectives: 2</b></p> <p><b>SEA Topics : Cultural Heritage and Landscape</b></p>
<p><b>Environment (natural resources and pollution)</b></p> <p>Water resources and availability are key considerations. Initiatives to encourage water saving technologies (e.g. grey water recycling) and sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) should be positively encouraged. Certain elements of SUDS can benefit both people</p>		<p>The plan contains policies which protect water resources and deliver SUDS, the latter being particularly important due to significant flood risk</p>		<p><b>Issues reflect SA objectives: 3 and 13</b></p>

<p>and biodiversity, reducing the risk of flooding and providing a wildlife resource. Water resources and changing demands for leisure activities also need to be considered.</p> <p>Water resources are also an issue with regard to wildlife with many important species dependent on aquatic and wetland habitats. East Lindsey also has a high proportion of the nationally important chalk streams, which warrant special protection and enhancement.</p> <p>The water quality of the district's rivers has been improving over the past fifteen years. Maintaining and improving water quality is still a key consideration for coastal waters, rivers, drains and aquifers. Water Framework Directive targets are challenging and East Lindsey has a number of watercourses at risk of failing to meet some of these targets. This has important implications for current land use management and future land use change that may result in new discharges to coastal and inland waters.</p> <p>Light pollution, particularly in more rural areas/on the periphery of market towns, is also an issue. It is of particular concern for the AONB where dark skies are an important part of the landscape. Improvements in technology are helping to facilitate lighting schemes that can minimise both energy use and light pollution.</p>	<p>issues in parts of the District.</p> <p>Biodiversity policies will also help address potential water related impact on wildlife.</p>	<p><b>SEA Topics :</b>  <b>Biodiversity,</b>  <b>Flora and Fauna;</b>  <b>Population and Human Health;</b>  <b>Water and Soil;</b>  <b>and Climate Factors</b></p>
<p><b>Environment (waste)</b></p> <p>Waste removal and pressure upon existing landfill sites in the medium to longer term are important issues. New developments should follow the 'reduce, reuse, recycle' principle through the design, construction and completion stages.</p> <p>Redundant waste sites can, once made safe, provide important areas for biodiversity and recreation through well planned reclamation. In some cases such uses will need to be carefully balanced against alternatives such as recycling or composting facilities which can often be well screened within such sites.</p>	<p>The scope of the plan to have a direct impact on waste generation and refuse policy is very limited. The plan can however, ensure recycling facilities are achievable within new development. Policies can also be formed which would support reuse of waste sites for suitable uses, once safe to do so.</p>	<p><b>Issues reflect SA objectives: 8, 11</b></p> <p><b>SEA Topics :</b>  <b>Climatic Factors;</b>  <b>and Water and Soil</b></p>
<p><b>Environment (climate change)</b></p>		
<p>Climate change is a global, national and local challenge. Climate</p>	<p>The policies of the Plan look to</p>	<p><b>Issues reflect SA</b></p>

<p>change induced sea level rise is a significant long term issue for the coast. Sustainability issues related to climate change cut across all three themes (social, economic, and environmental). Predicted future weather patterns may lead to more regular and possibly extreme flood events (in the longer term).</p> <p>There are three main sources of flooding within the district; from the sea, rivers and surface water flooding from drainage infrastructure. The need to adapt spatially is vital, rather than an increased reliance on mitigation. Only once all other options have been fully explored should mitigation be considered.</p> <p>Predicted weather changes combined with development and economic growth may also have implications for other environmental features. For example, water abstraction and availability, water quality and agriculture and cropping patterns. Irrigation reservoirs to store excess winter water for use during drier periods are likely to increase (with potential for landscape and visual impacts), although these reservoirs may be used for large scale wildlife habitat creation. In addition, more upstream flood storage areas may be required to protect vulnerable communities downstream.</p> <p>Other relevant impacts include the risk of drought (e.g. dry soils will erode and clay soils shrink, damaging agricultural land and potentially damaging buildings through subsidence). Lower river flows and higher temperatures will affect biodiversity in and around water, and activities such as angling. Climate change has the potential to impact upon, and put pressure upon both habitats and species which, if isolated, will find it difficult to adapt. Green corridors and large scale habitat recreation will become increasingly important to allow space for species and habitats to migrate in response to the stresses caused by climate change.</p> <p>Renewable energy production technologies locally should be given consideration. It should be noted however that bio-fuels may result in the loss of land utilised for food production, thereby</p>	<p>address the issue of flood risk spatially and through design.</p> <p>The plan has less scope to deal with some of the other issues raised, e.g. in connection with drought, although it can consider water usage in development to help offset some of the demands.</p> <p>The plan should set out the approach for renewable energy, pertinent to the circumstances in East Lindsey.</p>	<p><b>objectives: 3, 4, 13</b></p> <p><b>SEA Topics : All Topics</b></p>
--	--	--

<p>conflicting with the need for sustainable communities in terms of local food production.</p> <p>All development should take account of sustainable design principles as required by legislation.</p>		
---	--	--



4.3 The SEA Directive requires that future trends are considered in relation to the state of the environment, and the table above brings out a number of those trends. Below is a short summary:

- Population
  - growth will continue to be stimulated by inward migration, predominantly from the 50 – 80 age group;
  - The District's population is projected to be 153,600 by 2037.
- Housing
  - The gap between house prices and wages will continue to require the provision of affordable housing to meet the District's housing need;
  - The availability of brownfield land will not increase significantly.
- Transport and Access
  - Continued reliance on the car due to the spatial distribution of settlements and facilities and the poor viability of public transport systems in the District
- Biodiversity
  - Climate change will necessitate habitat adaptation and enhancement to allow for migration of species and change of species types.
- Natural Resources and Pollution
  - Water resources will require greater conservation, potential creation of storage reservoirs for agriculture.
- Climate Change
  - Climate change, in particular in terms of flood risk, will require a continued spatial response in respect of new development;
  - Upstream flood defences are being constructed at Louth and awaiting development in respect of Horncastle.

## **5 The Sustainability Appraisal Framework**

5.1 The Sustainability Appraisal Framework combines the previous elements set out in this report and brings them together so that they can be used to predict and assess the effects of the content of the plan.

5.2 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.

5.3 Indicators have been set for each objective to enable the effects of the plan to be monitored. Some of the indicators are repeated, as they apply to more than one objective; this will help to simplify the monitoring process. The indicators focus on data sources that are available to the District Council and directly attributable to the policies being assessed. There is no perceivable merit in including high level data, e.g. national CO2 levels, when it cannot be established how much of previous and new levels are attributable to development emerging from (or as a result of policies in) the Plan for East Lindsey. Similarly, there is no value in including indicators, no matter how useful, for which no data is available. These indicators will, wherever possible, be part of the monitoring indicators for the plan itself which will further strengthen the connectivity of the two documents. The most difficult aspect to monitor in statistical terms is the impact on landscape character. Measuring landscape quality and landscape impact is more descriptive in nature and cannot be easily represented numerically. To be meaningful, this issue will have to be monitored in a more narrative style. Targets are not set for all indicators, but they are set when they can provide a useful guide to progress or impact.



