

WORKING DRAFT VERSION A
Table XX: Alternative Options and Measures to Achieve the Core Strategy Objectives and Broad Based Appraisal of SASEA Objectives 4, 5 and 6

Option	Title	Option would have a positive or neutral effect with additional measures / mitigation, negative effects without	Option is likely to have a positive effect	Option is likely to have no effect / neutral effect	Policy effect is uncertain at this stage (could be any of the above)
4.	Avoid the risk of flooding (where possible) and fully mitigate against the impacts of flooding where it cannot be avoided.				6. Prioritise appropriate re-use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of the best agricultural land and greenfield sites.
A1	Unrestrained dispersal	<p>Comments: Flooding can occur from three sources – rivers, the sea and from poor drainage. This option may increase opportunities to build within floodplains across the district led by market demand and the need for more housing (significant proportion of the district lies within Flood Zone 3 as classified by the Environment Agency). Infill development and urban expansion may result in developments increasing flood risk from fluvial and coastal flooding both within new developments and possibly downstream (inland only) as a result of more impermeable surfaces, increased urban runoff changing weather patterns etc. The existing infrastructure within some of the smaller villages may not be capable of providing effective drainage as a result of more intense precipitation events. These events are becoming more common as a result of climate change and changes in annual / seasonal averages (e.g. warmer, drier summers, milder springs and autumns, and milder wetter winters) and increased frequency of extreme weather conditions (e.g. more very hot days, more intense downpours of rain and uncertain changes in storm frequencies, with possibly an increase in the winter¹).</p> <p>This option may rely on flood risk mitigation measures rather than being driven by policies to avoid flood risk in the first instance.</p>	<p>Comments: This option would encourage increased business opportunities within the smaller market towns and villages, possibly at the expense of lower developer interest in the larger towns where economic diversification is most needed. This scenario may undermine the need for greater employment opportunities (including skilled and professional roles) within the district and initiatives to improve access to affordable and quality education and training. A lack of economic diversification in the urban centres may also lead to a continuation of skilled workers migrating to other local centres for employment e.g. Boston, Grimsby and Lincoln. It is unlikely that this option will encourage sustainable economic growth in the longer term.</p>	<p>Comments: This option would promote most development within the seven largest towns across the district – Louth, Skegness, Horncastle, Mablethorpe, Alford, Spilsby and Coningsby/Tattershall. Whilst this option would be preferable to option A1 with a focus on development in key locations (i.e. it lends itself to the concept of developing 'sustainable communities'), this does need to be coupled with a robust strategy for attracting inward investment to allow successful diversification of local industries away from agriculture and tourism to allow the creation of new and more employment opportunities (including skilled and professional jobs) with accessible high quality (re)training. Without such an approach, the option may result in significant residential growth within the larger towns (and to a certain extent some of the larger villages), that continues to be defined by outward migration of young adults and commuting professionals - economic growth and diversification may well be constrained.</p> <p>Careful consideration needs to be given to promoting economic diversification and growth in the coastal towns of Skegness and Mablethorpe. The risk of coastal inundation in the longer term) may merit these towns as unsustainable (perhaps more so than the risks of fluvial flooding in Louth – prediction uncertain and needs to be clarified). However, it is these coastal towns where levels of deprivation are highest in the district and which would probably benefit most from the delivery of economic diversification.</p>	<p>Comments: This option would promote large urban extensions to Louth and Skegness and smaller urban extensions to Horncastle, Mablethorpe, Alford, Spilsby and Coningsby/Tattershall. It would include urban extensions onto greenfield sites which would result in the loss of either high quality agricultural land and / or greenfield sites. Consideration should be given at a local level to the most appropriate locations for urban extensions.</p>
