

EAST LINDSEY SETTLEMENT PROPOSALS

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

NOVEMBER 2016

Supporting Economic Growth for the Future



TABLE OF CONTENTS

NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY	3
1 INTRODUCTION	12
2 THE APPRAISAL METHODOLOGY	19
3 RELEVANT PLANS AND PROGRAMMES	30
4 BASELINE INFORMATION	32
5 THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL FRAMEWORK	42
6 OBJECTIVES COMPATIBILITY ASSESSMENT	52
7 ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSALS	53
8 CUMULATIVE, SYNERGISTIC AND INDIRECT EFFECTS	112
9 MITIGATION	115
10 MONITORING	116
11 CONCLUSION	117
12 REFERENCES	123

NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY

Introduction

1. This document provides a non-technical summary of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report of the East Lindsey Settlement Proposals 2016. The Settlement Proposals shows the sites that will be allocated and areas to be protected in key strategic locations across the District, up to 2031. The accompanying appendices are available on the Council's website at 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 sites 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 proposals or combination of proposals 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 Settlement Proposals

Objectives

7. The starting point in considering the overall sustainability of the Settlement Proposals is an assessment of its objectives against the SA objectives. The Settlement Proposals uses the same strategic objectives as the Core Strategy as the document forms part of an overall strategy for the plan.

8. The majority of the plan's objectives are assessed to be positive or neutral in respect of the SA objectives. The assessment identified a number of uncertain impacts, which primarily relate to development of individual sites and these will largely be resolved through the individual assessment of sites in this document. However, this will only apply to the sites that are allocated and the pursuit of windfall sites (for whatever land use) through the policies will have to be assessed on an application by application basis. In relation to the 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. However, no mitigation is available to address this issue and certainly, the settlement proposals can add no more to this issue.

Settlement Proposals

9. The Core Strategy sets a policy of directing growth the inland towns and large villages in the District. Therefore, the SA has focused on appraising only those sites in where growth will take place, sites put forward in other settlements have not be appraised at this stage; this means that 309 sites have been individually assessed. The full appraisal tables for the each of the sites can be seen in Appendix 1 to the main report. Tables for each settlement, providing a summary of each site along with a settlement overview, are set out in section 7 of the main report. Below is a summary of the findings. The sites performing best through the SA were taken forward to the site selection phase of the plan. Where more sites pass through the SA process than are needed to meet objectively assessed housing need, the Council will use planning considerations to select the most appropriate sites for allocation. The summary below relates to sites selected for allocation.

Conclusion

10. As is always the case when new areas are opened up for development, change will occur and that change can have both negative and positive effects. In seeking to identify sufficient land to meet the development needs of the District over the plan period, any change has to be managed to minimise any negative effects and maximise the positive impacts. There are significant positive impacts likely to come through the

plan's ability shape settlement proposals but there will be areas where impacts have to be carefully managed and which can lead to negative impacts. Impacts of site selection is largely felt more on a settlement by settlement basis, and are generally of local importance, and so the conclusions are presented on this basis.

Binbrook

Binbrook is located within the Lincolnshire Wolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). As a result, a number of promoted sites were discounted, and two small sites were allocated for housing, although falling short of the target set for the village. Following the consultation, including concerns from Natural England and the Lincolnshire Wolds Countryside Service, as well as local residents, the sites have been reassessed. On balance, the Council has decided that, given the sensitivity of the protected landscape, and the fact that sites can be found outside the AONB to meet the District's objectively assessed need, there will be no housing allocation in the village. Binbrook will remain a large village and any development will be achieved through windfall sites.

Burgh le Marsh

Sites BLM310 and 313 to the south west of Burgh le Marsh have been selected for allocation. There is likely to be a locally impact on landscape from the however, this can be mitigated through a high quality landscaping scheme. The Council has also determined to allocate site BLM320; however, this site has been identified as having negative impacts on biodiversity, landscape and historic environment, and access to services and facilities.

Coningsby and Tattershall

Of the sites selected, site C&T305 is a large site, however, any local impacts will be addressed through the design, layout and landscaping of the final scheme. The site has been enlarged following the consultation; however, the outcomes remain largely the same. Three smaller sites have been allocated around the development off Pilgrim Square. Again, there may be local impact on the landscape and some mitigation will be required through design, layout and landscaping of these sites, addressing any cumulative impact and also the proximity of the proposed employment site (shown as a direction of growth on the plan).

Friskney

The sites allocated in Friskney are all relatively small but have quite open boundaries due to the nature of the landscape in this area. There are likely to have only local impacts on landscape; however, this could be mitigated on a site by site basis through a good landscaping plan. Following the consultation, site FRI311 has been removed from the allocation due to its impact on the grade I listed church and associated heritage assets. Instead an enlarged site FRI317 has been allocated, however, this site sits directly between two heritage assets and, cumulatively, there is likely to be impact on their setting, the degree of which will have to be addressed through design and layout.

Grainthorpe

The impacts of the two allocated sites are likely to be felt at a local level on landscape and can be addressed at the planning application stage.

Hogsthorpe

Due to Hogsthorpe's relatively compact nature, the two identified sites, HOG306 and HOG3009, are located well for services and facilities, and are outside flood risk, which is an issue for the village. These sites are contiguous and therefore have the potential for local scale cumulative impact; they also are potentially visible in views from the west. However, there are opportunities through landscaping to break up the sites and reduce their visual impact.

Holton le Clay

Two of the allocated sites are quite small and only likely to have local impacts. Site HLC303 is large in East Lindsey's terms (15.3 ha) and will result in the loss of grade 3 agricultural land. However, with the lack of brownfield sites, any land will be of grade 3 agricultural quality. The scale of the site means that the most likely negative impact is on landscape as the development may be harder to assimilate into the local landscape. Larger sites can enable economies of scale to emerge so that services and facilities can be provided to serve the development; including green infrastructure, which can be provided at a level to also serve the wider community. This can also help to provide more opportunities for biodiversity than smaller sites. A high quality landscaping scheme will be needed to help address this issue.

Horncastle

No housing allocations are being made. The housing requirement can be met through existing planning commitments.

Huttoft

No allocations are being made. The housing requirement can be met through existing planning commitments.

Legbourne

Part of the housing requirement is met through existing planning permissions. The remainder is made up of two sites that are not considered to have significant impact on the sustainability objectives.

Louth

A number of sites have been put forward in and around Louth. Of those on the edge of the town, a number of are of significant size. The majority of sites are greenfield, as there is a limited supply of previously use land with the district, which means that there will be a negative impact on the objective to minimise the use of greenfield land. There is also a greater potential for a negative impact on landscape character, which will require addressing through structural landscaping and high quality design. However, this will present opportunities through the open space requirement and layout to create space for biodiversity and reduce impact on the wider landscape. Edge of settlement sites are generally more distant from centrally located services and facilities, although some of the more peripheral areas of Louth do have access to local shops and services

at a neighbourhood scale. The scale of the sites may enable the provision of additional local services and facilities, green infrastructure and transport links that can overcome some of the peripherally and meet the additional needs of the growth.

The Settlement Proposals show a direction of growth for additional employment land, extending the existing site to the north east. The site has a number of positive outcomes, but the site is on greenfield land and will require its landscape and biodiversity impacts to be addressed as it extends further into the countryside and crosses a strong wildlife corridor to the east. Connectivity of the site will also need to be addressed as the site continues to extend away from the town.

Manby and Grimoldby

One site was originally allocated and the impact was not considered to be significant. Following the June 2016 consultation, a further site has been allocated MAN314 which will impact on townscape, as the site is currently an open field, but this can be addressed by a high quality landscaping scheme.

Mareham le Fen

Mareham le Fen is quite a compact village, meaning that its services and facilities are rarely far from the majority of its residents. In addition to existing planning permissions, three sites were allocated, MLF021, MLF305 and MLF328. MLF021 is a small brownfield site only likely to have local impacts. Following the consultation, MLF303, which sits adjacent to MLF021, has also been allocated which will allow the two sites to come forward together to produce a better outcome. MLF305 has scored negatively for landscape impact due to its open boundaries; although this was also in part due to its joint impact with site MLF309, which now has the planning permission. MLF305 will still need to be progressed with a landscaping scheme that helps reduce its wider impact. There is potential for local scale cumulative impact on landscape to the west of the village with the three (MLF305, MLF309 and MLF328) as they would read together in views, with only the road to separate them. There could be potential benefits of the grouping of sites in terms of biodiversity, though this would mainly apply to the sites to the north of the main road. A more cohesive landscaping plan which can better assist wildlife and provide a diversity of green infrastructure would help reduce this impact.

Marshchapel

The majority of sites in the village are greenfield; those sites which contain some built development are agricultural in nature. Three of the sites are close together (MAR217, MAR300 and MAR304) and there are inevitable cumulative impacts, albeit at a local scale. The most likely cumulative impact would be on landscape and a good landscaping scheme will be needed to offset these impacts. Although there may be some negative impact on biodiversity through these sites being built, the fact the need for good quality landscaping and the fact that these sites can be linked together to create green corridors linking to the open countryside means that there are gains to be had.

North Thoresby

In common with much of East Lindsey, the majority of sites proposed in North Thoresby are greenfield. Sites NTH307, NTH308 and NTH313, have been allocated. Site NTH308 has some potential for negative impact on access to services and facilities; it can be accessed but this is some way from the centre of North Thoresby and safe pedestrian access would be difficult. It will also have clear landscape impact due to its size, location between the A16 and the village, and open boundary along the frontage with Ludborough Road. The remaining sites are considered less likely to have a significant impact.

Partney

No allocations are being made. The housing requirement can be met through existing planning commitments.

Sibsey

All the sites promoted at Sibsey are relatively close to services and facilities. Most are on greenfield land, in common with other villages in East Lindsey. The site which performs best through the SA is SIB304. This is a small site, centrally located. The other two sites to be allocated, SIB303 and SIB406, both record a negative impact for landscape,. Site SIB304 will have a significant impact, however, the capacity of the site has been reduced to acknowledge this and, with appropriate structural landscaping, there will be potential to enhance biodiversity and add to services and facilities, in particular green infrastructure; however this has to be weighed against potential negative impacts.

Spilsby

All bar one of the sites allocated in Spilsby are in the same area of the town. Bringing these sites forward together over and beyond the present plan period will create economies of scale and assist in the provision of infrastructure and green space. There will inevitably be cumulative effects if all, or the majority, of sites come forward. It is inevitable that a large group of development sites will bring about significant change. Some of this potential negative impact can be mitigated through good design, layout and landscaping. Potential archaeological impacts will also have to be assessed. There are potential positive benefits in terms of opportunities to create space for biodiversity, more comprehensive green infrastructure provision and other infrastructure needed in the town, and to create more direct pedestrian access to existing services, facilities and the town centre.

Stickney

Two small sites are allocated and the impact is not considered to be significant.

Tetford

Tetford lies within the Lincolnshire Wolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Two sites were allocated. One of the sites, TET303, was deemed unlikely to impact on the landscape as it is largely enclosed by existing development. The adjacent site TET302 could have an impact on views

from an adjacent public right of way; this will depend on the landscaping and design of any scheme. As a result, the cumulative impact of these sites was uncertain. TET302 is currently an employment site and loss of this site will lead to a negative impact on promoting economic growth, as there are few other employment opportunities. Following the consultation, including concerns from Natural England and the Lincolnshire Wolds Countryside Service, as well as local residents, the sites have been reassessed. On balance, the Council has decided that, given the sensitivity of the protected landscape, and the fact that sites can be found outside the AONB to meet the District's objectively assessed need, there will be no housing allocation in the village. Tetford will remain a large village and any development will be achieved through windfall sites.

Tetney

Part of the housing requirement in Tetney is met through existing planning permissions, the remainder through allocations. In common with much of the District, all of the sites in Tetney are greenfield. Although there is a Site of Scientific Interest close to the village, none of the sites under consideration are deemed to be close enough to directly affect the site. Three sites have been allocated TNY308, TNY311 and TNY320. None of the sites is considered to have significant negative impact. Site TNY311 will be more prominent in views from Humberston Road and will require appropriate landscaping but it will be viewed against the backdrop of the village and so will not be prominent.

Wainfleet

Flood Risk is a significant issue in Wainfleet, with both fluvial and coastal flooding affecting parts of the village; some of this being in combination. This has resulted in insufficient sites being allocated to meet the identified need over the plan period. Five sites have been allocated. Sites WAI305 and WAI401 are adjacent greenfield sites and will have a local level of cumulative impact in terms of the landscape; although due to the size of the sites this can be addressed at the planning application stage. Sites WAI308 and WAI308B are also adjacent and will also have a small amount of cumulative impact in terms of landscape and townscape; more in particular in terms of the historic environment..

Wragby

A significant part of Wragby's housing land requirement is met through existing planning commitments; the remainder is made up of one allocated site, WRA024. The impact of the site is not considered to be significant.

11. Mitigation is included in the Settlement Proposals to identify some of these issues and the policies of the Core Strategy also allow some of the local design and landscaping to be addressed at planning application stage. The Settlement proposals will be monitored to enable appropriate alteration or adjustments to take place when the plan is reviewed. The Core Strategy is being consulted on alongside this document and further amendments may be made as a result of these consultations.

Gypsy and Traveller Sites

12. The Council's Gypsy and Traveller needs assessment identified a requirement for 13 permanent pitches, 20 transit pitches and two pitches for travelling show people. Nine sites were put forward; five for permanent sites and four for transit sites. These were assessed through the same SA process as used for other sites.

13. In considering these sites, it was deemed that none had completely positive outcomes, although this is also true of sites for other uses. With the exception of the uncertainty about one of the sites in Alford, none of the sites were likely to have significant affect on biodiversity, and none were identified as having impact on landscape, town scape or historic environment. One of the sites at Alford and those at Mablethorpe, Trusthorpe and Manby are on brownfield land; although Mablethorpe is part of the industrial estate and further work would be needed to investigate the demand for employment land. The sites at Louth Industrial estate and Trusthorpe are the least accessible to services and facilities Site B at Alford and the site at Manby emerge with the least negatives due to their location close to services and facilities and use of brownfield land, although access to both sites would need consideration. Site A at Alford performed the next best, again due to proximity to services. Flood risk is an issue for four of the sites, but these are identified as transit sites with occupation limited to that of other caravans in the area. With an occupancy restriction in place, the sites on Mablethorpe Industrial Estate and at Marshchapel perform equally as well as the Alford site A; although (as highlighted) consideration of the need for the employment land in Mablethorpe would be needed. Site C at Louth scores similarly well and has already been granted panning permission by a government inspector and has been considered suitable

14. During the consultation, the site at Manby was withdrawn by the landowner. After further investigations, the sites at Alford were deemed too small for the needs of the travelling community and these sites were also rejected. A further site came to light when a planning application was lodged with the Council for a site at Burgh le Marsh. This has also been assessed against the sustainability objectives. The site is out of flood risk and has limited impact on the landscape, townscape and the historic environment. However, it is not easily accessible to services and facilities, being the opposite side of the bypass from the village.

15. For the reasons outlined above, the Council has chosen to pursue Site C at Louth, the Site on Mablethorpe Industrial Estate and the new site on Burgh le Marsh Bypass.

1 Introduction

1.1 This document is the Sustainability Appraisal Report of the draft East Lindsey Settlement Proposals 2016, which forms part of the Local Plan for East Lindsey. The report contains an update of 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 Settlement Proposals are 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 help 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.

East Lindsey Settlement Proposals

1.3 Before explaining how the Sustainability Appraisal has been carried out, it would be useful to explain the background to the preparation of the Local Plan and the context for the Settlement Proposals.

1.4 The Core Strategy sets the overall strategic approach for the district and there was some delay in the early stages of its preparation, due to uncertainties over the preparation of the East Midlands Regional Plan. Further details on this can be found in the SA for the Core Strategy.

1.5 Consultation took place on the draft Core Strategy in late 2012/early 2013. The document was revised and ready for submission. At this point, national Government announced it was to release revised housing projections, which would have implications for the figures in the Core Strategy and subsequent allocations. Consequently, the Core Strategy had to await the revised figures. Without the housing figures, it was not possible to progress the Settlement Proposals. However, this has now been resolved. Figures for the amount of housing, and employment, land needed across the district are set out in the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy does not include any strategic sites; consequently, all the allocations will take place through the Settlement Proposals.

1.6 The Settlement Proposals provide a spatial expression of elements of the Core Strategy's policies. The choice of inset maps in the Settlement Proposals reflects the Council's growth strategy for the district, identifying those settlements within the settlement pattern in policy SP1 that are to accommodate growth.