<p>historic environment.</p>	<p>Wolds (AONB) within the district?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintain and, where possible, increase the area of high quality green infrastructure within the district – e.g. woodlands, public rights of way etc?</li> <li>Prevent aspects / amenity being compromised?</li> <li>Provide opportunities to enhance the townscapes within the district – e.g. promotion of the repair and re-use of historic buildings?</li> <li>Maintain and enhance the character / distinctiveness of towns and villages (including conservation areas)?</li> <li>Protect or enhance known features of historical, archaeological, or cultural interest, including their setting?</li> <li>Protect areas associated with a known high risk archaeological resource where actual and / or quality / quantity of finds is</li> </ul>	<p>AONB.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amount (ha) of green infrastructure created through new development.</li> <li>Number Heritage Assets at Risk.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No target but increase in level created</li> <li><b>No nett increase in buildings on the Buildings at Risk register</b></li> <li><b>No nett increase in Scheduled Monuments and other archaeological sites at risk.</b></li> <li><b>Number of applications granted with archaeological conditions attached.</b></li> </ul>	<p>ELDC</p> <p>Historic England</p> <p>Historic England</p> <p>ELDC</p>	<p>Annually</p> <p>Annually</p> <p>Annually</p> <p>Annually</p>
------------------------------	--	--	---	---	---

<p>3. Protect natural resources from avoidable losses and pollution and minimise the impacts of unavoidable losses and pollution.</p>	<p>not known e.g. features associated with buried archaeology?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contribute to effective management of water resources (surface and ground waters) via a reduction in water consumption?</li> <li>• Contribute to effective management of water resources (surface waters) via storage of excess precipitation?</li> <li>• Reduce diffuse and point source water pollution (e.g. from STWs, commercial, industrial and agricultural sources) and therefore contribute to 'good ecological status' for all water bodies?</li> <li>• Protect the habitats and species reliant on the water environment e.g. in rivers, canals, lakes, ponds and adjacent areas of wetland habitats?</li> <li>• Avoid an increase in light pollutants, particularly in more rural areas and the Lincolnshire Wolds</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of permissions granted contrary to the advice of the Environment Agency, on water quality grounds.</li> <li>• Number of SUDS implemented in the District.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No permissions granted</li> <li>• No target (proposal specific)</li> </ul>	<p>ELDC</p> <p>ELDC</p>	<p>Annually</p> <p>Annually</p>
---	---	--	---	-------------------------	---------------------------------



	<p>AONB?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protect the best and most versatile agricultural land?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amount of Grade 1 and 2 agricultural land lost to development.</li> </ul>	No target set	ELDC	Annually
4. Avoid the risk of flooding (where possible) and fully mitigate against the impacts of flooding where it cannot be avoided.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it minimise flood risk to people, property, agricultural land and other assets from rivers and from drainage infrastructure e.g. resulting from intense or prolonged precipitation?</li> <li>Will it minimise flood risk to people, property, agricultural land and other assets from coastal inundation e.g. via storm surges?</li> <li>Increase flood risk to people, property, agricultural land and other assets downstream of the proposed development?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of applications approved within flood zones 2 and 3.</li> <li>Number of open market houses built within the Coastal Hazard Zones.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No target set.</li> <li>Total should not exceed 1308 over the plan period.</li> </ul>	ELDC  ELDC	
5. Promote viable and diverse economic growth that supports communities within the district.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assist the provision of appropriate land and premises for business activity?</li> <li>Provide diversity in the economy and encourage sustainable business development?</li> <li>Support the growth</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amount (ha) of new employment land developed.</li> <li>New business registrations.</li> <li>No current</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local Plan targets for creation of employment land.</li> <li>Increase in number of VAT registered businesses.</li> <li>No target set</li> </ul>	ELDC  ELDC  ELDC	

	<p>of sectors that offer scope to reduce outcommuting, e.g. to Lincoln, Grimsby and Boston?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve access to education and training, and support provision of skilled employees to the economy?</li> <li>• Support vital and viable town centres?</li> <li>• Encourage the rural economy and support farm diversification?</li> <li>• Enable tourism opportunities to be exploited?</li> </ul>	<p>indicator</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No current indicator</li> <li>• Number of vacant retail units as percentage of total ground floor business; by town.</li> <li>• Number of farm diversification projects approved.</li> <li>• Number of applications approved for tourism/leisure uses (including accommodation).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No target set</li> <li>• Decrease in vacancy rates.</li> <li>• No target set</li> <li>• No target set</li> </ul>		
<p>6. Prioritise appropriate re-use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of the best agricultural land and greenfield sites.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote the efficient re-use of land and buildings for new developments and ensure that more dense developments are well designed and are associated with good public transport systems to help achieve the most sustainable pattern and types of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Percentage of housing built on previously used land.</li> <li>• Percentage of all uses on previously used land.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No target set</li> <li>• No target set</li> </ul>	<p>ELDC</p> <p>ELDC</p>	<p>Annually</p> <p>Annually</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>development? Protect the best and most versatile agricultural land?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amount of Grade 1 and 2 Agricultural Ground lost to development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No target set</li> </ul>	ELDC	Annually
7. Improve accessibility to key services, facilities amenities and green infrastructure including the promotion of sustainable modes of access.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve access to local services, facilities, places of employment and green infrastructure for all residents throughout the district?</li> <li>Provide improved and sustainable public modes of transport in both urban and rural areas and reduce the need to travel by car?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of community facilities lost/gained</li> <li>Percentage of settlements with a recognised shopper bus service.</li> <li>Percentage of settlements with a recognised commuter bus service.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No nett change (will require a narrative monitoring).</li> <li>No decrease in level.</li> <li>No decrease in level.</li> </ul>	ELDC  ELDC  ELDC	Annually  Annually  Annually
8. Increase reuse and recycling rates and minimise the production of waste.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduce waste generated as part of all building programmes?</li> <li>Reduce household waste?</li> <li>Increase waste recovery and recycling (domestic, commercial etc)?</li> </ul>	No indicators identified	N/A	N/A	
9. Support inclusive, safe and vibrant communities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve the quality of life for communities by allowing residents to become actively involved in decision making at a local</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of Parishes with Parish Plan.</li> <li>Number of Parishes with Neighbourhood Development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No target set.</li> <li>No target set.</li> </ul>	ELDC  ELDC	Annually  Annually

	<p>level?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintain, enhance and create green infrastructure assets (e.g. green space) across the district accessible to the whole community?</li> <li>Improve the availability and accessibility of key local services and facilities, including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs etc.) that also reduce the need to travel?</li> <li>Promote more diverse and cohesive communities?</li> <li>Promote and encourage design principles that positively reduce crime and antisocial behaviour?</li> <li>Reduce the fear of crime, the actual levels of crime, antisocial behaviour</li> </ul>	<p>Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amount (ha) of green infrastructure created through new development.</li> <li>Number of community facilities lost/gained</li> <li>Number of pitches granted permission for gypsies and travellers</li> <li>Number of planning permissions refused on design grounds</li> <li>Incidence of recorded crime</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No target but increase in level created</li> <li>No net change (will require a narrative monitoring).</li> <li>Minimum of 7 pitches permanent stopping places for gypsies and travellers and 6 residential plots for circus and show people.</li> <li>No target set.</li> <li>No increase in recorded crime.</li> </ul>	<p>ELDC</p> <p>ELDC</p> <p>ELDC</p> <p>ELDC</p> <p>Lincolnshire Research Observatory</p>	<p>Annually</p> <p>Annually</p> <p>Annually</p> <p>Annually</p> <p>Annually</p>
--	--	---	--	--	---

<p>10. Ensure that local housing needs are met.</p>	<p>and improve public safety?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the provision of a range of house types and sizes, including affordable housing, to meet the identified needs of all sectors of the community?</li> <li>Enable first time buyers to purchase a home?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual House Building rate (based on trajectory in AMR).</li> <li>Mix of houses based on stock breakdown by Council Tax band.</li> <li>Affordability Ratio</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Housing Trajectory in AMR</li> <li>No target</li> <li>No increase</li> </ul>	<p>ELDC</p> <p>ELDC</p> <p>DCLG/ELDC Housing Dept</p>	<p>Annually</p> <p>Annually</p> <p>Annually</p>
<p>11. Increase energy efficiency and ensure appropriate sustainable design, construction and operation of new developments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure all new housing incorporates at least some energy saving measures?</li> <li>Lead to local developments built to a high standard of sustainable design?</li> <li>Reduce household waste and increase waste recovery and recycling (domestic, commercial etc)?</li> <li>Lead to an increased proportion of energy needs being met from renewable sources e.g. at domestic and commercial scales?</li> </ul>	<p>*sustainable design and construction is now part of the building regulations and standards will be set via this mechanism</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amount of waste going to landfill</li> <li>Percentage of household waste recycled</li> <li>Amount of kilowatt hours generated from renewable sources – granted through planning permissions</li> </ul> <p>N.B. the council can only monitor proposals requiring planning permission, it will have no record of small domestic schemes no needing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decrease</li> <li>Increase</li> <li>Increase</li> </ul>	<p>ELDC</p> <p>ELDC</p> <p>ELDC</p>	<p>Annually</p> <p>Annually</p> <p>Annually</p>