A2	Strong urban focus – rural restraint	<p>Comments: This option proposes to promote most development within the seven largest towns across the district – Louth, Skegness, Horncastle, Mablethorpe, Alford, Spilsby and Coningsby/Tattershall, with limited development in some larger villages. The coastline to the east of the district is low lying land and the towns of Skegness and Mablethorpe are located in an extensive Rapid Inundation Zone (RIZ), i.e. extensive areas would be subject to coastal flooding in the event of a breach of existing sea defences. Both towns are also at risk of flooding from inland fluvial sources. Flood risk in Louth is primarily associated with the River Lud that runs through the centre of the town. This is a fairly narrow and linear flood risk zone and it may be possible to avoid developing within the flood zone at this location (consideration will need to be given to the potential of increasing flood risk downstream). In Horncastle flood risk is primarily associated with the Rivers Bain and Waring (these also meet within the town). The flood zone is more extensive within the town compared with Louth and also south of the town where urban extensions should be avoided. In Alford, flood risk is primarily associated with the Wild Grift Drain. Whilst the zone of risk is fairly limited within the town centre, more extensive floodplains are located to the north and east of the town and urban extensions should be avoided in these locations. Tattershall/Coningsby has a fairly extensive flood zone lying between the two settlements in a northeast to southwest direction. The zone is quite extensive to the northeast and the southwest and urban extensions should be avoided in these areas. There is no flood risk zone associated with Spilsby.</p>	<p>Comments: This option would promote most development within the seven largest towns across the district – Louth, Skegness, Horncastle, Mablethorpe, Alford, Spilsby and Coningsby/Tattershall. Whilst this option would be preferable to option A1 with a focus on development in key locations (i.e. it lends itself to the concept of developing 'sustainable communities'), this does need to be coupled with a robust strategy for attracting inward investment to allow successful diversification of local industries away from agriculture and tourism to allow the creation of new and more employment opportunities (including skilled and professional jobs) with accessible high quality (re)training. Without such an approach, the option may result in significant residential growth within the larger towns (and to a certain extent some of the larger villages), that continues to be defined by outward migration of young adults and commuting professionals - economic growth and diversification may well be constrained.</p> <p>Careful consideration needs to be given to promoting economic diversification and growth in the coastal towns of Skegness and Mablethorpe. The risk of coastal inundation in the longer term) may merit these towns as unsustainable (perhaps more so than the risks of fluvial flooding in Louth – prediction uncertain and needs to be clarified). However, it is these coastal towns where levels of deprivation are highest in the district and which would probably benefit most from the delivery of economic diversification.</p>	<p>Comments: This option would promote large urban extensions to Louth and Skegness and smaller urban extensions to Horncastle, Mablethorpe, Alford, Spilsby and Coningsby/Tattershall. It would include urban extensions onto greenfield sites which would result in the loss of either high quality agricultural land and / or greenfield sites. Consideration should be given at a local level to the most appropriate locations for urban extensions.</p>	<p>Comments: This option would promote most development within the seven largest towns across the district – Louth, Skegness, Horncastle, Mablethorpe, Alford, Spilsby and Coningsby/Tattershall. It would include urban extensions onto greenfield sites which would result in the loss of either high quality agricultural land and / or greenfield sites. Consideration should be given at a local level to the most appropriate locations for urban extensions.</p>
A3	Louth and Skegness-led hierarchy	<p>Comments: Very similar to A2 (A2 comments apply to option A3) but with increased planned development focused in Louth and Skegness. There appears to be significantly more scope to effectively plan for urban extensions around Louth that are outside the floodplain (assuming appropriate mitigation measures are incorporated to ensure flood risk downstream does not increase as a result of any development) than land surround Skegness which is within both tidal and fluvial flood risk zones.</p>	<p>Comments: Very similar to A2 but with increased planned development focused in Louth and Skegness. The comments noted for A2 also apply here.</p> <p>The important issue of promoting economic diversification in Skegness remains important with regard to developing sustainable communities and coastal flood risk. Another potential effect of this option is the promotion of economic diversification along the eastern side of the district (southern half), primarily in Skegness. This may exclude future employment opportunities for many as a direct result of the geographical location of Skegness. Outward migration of the skilled and professional workforce may continue to constrain the districts economic growth. Consideration should be given to another town that may serve of larger proportion of the district and may perhaps be at a much lower risk of flooding.</p>	<p>Comments: This option would promote large urban extensions to Louth and Skegness and smaller urban extensions to Horncastle, Mablethorpe, Alford, Spilsby and Coningsby/Tattershall. It would include urban extensions onto greenfield sites which would result in the loss of either high quality agricultural land and / or greenfield sites. Consideration should be given at a local level to the most appropriate locations for urban extensions.</p>	<p>Comments: This option would promote large urban extensions to Louth, Horncastle, Skegness and Mablethorpe and smaller urban extensions to Alford, Spilsby and Coningsby/Tattershall. It would include urban extensions onto greenfield sites which would result in the loss of either high quality agricultural land and / or greenfield sites. Consideration should be given at a local level to the most appropriate locations for urban extensions.</p>