1.7 Pre-production work on the Settlement Proposals began with the development of some of the evidence work for the Core Strategy. Work which helps to inform the Settlement Proposals included the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), the Sport and Recreation Audit and the Green Infrastructure Study, Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, Village Facilities Survey and Employment Land Study. These documents provide background information on which to base allocations and notations in the forthcoming document; which will identify areas for housing and employment development and protect areas of sport and recreation and open space.

1.8 The Settlement Proposals document is laid out as follows. There is an introduction setting the scene, followed by a section explaining the background to the housing, employment and environmental allocations. For each settlement, there is a description of the services and facilities followed an explanation of the settlement's location, character, population and housing, employment, infrastructure and capacity to sustain growth. This is followed by a the map, then a proforma for each site setting out its reference number, location, description, area in hectares, approximate capacity, a description of its suitability, infrastructure, deliverability, viability, any phasing requirements and comments from statutory consultees. This includes the allocated sites, those suitable but not allocated, and those discounted sites. The sustainability appraisal summary sheet for each settlement has been included.

Local Plan Development and Assessment Process to Date

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

Scoping Report

1.9 The Scoping Report sets out the context within which the plan sits, including its relationship with other plans and programmes and legislative systems, baseline information on key aspects of sustainable development and key issues for the area. This 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 as it was at the time). A workshop was held with elected Members on 19th 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 was took place in autumn 2007. Due to the delays in preparing the Core Strategy, 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. Consequently, the document has been refreshed, in-house, to reflect changes in legislation and baseline data in the intervening period.

1.10 Consultation on the SA is carried out alongside consultation on the document being assessed. 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.

June 2016 Settlement Proposals

1.11 The Sustainability Appraisal of the allocations was first carried out on the June 2016 draft Settlement Proposals, which was the first time the Council had published proposed showing the spatial expression the its policies. The report was prepare din house by East Lindsey District Council. Consultation took place on the SA Report along side the Settlement Proposals document, as required by the legislation.

November 2016 Settlement Proposals

1.12 Comments on the documents have been fed into the revised Settlement Proposals and these have been reassessed against the Sustainability Objectives. This report was again carried out in house by East Lindsey District Council. The same methodology and approach was taken as for the previous version. Consultation on the SA Report is taking place alongside the Settlement Proposals consultation and following the same consultation process.

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 objectives against the SA Framework (B1) N.B. the Core Strategy objectives set the framework for the Settlement Proposals, which are their spatial expression	Plan objectives tested August 2009 Revised objectives tested August 2012 Revised Objectives tested December 2013	The objectives were tested, by AECOM, against the sustainability objectives and overall likely impacts. Revised objectives were assessed in house at ELDC, with a commentary expanding on the likely effects of the objective. Revised vision and objectives were assessed using the previous approach.
Appraising the options (B2)	Growth Options Tested August 2012 Site Specific Options (allocations and alternative sites) Tested February – December 2015	Carried out in-house by East Lindsey District Council. Carried out in-house by East Lindsey District Council (through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment).
Predicting the effects of the Settlement Proposals (B3) Evaluating the effects of the Settlement Proposals (B4) Considering ways of mitigating adverse effects and maximising	June 2016 Settlement Proposals November 2016 Settlement Proposals	Carried out in house by ELDC. Carried out in house by ELDC.

beneficial effects (B5)		
Proposing measures to monitor the significant effects of the Core Strategy (B6)	June 2016 Settlement Proposals November 2016 Settlement Proposals	Carried out in house by ELDC. Carried out in house by ELDC.
Preparing the SA Report (C1)	June 2016 Report November 2016 Report	Produced in house by ELDC. Produced in house by ELDC.
Consultation on the SA Report and the draft Core Strategy (D1)	June 2016 Settlement Proposals and SA report June – August 2106 November 2016 Settlement Proposals and SA Report	Consultation alongside Settlement Proposals Consultation alongside Settlement Proposals
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

1.13 The 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 has broadened the scope of this to require a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for all Spatial Plans.

Sustainability Appraisal

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

Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

1.15 The purpose of SEA is to consider the likely significant effects of the site allocations in the plan, and the interrelationship between them, on the environment, specifically the issues:

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

1.16 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.

1.17 The different stages of the SEA are similar to the SA stages; 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

1.18 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.

1.18 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 Settlement Proposals was carried out and it was 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

1.20 This report effectively covers stages B and C of the Sustainability Appraisal, as it assesses the available options and brings this together in the SA report. 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 Settlement Proposals;
- 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 Settlement Proposals;
- Review of the objectives of the Settlement Proposals;
- Review of the options considered; and
- Review of the preferred options.

2 The Appraisal Methodology

Meeting the requirements of the SEA Directive

2.1 The SA should also incorporate the SEA required of plans and programmes. Table 2.1 below shows the stages that are involved in preparing the Settlement Proposals 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	Stage A : Setting the context, the baseline and deciding on the scope	State A : Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding on the scope
Production	Prepare Issues and Options	Stage B : Developing and refining options and assessing the effects	Stage B : Developing and refining alternatives and assessing effects
		Stage C : Prepare SA report	Stage C : Prepare the Environmental Report
	Public Participation on draft Plan	Stage D : Consulting on the draft SA and SA report	Stage D : Consulting on the draft plan or programme and 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	Stage E : Monitoring the significant effects of implementing the SPD	Stage E : Monitoring the significant effects of implementing the plan or programme on the environment

2.2 Table 2.2 below sets out the sections of this report that relate specifically to the SEA Directive and explains where these matters are covered in the report.

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 environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme	Section 4
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 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 sets out the background to the plan, the policy context, baseline information and key issues. It covers the whole plan, so the issues content is as pertinent to the settlement proposals as it is to the policies of the Core Strategy. The Scoping Report the was prepared in 2007, by consultants Faber Maunsell/AECOM, on behalf of the Council,

and was informed by workshops with local stakeholders, a thorough review of the layers of policy that affect the relevant issues, and stakeholder and public consultation. The Scoping Report also 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.

2.4 The content of the Scoping Report has been reviewed and refreshed with the change of national Government in 2010 and with it a fundamental review of national policy (including the revocation of the regional tier). Changes were made to reflect revised legislation and alterations to data sources; which, particularly in respect of Government data, had undergone a significant overhaul with much data now not collected. The changes have been purely factual and have not required altered 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 reconsideration of the baseline and associated indicators. 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

2.5 The baseline has been established using a desk based assessment of the most relevant data available to each SA objective and 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 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

2.7 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. The assessment of the objectives was undertaken as part of the SA of the Core Strategy, as the same objectives pertain to the Settlement Proposals. The finding can be seen in the Sustainability Report for the Core Strategy.

B2 - Developing Strategic Alternatives

2.8 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. For an area like East Lindsey, with a large number of settlements, the broad level of strategic alternatives have already been developed through the Core Strategy. This has determined the level and broad location of growth, i.e. in which settlements it will take place.

2.9 In terms of the Settlement Proposals, the next set of options available for testing come in the form of the individual sites that are available for consideration. Developing the options is carried out in a number of stages.

Evidence gathering (finding potential sites)

2.10 An important part of developing the options around housing sites is the preparation of a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). The SHLAA is intended to identify which potential sites for housing development are deliverable within the identified settlements in East Lindsey; the amount of housing these sites are likely to provide; and

how this compares to the amount of housing the Council needs to provide over the lifetime of the Plan.

2.11 The Council has carried out a number of calls for land to establish which pieces of land are available for housing development and used site information collected in previous years with other studies (such as the old Urban Capacity Study). Sites have also emerged at various stages of consultation on the Plan.

Assessing the Potential Sites

2.12 The submitted sites were assessed to determine which were, in broad planning terms, suitable for development. A number of sites were deemed unavailable (mainly sites from the old Urban Capacity Study) and a number were located in settlements which the Council is not intending to grow. Those sites deemed to be broadly suitable and available form the range of sites from which the Council selects its allocations.

2.13 Although not linked directly to the sustainability objectives, the consideration of the suitability of sites through the SHLAA includes a number of factors which tie in with the sustainability objectives used in the SA. These factors are part of the determination of whether sites are discounted or if they continue to the site selection part of the plan process. These also provide a good starting point for assessing the sites through the SA process. Table 2.4 below demonstrates these links through a comparison of the SHLAA considerations in relation to the Sustainability Objectives.

Table 2.4 – Links between Sustainability Objectives and Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

Sustainability Objectives	SHLAA Considerations
1. Protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the areas' biodiversity (native plants and animals) and geodiversity.	Tree Preservation Orders; Boundary Treatment; Proximity to sites protected for biodiversity; Potential for Biodiversity.
2. Protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the area's landscapes, townscapes and historic environment.	Listed Buildings; Conservation Areas; Scheduled Ancient Monuments; AONB; Topography; Landscape Character Areas.
3. Protect natural resources from avoidable losses and pollution and minimise the impacts of unavoidable losses and pollution.	Contaminated Land; Agricultural Land Grade.
4. Avoid the risk of flooding (where possible) and fully mitigate against the impacts of flooding where it cannot be avoided.	Flood Zone or Hazard Map Zone.
5. Promote viable and diverse economic growth that supports communities within the district.	Proximity to sources of employment; current use of land; location within town centre.
6. Prioritise appropriate re-use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of the best agricultural land and greenfield sites.	Greenfield or Brownfield Land.

7. Improve accessibility to key services, facilities amenities and green infrastructure including the promotion of sustainable modes of access.	Proximity of Services and Facilities; Protected Open Space; Potential for Pedestrian and Cycle Links; Potential for Green Infrastructure.
8. Increase reuse and recycling rates and minimise the production of waste.	N/A
9. Support inclusive, safe and vibrant communities.	Access Constraints; Neighbouring Uses; Proximity of Services and Facilities; Potential for safe Pedestrian and Cycle Links; Flood Risk.
10. Ensure that local housing needs are met.	Ability to deliver a mix of housing.
11. Increase energy efficiency and ensure appropriate sustainable design, construction and operation of new developments.	Potential to create pedestrian and cycle links within the development (energy efficiency of dwellings is more part of the design process)
12. Encourage and provide the facilities and infrastructure for "healthy lifestyles"	Proximity of Services and Facilities; Protected Open Space and other green infrastructure; Potential for Pedestrian and Cycle Links; Access to sport and recreation facilities.
13. Positively plan for, and minimise the effects of, climate change.	Proximity of Services and Facilities; Protected Open Space; Potential for Pedestrian and Cycle Links; Boundary Treatment; Potential for Biodiversity; Flood Risk mitigation; opportunity for SUDS.

2.14 In 2012, a consultation was carried out on the sites put forward for the consideration in the SHLAA. This included a summary of their assessment. The consultation also helped to further publicise the SHLAA process and brought forward further sites; other sites have also emerged in the intervening period. All sites submitted have been through the process outlined above.

Sustainability Appraisal

2.15 This SA has confined itself to assessing sites in those settlements where growth will be focused; therefore coastal settlements and medium and small villages have not been included. Alford has not been included as Alford Town Council is preparing a Neighbourhood Development Plan which will be allocating sites and will be carrying out its own assessment of sites. Smaller sites, i.e. those for one or two dwellings have not been included, nor have sites which already have planning permission. The sites remaining after that sifting process represent the options for consideration. The SA has assessed all remaining potential housing sites to assist in the process of site selection; this has totalled almost 300 sites.

2.16 For Employment Sites, Policy SP9 (Inland Employment) of the Core Strategy requires that 1ha of employment land is protected at Alford; 1.5 -3ha at Coningsby/ Tattershall; 5.5 – 9ha at Horncastle and 8.6ha at Louth. The coastal towns of Mablethorpe and Skegness already have sufficient provision on existing employment sites so the existing areas will be notated with no further allocations. For the settlements where additional land will be required: Alford is preparing its own Neighbourhood

Plan, so will be allocating land itself; at Coningsby/Tattershall and Louth, a direction of growth will be identified and at Horncastle land is being allocated. For Coningsby/ Tattershall, Horncastle and Louth, an assessment of the locations has been carried out through the SA, even where precise boundaries are not identified, to enable an understanding of potential impacts.

2.17 Other Notations - The settlement proposals document identifies areas for sport and recreation, open space and wildlife sites (where these coincide with the inset maps). The towns include notations relating to town centres and primary shopping areas. In Mablethorpe and Skegness the plan also identifies the respective Foreshores, areas for Amusement Arcades and Serviced Holiday Accommodation. The sport and recreation sites, town centre areas and the coastally specific notations reflect development that is already in existence, so need no further detailed assessment; the SA implications of these policies that will operate in these areas has been assessed through the Core Strategy.

2.18 However, as an overall assessment: The open space is already used for such purposes or is unlikely to be deemed suitable for alternative uses, so there is no conflict with potential economic or social aspects of sustainability. The notation is considered to have positive benefits for biodiversity, landscape, protecting natural resources, minimising loss of greenfield land, access to services and facilities including green infrastructure, supporting vibrant communities, and encouraging and providing facilities for healthy lifestyles. The nationally and internationally designated biodiversity sites are statutorily protected so require no further assessment and the Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) have been through an independent assessment process, involving landowners, and so also do not require appraisal through the SA. These are considered to have positive benefits in terms of biodiversity, landscape, minimising loss of greenfield land, improving access to green infrastructure, supporting vibrant communities and improving access to infrastructure for healthy lifestyles. The town centre, foreshores, Amusement Arcades and Serviced Holiday Accommodation notations are considered to have positive benefits for promoting economic growth, improving access to services and facilities, and supporting vibrant communities.

2.19 The sites subject to SA have been assessed against the SA objectives, drawn from the Scoping Report, using the following criteria:

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 |

O neutral impact	the objective being appraised. 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.
X negative impact	The option or policy is likely to lead to moderate damage or loss, or other negative effects on the objective.
XX 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.
? 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).

2.20 Professional judgement informed the prediction of likely effects of each option. This was a qualitative assessment, as quantitative assessment of likely impacts is not possible due to the number of variable factors relating to the final design and layout of any proposals. Instead the degree of likely impact is assessed using the scale above.

2.21 For each settlement, a summary sheet has been produced, setting out the impacts for each potential housing site, including potential cumulative effects. The summary also reflects the sites (options) which emerge strongest in the SA. The assessment forms for each site and the corresponding settlement summary are set out in appendix 1 of this report.

2.22 There may be occasions where the number of sites performing equally through the SA provides more land than is needed to meet the housing requirements over the Plan period. In such cases, further assessment will be needed to select the sites to be allocated, based on planning issues not necessarily factored into the SA, such as infrastructure

requirements, results of other studies, overall deliverability and the sequential suitability of sites in place making terms.

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

2.23 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 assessment approach outlined above. The site allocations will have individual effects which have to be considered, however, it is also important that the potential cumulative effects of a number of sites are considered as part of the process. This has also been included, along with taking into account secondary and synergistic effects, so that everything is brought together in one table.

2.24 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 tables in appendix 1.

Secondary and Cumulative Effects Assessment

2.25 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 or site but as an indirect effect of the 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. Many of the potential sites considered through the plan process, particularly the smaller sites, are not likely to have significant negative impacts (even if there may be minor local effects). However, there still remains the potential for there to be cumulative impacts where more than one site is to be developed. For a larger settlement, such as a town, any predicted cumulative impacts may not apply across the settlement but may apply only to a cluster of sites in one part of the town. For example, where landscape impact is exacerbated by two or three sites being clustered together, where there may be no cumulative impact if these sites are in different parts of the town.

2.26 The potential for cumulative impact has been drawn out in the commentary element of the summary table for each settlement. There is more information on this in Chapter 8 of this report.

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

2.27 Through the evolution of the plan, areas of tension or conflict do emerge and the plan is, where possible, amended to address these. In terms of the site allocations, mitigation comes through a number of approaches. In assessing and carrying out an SA of the individual sites it enables sites to be rejected, in whole or in part, before they arrive at the site selection process. This could include considerations such as excluding

sites (or parts of a site) within areas of flood risk, excluding sites in environmentally sensitive locations or reducing the likelihood of cumulative impacts through the distribution of development. There may be opportunities to address some of the wider issues, such as shortfalls in infrastructure, through other mechanisms; although this may require individual sites to make a contribution to its provision.

2.28 Mitigation after the allocations process will largely be provided on a site by site basis when the plan is implemented. For example, through the layout, design and landscaping of ensuing proposals. While some of this may be left to the development management process, the SHLAA (and to an extent the SA) has, in some cases, identified mitigation that may be required; such as reducing the density of a site or the need for a strong landscaping scheme for a site in a sensitive location. These requirements have been built into the text accompanying the maps in the settlement proposals. As a result, it is not considered that additional mitigation measures will be required.

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

2.29 SA monitoring seeks to identify the causal links between the plan and the receptors being monitored. These will 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. The monitoring should also 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. Similarly, it is important that there are easily accessible sources of data, and that data is not resource hungry to collect. The monitoring of the settlement proposals will form part of the overall monitoring of the plan.