<p>12. Encourage and provide the facilities and infrastructure for "healthy lifestyles"</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that adequate health facilities and infrastructure is available for present and future generations?</li> <li>• Ensure health facilities are accessible to all sectors of the community?</li> <li>• Reduce health inequalities across the district?</li> <li>• Promote healthy and active lifestyles?</li> <li>• Maintain, enhance and create green infrastructure assets (e.g. green space, recreation and sports facilities, semi-wild/rural places) across the district accessible to the whole community?</li> </ul>	<p>consent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of doctors and dentist surgeries in the District</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase</li> </ul>	<p>ELDC</p>	<p>Annually</p>
<p>13. Positively plan for, and minimise the effects of, climate change</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimise flood risk to people, property, agricultural land and other assets from the sea, from rivers and from surface water drainage infrastructure?</li> <li>• Increase flood risk to people, property, agricultural land and other assets downstream of the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Levels of participation in sport and recreation.</li> <li>• Amount (ha) of green infrastructure created through new development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase</li> <li>• Increase</li> </ul>	<p>Sport England</p> <p>ELDC</p>	<p>Annually</p> <p>Annually</p>
<p>13. Positively plan for, and minimise the effects of, climate change</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimise flood risk to people, property, agricultural land and other assets from the sea, from rivers and from surface water drainage infrastructure?</li> <li>• Increase flood risk to people, property, agricultural land and other assets downstream of the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of applications approved within flood zones 2 and 3.</li> <li>• Number of open market houses built within the Coastal Hazard Zones.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No target set.</li> <li>• Total should not exceed 1400 over the plan period.</li> </ul>	<p>ELDC</p> <p>ELDC</p>	<p>Annually</p>



	<p>proposed development?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contribute to effective management of water resources (surface waters) (e.g. storage of excess precipitation)?</li> <li>• Promote appropriate energy production technologies at the district scale?</li> <li>• Contribute to a reduction in emissions of greenhouse gases within the district?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amount of kilowatt hours generated from renewable sources – granted through planning permissions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase</li> </ul>	<p>ELDC</p>	
--	---	--	--	-------------	--

## **6 Objectives Compatibility Assessment**

5.4 A matrix was used to establish if the objectives of the East Lindsey Core Strategy are compatible with the SA objectives. This has been carried out with each evolution of the plan and previous versions can be seen in the previous iterations of the sustainability appraisal report. The final objectives for the plan have now emerged and the table below is a summary of the compatibility matrix. The full assessment of the objectives, including commentary, can be seen at appendix 1 to this report.

5.5 The plan does not have a traditional vision and objectives as most plans have. Instead the plan has a series of topic based vision statements with action statements in lieu of objectives. These serve the same purpose, but mean that the assessment cannot be presented in one table, but instead are spread across three tables.

**Table 6.1 – Compatibility Matrix**

Vision (abbreviated)		Network of thriving, safer and healthy sustainable communities										Affordable and good quality housing					
		Define a pattern of settlements and identify broad areas for growth.	Protect and enhance the vitality and viability of our town centres.	Require new development to contribute to improving the environmental quality of our spaces and places.	Protect and improve essential community facilities in towns and villages	Ensure that infrastructure is capable of accommodating planned growth.	Develop where possible on suitable previously used land.	Support the work of communities in neighbourhood planning.	Provide land for housing development to meet all residents housing needs until 2028.	Enable the provision of affordable homes to meet local needs and reduce the current shortfall of supply.							
Core Strategy Actions (abbreviated)	Sustainability Objectives (abbreviated)																
1. Biodiversity & geodiversity																	
2. Landscapes/historic environment																	
3. Natural resources																	
4. Flood Risk																	
5. Economic growth																	
6. Previously developed land and loss of agricultural land and greenfield sites																	
7. Access to key services and facilities																	
8. Recycling and waste minimisation																	
9. Inclusive, safe and vibrant communities																	
10. Local housing need																	
11. Sustainable design and construction																	
12. Facilities and infrastructure for healthy lifestyles																	
13. Positively plan for, and																	



healthy lifestyles													
13. Positively plan for, and minimise the effects of, climate change													

Vision (abbreviated)		<b>A commitment to tackling the causes and effects of global climate change through local action</b>										
Core Strategy Actions (abbreviated)	Maintain and enhance the Districts biodiversity.	Encourage new development to be energy-efficient and carbon neutral.	Support the economy of the coastal communities whilst not putting more people at risk from flooding.	Support new development to ensure it does not cause flood risk to existing properties and encourage new development to reduce flood risk to existing properties.	Encourage new development to be water efficient.	Locate development to minimise traffic generation.	Support the use of renewable energy but balanced against the protection of the District's distinct landscapes.	Support the linking of areas of importance for biodiversity to assist in the provision of a green infrastructure network.				
Sustainability Objectives (abbreviated)												
1. Biodiversity & geodiversity.												
2. Landscape/historic environment												
3. Natural resources.												
4. Flood Risk												
5. Economic growth												
6. Previously developed land and loss of agricultural land and greenfield sites												
7. Access to key services and facilities												
8. Recycling and waste minimisation												
9. Inclusive, safe and vibrant communities												
10. Local housing need												
11. Sustainable design and construction												

12. Facilities and infrastructure for healthy lifestyles								
13. Positively plan for, and minimise the effects of, climate change								

**Key**

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



5.6 The majority of the plan's objectives are assessed to be positive or neutral in respect of the SA objectives. However, there are a number of uncertain impacts, which largely relate to the identification of sites or provision of infrastructure. Site locations will be included in the Settlement Proposals stage of the plan making process, and therefore likely impacts on some aspects of the SA objectives will have to be assessed in the SA of that document.

5.7 There are two objectives, in relation to farm and rural diversification, where the impacts are likely to be negative. These are in terms of landscape and loss of greenfield land, but these could be positive if suitable mitigation was in place through locational criteria and design. There is one negative impact, in respect of catering for the needs of gypsies and travellers and the SA objective for sustainable design and construction, as there is an inevitable tension between the preferred accommodation of these groups and the requirements for development to meet certain standards more appropriate to bricks and mortar accommodation.

## **7 Policy Assessment**

7.1 Sustainability Appraisal has been carried out on the policies throughout their evolution. Appraisals of earlier versions of the policies were published in the previous sustainability appraisals; these were subject to public consultation. This assessment considers the submission version of the policies (November 2016).

7.2 Table 7.1 below provides a summary of the likely impacts of each policy. The full appraisal sheets, which provide the more detailed assessment, can be seen as appendix 2 to this report.

### **Consideration of Alternatives**

7.3 The SEA Directive requires that the environmental report should consider:

‘reasonable alternatives taking into account the objectives and the geographical scope of the plan or programme’ and give ‘an outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with’ (Article 5.1 and Annex I).

7.4 Alternatives for the policies have been considered at the various stages of the plan making process. At every stage, there is always the alternative of not having a policy on a particular topic and instead allowing national planning policy to be used to determine decisions. However, this does not fully allow the local circumstances of an area to be reflected in outcomes. It is also likely to lead to greater uncertain outcomes through the sustainability appraisal and potentially more negative outcomes.

7.5 The range and scope of policies was established through the Issues and Options documents, which were the key stages in determining the alternatives for each policy topic. At each stage, the policies have evolved in response to consultation, changing legislation and the outcome of appraisal. Sometimes this involves subtle changes and in other cases the changes are more fundamental, either strengthening or relaxing the approach of the policy. The current proposed policies represent the culmination of this process.

### **Approach to Growth**

7.6 Alternative approaches have been considered for all areas of plan making, especially in the earliest stages of preparing the plan, when a number of different options were consulted on and assessed through SA for each topic area. However, the approach to growth across the District underpins the wider approach of the plan and is one of the key areas when considering alternatives, and therefore probably worthy of further exploration in this section. The settlement pattern and the requirement for housing growth are set out in policies SP1 and SP2 respectively.