A4	Four town-led hierarchy	<p>Comments: Very similar to A3 but with increased planned development focused in the four towns of Horncastle, Louth, Mablethorpe and Skegness. Comments for A2 and A3 apply here.</p>	<p>Comments: Very similar to A3 but with increased planned development focused in four towns - Horncastle, Louth, Mablethorpe and Skegness. The comments noted for option A2 and A3 are considered to be applicable here. Ensuring that economic growth and diversification is directed to the most sustainable towns is key and consideration should be given to outputs from the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (also see appraisal results for Objective 4 – flood risk) for each of these locations. All have differing levels of flood risk from fluvial and coastal sources and also differing levels of protection. There may be clear opportunities in some towns to plan development in areas that reduce flood risk to the development itself and in other locations.</p>	<p>Comments: This option would promote large urban extensions to Louth, Horncastle, Skegness and Mablethorpe and smaller urban extensions to Alford, Spilsby and Coningsby/Tattershall. It would include urban extensions onto greenfield sites which would result in the loss of either high quality agricultural land and / or greenfield sites. Consideration should be given at a local level to the most appropriate locations for urban extensions.</p>	<p>Comments: This option would promote large urban extensions to Louth, Horncastle, Skegness and Mablethorpe and smaller urban extensions to Alford, Spilsby and Coningsby/Tattershall. It would include urban extensions onto greenfield sites which would result in the loss of either high quality agricultural land and / or greenfield sites. Consideration should be given at a local level to the most appropriate locations for urban extensions.</p>
A5	Settlement hierarchy with coastal regeneration	<p>Comments: Very similar to A3 and A4 but with major new development-led regeneration in Mablethorpe and Skegness. This would require significant capital and maintenance spend on upgrading and maintaining coastal flood defences in the longer term (particularly in Mablethorpe) which may not be considered the most sustainable option. Opportunities exist within this option to provide smaller urban extension in Louth, Horncastle, Alford, Spilsby and Coningsby/Tattershall and comments documented in A2 and A3 are considered applicable here.</p>	<p>Comments: Very similar to A3 and A4 but with major new development-led regeneration in Mablethorpe and Skegness. The comments noted for option A2, A3 and A4 are considered to be applicable here. The potential effects associated with focusing a significant proportion of regeneration within Skegness as noted for option A3 may be further exacerbated with option A5. To reiterate, a linear development zone light against the eastern side of the district may exclude many residents from employment and (re)training opportunities, avoid stemming the outflow of younger skilled professionals and effectively reduce opportunities for economic diversification across many other areas within the district.</p>	<p>Comments: This option would promote large urban extensions to Louth, Horncastle, Skegness and Mablethorpe and smaller urban extensions to Alford, Spilsby and Coningsby/Tattershall. It would include urban extensions onto greenfield sites which would result in the loss of either high quality agricultural land and / or greenfield sites. Consideration should be given at a local level to the most appropriate locations for urban extensions.</p>	<p>Comments: This option would promote large urban extensions to Louth, Horncastle, Skegness and Mablethorpe and smaller urban extensions to Alford, Spilsby and Coningsby/Tattershall. It would include urban extensions onto greenfield sites which would result in the loss of either high quality agricultural land and / or greenfield sites. Consideration should be given at a local level to the most appropriate locations for urban extensions.</p>
A6	New sub-regional growth	<p>Comments: A different strategy to A2 to A5 but with potentially similar constraints. The location of the new growth points is not known and therefore no further predictions with regard to potential effects can be made at this stage.</p>	<p>Comments: A different strategy to A2 to A5 with accelerated growth of three of the larger villages within the district (not named). This option is designed to strengthen links with the higher order centres of Grimsby, Boston and Lincoln by allowing accelerated and substantial</p>	<p>Comments: A different strategy to A2 to A5 with accelerated growth of three of the larger villages (not named). It is assumed that 'substantial' growth associated with larger villages would mean the use of greenfield or agricultural land. However, this will be balanced against a</p>	<p>Comments: A different strategy to A2 to A5 with accelerated growth of three of the larger villages (not named). It is assumed that 'substantial' growth associated with larger villages would mean the use of greenfield or agricultural land. However, this will be balanced against a</p>

¹ UKGIP, <http://www.ukcip.org.uk/resources/>

WORKING DRAFT VERSION A

Option	Title	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.	6. Prioritise appropriate re-use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of the best agricultural land and greenfield sites.