Stage C : Prepare SA report

2.30 This document is the SA report accompanying the draft Settlement Proposals. It reports on the process undertaken in assessing the East Lindsey Settlement Proposals and sets out the findings to date.

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

2.31 Stage D1 requires public participation on the SA Report alongside the plan it assesses. The draft Core Strategy and accompanying SA Report were subject to consultation in 2012, the first time that the settlement proposals were subject to SA was in the consultation from 27th June – 8th August 2016. As required, consultation included Natural England, Historic England and the Environment Agency. Paragraph 1.11 above sets out who is consulted.

2.32 Stage D2, is to as appraising significant changes. When plans or programmes go through a consultation exercise, it is important to ensure

that the changes remain consistent with the initial objectives of the plan and the sustainability objectives. The SA published in June 2016 set out the first assessment of the sites. That consultation prompted changes to the Settlement Proposals. This included the submission of new sites which required assessment against the Sustainability Objectives and a reappraisal of the some the sites considered previously. Those changes have been subject to SA in line with stage D2 and this report brings together that assessment, so the evolution of the 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 this 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 preparation of planning policy 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 plan and which reflect the priorities of international, national and local plans and programmes to which the plan 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. The table also references the sustainability objectives and the SEA topics relevant to each identified topic area.

4.3 Many of the issues highlighted in the table below are better addressed at a strategic scale through the policies of the Core Strategy. Not all development proposals will necessitate allocations, nor can they be predicted. However, there are localised issues that are addressed through the site specific allocations.

Table 4.1 Baseline Information

Baseline Information		SA Objective/SEA Topic
Issue	Implications for Settlement Proposals	
Social (population and distribution)		
<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, and allocations, 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.</p> <p>Sites will be allocated for a range of housing and for employment to help address this imbalance. The settlement proposals will also protect important areas of open space to help retain the areas character.</p>	<p>Issues reflect SA objectives: 7 and 9</p> <p>SEA Issues : Population and Human Health</p>
Society (health)		
<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 protect green infrastructure and sport and recreation for health benefits. A high quality local environment can also encourage people to be more active.</p>	<p>Issues reflect SA objectives: 12</p> <p>SEA Topics : Population and Human Health</p>

		<p style="text-align: center;">Society (quality of life)</p> <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 accesses 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 (GI) 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>The Settlement Proposals allocates additional land for employment where a need has been identified.</p> <p>The settlement proposals will also protect green infrastructure and sport and recreation facilities.</p>	<p>Issues reflect SA objectives: 7, 9, 12</p> <p>SEA Topics : Population and Human Health</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Society (housing)</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</p>	<p>The larger allocated housing sites will provide a percentage of affordable housing. Exceptions sites may also come forward under the policy to enable local need be addressed in</p>	<p>Issues reflect SA objectives: 4, 6, 10, 11 and 13</p> <p>SEA Topics :</p>		

<p>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>more rural communities. 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 Settlement Proposals will prioritise brownfield land where it is suitably located, where this is the best use for the site.</p> <p>The assessment of sites through the allocations process has taken into account issues of flood risk.</p>	<p>Population and Human Health</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Society (Public transport and access)</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>The settlement proposals consider opportunities to maximises the possibility to use alternative means of transport to the private car.</p>	<p>Issues reflect SA objectives: 4, 7 and 13</p> <p>SEA Topics : Population and Human Health</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Economy (employment, economic independence, economic growth and diversification)</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 & retail;</p>	<p>The Settlement Proposals allocates additional land for employment where a need has been identified. Some tourism uses have also be notated on the inset maps.</p>	<p>Issues reflect SA objectives: 4, 5 and 13</p> <p>SEA Topics : Population and Human Health</p>

<p>accommodation & food services; public administration; education & 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 impact, 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 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>	
<p>Environment (biodiversity, nature conservation and geodiversity)</p> <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>Where protected sites coincide with the inset maps, these have been highlighted to support their protection. The site allocations process also considers the impact on biodiversity of potential sites.</p>
	<p>Issues reflect SA objectives: 1, 2</p> <p>SEA Topics : Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna</p>

Environment (important landscapes)		Issues reflect SA objectives: 2 SEA Topics : Cultural Heritage and Landscape; Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna
<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 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>The site allocations process considers landscape impact as a key part of site selection. Significant weight is given to the AONB and its setting, but the value attributed to the wider landscape is also reflected.</p>	
<p>Environment (historic built environment and archaeology)</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</p>	<p>Historic assets are shown where they coincide with the inset maps in the plan. The site allocations process has also take into account the potential for impacts of historic assets, including historic areas.</p>	

<p>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>Environment (natural resources and pollution)</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 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>The settlement proposals consider the availability of water resources and disposal, as well as impact on water quality, as part of the site allocations process.</p>	<p>Issues reflect SA objectives: 3 and 13</p> <p>SEA Topics : Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna; Population and Human Health; Water and Soil; and Climate Factors</p>

Environment (waste)	
<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.</p>
Environment (climate change)	
<p>Climate change is a global, national and local challenge. Climate 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</p>	<p>Flood risk is a fundamental consideration in the site selection process.</p> <p>The settlement proposals will have limited opportunity to deal with other issues in this section, which are better dealt with at a strategic level through the policies of the Plan.</p>
	<p>Issues reflect SA objectives: 8, 11</p> <p>SEA Topics : Climatic Factors; and Water and Soil</p>
	<p>Issues reflect SA objectives: 3, 4, 13</p> <p>SEA Topics : All Topics</p>

<p>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 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>	
---	--

4.4 The SEA Directive requires that future trends are considered in relation to the state of the environment, 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 also being pursued in respect of Louth and Horncastle 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, sub-objectives are identified that help to relate the higher level, strategic objectives to the site allocations. The sub-objectives from the core strategy have been reviewed and a small number have been excluded as not being appropriate to the site allocations. The settlement proposals are more localised than the policies in terms of their ability to directly address the SA objectives.

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.

Table 5.1 – The Sustainability Appraisal Framework

SA Objective	Sub Objectives: will the site allocation.....	Site Assessment criteria for allocation or notation	Indicator	Targets	Organisation Responsible for Monitoring	Frequency
1. Protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the areas' biodiversity (native plants and animals) and geodiversity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect and provide opportunities for improving / enhancing sites designated for their nature conservation value / geodiversity value (local and national levels)? Protect the habitats and species protected by International and UK law? Help achieve Lincolnshire Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets? Help to avoid / reduce the loss of / decline in semi natural habitats, agricultural habitats, urban habitats / geological resources? Conserve species and protect the districts overall biodiversity? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there currently a likelihood of biodiversity on site or close to the site? Can biodiversity be incorporated into the site? Does the site cause habitat fragmentation? Can the site help to create new opportunities for biodiversity, including connectivity between existing sites? Is there potential for the site to impact directly or indirectly on a site or species protected for its biodiversity or geodiversity importance? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of Local Wildlife Sites or Local Geological Sites affected by new development. Percentage of SSSI's regarded as in favourable condition. Changes to BAP habitats as a result of planning applications. Percentage of ancient woodland lost to development. Number of permissions for major 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Zero proposals resulting in nett loss or damage to Local Wildlife Sites or Local Geological Sites. Increase in SSSI's regarded as in favourable condition. No nett loss of BAP habitats over the plan period resulting from planning permissions. 0% Ancient Woodland lost to development 	ELDC	<p>Annually</p> <p>Natural England assess the condition of all SSSIs as part of a six year cycle</p> <p>Annually</p> <p>Annually</p>
2. Protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect and provide opportunities to enhance the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the site minimise impact on the wider landscape 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of permissions for major 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No major permissions granted for 	ELDC	Annually

of the area's landscapes, townscapes and historic environment.	<p>distinctive landscapes (e.g. Conservation Areas, Lincolnshire Wolds AONB) within the district?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain and, where possible, increase the area of high quality green infrastructure within the district – e.g. woodlands, public rights of way etc? • Prevent amenity being compromised? • Maintain and enhance the character / distinctiveness of towns and villages (including conservation areas)? • Protect or enhance known features of historical, archaeological, or cultural interest, including their setting? • Protect areas associated with a known archaeological resource? 	<p>or the historic environment?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the site protect or add to the amount and accessibility of green infrastructure? • Will the site impact unacceptably on existing neighbouring uses? • Are there opportunities for the layout and design of the site to enhance the local area? • Will the site impact unacceptably on a historic asset? 	<p>development within and adjacent to the AONB.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amount (ha) of green infrastructure created through new development. 	<p>major development within the AONB.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No target but increase in level created • No nett increase in buildings on the Buildings at Risk register • No nett increase in Scheduled Monuments and other archaeological sites at risk. • Number of applications granted with archaeological conditions 	<p>ELDC</p> <p>Historic England</p> <p>Historic England</p> <p>ELDC</p>	<p>Annually</p> <p>Annually</p> <p>Annually</p>
--	---	---	--	---	---	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contribute to effective management of water resources (surface waters) via storage of excess precipitation? Protect the habitats and species reliant on the water environment e.g. in rivers, canals, lakes, ponds and adjacent areas of wetland habitats? Protect the best and most versatile agricultural land? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where necessary, has the site the capacity to incorporate SUDS? Can the site operate within existing operational capacities for water supply and water treatment? Does the site include, or is close to, watercourses and other features that may support wildlife? Does the site require the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land? Is the site on contaminated land? Can the site minimise levels of air, light and noise pollution? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No SUDS implemented in the District. Number of permissions granted contrary to the advice of the Environment Agency, on water quality grounds. Amount of Grade 1 and 2 agricultural land lost to development. Level of emissions produced by households and businesses within the District. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No target (proposal specific) No permissions granted No target Decrease 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ELDC ELDC ELDC Department of Energy and Climate Change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annually Annually Annually Annually
<p>3. Protect natural resources from avoidable losses and pollution and minimise the impacts of unavoidable losses and pollution.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the site in flood zone 2 or 3 or in one of the flood hazard areas? Will the site create, or add to existing, local drainage issues? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No permissions granted No target (proposal specific) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No target set. Total should not exceed 1308 over the plan period. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ELDC ELDC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annually Annually
<p>4. Avoid the risk of flooding (where possible) and fully mitigate against the impacts of flooding where it cannot be avoided.</p>							

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it minimise flood risk to people, property, agricultural land and other assets from coastal inundation? Increase flood risk to people, property, agricultural land and other assets downstream of the proposed development? 					
<p>5. Promote viable and diverse economic growth that supports communities within the district.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assist the provision of appropriate land and premises for business activity? Provide diversity in the economy and encourage sustainable business development? Support vital and viable town centres? Encourage the rural economy and support farm diversification? Enable tourism opportunities to be exploited? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the allocated employment site contribute to meeting the identified level of need for the plan period? Would the site lead to loss of employment land or premises, or contribute to employment provision? Would the site enable people to work near their home? Does the allocated use help to support vital and viable town centres? Does the allocated used help to support the rural economy? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amount (ha) of new employment land developed. New business registrations. Number of vacant retail units as proportion of total ground floor business; by town. Number of new farm diversification projects approved. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local Plan targets for creation of employment land. Increase in number of VAT registered businesses. Decrease in vacancy rates. No target set 	<p>ELDC</p> <p>ELDC</p> <p>ELDC</p>	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the allocated use help to support tourism? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of applications approved for tourism/leisure uses (including accommodation). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No target set 		
6. Prioritise appropriate re-use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of the best agricultural land and greenfield sites.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 development? Protect the best and most versatile agricultural land? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the site wholly or partially brownfield land? Does the site require the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of housing built on previously used land. Percentage of all uses on previously used land. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No target set No target set 	ELDC	ELDC	Annually 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"> Improve access to local services, facilities, places of employment and green infrastructure for all residents throughout the district? Enable sustainable public modes of transport in both urban and rural areas and reduce the need to travel by 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can local services and facilities be easily accessed on foot or bicycle from the site? Is the site located close to areas of open space and other green infrastructure and can connections be made to it? Is the site able to add to green infrastructure provision? Can the site provide 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amount of Grade 1 and 2 Agricultural Ground lost to development. Number of community facilities lost/gained 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No target set 	ELDC	ELDC	Annually
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No net change (will require a narrative monitoring). 			

	car?	opportunities for safe walking and cycling? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there public transport options available from the site? • Does the site accommodate or link into the existing public rights of way network? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of settlements with a recognised shopper bus service. • Percentage of settlements with a recognised commuter bus service. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No decrease in level. • No decrease in level. 	ELDC	ELDC	Annually
8. Increase reuse and recycling rates and minimise the production of waste.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce waste generated as part of all building programmes? • Reduce household waste? • Increase waste recovery and recycling (domestic, commercial etc)? 	No criteria specific to site allocations	No current indicators				
9. Support inclusive, safe and vibrant communities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain, enhance and create green infrastructure assets (e.g. green space) across the district accessible to the whole community? • Improve the availability and accessibility of key local services and facilities, including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs etc.) that also 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the site located close to areas of open space and other green infrastructure and can connections be made to it? • Is the site able to add to green infrastructure provision? • Can local services and facilities be easily accessed on foot or bicycle from the site? • Can the site be accessed safely and can safe pedestrian 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amount (ha) of green infrastructure created through new development. • Number of community facilities lost/gained 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No target but increase in level created • No nett change (will require a narrative monitoring). 	ELDC	ELDC	Annually

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> reduce the need to travel? Promote more diverse and cohesive communities? Reduce the fear of crime, the actual levels of crime, antisocial behaviour and improve public safety? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> and cycle routes be provided into the existing network? Can the site provide a layout and design that promotes well used streets and public spaces? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of planning permissions refused on design grounds Incidence of recorded crime 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No target set. 	ELDC	Annually
10. Ensure that local housing needs are met.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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? Enable first time buyers to purchase a home? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allocate sufficient land to meet the needs of the District over the plan period. Can the site provide a range of housing types, sizes and tenures? Can the site contribute to affordable housing need? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual House Building rate (based on trajectory in AMR). Mix of houses based on stock breakdown by Council Tax band. Affordability Ratio 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing Trajectory in AMR No target 	ELDC	Annually
11. Increase energy efficiency and ensure appropriate design, construction and operation of new developments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lead to local developments built to a high standard of sustainable design? Lead to an increased proportion of energy needs being met from renewable sources e.g. at domestic and commercial scales? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can the layout of the site maximise opportunities for solar gain? 	No indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No increase 	DCLG/ELDC Housing Dept	Annually
12. Encourage and provide the facilities and infrastructure for	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that adequate health facilities and infrastructure is 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there sufficient health care facilities accessible to the sites, or can the site 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of doctors and dentist surgeries in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase 	ELDC	Annually

<p>“healthy lifestyles”</p>	<p>available for present and future generations?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure health facilities are accessible to all sectors of the community? • Promote healthy and active lifestyles? • 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? 	<p>contribute to additional provision?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the site located close to areas of open space and other green infrastructure and can connections be made to it? • Is the site able to add to green infrastructure provision? • Can local services and facilities be easily accessed on foot or bicycle from the site, including those for sport and recreation? • Does the site accommodate or link into the existing public rights of way network? • Does the site protect or add to sport and recreation opportunities in the area? 	<p>the District</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amount (ha) of green infrastructure created through new development. • Number of community facilities lost/gained • Levels of participation in sport and recreation. • Sport and recreation facilities in the District 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No target but increase in level created • No net change (will require a narrative monitoring). • Increase • Increase 	<p>ELDC</p> <p>Sport England</p> <p>ELDC</p>	<p>Annually</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"> • Minimise flood risk to people, property, agricultural land and other assets from the sea, from rivers and from surface water drainage infrastructure? • Increase flood risk to people, property, agricultural land and other assets downstream of the proposed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the site in flood zone 2 or 3 or in one of the flood hazard areas? • Will the site create, or add to existing, local drainage issues? • Where necessary, has the site the capacity to incorporate SUDS? • Can local services and facilities be easily accessed on foot or bicycle from the site, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of applications approved within flood zones 2 and 3. • Number of open market houses built within the Coastal Hazard Zones. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No target set. • Total should not exceed 1400 over the plan period. 	<p>ELDC</p> <p>ELDC</p>	

	<p>development?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contribute to effective management of water resources (surface waters) (e.g. storage of excess precipitation)? Contribute to a reduction in emissions of greenhouse gases within the district? 	<p>including those for sport and recreation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the site located close to areas of open space and other green infrastructure and can connections be made to it? Is the site able to add to green infrastructure provision? Can the site help to create new opportunities for biodiversity, including connectivity between existing sites and species adaptation and migration? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amount (ha) of green infrastructure created through new development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No target but increase in level created 		
--	---	--	--	---	--	--

6 Objectives Compatibility Assessment

6.1 The objectives that provide the direction and aspirations of the plan are included in the Core Strategy and were tested in the SA for that document. As the same overall plan objectives pertain to the settlement proposals, there is no merit in repeating the exercise in this document. The matrix establishing the compatibility of the objectives of the East Lindsey Core Strategy with the SA objectives can be found in section 6 of the Core Strategy SA and the full assessment of the objectives, including commentary, can be seen at appendix 1 of the same document.