7.7 East Lindsey is a rural area with over 200 settlements of varying sizes. The plan has set a pattern for development that supports the social and economic needs of the District, and its communities, without harming the environment. Two suites of options were presented at the Issue and Options stage. The first suite of options related to the spatial distribution of development and set out seven options, covering a range of alternatives. Three options : strong urban focus with rural restraint; a focus on Louth and Skegness; and focus on four towns, performed best in the sustainability appraisal. The second suite of options related to the types of sites identified within the selected strategy. The option for the identification of brownfield site with ensuing allocation of edge of settlement sites once these had been exhausted was the most sustainable options (given East Lindsey's low level of brownfield land).

7.9 The ensuing 2012 plan also presented four growth options. The Sustainability Appraisal did not select a preferred option. Although there were differences in the way the each option scored, given the complex pattern of settlements across such a large district, there was little difference in the overall scoring; with positives and negatives for different aspects of the sustainability objectives.

7.10 Option 2 (growth directed to the District's towns and main villages) was selected by the Council as the option to be carried through into the Core Strategy. There are a number of neutral and uncertain outcomes for this option, which is normal with strategic policies given that decisions about the location and scale of individual developments have not yet been made. There are potentially negative outcomes against landscape impact; minimising use of greenfield land; and local housing need. With positive outcomes for supporting safe and vibrant communities; encouraging infrastructure for healthy lifestyles; and positively planning for climate change. The objective for improving access to services has possibilities for both positive and negative outcomes.

7.11 The evidence base for the housing growth figures was produced by Edge Analytics, a specialist company, and considered four different scenarios (or options) for growth. Scenario 1 - Official Projection Scenario (ONS) using the Office of National Statistics 2012 sub-national population projections as the trend benchmark. Scenario 2 - 5 Year Population Growth (PG-5yr), this provides the lowest projected growth figures looking at migration over a 5 year period. Scenario 3 - 10 Year Population Growth (PG-10yr), looks over a longer time period than the 5 year scenario. Scenario 4 - 10 year Housing Completions, presents the population changes as a continuation of previous rates of house building across the District (500 homes per year).

7.12 Given the population growth of the District is driven by in-migration the Council considered the most appropriate scenario to define the District's housing needs for the plan period is considered to be PG-10yr (Scenario 3) averaged across the 2008 and 2012 based headship rates. This scenario presumes a continuous improvement to the economic situation and also maintains the assumption that growth will continue to be fed by in-migration and though job creation is small does provide some

level of jobs growth. This gives a District wide target of 481 homes or 7215 homes over 15 years and approximately 40 jobs per year or 600 jobs over 15 years.

## Summary

### Policy Assessment

7.13 Table 7.1 provides a brief overview of the outcomes of the appraisal of policies. The full appraisal tables can be seen as appendix 2 to this report and these set out the likely impact (in the form of a commentary), degree, likelihood, scale, permanence and duration of the impact.

**Table 7.1 – Policy Assessment Summary**

<p><b><i>Strategic Policy 1 – A Sustainable Pattern of Places</i></b></p> <p>This key policy sets the scene for the district and forms the baseline by which to guide new growth, based on the services and facilities in communities across the District. The approach was created by elected members through a workshop. As a result of its strategic nature, the majority of the direct impacts of the policy on the objectives are neutral. However, it forms a positive baseline for a number of other policies and therefore has potential positive impact on sustainability objectives of improving access to services and facilities; and supporting vibrant communities.</p> <p>Alternatives – an alternative methodology could be used to form the pattern, but this cannot be assessed as there are so many permutations that could be presented as alternatives. Also, the option to process without a settlement pattern could be pursued, but that would leave the plan with no mechanism for distributing growth and could not be assessed through SA as every outcome would be uncertain.</p>
<p><b><i>Strategic Policy 1A – Sustainable Development</i></b></p> <p>This policy statement sets a framework for the other policies of the plan. The impact of the policy statement on the objectives is positive or neutral. This is predominantly because, although the policy statement embraces the objectives, other policies of the Plan deal more specifically with individual issues.</p> <p>Alternative – to not have a policy</p>
<p><b><i>Strategic Policy 2 – Housing Growth and the Location of Inland Growth</i></b></p> <p>The policy seeks to focus housing on the inland towns and large villages. There are a number of neutral and uncertain outcomes for the policy, given that decisions on the precise location and scale of individual developments are not made through this policy. There are potentially negative outcomes against landscape impact; minimising use of greenfield land; and local housing need. With positive outcomes for supporting safe and vibrant communities; encouraging infrastructure for healthy lifestyles; and positively planning for climate change. The objective for improving access to services has possibilities for both positive and negative outcomes.</p> <p>Alternatives – paragraphs 7.6 – 7.10 above discuss alternatives that were previously consulted on and appraised.</p>
<p><b><i>Strategic Policy 2A – Housing in Medium and Small Villages</i></b></p> <p>The policy seeks to allow development of brownfield sites, which have reached the end of their life as employment sites, in the medium and small villages, where housing would not normally be permitted. Outcomes are largely positive or</p>

neutral. However, there is uncertainty about impacts on biodiversity as it is not known where these sites will come forward and brownfield sites can have a biodiversity aspect if vacant for some time. Negative outcomes are identified from access to services and facilities and green infrastructure and for minimising the effects of climate change. Development arising through this policy will be located in villages, however, the policy is specifically for the medium and small villages and these do not, generally, possess many services and facilities, so this will not increase accessibility to such services.

Alternatives – the Council could have no policy and allow any redevelopment of brownfield land in smaller villages to be dealt with as an exception to policy on a site by site basis. This would bring about largely uncertain outcomes throughout any assessment as there would be no consistent parameters for decision making, other than the NPPF, which does not address all the issues in the policy.

### ***Strategic Policy 2a – Neighbourhood Planning***

This policy directly affects little in the sustainability appraisal as it is more a statement of the Council's support for and approach to NDPs. The only positive outcome against the SA objectives is for vibrant communities.

Alternatives – Have no policy. This would have little effect on the outcome of the SA but would not provide a positive statement of the Council's support for Neighbourhood Planning. Have a policy which sets out more criteria for what a Neighbourhood Development Plan should contain. This would potentially bring about more positive outcomes through the SA but would run counter to the ethos of Neighbourhood Planning which allows communities to determine what is important to them.

### ***Strategic Policies 3, 4 and 5 – Affordable Housing***

These policies provide a suite of approaches to affordable housing and, overall, have a number of potentially positive impacts on the objectives. There is one negative impact as a result of possible building in flood risk areas. To a degree, this impact could be identified as uncertain, as it is not yet known exactly where these sites will emerge. However, as some of the areas of greatest need appear along the Coast, in flood risk areas, it is likely that there will be a degree of conflict to be addressed. Affordable housing in areas of flood risk will require mitigation. There are a number of other issues, such as biodiversity, landscape quality etc, where development of affordable housing may have an impact but this cannot be quantified until the location of sites is known. However, other policies of the plan deal with these issues and will be used to mitigate potential impact.

Alternatives – the plan could move forward without a policy on affordable housing (or with some of the policies removed), however, this would result in negative scores against the sustainability objectives on safe and vibrant communities and meeting housing need. Also, the plan could contain policies with different thresholds but this would not change the scoring through the SA.

### ***Strategic Policy 6 – Design***

There are a number of positive impacts emerging from this policy and no negative. The design policy, working in conjunction with other policies of the plan, will contribute to providing safe, inclusive communities and will improve the character and vibrancy of the district. The policy text seeks to address the issues of light pollution, recycling, protection of water resources etc. Following appraisals and consultation, reference to natural resources, has been added to the policy and text. The prioritisation of brownfield land is a cross cutting theme that has been moved from the text to the policy after the last SA and there is now reference to the protection of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Amendments to the policy and text have also strengthened existing positive impacts in relation to

objectives 1. Biodiversity; 2. Landscapes, townscapes and historic environment; 3. Natural resources; and 13. Positively plan for, and minimise the effects of, climate change.