	points		growth of selected village locations. The potential benefits of this option include a high potential to attract inward investment from outside the district, particularly if land prices are cheaper outside the peripheral urban areas. This may help to stem the outward migration of professional and skilled workers as a result of increased and more diverse employment opportunities. Conversely, this option may stagnate economic growth and diversification in the established larger towns across the district as a result of investment associated with the new sub-regional growth points.	reduced requirement to utilise greenfield sites elsewhere within the district.
A7	New Town	Comments: The focus of the development would be in one specific area with much of the rest of the district subject to limited development. This may have significant benefits by (a) avoiding any further development in floodplains outside the proposed 'new town' and (b) locating a 'new town' in an area that is not presently subject to flood risk from any sources. Clearly, the potential to meet the SAVSEA objective will depend on how this option is implemented.	Comments: The focus of the development would be in one specific area with much of the rest of the district subject to limited development. This option may have limited potential to help grow and diversify the districts economy due to in essence one key growth point within the district and limited development in all other settlements including the towns. Therefore the potential benefits associated with options A2 to A4 and A6 may not be realised. This assumption is also considered applicable if option M1 were to be pursued (phased relocation of coastal communities subject to flood risk).	Comments: A different strategy to all other options that it is assumed would result in loss of greenfield or agricultural land. If this option were to be pursued, further detailed investigation into areas of land that may have least environmental impact should be undertaken.
B1	Urban extensions	Comments: The comments already noted for option A2 to A7 are considered applicable to this option.	Comments: This option effectively sits as a sub-option within options A1 to A7. There are no predicted impacts with this option as it stands – the most important issues with regard to any economic growth and diversification are primarily associated with strategic location rather than where and how land is allocated at a chosen location and have been addressed in the option appraisal for A1 to A7 above.	Comments: Most new development will need to be provided using greenfield sites due to a lack of existing brownfield sites to accommodate the scale of growth required within the district. The use of greenfield sites is an inevitable outcome and therefore attention should be focused on how the impacts of losing this type of land can be minimised or mitigated for and also, the most sustainable locations for such extensions based on other SAVSEA objectives.
B2	Dispersed sites within a settlement boundary	Comments: This option may give more scope to avoid development in areas of floodplain by allocating smaller parcels of land for development. In effect, it may give a greater degree of flexibility.	Comments: This option effectively sits as a sub-option within options A1 to A7. There are no predicted impacts with this option as it stands – the most important issues with regard to any economic growth and diversification are primarily associated with strategic location rather than where and how land is allocated at a chosen location and have been addressed in the option appraisal for A1 to A7 above.	Comments: This option may provide more scope to utilise brownfield sites due to the flexibility of allocating more fragmented parcels of land. However, this option alone is very unlikely to deliver the scale of growth needed within the district and therefore the comments noted in option B1 above are considered to apply.
B3	Criteria-led development	Comments: The effects of this option require further investigation.	Comments: The effects of this policy require further investigation.	Comments: The effects of this policy require further investigation.