7 Assessment of Proposals

7.1 Sustainability Appraisal of the sites was carried out for the first time alongside the Settlement Proposals published in June 2016. This assessment considers the submission version of the Plan (November 2016). Section 2 of this report sets out the methodology used to carry out this assessment in more detail.

Consideration of Alternatives

7.2 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 1h).

7.3 The assessment of whether to grow a particular settlement has taken place in the Core Strategy. So, in terms of site allocations, the consideration of alternatives centres around the selection of sites from those determined to be deliverable through the SHLAA process.

Site Assessment Summaries

7.4 The tables below are the summary sheets for each settlement being included in the Local Plan as settlements for growth. Each table shows the impact in relation to the sustainability objectives for each site, followed by a summary for the settlement as a whole, which brings the sites together in an overall assessment. The full appraisal sheet for each individual site, as highlighted in the methodology in section 2 above, can be seen in Appendix 1 to this report.

Binbrook						
Sustainability Objectives (abbreviated)	BIN021	BIN303	BIN305	BIN306	BIN307	BIN310
1. Biodiversity & geodiversity	X	✓	O	X ✓	X ✓	✓
2. Landscapes/ historic environment	O	XX	O	X	XX	XX
3. Natural resources	O	O	O	O	O	O
4. Flood Risk	O	O	O	O	O	O
5. Economic growth	O	O	O	O	O	O
6. Previously developed land and loss of agricultural land and greenfield sites	X	X	X	X	X	X
7. Access to key services and facilities	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
8. Recycling and waste minimisation	O	O	O	O	O	O
9. Inclusive, safe and vibrant communities	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
10. Local housing need	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
11. Sustainable design and construction	O	O	O	O	O	O
12. Facilities and infrastructure for healthy lifestyles	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
13. Positively plan for, and minimise the effects of, climate change	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Summary	<p>All of the sites are located well in terms of their relationship to the village. However, a number of sites have scored poorly on landscape impact grounds, and all are greenfield sites. Most of the sites were discounted through the SHLAA on the grounds of suitability and, in some cases, availability. Leaving BIN306 and 307 as the deliverable sites. BIN306 scores negatively for landscape impact, as does BIN307 which also score negatively against objectives for the historic environment. These sites have negative scores for the fact they are greenfield sites and potential loss of biodiversity, although the latter will be offset by opportunities to create additional areas for wildlife within the sites.</p> <p>They are on opposite sites of the village and there are unlikely to be cumulative impacts in terms of the sustainability. Bringing the discounted sites into the equation, sites BIN303 and 310 would together have a significant cumulative impact on landscape character as reflected by their scoring in the sustainability appraisal.</p>					

	<p>Similarly, although to a much lesser degrees, sites BIN021 and 305, while not scoring negatively as individual sites in the table, could have a greater landscape impact cumulatively.</p> <p>Following the June 2016 consultation, the impact on the heritage assets was reassessed and determined to be negative and, as a result, the sites will no longer be allocated. Finding additional sites will be difficult as all available sites have been assessed already. The most significant environmental constraint is the topography which means that those sites stretching out of the village, up the surrounding hills, could have a significant impact on the landscape. The village is within the Lincolnshire Wolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), designated for its landscape quality, and those sites are not being pursued because of their impact on landscape quality. There is no brownfield land in Binbrook and much of the land on the edge of settlements will have the same topographical/landscape impact issues. It may be that the two sites being pursued are the only two suitable sites available at this time. It has therefore been determined that no sites will be allocated in Binbrook for the Plan period.</p>
--	---

Burgh le Marsh Sustainability Objectives (abbreviated)	Burgh le Marsh																
	BLM038	BLM301	BLM302	BLM303	BLM305	BLM307	BLM308	BLM310	BLM311	BLM312	BLM313	BLM314	BLM316	BLM317	BLM318	BLM319	BLM320
1. Biodiversity & geodiversity	✓	X	X	X	✓	X	?	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	0	?	✓	X
2. Landscapes/historic environment	0	X	✓	X	X	X	✓	X	0	✓	✓	✓	X	X	?	X	X
3. Natural resources	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Flood Risk	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	0	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
5. Economic growth	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. Previously developed land and loss of agricultural land and greenfield sites	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	✓	X	X	X	X
7. Access to key services and facilities	?	✓	✓	X	✓	X	✓	X	X	✓	✓	X	✓	X	✓	X	X
8. Recycling and waste minimisation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9. Inclusive, safe and vibrant communities	?	✓	✓	X	✓	X	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	X	✓	X	X
10. Local housing need	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
11. Sustainable design and	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

construction	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
12. Facilities and infrastructure for healthy lifestyles	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
13. Positively plan for, and minimise the effects of, climate change	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Summary	<p>Burgh le Marsh has the same issue with the low level of brownfield land as the rest of the district, which means that most of the sites have a negative outcome for this SA objective. The key issues for the village are the potential impacts that proposed sites may have on biodiversity, landscape and their ability to build cohesive communities through their spatial location. There is a degree of uncertainty about the first of these issues for the sites in Burgh le Marsh, as a number of paddocks and other field which have not been intensively farmed have been put forward. These sites tend to be smaller, have mature boundary treatment and in some cases there are watercourses alongside or within the site. These sites have greater potential for biodiversity than a large open arable field with little in the way of cover or habitat. The likely impacts on these sites can only be determined at a more detailed level. In terms of landscape impact, the sites that are more likely to have a negative impact are those on the edge of the village which for various reasons, topography, lack of landscaping etc, are likely to create a greater impression on the landscape. Again, the more peripheral sites are more likely to have negative outcomes in terms of their access to services and facilities as Burgh le Marsh has a more traditional market square type spatial arrangement so the facilities are largely grouped together.</p> <p>A number of sites have been discounted through the SHLAA process, leaving four sites remaining for consideration through the plan process; BLM305, BLM310, BLM313, BLM318. These sites generally perform best through the sustainability appraisal. An additional site was added following the June 2016 consultation, BLM320, however, BLM320 has negative scores for biodiversity, impact on the historic environment and access, as it is detached from the development of the village. Orby Road is a narrow lane with no footpaths or street lights and little prospect of creating footways. If footpaths were provided, these would change the rural character of Orby Lane. One other site (BLM038) also performs on a similar level but this site has been discounted because means of access has not been established (this is only for a small number of plots so does not add significantly to deliberations), but in any case this site would only provide a maximum of four plots.</p>																

Coningsby and Tattershall										
Sustainability Objectives (abbreviated)	CT009	CT016	CT301	CT302	CT303	CT305	CT306	CT311	CT313	Employment Site
1. Biodiversity & geodiversity	X	O	X	O	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
2. Landscapes/historic environment	X	✓	?	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	X	X
3. Natural resources	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
4. Flood Risk	X	X	X	X	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
5. Economic growth	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	X	O	✓
6. Previously developed land and loss of agricultural land and greenfield sites	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
7. Access to key services and facilities	✓	X	X	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	X
8. Recycling and waste minimisation	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
9. Inclusive, safe and vibrant communities	X	X	X	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	?	✓
10. Local housing need	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X
11. Sustainable design and construction	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
12. Facilities and infrastructure for healthy lifestyles	✓	X	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	X
13. Positively plan for, and minimise the effects of, climate change	O	X	X	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	?	X
Summary	Coningsby and Tattershall together are considered a town									

	<p>for the purposes of planning. There have been few sites promoted across the settlements and all of these are on greenfield sites; reflecting the low level of previously used land in the District. A number of the sites are affected by flood risk, indeed this halves the number of sites for consideration through the Plan. Due to the size of Coningsby and Tattershall, most of the sites are close to services and facilities. However, of the sites that lie out of flood risk, most are on the edge of the village and are more remote from services and facilities than those that are discounted on flood risk grounds. There are a number of historic assets in the two settlements and some of the sites may impact on them and there is potential for negative landscape on a number of sites. There may be opportunities to mitigate this with landscaping but this will take time to establish and there will be effects in the interim.</p> <p>As a result of the above considerations, sites C&T305, C&T306, C&T311 and C&T313 have emerged through both the SHLAA and the SA process as the most appropriate sites to allocate. Other alternatives are affected by flood risk. This still leaves a shortfall to met development needs but finding available alternatives that are not subject to constraints is a challenge.</p> <p>A requirement for an additional 1.5 - 3ha of employment land has been identified over the plan period. There are no options available in Coningsby or Tattershall that would enable brownfield land to come forward to fulfil this need. The most appropriate option is considered to be an extension of the existing site at Coldham Lane. Although there are potentially negative sustainability outcomes, as the site is greenfield land, extends into the countryside, and is located on the edge of Coningsby, this would equally apply to other options and there would be other issues, such as flood risk and biodiversity which would also score negatively for other areas. The ability for an extension of the existing industrial land to help provide synergy between businesses potentially strengthens the economic outcomes from the development. It is therefore considered that this area provides the most suitable direction of growth for further employment development.</p>	
--	---	--

Friskney		FRIS301	FRIS302	FRIS303	FRIS305	FRIS306	FRIS307	FRIS308	FRIS309	FRIS310	FRIS311	FRIS316	FRIS317	FRIS321	FRIS322	FRIS323	FRIS324	FRIS402	FRIS403	FRIS405	FRIS406
Sustainability Objectives (abbreviated)																					
1. Biodiversity & geodiversity	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	✓	✓	✓	○
2. Landscapes/historic environment	X	○	X	X	✓	✓	X	✓	○	✓	XX	✓	X	✓	○	XX	X	X	X	X	X
3. Natural resources	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
4. Flood Risk	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X
5. Economic growth	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	X	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
6. Previously developed land and loss of agricultural land and greenfield sites	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	✓	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
7. Access to key services and facilities	✓	X	X	X	X	✓	X	X	X	X	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	X	X	X	X
8. Recycling and waste	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

minimisation																				
9. Inclusive, safe and vibrant communities	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
10. Local housing need	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
11. Sustainable design and construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12. Facilities and infrastructure for healthy lifestyles	✓	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
13. Positively plan for, and minimise the effects of, climate change	✓	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Summary	Friskney is one of the District's Large Villages. Along with much of the District, the supply of brownfield land is very restricted, and all but one of the sites promoted are on greenfield land. A number of the sites are quite large, open agricultural fields. While these are not necessarily devoid of biodiversity, there will be opportunities through landscaping on these sites to link into existing linear features such as hedgerows and drainage ditches to provide additional opportunities for biodiversity. Conversely, some of the sites are quite small and there will be little opportunity, beyond private gardens, to protect or contribute to biodiversity in the area. In terms of landscape impact, there are a number of sites that relate well to the existing settlement and are suitable on landscape grounds. However, a number of sites are more remote or have a form that extends them inappropriately into the open countryside and have been discounted on this basis. In a similar vein, these sites are considered to have a negative impact in terms of their access to																			

	<p>services and facilities and therefore their ability to create vibrant communities and minimise the effects of climate change.</p> <p>Sites FRIS301, FRIS306, FRIS311, FRIS316, FRIS317 and FRIS322 emerged through the SHLAA process as being available for consideration, the majority have only one negative impact and that is their use of greenfield land; so they perform best in this assessment. FRIS322 has negative impacts in terms of its access to services and facilities in village, as it is starting to move away from existing services. However, the site sits close to two existing areas of development and is 800m from the school, shop, sport and recreation facilities and so is in walking distance. FRIS301 has a negative impact identified for landscape due to the open boundaries of the site; however, this could be mitigated through a good landscaping plan, which it will need in order to be able to fulfil its potential to improve biodiversity. Together these sites provide more than sufficient land to meet development needs. So the option to extend the village further out through site FRIS322 may not be needed at this time. A subsequent reappraisal of site FRIS311, following representations from Historic England has identified potentially significant impact on the grade I listed church and so removing this site from consideration. Site FRIS317 has also been extended following the June 2016 consultation, taking it from a site for two dwellings to a potential capacity of 26 which has changed the assessment of the site. The site sits between two designated heritage assets and, although replacing previous development on the site, is likely to have an impact.</p> <p>Three additional sites were promoted following the consultation and these have also been assessed (FRIS322, FRIS323 and FRIS324) but none of the sites are proposed for allocation.</p> <p>There is potential for cumulative impact in respect of a number of sites that have been put forward. The largest group is to the south of the village, at Fold Hill. Sites FRIS301, FRIS302, FRIS303, FRIS308 and FRIS309 all sit close together and are likely to have cumulative landscape impact, especially when viewed from Field Lane and Wright's Lane. On a more positive note, there may be greater benefits for biodiversity if sites were brought forward with a comprehensive approach. However, most of these sites have been discounted through the SHLAA, so it is unlikely these impacts will be realised. To the north of the village, FRIS306, FRIS307 and FRIS322 sit close to each other. Again, there could be potential for landscape impact around Low Road and Burgh Road with similar potential for biodiversity as to the south. However, as one of these sites has been discounted and one is less favourable, the cumulative impacts, both positive and</p>
--	--

	<p>negative, are likely to be removed, or at least lessened. The addition of sites FRIS322 and FRIS323 for consideration adds a further cumulative dimension. These sites, added to FIRS307 and FRIS321 would form an arch of development round the village, leaving a central undeveloped area, impacting negatively on landscape character. However, currently, these sites are not proposed for development.</p>
--	---

Grainthorpe														
Sustainability Objectives (abbreviated)		GRA209	GRA210	GRA211	GRA213	GRA302	GRA303	GRA304	GRA305	GRa307	GRA308	GRA309	GRA310	GRA311
1. Biodiversity & geodiversity		o	✓	✓	✓	o	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
2. Landscapes/ historic environment		x	x	x	x	x	x	o	o	x	x	x	x	o
3. Natural resources		o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o
4. Flood Risk		o	xx	x	xx	o	x	xx	x	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx
5. Economic growth		o	o	o	o	o	o	o	xx	o	o	o	o	o
6. Previously developed land and loss of agricultural land and greenfield sites		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x	x	x	x
7. Access to key services and facilities		✓	x	✓	x	✓	✓✓	o	x	x	✓	x	x	✓
8. Recycling and waste minimisation		o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o
9. Inclusive, safe and vibrant communities		✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	✓
10. Local housing need		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
11. Sustainable design and construction		o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o
12. Facilities and infrastructure for healthy lifestyles		✓	o	✓	o	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	x	✓	x	x	✓
13. Positively plan for, and minimise the effects of, climate change		✓	x	✓	x	✓	✓	x	x	✓	x	x	x	x
Summary	Tidal flood risk is a significant issue for growth in Grainthorpe, with only two sites being outside the Environment Agency's hazard areas. Because this limits the amount of growth in the future, it is unlikely that there will be any cumulative effect of development. The impact, both singularly and cumulatively,													

on the landscape of a number of the sites promoted would have been a factor had flood risk not been a factor, in particular sites GRA309 and GRA310. In common with many villages in East Lindsey, Grainthorpe has no brownfield land and, if development is to come forward in the large villages, greenfield sites will have to be released.

A number of the sites that have come forward are on the western side of the main road, footpaths links within the main part of the village are limited and there are no safe pedestrian links to the sports facilities from these sites. There are a few areas in the heart of the village that are outside flood risk but once these are built, there will be few alternative opportunities. The sites that are outside the flood risk area, and deemed suitable for development in planning terms (GRA209 and GRA211), are within the village and accessible to services and facilities. This will not provide sufficient land to meet Gainthorpe's needs for the next plan period. If it were not for flood risk, there would be other options available for development. With flood risk, there are no further deliverable options in the village; now or moving forward.