Alternatives – the plan could move forward without a policy on design or with different criteria. Clearly, without a policy there could be uncertain or negative outcomes where there are now positive, and outcomes for different criteria are difficult to identify without having them presented.

#### ***Strategic Policy 7 – Historic Environment***

The policy has a number of positive outcomes as it seeks to improve environmental quality through the historic environment of the District, which is an important component of the character of East Lindsey. All other outcomes are neutral. The impact of flood mitigation, either as part of development or stand alone projects, and the impact on the historic environment will vary between circumstances, depending on location and design, and so is identified as uncertain.

Alternatives - the plan could move forward without a policy on design or with different criteria. Clearly, without a policy there could be uncertain or negative outcomes where there are now positive and outcomes for different criteria are difficult to identify without having them presented. Statutory consultees have made representations on and helped to shape this policy so it is considered the alternatives are less viable. The NPPF also requires that Local Plans should contain strategic policies on the historic environment.

#### ***Strategic Policy 8 – Gypsies, Travellers and Show People***

The policy and text have been amended, following the consultation, to provide clarification on what is meant by close, near, accessible etc which should help to strengthen the link between the policy and SA objective 7. Improve accessibility to key services, facilities amenities and green infrastructure including the promotion of sustainable modes of access. It also supports mixed use of the sites with employment. There are a number of positive impacts from the policy and one negative impact in relation energy efficiency. It is considered that this impact is unavoidable and difficult to mitigate due to the inherent nature of the preferred accommodation of gypsies and travellers. There are also two areas of uncertainty, in respect of flood risk; and prioritising brownfield land. While brownfield sites will be prioritised, the nature of and the locational requirements for these sites is such that some loss of greenfield land may occur. An anomaly has been identified between this policy and the Coastal Policy, in that the period of occupation allowed for gypsy and traveller accommodation differs from that for other caravans on the coast and this could be viewed as discriminatory and this has been changed. The addition of a paragraph encouraging the settled and travelling communities working together on the design of new sites is another way to help create inclusive communities and will strengthen the link between this policy and SA objective 9. Support inclusive, safe and vibrant communities.

Alternative – the Council has a legal duty to address the needs of gypsies and travellers, so not having a policy is not a viable alternative. The policy could contain different criteria; however, changing locational criteria could lead to negative outcomes in for objectives 2. 6. and 7.

#### ***Strategic Policy 9 – Inland Employment***

The previous SA identified a number of positive impacts in respect of viable and diverse economic growth; and supporting inclusive and vibrant communities. It can also help in positively planning for climate change by supporting home working and the use of new technologies could reduce the number of vehicle journeys and assist with the sustainability of settlements. Uncertainty of impacts centres on biodiversity and landscape, as there is no locational aspect to the



policy beyond the towns where additional employment land is identified. The changes to the policy strengthen the link in respect of protecting and enhancing the quality and distinctiveness of the area's landscapes, townscapes and historic environment but do not increase the degree of impact.

Alternatives – to not have a policy would lead to negative outcomes for promoting viable and diverse economic growth. Also, the creation of policy and allocation of land to support employment was well supported at the issues and option stage.

***Strategic Policy 10 – Town/Village Centres and Shopping***

The Policy aims to promote the role of town centres as the focal point of community activity, maintaining their distinctiveness and their economic vitality. As a consequence, its impacts will be of greatest benefit to the community elements of the sustainability spectrum, and economic growth. There is one unquantifiable impact, in respect of natural resources. The changes to the policy and supporting text have not had a significant effect on the Sustainability Appraisal. Additions such as increased reference to the sequential test, design, and retailing from industrial estates will help strengthen some of the positive links already identified between the policy and the SA objectives.

Alternative – to have no policy on shopping would create negative impacts for those outlined as positive above and would not create compensatory positive objectives for other objectives. The NPPF requires that certain elements of the policy are in place, such as defining town centres and primary shopping areas. The NPPF also requires the Council to support the rural economy so an approach form villages is also needed.

***Strategic Policy 11 – Widening the Tourism and Leisure Economy***

There are positive outcomes to the policy, in respect of economic development; access to services and facilities; supporting inclusive, safe and vibrant communities; and access to facilities for healthy lifestyles. The removal of the criterion to promote the Lincolnshire Wolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and reference to landscape and historic assets impact has resulted in objective 2. "Protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the area's landscapes, townscapes and historic environment", changing from negative to positive. Similarly, reference to biodiversity in the November 2016 plan changes this outcome to a positive. Also, changes to the policy and text with regard to locational criteria should help to strengthen the outcome in respect of SA objective 7 "Improve accessibility to key services, facilities amenities and green infrastructure including the promotion of sustainable modes of access" by placing stronger emphasis on safe routes for pedestrians. The draft SA recorded a neutral impact between the policy and objective 9 "Support inclusive, safe and vibrant communities". However, employment opportunities are part of a vibrant community and this policy aims to expand the leisure and tourism economy and so warrants a positive impact. The draft SA also recorded a neutral impact for objective 12 "Encourage and provide the facilities and infrastructure for healthy lifestyles". However, amongst the range of leisure and tourism proposals that may result from this policy, there may be opportunities for new facilities for walking, cycling and exploring the countryside and so is felt to warrant a positive impact.

Alternatives – the plan could progress without a policy on tourism and leisure economy, however, this would lead to a negative outcome for the objective on economic development and potentially for objective 9 and 12. Also, the tourist economy is an important part of the economy of the district and to omit a policy on this topic would leave a gap in terms of local policy issues.

***Strategic Policy 12 – Inland Flood Risk***

With the presence of flood risk in a number of its towns and villages, the previous

Sustainability Appraisal recognised that the policy had to balance the need for economic development and housing development to meet the future needs of its communities. The policy seeks to prioritise economic development in these areas and only allow housing in exceptional circumstances and, in all cases, only where appropriate mitigation can be put in place. As a result there are a number of positive impacts from this policy but there are also some uncertainties. New flood risk works may have an impact on heritage assets, but this cannot be quantified without locational or other details. In respect of natural resources it is unclear what the impact will be at this stage, similarly, work on flood defences could have an impact on biodiversity if work is undertaken in river courses, but this may be mitigated. The ability of the policy to prioritise the use of brownfield land is another uncertainty, as some of this land may be in flood risk areas. In the case of supporting inclusive, safe and vibrant communities, the impact has is a mixed positive and negative. Due to the breadth of the objective, the policy can meet some parts but not others, although flood mitigation measures will help offset some of the negatives.

Alternatives – the plan must deal with flood risk, so having no policy is not an option. The policy could introduce a blanket prohibition on development in flood risk areas, but this would create a number of negative outcomes in relation to promoting economic growth (as flood risk affects a number of town centres), use of previously used land (for the same reason), access to services and facilities and vibrancy of communities.

***Strategic Policy 13 – Coastal East Lindsey***

The coastal policy has neutral or has positive impacts on many of the SA objectives, in that it supports development to enable continued sustainable growth of the coastal area. Due to the flood risk in this part of the District, housing is limited to that which maintains the present population at a broadly stable rate. However, housing for vulnerable groups and affordable housing has been taken out of the restriction, reflecting the high need for this type of housing along the coast and the fact that many parts of it are in areas of deprivation. There is some uncertainty over the impacts of the policy on biodiversity and landscape. Although much of the housing is already in the form of commitments, as the location of development supported through this policy is not yet known as it will come forward as windfalls; as will economic development. Protection of the landscape and areas of biodiversity importance is provided through other policies of the Plan. There are considered to be negative impacts on the objectives 4 – Avoiding Flood Risk (where possible). As a result the outcome for objective 9 is mixed with negative for the safety element but positive for the vibrant communities as the policy is seeking to strike a balance between the needs of existing communities and concerns over flood risk. This balance is demonstrated by the fact that a number of the impacts of the positive impact of the policy would then become negative if a more restrictive framework were put in place for the coast. Similarly objective 7 to improve accessibility to key services, facilities amenities and green infrastructure including the promotion of sustainable modes of access, has mixed outcomes. Some of the criteria have a spatial element to them; however, economic development and change of use of buildings to holiday accommodation do not. It is therefore not clear if these parts of the policy will improve access to services and facilities or promoting sustainable modes of access, in that they, in principle, would allow for development in isolated locations.