C1	By allocating land specifically for affordable housing	Comments: Scale and location of allocation unknown but generic effects with regard to flood risk may be considered similar to those noted in A1 to A7 i.e. the need to allocate housing / development sites outside the floodplain.	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.	Comments: It is not known whether affordable housing will be located on brownfield or greenfield sites (it is assumed that the most likely scenario would be both). Therefore, the comments noted in option B1 above are considered to apply. In addition, there may be opportunities to re-use existing buildings as part of the affordable housing allocation?
C2	By requiring a percentage of general housing developments to be for affordable housing	Comments: The comments noted for C1 are considered to apply here.	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.	Comments: The comments noted for C1 are considered to apply here.
C3	By allowing "exceptions" sites to be developed for affordable housing where general market housing would not normally be permitted	Comments: The comments noted for C1 are considered to apply here.	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.	Comments: The comments noted for C1 are considered to apply here.
C4	By direct provision by a Housing Association (or Registered Social Landlord)	Comments: The comments noted for C1 are considered to apply here.	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.	Comments: The comments noted for C1 are considered to apply here.
C5	By the re-use of vacant properties	Comments: This option is not likely to have an effect assuming that all vacant properties that are re-used do not increase flood risk.	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.
D1	Define town centre roles	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.	Comments: This option would create a clear direction for the role of town centres as part of the settlement hierarchy. The increased focus on the provision of more diverse services and facilities in some of the larger town centres may result in increased employment opportunities. However, this option is considered to be complementary to options A1 to A7 and alone would not promote economic growth and diversification.	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.
D2	Free-market town centres	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect. The unrestrained growth of town centres should ensure that flood risk does not increase either within or downstream from an urban location.	Comments: The comments for D1 are considered to be applicable here.	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.

WORKING DRAFT VERSION A

Option	Title	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.	6. Prioritise appropriate re-use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of the best agricultural land and greenfield sites.
E1	Protecting town centre vitality and viability by restricting out of town centre retail development	Comments: Option is likely to have a neutral effect and may avoid the need to develop in the floodplain.	Comments: This option may restrain economic growth and diversification at a very local level compared to promoting out of town retail development.	Comments: This option would have a positive effect as a result of avoiding the use of greenfield sites for retail development.
E2	Permitting out of town centre retail development in a strategic location	Comments: Whilst the focus of the development would be in one specific area (not known at this stage) the effects of flood risk associated with, or downstream, from the development may have adverse effects.	Comments: This option would provide the opportunity for a significant retail development. However, as a stand alone option, this would be unlikely have a positive significant effect on economic growth or diversification within the district and would not promote sustainable growth. However, at a local level, it may provide new employment opportunities and increase the range of services available within a given location. Overall, this option would have a neutral effect and is considered complimentary to options A2 to A5 and A7.	Comments: This option may result in a loss of high quality agricultural land and therefore resource. However, the scale of development (assumed to be limited in its size / geographical extent) would most likely result in a no impact scenario at a district wide scale.
F1	Giving community safety the highest priority	Comments: This option would ensure that the allocation of land for development takes into account the safety implications to the public of developing in the floodplain or within rapid inundation zones along the coast.	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.
F2	Designing out crime	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.
G1	Reinforcement of land allocated for employment	Comments: Land allocated for employment purposes is considered to be integral to options A1 to A7 and therefore effects of flood risk are documented above.	Comments: Land already allocated for employment purposes is considered to be integral to options A1 to A7. The effects of this option correlate closely with those already described for dependent on the option(s) chosen between A1 and A7. This option is therefore considered complimentary and the comments noted for A1 to A7 are considered to apply.	Comments: Land already allocated for employment purposes is considered to be integral to options A1 to A7 and therefore effects on brownfield sites are as documented above.