Grimoldby and Manby	MAN003	MAN21	MAN30	MAN23	MAN301	MAN302	MAN305	MAN309	MAN310	MAN313	MAN314	MAN316	MAN319	MAN325	MAN330	MAN332	MAN335
Sustainability Objectives (abbreviated)																	
1. Biodiversity & geodiversity	X	X	X	?	?	?	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	0	?	✓	✓	?
2. Landscapes/historic environment	X	0	✓	X	X	X	✓	X	X	X	X	✓	X	X	✓	0	X
3. Natural resources	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Flood Risk	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
5. Economic growth	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	0
6. Previously developed land and loss of agricultural land and greenfield sites	X	X	X	X	X	X	✓	X	X	X	X	✓	X	X	✓	X	X
7. Access to key services and facilities	✓	X	X	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	X	?	✓	✓
8. Recycling and waste minimisation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9. Inclusive,	✓	X	X	✓	✓	X	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	X	?	✓	X

safe and vibrant communities	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
10. Local housing need	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
11. Sustainable design and construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12. Facilities and infrastructure for healthy lifestyles	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
13. Positively plan for, and minimise the effects of, climate change	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Summary	<p>In common with much of East Lindsey, most of the sites being promoted in Grimoldby and Manby are on greenfield land. Although Manby has a significant amount of brownfield land, as a result of the former Royal Air Force base, much of this is still in commercial use. There are a number of sites in the villages that have also not been intensively framed in the past and are small paddock type areas with mature hedgerows and/or trees and have the potential to host a variety of flora and fauna. The impact of any development on these sites is uncertain without an ecological survey of the site and a proposed layout and density. A number of sites are likely to have a landscape impact due to either their scale, their location on the edge of the village, or because they are located in more sensitive parts of the village in townscape terms. Away from the main roads, both villages (but Grimoldby in particular) are characterised by narrow lanes, soft edges and well treed frontages or open fieldscapes. Development in these areas is likely to have an impact on local character. Most of the sites are located within walking distance of services and facilities and there are pavements alongside the larger roads to facilitate pedestrian access. Away from these routes, local circumstances mean that providing pavements would either not be possible or would change the character of local lanes.</p>																								

<p>The SLHAA process has narrowed the choice of sites in Grimoldby and Manby to four MAN314, MAN316, MAN323 and MAN330, largely on the grounds of suitability. These sites are the most centrally located in relation to services and facilities, although one site (MAN330) has a number of uncertain outcomes in terms of its access as direct pedestrian access to these services is not readily available and some work will need to be done to ensure this can be provided. Some of the sites will need thoughtful design in order to address potential impact on the landscape, townscape or historic environment, but all have opportunities to protect and/or enhance biodiversity through this process. Site MAN305 scored quite well on the sustainability appraisal, however, this site would be shared with the local highways depot so would be a less than desirable outcome for future residents.</p> <p>None of the sites are close together or are read together and therefore, the cumulative impact of development is not likely to be significant.</p> <p>These sites provide more than sufficient land for the needs of the two villages over the plan period. However, if the site with access issues does not come forward, this will leave a significant gap in the housing supply and some of the other sites that have not performed as well in the sustainability assessment will need to be considered again.</p>	
---	--

Hogsthorpe								
Sustainability Objectives (abbreviated)	HOG301	HOG303	HOG304	HOG305	HOG306	HOG307	HOG308	HOG309
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 minimise the effects of, climate change	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓
Summary	<p>Significantly more land has been put forward in Hogsthorpe than is needed over the plan period. However, a number of sites have been discounted as, due to flood risk being a significant issue in the village, few of the sites are able to be pursued. Due to Hogsthorpe's relatively compact nature, all of the sites are located well for services and facilities, although there may be difficulty in connecting a few of the sites to the existing footways in the village. Only one site is on brownfield land, however, this site is still in use for employment, so in bringing forward a brownfield site, employment opportunities in the village would be reduced. There are a number of sites in Hogsthorpe which together would have a significant cumulative impact. However, as many of these sites have been discounted through the SHLAA, these cumulative impact</p>							

	<p>are not likely to materialise. HOG306 and HOG3009 are outside flood risk, and can be delivered. These sites are contiguous and therefore have the potential for cumulative impact. However, there are opportunities through landscaping to break up the sites and reduce their visual impact. Of the remaining sites that are not entirely within flood risk, HOG308 performs well through the SA but has insufficient access and so this would have to be overcome for the site to be feasible.</p>
--	---

Holton le Clay									
Sustainability Objectives (abbreviated)	HILC42	HILC43	HILC206	HILC301	HILC302	HILC303	HILC304	HILC305	HILC308
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 minimise the effects of, climate change	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Summary	In common with most of East Lindsey, the majority of sites								

	<p>identified at Holton le Clay are greenfield sites, the exception being HLC206 which, albeit a small site, is a disused scrapyards. In order to meet the housing requirements for the plan period, this will mean that most development will be on greenfield sites. Two of the sites promoted are large (15.3 and 17.7ha) and will result in the loss of grade 3 agricultural land. However, with the lack of brownfield sites, in order to meet the required housing target, any land will be of grade 3 agricultural quality and whether this comes forward on one large site a number of smaller ones, the cumulative loss will be the same. There are benefits and disbenefits to large sites being pursued. In terms of the benefits, larger sites enable economies of scale to emerge so that services and facilities can be provided to serve the development; including green infrastructure, which can be provided at a level that serves the wider community and not only the site in question. This green infrastructure can also help to offset biodiversity impact and has space to provide more opportunities for biodiversity than smaller sites. The most likely disbenefit is that the scale of the site potentially increases landscape impact as the development may be harder to assimilate into the local landscape. Although site HLC305 has positive outcomes for access to services and facilities and safe and vibrant communities, this depends on suitable access being established as there are some constraints to this.</p> <p>In terms of the sustainability appraisal, site HLC206 emerges as the best site but this can only accommodate around 5% of the required development. In respect of the remaining sites, HLC301, HLC303, HLC305 and HLC308 all emerge equally; however, HLC305 and HLC308 have been discounted through the SHLAA, 305 on the grounds of suitability and 308 on availability. Sites HLC302 and HLC304 score similarly, although they have negative outputs for different objectives. Not all of these sites will be needed to provide for Holton le Clay's needs over the plan period and decisions, based on the planning merits of the sites will have to be made.</p>
--	---

forward in Horncastle and the location of some of the sites, either together or close to existing green space or the countryside, there will be opportunities.

In terms of cumulative impact, there are a number of significant clusters of sites. To the south of Spilsby Road, four sites have been put forward; one already has planning permission. With the remaining sites (HOR314, HOR315 and HOR330) it will be important that, if they were all to come forward, they are co-ordinated so that landscaping and green infrastructure provision both minimises landscape impact as the sites will be viewed together on entering Horncastle from the east, and maximise opportunities for recreation and biodiversity. While loss of biodiversity due to development will occur, even with development of intensively farmed land, sites need to maximise the opportunities to provide new opportunities to wildlife to establish itself and migrate through our settlements. To the west of Horncastle a number of sites have been promoted, two of the sites have been discounted on landscape grounds, and a further site due to access; only one of the sites has passed through the SHLAA to site selection. If this were not the case, and the sites were under consideration, along with the site to the north which was granted permission at appeal, there would be potential for a significant change in this area in landscape terms.

A number of sites have passed through the SHLAA process and are available for selection through the plan process. Planning permissions in the town have accelerated in the last few years (although these are largely in outline) and these sites have not been assessed through the SA. Of those that have passed through to sites selection, most perform well against the SA objectives. HOR303 has some of its area in flood risk and would result in the loss of a business, so does not perform as well as some other sites. Similarly, site HOR333 has potentially negative outcome for landscape, due to its proximity to the river and the public woodland across the bank; however, this could be mitigated through design, layout and landscaping. Other sites perform similarly well, so it will be planning considerations that influence the selection of sites.

An additional area of between 5.5 and 9ha of additional employment land has been identified as being needed over the plan period. There are no options available in the town that would enable brownfield land to come forward to fulfil this need. Land immediately west of the town is quite well landscaped, but would still be likely to have a negative impact on the landscape, given the nature of employment development which tends to be tall and utilitarian in design. The sites to the north and east are more open with less intervening landscaping and they would be visible in views on entering the town. There is also less of a commercial presence in these areas to soften the impact of the development. The site for additional land has been chosen to the south of Horncastle, extending the existing Boston Road Industrial Estate to accommodate additional demand. The scores above show that there are a number of potentially negative outcomes from this choice, which largely relate to its location on greenfield land and its distance from some areas of the town; particularly to the north and west. There are no more advantageous options for additional employment land emerging through the site selection process. Also, the ability for an extension of the existing industrial land to help provide synergy between businesses potentially strengthens the economic outcomes from the development.

Huttoft					
Sustainability Objectives (abbreviated)	HUT206	HUT301	HUT302	HUT304	HUT306
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 minimise the effects of, climate change	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓
Summary	Huttoft lies outside the flood hazard zone, so does not suffer from the flood risk many the parts of the coast are at risk from. All the				

	<p>sites that have been promoted are, or are predominantly, greenfield sites and so this means there will be loss of agricultural land whichever choices are made; this is a common situation for East Lindsey. Three sites have emerged from the SHLAA; HUT206, HUT304 and HUT306. A number of sites have been discounted as their potential landscape impact, given the size of the sites, is considered to be too great. However, site HUT306 has scored negatively for its impact on the landscape and careful consideration would be needed for possible mitigation if this site is to be pursued further. There is generally good access to services and facilities due to the compact nature of the village, and safe pedestrian access can be established from most sites, although this has been a negative impact in the case of site HUT306 for which such access cannot be established. The centre of the village has the most environmental constraints, with the listed church and some trees protected by tree preservation order. These do not preclude development and impacts can be addressed through design. In cumulative terms the impact of the sites selected would be not significant. There is shortfall of development sites in, even if all the promoted sites were suitable and deliverable.</p>
--	---

Legbourne	LEG001	LEG009	LEG302	LEG303	LEG305	LEG307	LEG309	LEG310	LEG312	LEG214
Sustainability Objectives (abbreviated)										
1. Biodiversity & geodiversity	X	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
2. Landscapes/ historic environment	O	✓	X	O	X	O	O	X	X	O
3. Natural resources	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
4. Flood Risk	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
5. Economic growth	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
6. Previously developed land and loss of agricultural land and greenfield sites	X	✓	✓	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
7. Access to key services and facilities	X	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	X	X	X	✓
8. Recycling and waste minimisation	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
9. Inclusive, safe and vibrant communities	X	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	X	X	X	✓
10. Local housing need	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
11. Sustainable design and construction	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
12. Facilities and infrastructure for healthy lifestyles	X	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	X	X	X	✓
13. Positively plan for, and minimise the effects of, climate change	X	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	X	X	X	✓
Summary	<p>There is very little brownfield land in Legbourne so most of the sites are greenfield sites. Legbourne is largely linear in form so, inevitably, the sites that have been promoted tend to be at the extent of the current settlement. This would extend the housing away from services and facilities, and some of the sites have scored negatively as a result of this. Two large sites to the west of the village (LEG309 and LEG310) have been discounted from the SHLAA for this reason and also due to their landscape impact. The individual sites are deemed to have an unacceptable impact, and cumulative the impact would be significant. To the east of the</p>									

	<p>village, three sites have been put forward. One of these (LEG301) already has planning permission. The remaining two sites are on the opposite side of the road LEG307 and LEG312 from it. Cumulative, the impact of these sites could be significant. Although there is flood risk in and around Legbourne, all the sites promoted through the SHLAA lie outside the flood risk area.</p> <p>The SHLAA process has reduced the number of potential sites in Legbourne to three; LEG301, LEG303 and LEG307. Site LEG301 has not been taken through the appraisal as it already has the benefit of planning permission. Sites 303 and 307 have the same outcome in the sustainability appraisal only scoring negatively for the use of greenfield land; which is inevitable in a rural context. With the exception of site LEG009, which is a site for only one dwelling and is not known to be available, these sites perform the best in terms of the sustainability appraisal and would provide for identified need in Legbourne over the plan period.</p>
--	---

Louth	L0002	L0044	L0096	L0099	L0143	L0150	L0154	L0155	L0301	L0302	L0303	L0305	L0306	L0307	L0308	L0311	L0312	L0313	L0318	L0321	L0325	L0326
Sustainability Objectives - abbreviated																						
1. Biodiversity & geodiversity	0	X	0	0	✓	X	X	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	0	✓	✓	✓	0	✓
2. Landscapes/ historic environment	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	?	✓	X	X	?	0	?	✓	X	X	0	0	?
3. Natural resources	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Flood Risk	0	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
5. Economic growth	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. Previously developed land and loss of agricultural land and greenfield sites	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	X	X	X	✓	X	X	✓	✓	X	✓	X	X	X	X	X
7. Access to key services and facilities	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	X	✓	✓
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	0	0
9. Inclusive, safe and vibrant communities	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	X	✓	✓
10. Local housing need	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
11. Sustainable design and construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12. Facilities and infrastructure for healthy lifestyles	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	X	✓	✓
13. Positively plan for, and minimise the effects of, climate change	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	X	✓	✓

Louth cont	L0327	L0328	L0329	L0330	L0332	L0333	L0334	L0337	L0338	L0341	L0344	L0345	L0372	L0462	L0501	L0502	L0521	L0523	L0527	L0528	L0705	Employment Site
Sustainability Objectives - abbreviated																						
1. Biodiversity	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	X	0	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	0	0	X

enormously and is not always related to the size of the site.

In terms of settlements growth, it is truism that, as places grow they move away from services and facilities, which are often centrally located. Some of the more peripheral areas of Louth do have access to local shops and services at a neighbourhood scale, though many of the outer lying sites are not so readily accessible to the largest range of services. However, the fact that quite a number of adjacent sites are being promoted means that, by working together, there are economies of scale sufficient to bring forward additional local services and facilities, green infrastructure and transport links that can overcome some of these difficulties. The negative aspect of this is that by bringing these sites together there can also be a greater negative impact in terms of landscape and the effects on biodiversity, if sites are not sensitively developed. Therefore, the potential cumulative impacts of development in a context such as Louth's, where clusters of sites are prevalent, are very mixed.

A number of positive community benefits could accrue; however, the potential for more negative impacts on the natural environment will depend very much on how the sites are developed. A number of cluster areas have been discounted through the SHLAA. One of these, encompassing sites LO318, LO332, LO333, LO334 and LO372 has scored negatively for landscape and biodiversity due to its location within, and impact on, the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The other cluster, sites LO327, LO337, LO338, LO501 and LO523, is discounted due to insufficient access to accommodate the amount of development likely to come forward. The remaining clusters of sites will also have some cumulative impact, particularly in terms of landscape. The cluster to the north east of Louth, sites LO305, LO306 (discounted), LO325, LO340 (planning permission granted), LO505 (discounted) and LO705 (discounted) are likely to have a more local impact. To the north west is a small cluster of sites (LO301 and LO302) adjacent to the A16 and abutting the AONB boundary. Site LO302, which is the site abutting the boundary will need to be developed in a way that respects that proximity and, given that the whole site is not to be allocated, it is possible to achieve a better outcome on this site. The cluster to the south of Louth, LO313, LO329, LO330, LO344 and LO345 are more likely to have a wider impact. However, as referred to above, there may be positive cumulative impact emerging from these clusters in terms of green infrastructure, biodiversity and social infrastructure.