Alternatives - the plan must deal with flood risk, so having no policy is not an option. The policy could introduce a blanket prohibition on development in flood risk areas, but this would create a number of negative outcomes in relation to promoting economic growth (as flood risk affects a large swathe of the coast including two towns), use of previously used land (for the same reason), access

to services and facilities and vibrancy of communities.

**Strategic Policy 14 – Transport and Accessibility**

The transport policy works toward minimising car journeys, especially in the urban settlements. In rural East Lindsey this will be problematic but the policy tries to balance this by locating development near to the centre of rural settlements, this will also assist in continuing to support rural services and facilities. As a result, the impacts are positive or neutral. Some of these neutral scores come from a balance between the positive aspiration of the policy and the reality of the situation in terms of car use and the rural nature of the District. The changes to the policy and supporting text have not had a significant effect on the SA. Additions such as increased reference to accessibility will help strengthen some of the positive linkages already identified between the policy and the SA objectives but not change the outcome.

Alternative – the plan could proceed without a policy on transport as much of the spatial aspects of the policy are covered elsewhere but this would omit some of the detail of the policy. Conversely, the Council could go for a more detailed approach but much of this would be beyond its gift (ie. Access to public transport, delivery of transport infrastructure).

**Strategic Policy 15 – Landscape**

The impacts of the policy are positive or neutral as the policy does not in itself proposed development but sets requirements for consideration. The changes to the policy are not significant and do not affect the assessment of the policy.

Alternatives – the plan could proceed without a policy on landscape character and leave consideration to the development management process. However, the NPPF requires that Local Plans include strategic policies for the landscape and the district contains the Lincolnshire Wolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty which is should be given great weight in plan making and decision taking.

**Strategic Policy 16 – Biodiversity and Geodiveristy**

The impacts of this policy are all neutral or positive, as the policy does not in itself proposed development but sets requirements for consideration as part of proposed development. None of the changes to the policy and supporting text affect the approach of the policy and are only intended to bring clarity and strengthen the approach. Therefore, the appraisal of the policy remains unaffected.

Alternatives - the plan could proceed without a policy on biodiversity and geodiversity and leave consideration to the development management process and the NPPF. However, the NPPF requires that Local Plans include strategic policies for the natural environment and, as the District contains protected sites from international to local and biodiversity has been identified as being in a low baseline condition, including a policy raises the profile of the issue and enables more positive outcomes to emerge.

**Strategic Policy 17 – Green Infrastructure**

The impacts of the green infrastructure policy on the sustainability objectives are all positive or neutral. The policy is does not actively promote development, aside from additional green infrastructure initiatives, but is helping to shape new development and so is less likely to have negative impacts on sustainable development. The addition of criteria for judging the protection of open space through the development management process will help to support this.

Alternatives – the plan could proceed without a policy on GI but this would turn a number of positive outcomes into negative. The Council’s GI study identified low levels of GI across the District and to not have a policy would not reflect the needs to improve this situation. A more prescriptive policy could be included.

However, a large proportion of sites in the district are relatively small and lowering the threshold could create fragmented delivery and increasing the amount of land to be provided could mean increased densities on the developable part of the sites which would be out of character with the local area.

***Strategic Policy 18 – Open Space, Sport and Recreation***

The effects of the policy on the sustainability appraisal objectives are largely neutral or positive. There are two areas of uncertainty. One in respect of flood risk as it is not known where sites will come forward or what infrastructure will be involved so how this will contribute to sustainable drainage. The other is the use of greenfield land. Some sport and recreation uses can have a large land take and this often requires rural or edge of centre location and may well require the use of greenfield and possibly agricultural land. At this stage, proposals under this policy cannot be predicted and the impact cannot be quantified.

Alternatives - the plan could proceed without a policy on Open Space, Sport and Recreation, but this would turn a number of positive outcomes into negative as they can contribute to many SA objectives beyond their primary purpose. Also, the Council's study identified low levels of sport and recreation provision across the District and to not have a policy would not reflect the needs to improve this situation.

***Strategic Policy 19 – Renewable Energy***

The renewable energy policy tries to strike a balance between the needs of climate change and government support for the renewables sector, and the need to protect local character and environment. The policy is generally more supportive of small and micro energy production that is likely to have a lesser impact on its surroundings. There are no negative impacts predicted for the policy, as it contains a number of mitigating criteria to try to address any potential concerns. There are some positive outcomes, although the majority of predicted impacts are neutral. Although there has been significant change to the wording of the point itself, and the supporting text, the underlying principle of the policy has not changed.

Alternative – recent change to government approach, through a ministerial statement has increased the emphasis on Local Plans allocating sites for renewable energy. This came in too late for it to be reflected in the current plan. This approach could be considered in any review of policy, but it will require a rigorous assessment to make sure that the balance is struck between identifying sites to meet our energy requirements while still protecting the rural character and landscape of the district, its historic environment and biodiversity.

***Strategic Policy 20 – Infrastructure and Section 106 Obligations***

There have been no major changes to this policy from the draft Core Strategy so SA is unchanged. Infrastructure planning and delivery, either to enable development to occur or, to service the needs of residents, is fundamental to sustaining communities whether in the shape of utilities or social infrastructure. This policy seeks to ensure that necessary provision is made at the outset by establishing through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan what deficiencies exist and how they will be met. The impacts of the policy are largely positive on the sustainability objectives as the policy is seeking to achieve positive outcomes for communities through infrastructure but also makes reference to sustainable development and landscape character in delivering the infrastructure.

Alternatives - the plan could proceed without a policy on infrastructure and leave consideration of requirements to the development management. However, the NPPF requires that Local Plans include strategic policies for the infrastructure delivery.

7.13 Table 7.2 provides a summary of the impact of each policy on the sustainability objectives. Some policies have both a positive and a negative impact on a particular SA objective. This is because some of the objectives are very broad in their scope and the criteria of a particular policy can have different effects on different aspects; to balance them out with a neutral impact would not fully reflect the effects of the policy. The full assessment tables are set out in Appendix 2.

### Key

√	Policy will have a Positive impact on the objective
0	Policy will have no effect on or has no link to the objective
?	Policy's impact on the objective that cannot be quantified
X	Policy will have a negative impact on the objective

**Table 7.2 – Policy Assessment**

Core Strategy Policy Sustainability Objectives (abbreviated)	Core Strategy Policy																				
	SP1 Sustainable Pattern of Places	SP1A Sustainable Development	SP2 Housing Growth	SP2A Housing in Medium and Small Villages	SP2a Neighbourhood Planning	SP3 Affordable and Low Cost Housing	SP4/SP5 Affordable Housing	SP6 Design	SP7 Historic Environment	SP8 Gypsies, Travellers and Showpeople	SP9 Inland Employment	SP10 Town/Village Centres and Shopping	SP11 Inland Tourism and Leisure	SP12 Inland Flood Risk	SP13 Coastal East Lindsey	SP14 Transport and Accessibility	SP15 Landscape	SP16 Biodiversity and Geodiversity	SP17 Green Infrastructure	SP18 Open Space Sport and Recreation	SP19 Renewable Energy
1. Biodiversity & geodiversity	0	✓	?	?	0	?	✓	✓	0	0	?	0	✓	?	?	0	0	✓	✓	?	✓
2. Landscapes/historic environment	0	✓	X	✓	0	?	✓	✓	✓	✓	0	0	✓	?	?	0	0	✓	✓	?	?
3. Natural resources	0	✓	?	✓	0	0	✓	✓	0	0	0	?	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓
4. Flood Risk	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	?	0
5. Economic growth	?	✓	0	✓	0	0	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	0	0	0	X	✓	0	0
6. Previously developed land and loss of agricultural land and greenfield sites	0	0	X	✓	0	0	✓	✓	?	0	0	✓	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	?	0
7. Access to key services and facilities	✓	0	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	0	✓	0	0	✓	✓	0	✓	0	0	0	✓	✓	0
8. Recycling and waste minimisation	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9. Inclusive, safe and vibrant communities	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	0
10. Local housing need	0	0	X	✓	0	✓	0	0	✓	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11. Sustainable design and construction	0	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	✓	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0
12. Facilities and infrastructure for healthy lifestyles	0	✓	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	0
13. Positively plan for, and minimise the effects of,	0	✓	✓	X	0	0	✓	0	0	✓	✓	0	0	✓	0	0	0	✓	✓	✓	✓



climate change



## 8 Cumulative, Synergistic and Indirect Effects

8.1 The SEA regulations require that the cumulative, synergistic and indirect effects of the plan are assessed during the appraisal. Paragraph 2.21 of this report explains what constitutes these effects.