G2	Coastal Regeneration	Comments: Land allocated for employment purposes concentrated within Skegness and Mablethorpe and is considered to be integral to options A3 to A5 and therefore the potential effects associated with flood risk are as documented above.	Comments: Land already allocated for employment purposes concentrated within Skegness and Mablethorpe and is considered to be integral to options A3 to A5 and therefore the potential constraints and opportunities for economic growth and diversification are as documented above. In addition, this option will allow tourism opportunities to be further exploited that may benefit the districts economy (tourism is one of the largest employment sectors).	Comments: Land already allocated for employment purposes is considered to be integral to options A3 to A5 and therefore effects on brownfield sites are as documented above.
G3	Prestige Employment Locations	Comments: Whilst the focus of the development would be in one specific area e.g. a science park on the western edge of the district linked to Lincoln University, the effects associated with flood risk cannot be predicted without further information regarding a location.	Comments: This option would very likely play an important role in promoting sustainable economic growth by attracting inward investment into the district. It is assumed that the scale and 'prestige' of such a development would attract skilled professionals from within (and possibly outside) the area reflecting diverse employment opportunities (and possibly (re)training opportunities) that may offer scope to reduce out-commuting.	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.
G4	Diversification	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.	Comments: This option would support the rural economy and farm diversification (and perhaps even green tourism?). This is an important option with a declining agricultural sector and could possibly benefit many smaller communities throughout the district where opportunities for employment, training and re-use of buildings for business purposes may not have previously been actively promoted. This option could make a significant contribution to economic growth and investment across the district (particularly cumulatively).	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect. This assumes that small businesses enterprises will be located within existing buildings or will re-use vacant buildings for business purposes i.e. the need to utilise greenfield land or high quality land is considered unlikely.
G5	Working from home	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.	Comments: Cumulatively, the option to allow more domestic properties to be used for business purposes may have positive effects. However, many people already work from home within the district and therefore a high degree of uncertainty exists with regard to the magnitude of any beneficial effects.	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.
H1	Develop a spatial tourism theme strategy	Comments: Overall, this option is unlikely to have an effect. However, the promotion of the 'Holiday Coast' theme in areas at high risk from both fluvial and coastal inundation (Mablethorpe, Sutton on Sea, Chapel St Leonards, Ingoldmells and Skegness), in principle, may allude to a commitment of long term coastal protection along areas of east Lindsey's coastline that may not be sustainable. Potential effects may be similar to those documented for options A3 to A5. Due to the nature of this option (a spatial tourism theme strategy), the effects associated with flood risk are uncertain at this stage.	Comments: This option is promoting a spatial tourism 'theme' which may provide a diverse range of tourism opportunities that can be exploited throughout the district in the longer term. This may involve building on existing assets and also creating more diverse tourism outlets within a defined spatial context. This option is considered to be very positive with regard to promoting sustainable economic growth through building upon an already important and established sector. Opportunities to promote year round tourism within the defined themes should be explored to address the seasonal nature of employment within this industry. The expansion of tourism away from the coast is evident here and may provide significant employment opportunities that could support many smaller fragmented rural communities.	Comments: The resultant tourism opportunities that may be identified as part of the strategy are unknown. Therefore at this stage, this option is not considered likely to have an effect at this stage.
H2	Develop a tourism activity strategy	Comments: See comments for H1. This option proposes an array of tourism activities. The effects of most activities described appear to have no effects with regard to flood risk. However, the siting of caravan parks and camp sites should take full account of the associated flood risk for a given area and where possible, avoid these locations.	Comments: See comments for H1.	Comments: See comments for H1. The types of activities described for this option may in some circumstances have implications for greenfield sites i.e. new fishing lakes and the siting of caravan parks. It is unlikely that such outdoor activities could be accommodated on brownfield sites and careful consideration should be given to their location to minimise the loss of the most valuable greenfield land.
J1	Reducing the need to travel to access services	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.	Comments: The locations for major new development would be primarily driven by accessibility of sustainable modes of transport. This may have important benefits for residents without private transport in the form of better access to employment and possibly (re)training. This may help to develop a more mobile workforce associated with the new growth areas and in turn, have economic benefits.	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.