Land for an additional 8.6ha of employment land will be needed over the plan period. There are no options available in the town that would enable brownfield land to come forward to fulfil this need. This means that the only options available to the Council will be edge of settlement locations on greenfield land. In narrowing down the options further, it is important that the site chosen has readily available and safe access to the Strategic Road Network to enable the movement of goods whilst causing minimum disturbance to residential areas of the town and avoiding, where possible, the narrow historic streets in the town centre. This would preclude development to the east of Louth. To the west of Louth lies the Lincolnshire Wolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and development further west of the existing built area of development risks harming this protected landscape or its setting. This leaves two main options for a future direction of growth: extending the town's existing industrial estate on the north of the town; or creating a new area of employment land to the south of the town where there is also convenient access to the A16. The direction of growth for additional land has been chosen to the north of Louth, extending Fairfield Industrial Estate to accommodate additional demand. The assessment above shows that there are some potential negative outcomes from this choice, which largely relate to its location on greenfield land and its distance from some areas of the town; particularly to the south. A site to the south would receive similar outcomes, with negative and neutral scores as highlighted above. However, in

	<p>addition, a site to the south would also receive a negative degree of impact for landscape as, depending on the exact siting, it would be more visible in views from Kenwick Hill and Kenwick Road. There is also less of a commercial presence in this area to soften the impact of the development. Also, the ability for an extension of the existing industrial land to help provide synergy between businesses potentially strengthens the economic outcomes from the development.</p>
--	--

Mareham le Fen	MLF021	MLF026	MLF301	MLF303	MLF305	MLF308	MLF309	MLF310	MLF311	MLF312	MLF313	MLF314	MLF328	MLF329	MLF330	MLF331
Sustainability Objectives (abbreviated)	MLF021	MLF026	MLF301	MLF303	MLF305	MLF308	MLF309	MLF310	MLF311	MLF312	MLF313	MLF314	MLF328	MLF329	MLF330	MLF331
1. Biodiversity & geodiversity	✓	?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	○	✓	✓	✓	✓	○
2. Landscapes/ historic environment	✓	X	X	✓	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	?	✓	X	X	X
3. Natural resources	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
4. Flood Risk	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
5. Economic growth	○	○	○	X	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
6. Previously developed land and loss of agricultural land and greenfield sites	✓	X	X	X	X	✓	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
7. Access to key services and facilities	✓	✓	X	✓	X	✓	X	✓	✓	X	X	✓	X	✓	X	X
8. Recycling and waste minimisation	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
9. Inclusive, safe and vibrant communities	✓	✓	X	✓	X	✓	X	✓	X	X	X	✓	X	✓	X	X
10. Local housing need	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
11. Sustainable design and construction	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
12. Facilities and infrastructure for healthy lifestyles	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	X	✓	✓	X	X	✓	X	✓	X	X	X
13. Positively plan for, and minimise the effects of, climate change	✓	✓	X	✓	X	✓	X	✓	✓	X	X	✓	X	✓	X	X
Summary	In common with most other villages in East Lindsey, Mareham le Fen does not															

have much brownfield land and most of the sites promoted are on greenfield land. The village is predominantly out of flood risk, so this is not a constraint. A number of the sites promoted are likely to have landscape impact, as the majority of sites are agricultural land on the edge of the village and fields around Mareham le Fen tend not to have strong boundary treatments. Some of the sites may be better placed to mitigate potentially negative impacts whereas, for others, this will be more difficult due to their locations or the sensitivity of the site. Mareham le Fen is quite a compact village for its size, meaning that its services and facilities are rarely far from the majority of its residents. However, a number of sites have been identified as having negative impacts as, while within a reasonable distance, they do not have the benefit of footways, not would these be easy to provide. The SHLAA has already considered these sites and a number have been discounted on the basis of their landscape impact and/or the inability to serve the sites through safe pedestrian access. Of the sites moving through the SHLAA, the more accessible sites will be available for consideration under the settlement proposals. Two of these sites (MLF305 and MLF309) have scored negatively for landscape impact and, if the sites are to progress, the issues of landscaping and design and layout of any proposals would be a significant issue. The remaining sites are MLF021 and MLF328; and these score best through the SA. These are generally the sites which score best through the SA. MLF313 scored similarly through the SA, however, its landscape value, as a significant and valued entrance feature to the village has meant that it has been discounted through the SHLAA.

In terms of cumulative impact, a number of the sites have been promoted in clusters, or are close to other sites. To the west of the village, three sites have been put forward (MLF305, MLF309 and MLF328). Two are contiguous and one is to the south of Main Street. The main impact of these sites would be on the landscape as they would read together in views, with only the road to separate them. There could be potential benefits of the grouping of sites in terms of biodiversity, though this would only really apply to the sites to the north of the main road. Bringing the sites forward together would allow for a more cohesive landscaping plan which can better assist wildlife and provide a diversity of green infrastructure. This will need to be offset against visual impact and mitigated through the landscaping. A number of sites have been put forward at the east of the village but the majority of these will not be viewed together so landscape impact is not as significant an issue. However, the two small sites that do read together (MLF312 and MLF313) would have an important local cumulative impact as together they provide a strong entrance feature to the village. There may be opportunities to link all the sites on the eastern side of the village, through their landscaping, so benefit biodiversity. However, this benefit would not override the loss of these important spaces and there is nothing to prevent the other sites linking their landscaping to these existing open spaces.

Marshchapel										
Sustainability Objectives (abbreviated)	MAR217	MAR226	MAR228	MAR229	MAR234	MAR300	MAR301	MAR304	MAR410	MAR412
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 minimise the effects of, climate change	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
Summary	The most significant issue in Marshchapel is flood risk, which discounts a number of the sites. A number of sites have also been discounted through the SHLAA process as they are not available. This leaves five sites to be considered through the plan process; MAR217, MAR226, MAR300, MAR304 and MAR412. However, MAR412 has no defined access and so is also discounted. The remaining sites all perform similarly									

	<p>through the SA, although MAR217 and MAR300 perform slightly better as they are not deemed to have the same landscape impacts. All the sites are located so access local services and facilities on foot is possible. The majority of sites in the village are greenfield sites; those sites which contain some built development are agricultural in nature, which is considered greenfield under the NPPF. This is a common situation in East Lindsey where there is a low level of brownfield land available. The two sites containing agricultural buildings (MAR300 and MAR301) are still in operation and it is unclear if the holdings will continue without the buildings; so the impact on the local economy is uncertain. Three of the sites are close together (MAR217, MAR300 and MAR304) and there are inevitable cumulative impacts if all the sites were to be developed; which would be the case if Marshchapel were to fulfil its housing target over the plan period. The cumulative impact most likely to be experienced in relation to landscape impact and a good landscaping scheme will be needed to offset these impacts. There are possible gains to be had in terms of biodiversity in relation to these sites. Although there may be some negative impact on biodiversity through these sites being built, the fact that there will be need for good quality landscaping and the fact that these sites can be linked together to create green corridors linking to the open countryside means that there are gains to be had. There are some uncertainties in relation to access of these sites as all will need to use the same, upgraded, access which may be too narrow to accommodate all the traffic generated. However, if the development of the sites is phased, there may be the possibility to take part of site MAR304 to facilitate a better access; bringing a cumulative benefit.</p>
--	--

North Thoresby Sustainability Objectives (abbreviated)	NTH203		NTH301		NTH302		NTH303		NTH304		NTH305		NTH307		NTH308		NTH311		NTH312		NTH313		NTH315		NTH318		NTH319	
	1. Biodiversity & geodiversity	0	?	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. Landscapes/ historic environment	X	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Natural resources	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Flood Risk	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
5. Economic growth	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. Previously developed land and loss of agricultural land and greenfield sites	✓	✓	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
7. Access to key services and facilities	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

9. Inclusive, safe and vibrant communities	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	X	X	X
10. Local housing need	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	X	X
11. Sustainable design and construction	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
12. Facilities and infrastructure for healthy lifestyles	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	X	X	X
13. Positively plan for, and minimise the effects of, climate change	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	X	X
Summary	In common with much of East Lindsey, the majority of sites that have been proposed in North Thoresby are greenfield sites; due to the low level of brownfield options in the District. None of the sites are in flood risk and there are opportunities to enhance the biodiversity of a number of sites, which are currently in agriculture, linking to nearby drains and substantial boundaries. A number of sites in the village do not perform well in terms of access to services which is due to their location on the edge of the village, rather than there being poor services and facilities in North Thoresby. There are also a number of sites which are identified as having a potential negative impact on the landscape. Only four sites NTH301, NTH307, NTH308 and NTH313, have emerged through the SHLAA to the site selection process. These sites perform well through the SA, although NTH308 has some potential negative impact for access as it can be accessed safely but this is some way from the centre of North Thoresby and safe pedestrian access would be difficult. Also performing well through the SA are NTH302 and NTH303. However, availability of both sites is uncertain and the accesses are inadequate for the size of site.																						

In terms of the cumulative impact of development, several sites were promoted to the east of the village, covering over 17 hectares. The sites to the north of Station Road are quite enclosed and do not read in relation to the sites to the south. The sites south of Station Road, comprising 1.6 hectares, would read more as one site and together would have had a significant impact on the landscape; and as a result have been discounted. These sites would also be extending the development away from the centre of the village where the majority of services and facilities are; although there could have been benefits to biodiversity and green infrastructure, with sites linking together greenspace and providing space for wildlife linking to adjacent drains and treed area. A swathe of sites has also been promoted to the west of the village. However, the majority of these sites are quite enclosed and so the landscape impact will be reduced. The largest of the sites (NTH308) will have a clear landscape impact as a result of its location next to the A16 but this is a stand alone impact. These sites are better located in relation to services, although with an access off Ludborough Road site NTH308 is approx 700 metres from the majority of services; again, opportunities to enhance biodiversity exist. The sites that have emerged through the SHLAA are largely the best located sites, although NTH308 will require alternative pedestrian access to fulfil this potential, without that it is as remote by foot as some of the site on the edge of the village. Sufficient land has been identified through these sites to meet North Thoresby's needs over the plan period and allow for some reduced capacity on more sensitive sites.

Partney	PAR302	PAR303	PAR306	PAR307	PAR308
Sustainability Objectives (abbreviated)					
1. Protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the areas' biodiversity (native plants and animals) and geodiversity.	X	✓	O	✓	?
2. Protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the area's landscapes, townscapes and historic environment.	O	O	X	X	XX
3. Protect natural resources from avoidable losses and pollution and minimise the impacts of unavoidable losses and pollution.	O	O	O	O	O
4. Avoid the risk of flooding (where possible) and fully mitigate against the impacts of flooding where it cannot be avoided.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
5. Promote viable and diverse economic growth that supports communities within the district.	O	O	O	O	O

6. Prioritise appropriate re-use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of the best agricultural land and greenfield sites.	X	X	X	X	X
7. Improve accessibility to key services, facilities amenities and green infrastructure including the promotion of sustainable modes of access.	✓	✓	X	X	X
8. Increase reuse and recycling rates and minimise the production of waste.	O	O	O	O	O
9. Support inclusive, safe and vibrant communities.	✓	✓	X	X	X
10. Ensure that local housing needs are met.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
11. Increase energy efficiency and ensure appropriate sustainable design, construction and operation of new developments.	O	O	O	O	O
12. Encourage and provide the facilities and infrastructure for "healthy lifestyles"	✓	✓	X	X	X

13. Positively plan for, and minimise the effects of, climate change.	✓	✓	X	X	X
Summary	<p>As it the case with the majority of East Lindsey, due to the low level of brownfield sites, all the sites in Partney are greenfield so score negatively for use of brownfield land. One of the sites (PAR308) has a small area of flood risk but this can be addressed through layout of the site so all the sites score positively for flood risk. Site PAR302 has a negative score for biodiversity. Unlike all the other sites which are arable or heavily mown grass, this site has a natural or semi-natural feel to it and is more likely to be host to biodiversity, which will be affected by development. It may be that with low density scheme and a good planting scheme, some of this can be offset but the site has a different character to the others. PAR308 scores as uncertain for biodiversity. Part of the site contains a wooded area and this should not be lost to development, otherwise the score would be negative. If this area is retained, there may be opportunities to incorporate this and enhance biodiversity. However, as the area is incorporated into the development area, this has to be scored as uncertain. In terms of landscape, sites PAR302 and 303 score neutrally as, although they don't enhance the landscape character, they will have a lower impact. The other sites have a negative score and PAR308 in particular as this site is the only site in the village which sits within the Lincolnshire Wolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Sites PAR302 and 303 score more positively for a number of other objectives as they are closer to the centre of the village than the other three sites. Although services and facilities are spread across a number of locations around the village, rather than clustered in one area, they tend towards the south and west of the village. The other three sites are towards the north and further to the east and so are starting to move further away. Also, both PAR302 and 303 link to the public rights of way network and so can afford access to the wider countryside for recreation and healthy lifestyles. Cumulatively, sites PAR303, PAR306 and PAR307 would together have a significant negative impact on the landscape.</p>				

Sibsey	SIB302	SIB303	SIB304	SIB305	SIB306	SIB401	SIB402	SIB404	SIB405	SIB406	SIB410
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 minimise the effects of, climate change	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Summary	All the sites promoted at Sibsey are relatively close to services and facilities and outside of flood risk. Most of the sites are on										

	<p>greenfield land, in common with most villages in East Lindsey. The only exception is site SIB404, but redevelopment of this site would mean the loss of, or loss of potential for, employment. A number of sites are highlighted as having potential for negative impact on landscape. In general, this is down to the size of the sites in question, as the majority of sites promoted in Sibsey are large with a low level of boundary treatment and are located on the edge of the village.</p> <p>The site which performs best through the SA is SIB304, this is a small site, centrally located. In terms of the remaining sites, SIB302, SIB303, SIB406 and SIB410 perform the best. All these sites have gone through the SHLAA process, with the exception of SIB410 where it has been deemed that the landscape impact is too significant. The remaining sites are also identified as having landscape impact but the capacities of the sites have been reduced to reflect this.</p> <p>There is potential for cumulative impact on both the eastern and western sides of the village. A number of adjacent sites have been put forward on both sides of the village; which vary in size but both sides contain sites of significant size. Some of the sites are proportionately smaller and better screened but the overall impact will be high. There are, however, potential benefits to be gained from grouping sites together. There will be potential to enhance biodiversity and add to services and facilities, in particular green infrastructure; however this has to be weighed against potential negative impacts. The SHLAA process has discounted a number of sites, largely on landscape grounds, although a few of the smaller sites have insufficient access to enable their development. This means that there is less likelihood of cumulative impacts being realised but there is still some potential to the west of the village as there are still multiple sites still under consideration as part of the plan process. To the east there is still potential for significant impacts, but these are the result of one very large site, larger in fact than the accumulation of sites on the western side of the A16, rather than cumulative impact.</p> <p>The SHLAA has already substantially reduced the capacity of the largest of these sites with a view to addressing potential landscape impact through the design and layout of any development, and this will need to be a key consideration.</p>
--	---

Spilsby								
Sustainability Objectives (abbreviated)	SPY022	SPY203	SPY301	SPY302	SPY303	SPY304	SPY305	SPY306
1. Biodiversity & geodiversity	X	O	✓	?	✓	O	✓	✓
2. Landscapes/historic environment	X	✓	?	X	X	?	X	X
3. Natural resources	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
4. Flood Risk	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
5. Economic growth	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
6. Previously developed land and loss of agricultural land and greenfield sites	X	✓	X	X	X	X	X	X
7. Access to key services and facilities	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
8. Recycling and waste minimisation	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
9. Inclusive, safe and vibrant communities	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
10. Local housing need	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
11. Sustainable design and construction	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
12. Facilities and infrastructure for healthy lifestyles	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
13. Positively plan for, and minimise the effects of, climate change	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Summary	<p>Spilsby is a small, and quite compact, town and so all of the sites promoted are within walking distance of the town centre and can provide safe and easy access to services and facilities. As is the usual situation in East Lindsey, the majority of sites are on greenfield land. There is a limited supply of brownfield land in Spilsby, and where sites do come available, they are small and would not make a significant contribution to housing supply.</p> <p>The majority of sites have progressed through the SHLAA as there</p>							

	<p>are no significant impediments to their development. Sites SPY203, SPY301 and SPY304 perform best as they are deemed not to impact on the wider landscape as they are closer to the current settlement form. The sites to the east of the town do coincide with an area of potential archaeological interest (medieval field pattern) and this will require further investigation to see how much of that remains as the area has been heavily farmed. However, they will not provide sufficient housing land on their own and other sites will have to be selected from the available sites. The majority of sites promoted are on the eastern side of Spilsby; in part because the town cannot expand to the west. There will inevitably be cumulative effects if all, or the majority, of sites come forward. These effects not all need be negative. There will be greater cumulative impact on landscape impact if these sites are brought forward over time) as a comprehensive development. Some of this potential negative impact can be mitigated through good design, layout and landscaping, however, it is inevitable that a large group of development sites will bring about significant change. However, there are potential positive benefits in terms of opportunities to create space for biodiversity, to create more comprehensive green infrastructure provision and to create more direct pedestrian access to services and facilities.</p>
--	--

Stickney														
Sustainability Objectives (abbreviated)	STK301	STK304	STK305	STK306	STK312	STK313	STK314	STK315	STK316	STK318	STK319	STK320	STK322	STK330
1. Biodiversity & geodiversity	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
2. Landscapes/ historic environment	X	X	o	o	o	o	o	o	X	X	o	X	X	X
3. Natural resources	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o
4. Flood Risk	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	X
5. Economic growth	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o
6. Previously developed land and loss of agricultural land and greenfield sites	X	X	X	✓	X	X	X	X	X	X	✓	X	X	X
7. Access to key services and facilities	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	X	✓	X
8. Recycling and waste minimisation	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o
9. Inclusive, safe and vibrant communities	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	X	✓	X
10. Local housing need	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
11. Sustainable design and construction	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o
12. Facilities and infrastructure for healthy lifestyles	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	X	✓	X
13. Positively plan for, and minimise the effects of, climate change	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	X	✓	X

Summary	<p>Due to the very low level of brownfield land in Stickney (and the District as a whole) most of the sites put forward for development are greenfield sites. Farming practices in this part of the district also mean that many of these sites are either very large fields, or a collection of medium sized fields, with little in the way of landscaping. There is unlikely to be a significant amount of biodiversity due to the intensive agriculture, although some of the sites contain or are alongside drainage ditches which may enhance opportunities for biodiversity. As a result, any landscaping associated with development (planting, open space etc) may present opportunities for biodiversity; although in a lot of cases will do little to overcome significant impact on the wider landscape. Most of the sites are outside of flood risk, although sites STK320 and STK330 are in flood zone 3. A number of sites have significant landscape impacts and most of these sites have been discounted on this basis. Some of the more peripheral sites have also been identified as having a negative impact in terms of access to services and facilities. Six sites have passed through the SHLAA to the site selection process; STK304, STK306, STK312, STK314, STK315 and STK319. These sites generally perform the best through the SA, although STK304 has negative impacts identified for landscape. STK305 performs similarly to the remainder of these sites but is not available.</p> <p>Many of the sites are not read together and are not contiguous so they are less likely to have cumulative impacts, although they may have significant impacts on their own. There may be cumulative impacts if all the sites proposed were brought forward, primarily in terms of sustainability objectives on landscape and access to services; although as substantially more land has been promoted than is needed in Stickney, not all these sites will be progressed and careful selection will be need on those sites that are chosen.</p>
---------	--

Tetford			
Sustainability Objectives (abbreviated)	TET302	TET303	TET304
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 minimise the effects of, climate change	✓	✓	✓
Summary	<p>There are many positive outcomes to the sites promoted in Tetford but there also remain a number of negatives. All of the sites are, or contain a proportion of greenfield land. The only site with an element of brownfield land is site currently in employment use. To capitalise on the opportunity to develop on a brownfield site would mean losing the single largest employer in the village, and/or the opportunity for the site to be redeveloped for employment activities. Tetford sits within the Lincolnshire Wolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, designated nationally for its landscape quality. Development here needs to be very carefully considered in terms of its impact on the landscape. One of the sites is very open and would have impact on the</p>		

surrounding countryside. The other two sites sit adjacent to each other and there is potential for a cumulative impact on the landscape. One of the sites (TET303) is unlikely to impact on the landscape as it is largely enclosed and the adjacent site (TET302) could have an impact on views from an adjacent public right of way, but this will depend on the landscaping and design of any scheme. As a result the cumulative impact of these sites is currently uncertain. In terms of biodiversity, there are potential positives to be gained (to different degrees) from both sites and if the landscaping plan for the sites complemented each other (they are different ownership) the cumulative impact of the benefits could be increased. As Tetford is one of the smaller Large Villages, none of the sites are far removed from local services and facilities, and their location will enable people to walk to use them. Residents will be able to utilise the extensive public rights of way network around the surrounding countryside. The sites have potential to provide and link to existing footways. However, Tetford itself does not have many footways as the village remote from larger centres of population, not very heavily trafficked compared to many villages and there has been a trade off between the need for footways and the impact that such urban elements would have the very rural character of the village.