8.2 Table 8.1 below sets out where policies can provide these effects in respect of each of the sustainability objectives.

**Table 8.1 – Cumulative, Synergistic and Indirect Effects**

SA Objective	Policies	Effects	Significance
Protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the areas' biodiversity (native plants and animals) and geodiversity.	SP1A, SP7, SP16, SP17, SP19	This suite of policies includes development specific policies and overarching policies which together seek to mitigate the impact of development and enhance existing biodiversity.	Impacts could be positive significant benefits if the policies are operated effectively.
Protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the areas' landscapes, townscapes and historic environment	SP1A, SP6, SP7, SP8, SP15, SP16, SP17, SP20	Again a range of development specific and broad policies. Together these should address landscape issues across the district.	Again, there could be significant positive benefits from the policies, working together or independently.
Protect natural resources from avoidable losses and pollution and minimise the impacts of unavoidable losses and pollution	SP1A, SP2A, SP6, SP7, SP16, SP19, SP20	Development will inevitably have an effect on use of natural resources. The role of the plan is to minimise and mitigate this where possible. Loss of resources is referred to in the plan through the sustainable development policy, historic environment, biodiversity, renewable energy and infrastructure policies.	National legislation is potentially the key focus in the case of natural resources and pollution. However, the policies of the plan seek to contribute to these issues, although with potentially less direct relationship than other mechanisms.
Avoid the risk of flooding (where possible) and fully mitigate against the impacts of flooding where it cannot be avoided	SP17, SP20	Although only two policies deal with flood risk (one for inland and the other for coastal) this is a significant issue for East Lindsey. These policies, working together, provide the framework within which the rest of the plan will operate in such areas.	These policies are highly significant in addressing a key issue for East Lindsey. They will have long term effects for the District moving forward.
Promote viable and	SP1A, SP6,	The plan as a whole seeks	There are significant

diverse economic growth that supports communities within the district	SP7, SP9, SP10, SP11, SP12, SP13, SP14, SP15, SP16, SP17, SP20	to support a viable and diverse economy, be it directly through policies that deal with economic growth or by creating an environment that will be a place people want to live, work and invest. The policies highlighted are those that specifically address economic growth or which are aimed at the environmental quality of the District.	positive benefits from the synergy between the policies of the plan in term of economic growth.
Prioritise appropriate re-use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of the best agricultural land and greenfield sites.	SP2A, SP6, SP7, SP10, SP12	There are indirect effects on this objective through the reuse of historic buildings and development in town centres, which utilise brownfield land. The design policy refers more specifically to this issue.	There are positive impacts from these policies. However, the significance of the plan in terms of meeting national targets is likely to be not likely to be high, as East Lindsey has relatively little brownfield land.
Improve accessibility to key services, facilities, amenities and green infrastructure including the promotion of sustainable modes of access.	SP1, SP2, SP3, SP6, SP8, SP10, SP11, SP13, SP14, SP15, SP17, SP18, SP20	There are several policies which seek to improve accessibility through spatial approaches to allocating land and determining planning applications. These relate to both specific types of development and more overarching policies. The framework set out is influenced by the character of the district, which is rural, with a dispersed settlement pattern, low level of public transport and high car dependency.	There are positive synergistic effects of the policies on this issue. However, due to the dispersed nature of the district, the degree of significance will be affected.
Support inclusive, safe and vibrant communities	SP1, SP1A, SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, SP6, SP7, SP8, SP9, SP10, SP11, SP12, SP13, SP14, SP15, SP16, SP17, SP18, SP20	The majority of the plan will have a positive effect on this objective. Be this protecting and enhancing the environment or providing for services, employment and facilities. With the combination of policies seeking to achieve positive outcomes for all aspects of the SA objective.	The synergy between the policies sets a positive framework for communities that are places that people want to live, work and invest.
Ensure that local housing needs are	SP3, SP4, SP5, SP8,	The plan contains a small number of polices which	Although the number of policies

met	SP10, SP13, SP20	all have a direct impact on this objective.	on this issue is small, together they have a significant positive impact on the ability of the Council to seek to meet housing need in the District.
Increase energy efficiency and ensure appropriate sustainable design, construction and operation of new development.	SP1A, SP3, SP4, SP5, SP7, SP17	Again, there are few policies that are focused towards this objective. Some of the policies have an indirect impact; such as the policy on the historic environment which contributes by reuse of existing buildings and repair and use of traditional materials which often perform well environmentally. Other policies, e.g. the policy on sustainable development, are more direct and specific.	Other mechanisms have potentially more direct impact on energy efficiency and sustainable construction. However, the policies of the plan do seek to contribute to these issues, although with potentially less significance than other mechanisms.
Encourage and provide the facilities and infrastructure for healthy lifestyles	SP1A, SP2, SP6, SP11, SP13, SP14, SP15, SP17, SP18, SP20	There are a range of policies that help provide opportunities for healthy lifestyles. These range from indirect impacts, such as locating development in a way that enables walking as part of daily life, to more direct approaches in protecting and providing sport and recreation facilities and green infrastructure. The rural nature of the District does present some difficulties. A dispersed population means that economies of scale are often not present to provide facilities for the whole population and the ability to incorporate walking to access daily facilities can be constrained.	The combination of policies in the plan work together to provide a base for providing opportunities for healthy lifestyles. Both indirect and direct approaches work together to support this objective, although the rural nature of the District means that there are limitations to the significance in terms of providing infrastructure and walking and cycling to access these.
Positively plan for, and minimise the effects of, climate change	SP1A, SP2, SP6, SP9, SP10, SP12, SP13, SP15, SP16, SP17, SP18, SP19	There is a suite of policies acting both directly and indirectly to meet different parts of this objective. A number of policies seek a spatial distribution that seeks to	The suite of policies can make a significant positive impact on dealing with the effects of climate change. Flood risk is a

		<p>minimise car use, as much as is possible in a rural area such as East Lindsey. Other policies, such as biodiversity and green infrastructure, sport and recreation seek to make space for the changing environment and potentially also provide space for water. Whereas other policies deal more directly with the effects of climate change, such as policies on flood risk and renewable energy.</p>	<p>particularly important climate change issue in East Lindsey and a number of policies deal (directly or indirectly) with the potential impact on the District's communities.</p>
--	--	--	--

## 9 Mitigation

9.1 Mitigation covers changes to policy or implementation which seek to prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse effects on the sustainability objectives; as identified through the Sustainability Appraisal. Mitigation can also assist in achieving better outcomes where positive outcomes have been identified but changes could enhance this further.

9.2 Mitigation can take a number of forms, such as:

- The range of options (in the early stages of plan preparation) and/or policy wording to ensure positive outcomes;
- Setting settlement or site specific requirements in settlement proposals to ensure locally specific outcomes are positive;
- Introducing compensatory measures where harm cannot be avoided; or
- Monitoring to enable early identification of negative impacts where outcomes are uncertain.

9.3 The primary focus should be on avoiding negative outcomes by appraising and selecting the least harmful options. Policy wording should seek the most positive outcomes, balancing competing elements of sustainable development where necessary and addressing any inherent negative outcomes. Only then should compensatory measures be considered.