J2	Catering for the essential use of the car	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.	Comments: The option of catering for essential car use will help to maintain the district existing economic base. However, this option alone is unlikely to promote sustainable economic growth or diversification and is considered complimentary to options A1 to A7.	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.

WORKING DRAFT VERSION A

Option	Title	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.	6. Prioritise appropriate re-use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of the best agricultural land and greenfield sites.
J3	Developing cluster services	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.
K1	Identifying a specific site or sites for Traveller and Gypsy accommodation	Comments: It is assumed that such sites would most likely be associated with urban centres or market towns to ensure adequate provision to essential services. The assumption has also been made that sites would be allocated on brownfield sites rather than greenfield locations and that any site would be relatively restricted in its size. The potential effect to and from flood risk will reflect those documented for A1 to A7 and will depend on location of sites.	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.	Comments: It is not known whether Traveller and Gypsy accommodation will be located on brownfield or greenfield sites (it is assumed that the most likely scenario would be brownfield to ensure good links to local services and facilities).
K2	Identifying an area of search for Traveller and Gypsy accommodation	Comments: See comments for K1.	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.	Comments: See comments for K1.
K3	Applying a criteria-based policy	Comments: See comments for K1.	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.	Comments: See comments for K1.
L1	District-wide Landscape Strategy	Comments: The character of existing landscapes within the district includes floodplains. This strategy may provide a strong focus for maintaining and enhancing both high quality and degraded landscapes and therefore strategic direction to allow the floodplain components of landscapes to be conserved i.e. by ensuring more natural functioning of river geomorphical processes to take place. This may also apply to some coastal areas e.g. between Skegness and Mablethorpe, where significant synergies may exist between providing coastal flood protection in the form of managed realignment schemes and the recreation of historic landscapes e.g. coastal marshes and lagoons.	Comments: The strategy will reinforce the important and attractive landscape elements that define East Lindsey e.g. the Lincolnshire Wolds, the coastal zones, the many historic towns and villages. Their protection is paramount to future tourism (and green tourism) initiatives and opportunities (also see option H1 and H2). Whilst an attractive environment may attract new business and investment, a landscape strategy alone is very unlikely to encourage economic growth and diversity but will have significant implications for other options which may aid economic growth e.g. building on the tourism themes of H1 and H2.	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect. Greenfield sites will be required and the strategy may be able to provide useful information with regard to the best locations for urban extensions based on their sensitivity to future land use change.
L2	Promoting market town themes	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.	Comments: See comments for L1.	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.
L3	Balancing Landscape Promotion and Protection	Comments: See comments for L1.	Comments: See comments for L1.	Comments: See comments for L1.
M1	Protect and conserve the District's existing biodiversity	Comments: This option may have significant benefits for biodiversity in the longer term. Many floodplain wetland habitats within the district have been altered over many decades through drainage (e.g. the fenland areas) and flood risk management measures (e.g. floodplain associated with urban and semi-rural areas). The confinement of rivers within fixed channels altered ground water levels has resulted in many wetland floodplain habitats being lost (including the associated wildlife). This option may provide opportunities for restoring functioning floodplain habitats in certain areas where the need for defences may no longer be necessary. Avoiding further development in floodplains may also ensure future initiatives for restoration of floodplain habitats are not compromised. Opportunities to reconnect floodplain habitats (e.g. through a Green Infrastructure Strategy) may also reduce the high level of fragmentation of such habitats where they currently exist (which are potentially unsustainable). It should also be noted that the ability to maintain or improve the ecological quality and hydrological functions of floodplain ecosystems is a key principle in the EU Water Framework Directive.	Comments: This option may constraint new developments designed to encourage and promote economic growth and diversification across the district as a result of potentially negative effects on biodiversity (see comments for options A1 to A7 associated with objective 1). Any effects will depend on the location and scale of development, the sensitivity of associated habitats and species and their ability to adapt to change. The importance of the tourism sector, the proposed tourism strategy and the opportunities for economic growth has already been noted (see option H1 and H2). Similarly, this option may constraint economic growth associated with tourism. However, any effects will be largely dependent on option implementation.	Comments: Biodiversity is an important element of both greenfield and brownfield sites (this is dependent on site specific characteristic and some sites will clearly have a higher conservation value in comparison to others). Greenfield sites will be required. This option clearly promotes the protection and conservation of the districts existing biodiversity and therefore, would be considered to have a positive effect on ensuring that only those greenfield sites are chosen for development that are least sensitive to change with regard to biodiversity.