Site TET304 has been discounted through the SHLAA leaving the two adjacent sites to be considered. If the landscape impact of TET302 can be mitigated through the design, this will still leave the sustainability balance of the loss of employment against the use of brownfield land and the ability of the site to be assimilated into the landscape to be resolved.

Tetney	TN Y021	TN Y302	TN Y303	TN Y305	TN Y308	TN Y309	TN Y311	TN Y313	TN Y315	TN Y316	TN Y318	TN Y319	TN Y320	TN Y232
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 minimise the effects of, climate change	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗
Summary	In common with much of the District, all of the sites in Tetney are greenfield sites. There is little history of brownfield land in the village													

and no such sites are currently available for development. Although there is a Site of Scientific Interest close to the village, none of the sites under consideration are deemed to be close enough to directly affect the site; being mostly on the opposite side of the village. Tetney Blow Wells (SSSI) relies on the groundwater source of local aquifers to feed it and maintain its integrity as a site. Increased building in the area will add to the water supplies needed. However, the boreholes in the wider area are not identified as being drought vulnerable and the abstraction from the borehole at Tetney is to cease on Environmental grounds. This should further protect the integrity of the site, which is identified by Natural England as in "Unfavourable Recovering" condition. There will be some opportunities for sites to provide suitable landscaping to help biodiversity, linking to existing features in and around the village, but a number of the sites are too small to make a significant contribution.

The majority of sites are located outside the form of the settlement and are likely to have a greater landscape impact as a result; these sites have been discounted on this basis through the SHLAA. However, a few are in locations that form a more natural extension to the village. Given the location of many of the sites on the edge of the village, access to services and facilities is an important issue. A number of the sites are somewhat distant from the existing footways in the village and connecting to them could be an issue in terms of cost and land ownership. Also, some of the lanes which serve the sites do not have the benefit of street lighting and these issues together mean that they would not encourage walking and cycling to access services and facilities in the village. This is particularly relevant as services are not clustered, but are instead spread across a number of areas of the village.

One of the sites currently houses a few buildings used by businesses, although these are only on a small part of the site. This site has consequently scored negatively for economic growth, as the buildings are within the area identified for potential housing development.

The eastern side of the village is in the flood hazard areas and so sites in this area are not suitable for further development. The remainder of the village is outside of flood risk and so there are still areas with development potential.

In terms of cumulative impacts, there are three areas where sites have been put forward that form groups. To the east of the village, the cumulative impact is likely to be modest as the greater impact will come from the largest site and most sites here have been discounted or scaled down on flood risk grounds. To the west of the village, there would be a small local cumulative impact on landscape if all the sites were to be brought forward, although this is potentially reduced by the roadside hedges and trees. The sites furthest to the west have been discounted due to their location so this would not materialise through the current plan. To the north of Tetney, there would be a greater cumulative impact on landscape grounds. Three almost consecutive sites have been promoted along Humberston Road. Although views of the most northerly site are partially broken by vegetation, the development of all three sites would change the open landscape of this part of the village. The two more northerly sites have, however, been discounted.

Wainfleet									
Sustainability Objectives (abbreviated)	WAI302	WAI305	WAI306	WAI307	WAI308	WAI308B	WAI401	WAI404	WAI405
1. Biodiversity & geodiversity	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
2. Landscapes/ historic environment	X	X	XX	X	XX	XX	X	✓	X
3. Natural resources	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
4. Flood Risk	X	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	X	✓
5. Economic growth	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
6. Previously developed land and loss of agricultural land and greenfield sites	X	X	X	X	○	X	X	X	○
7. Access to key services and facilities	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X
8. Recycling and waste minimisation	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
9. Inclusive, safe and vibrant communities	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X
10. Local housing need	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
11. Sustainable design and construction	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
12. Facilities and infrastructure for healthy lifestyles	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X
13. Positively plan for, and minimise the effects of, climate change	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X
Summary	Flood Risk is a significant issue in Wainfleet, with both fluvial and								

	<p>coastal flooding affecting parts of the village; some in combination. The sites are largely individual sites in different parts of the village and so the chance for cumulative effects is reduced. The exceptions to this are sites WAI305 and WAI401 are adjacent and will have a degree of cumulative impact in terms of the visual impact and that in terms of traffic generation; although the cumulative impact is not significant due to the size of the sites. Also, there will be a small amount of cumulative impact from sites WAI308 and WAI308B, but this is not significant.</p> <p>Due to the flood risk and/or landscape impact, a number of sites have been discounted at the initial SHLAA stage. There are six sites under consideration for allocation through the Plan; WAI305, WAI307, WAI308, WAI308B, WAI401 and WAI405. All sites are accessible to services and facilities in the village and will assist in creating vibrant communities. There will be some landscape impact from the sites, as there is with many new developments on the edge of settlements, however, none of these sites will have a significant impact. However, Historic England has raised the issue of the impact on heritage assets (e.g. the former Salem Bridge Brewery site and nearby Listed Buildings and their settings) from WAI308 and Wai308B. These sites have been reassessed and there is considered to be significant impact on the setting of Bateman’s Brewery and buildings, the church opposite and the Wainfleet Conservation Area. Most of the sites are greenfield land, a situation that exists across East Lindsey, the sites with some element of brownfield are outside the flood risk area so can be brought forward for development. The sites passing through the SHLAA test perform the best in terms of the sustainability criteria. However, these sites do not provide sufficient land to meet the requirement for Wainfleet. There areas of the village that are outside flood risk and could potentially help to meet the short fall, although they would have greater landscape impact than the site currently under consideration. However, these sites have not been promoted by their owners and are currently not available for development.</p>
--	--

Woodhall Spa																	
Sustainability Objectives (abbreviated)	WSP301	WSP304	WSP305	WSP306	WSP310	WSP311	WSP312	WSP313	WSP314	WSP315	WSP316	WSP317	WSP318	WSP321	WSP322	WSP323	WSP327
1. Biodiversity & geodiversity	0	✓	✓	✓	0	0	✓	X	✓	0	✓	✓	✓	0	?	✓	?
2. Landscapes/historic environment	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	X	X	✓	✓	X	?	X	X	X	X	X
3. Natural resources	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Flood Risk	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	X	X	✓	✓	X	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
5. Economic growth	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. Previously developed land and loss of agricultural land and greenfield sites	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	✓	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
7. Access to key services and facilities	X	✓	✓	X	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	X	X	X	X
8. Recycling and waste minimisation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9. Inclusive, safe and vibrant communities	X	✓	✓	X	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	X	X	X	X
10. Local housing need	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
11. Sustainable design and construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12. Facilities and infrastructure for healthy lifestyles	X	✓	✓	X	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	X	X	X	X
13. Positively plan for, and minimise the effects of, climate change	X	✓	✓	X	X	✓	✓	?	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	X	X	X	X
Summary	Woodhall Spa has a number of environmental factors, including sites protected for																

their biodiversity, trees and ancient woodlands and a conservation area. However, few of these affect the sites that have put forward for development as most of the protected areas are central or a distance from the edge of the village, and the sites are mostly located immediately adjacent to the settlement. In common with much of the district, Woodhall Spa does not have a lot of brownfield and available and only one of the sites promoted is on brownfield land. Even though none of the sites put forward would compromise the environmental factors in the village, some of the sites are adjacent to sensitive locations, mainly treed areas and areas protected for biodiversity; and there will have to be careful consideration of how some of the sites are developed and landscaped. However, their proximity is not always negative as it can often enable links through landscaping and enhance opportunities for biodiversity. A number of sites have been discounted because of their landscape impact and/or flood risk, leaving eight sites emerging through the SHLAA process. One site (WSP318) still has potential for a negative impact on landscape as it is a large site, with some sparse boundary treatment. Parts of the site will not have a significant impact due to its distance from public view points and intervening trees and hedges, and there will be the possibility through layout and landscaping to reduce the impact over time. Due to the shape and form of Woodhall Spa, a number of sites have scored negatively for access to services and other related objectives, as they are starting to extend two kilometres or more from the majority of services and facilities and are less likely to be accessed by non-car transport.

In terms of cumulative impact, a number of clusters of sites have been put forward. There are two clusters to the west of the village, one adjacent to the river and one south of Witham Road. The sites adjacent to the river extend to the north and south of Witham Road (WSP312 and WSP313) and could potentially have cumulative impacts on biodiversity as there is potential for a length of the river to be affected. Landscape impact may also be an issue from the riverside, which is well used as a recreational resource, although the impact will not be felt as greatly from the east. To the south of Witham Road (site WSP306 which is adjacent to sites already granted planning permission), there would be cumulative landscape impact as development would extend over a large area, although this is reduced through intervening trees. To the south of the village, a swathe of land has been put forward, stretching from the west of Tattershall Road across to the east and almost meeting Kirkby Lane; encompassing sites WSP304, WSP305, WSP316, WSP317 and WSP318. There would be cumulative landscape impacts if all these sites were brought forward together, although there could also be cumulative benefits for biodiversity and the provision of green infrastructure. These areas are currently arable land, with some trees and a water course running through the site. Together, these sites would be required to provide a significant amount of green infrastructure, which could be linked together to provide benefits for wildlife. There are also two sites to the east of Woodhall Spa which are almost contiguous; WSP322 and WSP327. There is some screening to the sites, and although there will be some landscape impact this may be reduced by a high quality landscaping scheme. However, they are distant from the main part of the village so do not relate to its form and would be introducing a large number of houses in this location. There is also uncertainty on the impact on biodiversity as the both sites abut a Site of Special Scientific Interest; individually their impact on the SSSI is not known, therefore the cumulative impact is also in doubt.

Wragby										
Sustainability Objectives (abbreviated)	WRA024	WRA301	WRA303	WRA304	WRA306	WRA307	WRA310	WRA311	WRA312	WRA313
1. Biodiversity & geodiversity	✓	✓	?	✓	○	✓	✓	?	✓	✓
2. Landscapes/historic environment	✓	✓	?	✓	✓	X	✓	XX	X	✓
3. Natural resources	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
4. Flood Risk	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	✓
5. Economic growth	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
6. Previously developed land and loss of agricultural land and greenfield sites	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
7. Access to key services and facilities	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	X	X	✓	✓	✓
8. Recycling and waste minimisation	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
9. Inclusive, safe and vibrant communities	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	X	X	✓	✓	✓
10. Local housing need	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
11. Sustainable design and construction	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
12. Facilities and infrastructure for healthy lifestyles	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	X	X	✓	✓	✓
13. Positively plan for, and minimise the effects of, climate change	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	X	X	✓	✓	✓
Summary	In common with the rest of the District, Wragby has little brownfield land and all the sites promoted are on greenfield land. Some of the sites (WRA303 and WRA310) have no identified means of access; such sites cannot provide access to services and facilities or contribute to sustainable communities, so these have been discounted from the SHLAA. There is a small swathe of flood risk through the eastern edge of the village, however, this only affects site WRA312. Landscape impact is an issue for a three sites, and for site WRA311 these impacts are significant as they									

affect a scheduled ancient monument. There are some uncertainties for biodiversity and historic environment for site WRA. This site has been undisturbed for many years and the existing levels of biodiversity are not known. In terms of the historic environment the detail of any proposal on this site will be an important consideration which cannot be identified at this stage. However, as this site has no access shown, so the site has been discounted. Most of the remaining sites have safe access to services and facilities, which are in easy walking distance.

The sites that have emerged through the SHLAA, WRA024, WRA301, WRA304, WRA306 and WRA313 perform best through the SA process.

There have been sites promoted all round Wragby, however, the sites are not located together and it is considered that the potential for cumulative impacts is quite small. They will not be read together visually so will not have cumulative landscape impact. However, there are also no likely cumulative benefits to be gained, such as provision and additional facilities, green infrastructure and wildlife corridors. As more land has been put forward than is needed in Wragby, so there is not much likelihood that all sites would be pursued.

Gypsy and Traveller Sites	A - Alford	B - Alford	C - Louth	D - Louth	E - Mablethorpe	F - Marshchapel	G - Skegness	H - Trusthorpe	I - Manby	J - Burghle Marsh	
Sustainability Objectives (abbreviated)											
1. Biodiversity & geodiversity	?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	0	
2. Landscapes/historic environment	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
3. Natural resources	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
4. Flood Risk	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	X	X	X	✓	✓	
5. Economic growth	0	0	✓	X	X	0	X	0	0	0	
6. Previously developed land and loss of agricultural land and greenfield sites	X	✓	X	X	✓	X	X	✓	✓	X	
7. Access to key services and facilities	✓	✓	?	✓	X	✓	✓	X	✓	X	
8. Recycling and waste minimisation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
9. Inclusive, safe and vibrant communities	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	X	
10. Local housing need	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
11. Sustainable design and construction	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
12. Facilities and infrastructure for healthy lifestyles	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	
13. Positively plan for, and minimise the effects of, climate change	✓	✓	✓	X	X	✓	X	✓	X	✓	X

Summary	<p>None of the sites have completely positive outcomes. With the exception of the uncertainty about one of the sites in Alford, none of the sites are likely to have significant affect on biodiversity. Similarly, there is no significant impact identified on landscape, town scape and historic environment. One of the sites at Alford and those at Mablethorpe, Trusthorpe and Manby are on brownfield land; although Mablethorpe is part of the industrial estate and further work would be needed to investigate the demand for employment land. The sites at Louth Industrial estate, Trusthorpe and Burgh le Marsh are the least accessible to services and facilities due to their peripheral location in respect of the majority of services in their respective locations. Site B at Alford and the site at Manby emerge with the least negatives due to their location close to services and facilities and use of brownfield land. The access to both sites will need consideration. Site A at Alford performs the next best, again due to proximity to services. Flood risk is an issue for four of the sites, but these are identified as transit sites and their occupation would be limited to that of other caravans in the area. The site is Burgh le Marsh would address the transit need on the coast but would allow the site to be out of the flood risk area. If, as a result of this occupancy restriction, the flood risk is put aside, the sites on Mablethorpe Industrial Estate and at Marshchapel perform equally as well as the Alford site A; although (as highlighted) consideration of the need for the employment land in Mablethorpe would be needed. Similarly, Site C at Louth scores similarly well and has already been granted panning permission by a government inspector and has been considered suitable.</p>	
---------	--	--

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 2.24 of this report explains what constitutes these effects.