9.4 This approach has been inherent through the process of plan preparation and option selection and previous amendment to policy has been covered in earlier iterations of the SA. Leading up to the preparation of this version of the Core Strategy, a number of changes have been made to the policies to better help the Plan to meet the SA Objectives. There have been a number of minor wording changes to the policies and supporting text to provide greater clarification which will help improve outcomes. However, there have been some more significant changes, these include:

- Including reference to reducing demand for finite resources, use of brownfield land and protecting the best and most versatile agricultural land to policy 6;
- The creation of a new discrete policy on the historic environment to better meet the objective on this topic;
- Changes to the policy for gypsies, travellers and show people to bring the policy better in to line with policies for the settled community to strike a better balance against the objective on inclusive communities and equalities impact;
- Criterion on the Lincolnshire Wolds AONB and landscape character in the policy on inland employment to better mitigate negative impact on the landscape objective;

- The inland tourism policy has been amended to refer to biodiversity, landscape, and historic assets, along with removing the reference to “promoting the Lincolnshire Wolds” which was felt to potentially add pressure on this protected landscape;
- A section has been added to the policy to provide an area of protected open space between Chapel St Leonards and Ingoldmells to better outcomes in relation to objectives on landscape and inclusive, safe and vibrant communities;
- Criteria in SP2 Housing Growth and Location of Inland Growth and SP13 Coastal East Lindsey, along with a new policy SP2A Housing in Medium and Small Villages, to allow the redevelopment of brownfield land for housing, which will help to achieve targets for the reuse of brownfield land, prevent the land deteriorating and impacting negatively on townscape,
- Some changes to the policy and text on biodiversity to enhance the positive effects of the policy.

9.5 These changes have been incorporated into the policies and text of the plan to better support the SA objectives through their implementation.

9.6 Additional mitigation on the policies for the delivery of housing growth will take place through the site selection process of the settlement proposals document. Further mitigation is also provided through the implementation stages of the policies and site allocations through the development management system.



## 10 Monitoring

10.1 The SEA Directive requires that the significant effects of the implantation of plans and programmes shall be monitored in order to identify unforeseen adverse effects at an early stage, and to be able to undertake appropriate remedial action. It also requires that the environmental report includes a description of the measures envisages concerning monitoring.

10.2 When the SEA is incorporated into the preparation of a Sustainability Appraisal, the monitoring should be expanded to include the social and economic effects of the plan, as well as the environmental effects. Guidance on SA states that information and indicators can be drawn from existing sources to avoid unnecessary duplication for example, the Annual Monitoring Report produced by the Council. It suggests that monitoring measures may include; objectives and targets developed for the SA; features of the baseline that will indicate the effects of the Plan; likely significant effects identified during the assessment; and the mitigation measures proposed to offset the effects. Monitoring should be manageable, or it will risk being difficult to complete and hard to assimilate, and it has to be meaningful otherwise it will be monitoring for its own sake. Similarly, indicators should not be subjective, but should be clearly measurable.

### Significant Effects

10.3 The 2009 SA identified 156 indicators and 25 targets, which represents a large amount of data to be collected. Some of that data was collected by bodies other than the Council, so there is no control over its long term collection or accessibility. Other data sets measured matters, or is not collected or disseminated to a low enough level, to enable results be directly attributed to the impact of the Core Strategy. A slimmer set of indicators and targets has been drawn up that better link to the monitoring of the Core Strategy; that are more directly attributable to the effects of the Plan; and for which the data is more readily available and continued collection likely. Some of the indicators are repeated, as they apply to more than one objective, this will help to simplify the monitoring process.

10.4 The indicators have been linked to the Council's Monitoring Framework where possible. Relevant indicators for monitoring the effects of the Plan have been identified against each of the SA objectives. This is set out in Table 5.1 – Sustainability Appraisal Framework.

## 11 Conclusion

11.1 The majority of policies that comprise the East Lindsey Local Plan are predicted to have a positive effect on the Sustainability Objectives, and therefore the long term sustainable development of the District. The iterative process throughout the preparation of the plan has seen a number of changes to the policies to enable a positive outcome or to provide mitigation for predicted impacts.

11.2 The positive effects are most likely to be felt in relation to the SA objectives on access to services and facilities, inclusive, safe and vibrant communities, local housing need, sustainable design and construction (with the caveats outlined in paragraphs 11.4 and 11.5 below) and positively planning for, and minimise the effects of, climate change.

11.3 The policy assessment contains a number of uncertain outcomes, particularly in respect of biodiversity, landscape and townscape. The uncertainties lie in the fact that many of the outcomes of these policies will depend on the ensuing site allocations. The policies themselves (housing growth, affordable housing, employment etc) can be applied in a way that has a positive outcome, especially when used in conjunction with other specific policies of the plan. However, the sites selected through the site allocations document will have a significant bearing on whether or not those positive outcomes are achieved and this cannot be predicted at this stage.

11.4 However, there remain a number of negative outcomes, or outcomes that have a negative outcome alongside a positive one – as some of the SA objectives cover a range of elements. Almost half of these negative outcomes come from the housing growth policy - in respect of landscape, previously developed land, access to services and facilities and local housing need. The option chosen (option 2) focuses development on the towns and large villages; any locally significant growth in these settlements will have an impact on the landscape. This can be mitigated through positive design and landscaping but nonetheless, there will be change to landscapes at a local scale. Given the fact that East Lindsey does not have a bank of brownfield sites on which to build new housing, it is inevitable that there will be loss of greenfield land, with extensions to settlements being the only way to accommodate growth in the majority of settlements. Focusing growth on the larger settlements will provide greater access to services and facilities for those residents but could mean other areas of the district continue to be reliant on travel to access services. In terms of meeting local housing need this will be met in the towns and large villages but with very little housing being developed in medium and small settlements, the ability to meet affordable and general market housing needs in these areas will reduce; although there are policies for affordable housing on exceptions sites and single plot exceptions that will offset some of this.

11.5 The new policy 2A on Housing in the Medium and Small Villages may lead to development in locations which do not increase access to services and facilities, although helping to meet the objective to prioritise brownfield land. This situation will require monitoring to determine how much development is coming forward in the settlements, where permission would otherwise not be granted.

11.6 The policies for flood risk (inland and coastal) account for almost half of the negative outcomes. Both policies allow for some development in areas of flood risk including, in very specific circumstances, an element of housing. This automatically generates a negative outcome against the SA objective on avoiding the risk of flooding and mitigating where development cannot be avoided. Although mitigation can take place, development in these areas could be avoided (albeit then creating negative outcomes against other objectives), so there is still an underlying tension; as there is with the objective for safe communities.

11.7 The potential negative impacts of these policies will be monitored to enable appropriate alteration or adjustments, through the policies or their implementation, to take place. The policies for growth, that have potential for negative outcomes for landscape, biodiversity etc, will be further assessed at the site allocations stage, when the sustainability appraisal will be used as part of the site selection process.

## 12 References

East Lindsey Scoping Report - Faber Maunsell (2007) (refreshed 2013 – East Lindsey District Council)

East Lindsey Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2015)

East Lindsey Updating the Demographic Evidence Edge Analytics (2015)

East Lindsey Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2014)

East Lindsey Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (2016)

East Lindsey District Council Village Facilities Survey (2015)

Lincolnshire Coastal Study – Atkins (2010)

East Lindsey Water Cycle Study - JBA (2015/16)

Sites of Special Scientific Interest Condition Survey – English Nature (rolling programme)

Heritage at Risk Register – Historic England (2015)

Department for Energy and Climate Change (DECC) Local and Regional CO2 emissions estimate 2005 – 2013

ODPM A Practical Guide to the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive (2005)

East Lindsey Landscape Character Assessment – ECUS (2009)

The National Heritage List for England – Historic England

East Lindsey District Council Sport and Recreation Studies (indoor and outdoor) (2013)

East Lindsey District Council Green Infrastructure Audit (2012)