M2	Protect, enhance and promote the District's biodiversity	Comments: See comments for M1.	Comments: See comments for M1.	Comments: See comments for M1.
N1	Phased re-location of communities from areas of greatest flood risk	Comments: The shift inland of Mablethorpe, Trushorpe and Sutton on Sea to avoid future flood risk would be most likely to have significant positive effects in the very long term. However, this option does suggest that the vacated coastal areas may be redeveloped as an extensive national or international visitor attraction resort. This implies that flood coastal defences would still be required and that development would be occurring in the floodplain. The option would ensure the safety of residents and promote more sustainable communities but only appears to be a 'partial' relocation.	Comments: A major new national or international visitor attraction resort coupled with a new inland town may provide a strong focus for inward investment within the district. This may have important benefits for job creation and diversity of job types. However, the focus on tourism may not address the issues associated with seasonal work. This option alone is unlikely drive investment into the district at a level to promote a sustainable economy and may have constraints with regard to the geographical location within the district of the coastal development and new town (also see comments for A5). It should be seen as complimentary to other large developments.	Comments: The shift inland of Mablethorpe, Trushorpe and Sutton on Sea to avoid future flood risk would most likely involve a major loss of greenfield land.
N2	Improved sea defences to permit coastal regeneration	Comments: This would require significant capital and maintenance spend on upgrading and maintaining coastal flood defences in the longer term (particularly in Mablethorpe) which may not be considered sustainable.	Comments: Continued maintenance and improvement of coastal sea defences would allow expansion of the coastal towns with the potential for economic growth and diversification. See comments for options A2 to A6 and H1 and H2. It should be noted that coastal regeneration alone may not deliver the level of economic growth needed within the district. This option should be considered complimentary to options such as A2 to A4.	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect. Land may be utilised in the longer term for managed realignment schemes but the loss of greenfield sites would be replaced with valuable coastal habitats.
N3	Restrict development in areas at risk from fluvial or	Comments: The comments noted for options A1 to A4 and A7 are considered to apply here. This option would proactively promote policies that would restrict the use of the floodplain for future development. Further consideration should be given to reducing the existing use of the floodplain where opportunities arise.	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.	Comments: Restricting development in floodplains may be unlikely to reduce the need for utilising greenfield sites. They will simply be located in areas outside the floodplain. However, there may be issues associated with the use of greenfield sites within the floodplain for development versus other sites that may have biodiversity or landscape sensitivities.

WORKING DRAFT VERSION A

Option	Title	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.		6. Prioritise appropriate re-use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of the best agricultural land and greenfield sites.
P1	flash flooding Reducing carbon energy use	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.		
P2	Promoting and developing sustainable renewable energy sources	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect unless it involves the promotion of renewable energy schemes that would require land take from greenfield site. However, effects would be dependent upon the type of scheme e.g. wind farms have a very small footprint with regard to land take.		
P3	Restricting sustainable renewable energy development	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect (also see comments for P2).		
P4	Promoting the development of a nuclear power station	Comments: It is assumed that a nuclear power station would most likely be located along the districts coastline and would therefore be within both the fluvial flood zone and the coastal rapid inundation zone. Such a large scale development would require substantial flood risk management measures to ensure it is both protected from flooding and that the risks from flooding elsewhere are not increased. Predicted sea level rises combined with isostatic tilt may also have implications for the long term sustainability of this type of development in a coastal location.	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.	Comments: The construction of a nuclear power station would most likely involve a considerable amount of land take within a greenfield coastal location.		
Q1	Planning Obligations applied consistently across the county	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.		
Q2	Planning Obligations to meet the needs of East Lindsey	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.	Comments: Option is not likely to have an effect.		