8.2 The settlement proposals present clear opportunities to create these effects, as they can relate to a number of sites over a geographic area. Individual sites, especially smaller sites, are not likely to have a significant effect, though there may be local scale impacts. However, a number of sites proposed in one town or village may well have a joint impact, positive or negative, on any one of the SA objectives, or a combination of them. These effects can be as a result of their spatial locations, if the sites are close together or abut each other, such as landscape impact or effect on part of the road network. Or they can result from the overall impact on a community; for example, in terms the effect on infrastructure which may be negative due to extra demands on it, or be positive as the increase in population may lead to increased provision of services to support the whole community.

8.3 Finally, are the indirect effects. Some elements of the SA objectives have a more remote connection with the development of a site. However, there could still be indirect effects; such as the effects of good design on crime and the pressures additional residents may bring to a neighbouring wildlife site in terms of extra visitors.

8.4 The assessment of sites includes potential for cumulative, synergistic or indirect impacts, where relevant, and these are included in the summary looking across each settlement as well as individual site assessments, where relevant.

8.5 There are some cumulative and synergistic effects that will be felt across the settlements in the District, where more than one allocation is being made; as opposed to settlement specific effects. There will be positive cumulative benefits in supporting vibrant communities and ensuring the local housing needs are met, and potentially in providing the facilities and infrastructure for healthy lifestyles. In terms of the broad negative cumulative effects, the lack of brownfield sites in most communities across the District means that there will be a negative cumulative effect on greenfield land, which will be particularly relevant to the towns where the larger sites are generally located. In the towns and larger villages, there will be a greater demand for services and infrastructure. There may be cumulative benefits in terms of improving access to services and facilities, and in the case of larger sites, where there will be an open space requirement there may be cumulative and synergistic benefit to the provision of green infrastructure. However,, there may be a negative effect where demand is already high; although requirements for section 106 contributions to meet this shortfall will address the additional cumulative demand created.

8.6 In the towns, the provision of additional employment land, and the providing for additional households, will bring cumulative benefits for promoting viable and diverse economic growth.

8.7 Cumulative impacts in terms of biodiversity and geodiversity, and landscape and townscape are more likely to be felt on a settlement by settlement basis. There may be some negative cumulative effects on landscape as sites are read together, but these can largely be addressed through appropriate landscaping of the sites, choice of materials and design. There may be small scale negative effects on biodiversity as sites close to each other remove habitat or migration route, however, sometimes this can be mitigated through the design of the sites. Conversely, on the small to medium sites, in the larger settlements, there maybe opportunities to provide benefits for wildlife through cumulative impact of landscaping, green infrastructure or SUDS proposals on adjacent or nearby sits.

8.8 Some of the local cumulative, synergistic or indirect effects have been drawn out in the commentary for a site or the overall settlement summary. Only the settlements where cumulative, synergistic or indirect effects are likely, or could have the potential, to be significant have been identified below.

8.9 Louth – A large number of sites have been put forward in and around Louth. Of those on the edge of the town, a number of are of a significant size. This means that there a clusters of sites around the town which would have significant cumulative impacts should they be brought forward together, primarily in terms of loss of greenfield land and landscape character. In the same way, there could by synergy in developing clusters of sites in terms providing economies of scale sufficient to bring forward additional local services and facilities, green infrastructure and transport links. Therefore, the potential cumulative effects of development in a context such as Louth's, where clusters of sites are prevalent, are very mixed. However, a number of these clusters have been discounted, or sites within the cluster have been discounted, meaning that the cumulative impacts, beyond those outlined in paragraphs 8.5 and 8.6 above, have been significantly reduced.

8.10 Spilsby - The total amount of housing needed in the plan period is 229. It is proposed to allocate three sites in the town two of which will together provide 229 homes. However, the Council has also indicated a direction of growth for future development and has mapped a large area on the eastern side of the town, as the town has constraints on developing in other directions. Much of this will remain in agricultural use and be amenity green space. Discussions have been held with land owners and a developer, working together to bring forward a larger development over and beyond the present plan period. This will create economies of scale and assist in the provision of infrastructure and green space. There will inevitably be cumulative effects if all, or the majority, of sites come forward; albeit beyond the plan period. Not all these effects need be negative. There will be greater cumulative impact on landscape impact if these sites are brought forward (over time) as a comprehensive

development. Some of this potential negative impact can be mitigated through good design, layout and landscaping, however, it is inevitable that a large group of development sites will bring about significant change. There are potential positive benefits in terms of opportunities to create space for biodiversity, to create more comprehensive green infrastructure provision and other infrastructure needed in the town, and to create more direct pedestrian access to existing services, facilities and the town centre.

9 Mitigation

9.1 The regulations require that any mitigation is outlined as part of the document. In the case of the Settlement Proposals, there are three ways this is carried out. Firstly, in assessing (through the SHLAA and SA process) the range of sites available for site selection, it enables sites to be rejected (in whole or in part) where they conflict with the SA objectives or the objectives of the Plan. Sites are discounted for many reasons, such as flood risk, landscape impact, effect on biodiversity, distance from services and facilities. Sometimes the sites can still be considered in the site selection process, as only part of the site needs to be excluded. In some cases, rejection of the site is the only, or most appropriate, form of mitigation.

9.2 Secondly, mitigation can take the form of a requirement in the Settlement Proposals document for appropriate mitigation such as provision of landscaping, green infrastructure, SUDS etc to offset the impact identified.

9.3 The third form of mitigation is through the planning application process itself. When the plans are submitted, potential impacts that have been identified at the SHLAA or SA stage may be addressed through a site's individual design and layout.

9.4 The first two forms of mitigation are expressed through the SA in the site assessment forms, in the settlement summary sheets and in the cumulative and synergistic effects summary table in appendix 2.

10 Monitoring

10.1 The monitoring of Significant Effects is a requirement of both the SA and SEA guidance. Section 5 of this report sets out more information about how monitoring will be addressed, including Table 5.1 (The Sustainability Framework) which sets out the parameters that will be monitored.

10.2 As section 5 explains, although the majority of any monitoring will be quantitative, there are some aspects of the plan that are difficult to monitor in this way; impact on landscape character being a particular case. To be meaningful, some aspects of the plan 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.

10.3 It is intended that the monitoring of the Settlement Proposals document should be carried out as an integral part of monitoring of the plan as a whole. Table 5.1 does not contain criteria for the monitoring of individual sites. However, the some of the matters that are monitored, for example loss of ancient woodland or amount of new green infrastructure created, will enable site specific impacts to be established. This monitoring is aligned with and, where possible, be published as part of the Council's Authority Monitoring Report.

11 Conclusion

Significant impacts of the Settlement Proposals

11.1 The purpose of carry out an SA is to identify the significant effects of the plan; rather than each individual impact. The sites and proposals in the draft Settlement Proposals have been subject to appraisal against the Sustainability Objectives that were initially developed through the Scoping phase of the SA process. As is always the case when new areas are opened up for development, change will occur and that change can have both negative and positive effects. In seeking to identify sufficient land to meet the development needs of the District over the plan period, any change has to be managed to minimise any negative effects and maximise the positive impacts.

11.2 There are significant positive impacts likely to come through the plan's ability shape settlement proposals but there will be areas where impacts have to be carefully managed and which can lead to negative impacts. Section 8 of the plan highlights some of the generic impacts of the policies that will be felt across the district. In providing additional housing and seeking additional benefits from that development, such as green infrastructure and other social infrastructure, there are benefits in supporting vibrant communities, ensuring the local housing needs are met, and potentially in providing the facilities and infrastructure for healthy lifestyles. Given the rural nature of the District, and the lack of a legacy of large areas of brownfield land the release of additional land for housing will inevitably have a negative impact on minimising the use of greenfield land, which will be particularly relevant to the towns where the larger sites are generally located. There may also be negative impact on biodiversity and landscape, depending on the location and nature of the sites being developed. However, unlike the impact on greenfield land, there are measures that can be put in place to mitigate these impacts. In the towns, the provision of additional employment land, and the providing additional households, will bring cumulative benefits for promoting viable and diverse economic growth.

11.3 Overall, impacts are largely felt more on a settlement by settlement basis and so the conclusions are presented in this way. Settlements are listed alphabetically. However, many of these impacts will be on local importance and not significant in terms of the SA; this is largely due to the scale of sites being proposed.

Binbrook

11.4 No allocations.

Burgh le Marsh

11.4 There is likely to be a locally significant impact on landscape from the sites (BLM310 and 313) to the south west of Burgh le Marsh, however, this can be mitigated through a high quality landscaping scheme.

Similarly, the addition of site BLM320, alongside a recently granted planning permission, may impact on biodiversity, and landscape (including the historic environment).

Coningsby and Tattershall

11.5 Site C&T305 is a large site, however, any local impacts will be addressed through the design, layout and landscaping of the final scheme. Three smaller sites have been allocated around three sides of the development off Pilgrim Square. Again, there may be local impact on the landscape and some mitigation will be required through the design, layout and landscaping of these sites, that takes into account the proximity of the other sites and also the proximity of the proposed employment site (shown as a direction of growth on the plan).

Friskney

11.6 The sites allocated in Friskney are all relatively small but have quite open boundaries due to the nature of the landscape in this area; so are likely to have only local impacts on landscape; however, this could be mitigated on a site by site basis through a good landscaping plan. The extended FRIS317 is likely to have an impact on landscape, including the historic environment, and will require mitigation to reduce this.

Grainthorpe

11.7 The impacts of the two allocated sites are likely to be felt at a local level on landscape and can be addressed at the planning application stage.

Hogsthorpe

11.8 Due to Hogsthorpe's relatively compact nature, the two identified sites, HOG306 and HOG309, are located well for services and facilities, and are outside flood risk, which is an issue for the village. These sites are contiguous and therefore have the potential for local scale cumulative impact, they also are potentially visible in views from the west. However, there are opportunities through landscaping to break up the sites and reduce their visual impact.

Holton le Clay

11.9 Two of the allocated sites are quite small and only likely to have local impacts. Site HLC303 is large in East Lindsey's terms (15.3 ha) and will result in the loss of grade 3 agricultural land. However, with the lack of brownfield sites, in order to meet the required housing target, any land will be of grade 3 agricultural quality. There are benefits and disbenefits to a large site being pursued. In terms of the benefits, larger sites enable economies of scale to emerge so that services and facilities can be provided to serve the development; including green infrastructure, which can be provided at a level that can serve the wider community and not only the site in question. This can also help to offset biodiversity impact and has space to provide more opportunities for biodiversity than smaller sites. The most likely disbenefit is that the scale of the site potentially increases landscape impact as the development may be harder to

assimilate into the local landscape. A high quality landscaping scheme will be needed to help address this issue.

Horncastle

11.10 No housing allocations are being made. The housing requirement can be met through existing planning commitments. An employment allocation is made in the plan extending the current industrial estate to the south. The site has a number of positive outcomes, but the site is on greenfield land and will require its landscape impact to be addressed as it extends further into the countryside, also connectively may need to be addressed as the site continues to extend away from the town.

Huttoft

11.11 No allocations are being made. The housing requirement can be met through existing planning commitments.

Legbourne

11.12 Part of the housing requirement is met through existing planning permissions. The remainder is made up of two sites that are not considered to have significant impact on the sustainability objectives.

Louth

11.13 A number of sites have been put forward in and around Louth. Of those on the edge of the town, a number of are of a significant size. The majority of sites are greenfield land, as there is a limited supply of previously use land with the district, which means that there will be a negative impact on the objective to minimise the use of greenfield land. There is also a greater potential for a negative impact on landscape character, which will require addressing through structural landscaping and high quality design. The scale of the sites does present opportunities through the open space requirement and layout to create opportunities for biodiversity and to reduce impact on the wider landscape. As largely edge of settlement sites, they are more distant from centrally located services and facilities, although some of the more peripheral areas of Louth do have access to local shops and services at a neighbourhood scale. The scale of the sites means that there may be opportunities to bring forward additional local services and facilities, green infrastructure and transport links that can overcome some of the peripherally and meet the additional needs of the growth.

11.14 Additional employment land is shown in the Settlement Proposals as a direction of growth, extending the existing site to the north east. The site has a number of positive outcomes, but the site is on greenfield land and will require its landscape and biodiversity impacts to be addressed as it extends further into the countryside and crosses a strong wildlife corridor to the east. Connectively of the site will also need to be addressed as the site continues to extend away from the town.

Manby and Grimoldby

11.15 Two site have been allocated. MAN316 is not considered to have a significant impact.

Mareham le Fen

11.16 Mareham le Fen is quite a compact village, meaning that its services and facilities are rarely far from the majority of its residents. Four sites have been allocated MLF021 which is a disused garage site and MLF303 behind it, along with MLF305 and MLF328. MLF305 has scored negatively for landscape impact due to its open boundaries, although this was also in part due to its joint impact with site MLF309; which now has the benefit of planning permission. MLF305 will still need to be progressed with a landscaping scheme that helps reduce its wider impact. There is potential for local scale cumulative impact to the west of the village with the three (MLF305, MLF309 and MLF328). The main impact of these sites would be on the landscape as they would read together in views, with only the road to separate them. There could be potential benefits of the grouping of sites in terms of biodiversity, though this would mainly apply to the sites to the north of the main road. A more cohesive landscaping plan which can better assist wildlife and provide a diversity of green infrastructure would help reduce this impact.

Marshchapel

11.17 The majority of sites in the village are greenfield sites; those sites which contain some built development are agricultural in nature. This is a common situation in East Lindsey where there is a low level of brownfield land available. Three of the sites are close together (MAR217, MAR300 and MAR304) and there are inevitable cumulative impacts, albeit at a local scale, if all the sites were to be developed. The cumulative impact most likely to be experienced in relation to landscape and a good landscaping scheme will be needed to offset these impacts. Although there may be some negative impact on biodiversity through these sites being built, the fact that there will be need for good quality landscaping and the fact that these sites can be linked together to create green corridors linking to the open countryside means that there are gains to be had.

North Thoresby

11.18 In common with much of East Lindsey, the majority of sites that have been proposed in North Thoresby are greenfield sites; due to the low level of brownfield options in the District. Sites NTH307, NTH308 and NTH313, have been allocated. Site NTH308 has a some potential negative impact for access to services and facilities as it can be accessed safely but this is some way from the centre of North Thoresby and safe pedestrian access would be difficult. It will also have clear landscape impact due to its size, location between the A16 and the village and open boundary along the frontage with Ludborough Road. The remaining sites are less likely to have a significant impact.

Partney

11.19 No allocations are being made. The housing requirement can be met through existing planning commitments.

Sibsey

11.20 All the sites promoted at Sibsey are relatively close to services and facilities. Most of the sites are on greenfield land, in common with most villages in East Lindsey. The site which performs best through the SA is

SIB304, this is a small site, centrally located. The other two sites to be allocated SIB303 and SIB406 both have negative impacts for landscaping and, although SIB406 as a smaller site will have less of an impact. Site SIB304 will have a significant impact, however, the capacity of the site has been reduced to acknowledge this and, with appropriate structural landscaping, there will be potential to enhance biodiversity and add to services and facilities, in particular green infrastructure; however this has to be weighed against potential negative impacts.

Spilsby

11.21 All but one of the sites allocated in Spilsby are in the same area of town. The potential cumulative effects have been explored in paragraph 8.10 above.

Stickney

11.22 Two small sites are allocated and the impact is not considered to be significant.

Tetford

11.23 No allocations.

Tetney

11.24 Part of the housing requirement in Tetney is met through existing planning commitments, the remainder is through allocations. In common with much of the District, all of the sites in Tetney are greenfield sites. Although there is a Site of Scientific Interest close to the village, none of the sites under consideration are deemed to be close enough to directly affect the site. Three sites have been allocated TNY308, TNY311 and TNY320. None of the sites is considered to have significant negative impact. Site TNY311 will be more prominent in views from Humberston Road and will require appropriate landscaping but it will be viewed against the backdrop of the village and so will not be promising.

Wainfleet

11.25 Flood Risk is a significant issue in Wainfleet, with both fluvial and coastal flooding affecting parts of the village; some in combination. This has meant that insufficient sites have been identified to meet the need over the plan period. Five sites have been allocated. Sites WAI305 and WAI401 are adjacent greenfield sites and will have a local level of cumulative impact in terms of the landscape; although due to the size of the sites this can be addressed at the planning application stage. Sites WAI308 and WAI308B are also adjacent and will also have a small amount of cumulative impact in terms of landscape and townscape, but this is not significant.

Wragby

11.26 A significant part of Wragby's housing land requirement is being met through existing planning commitments; the remainder is made up of one allocated site, WRA024. The impact of the site is not considered to be significant.

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)