

EAST LINDSEY SETTLEMENT PROPOSALS

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

NOVEMBER 2017 – MAIN MODIFICATIONS

Supporting Economic Growth for the Future



TABLE OF CONTENTS

NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY	3
1 INTRODUCTION	7
2 THE APPRAISAL METHODOLOGY	9
3 PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION S ASSESSMENT	122
CUMULATIVE, SYNERGISTIC AND INDIRECT EFFECTS	155
MITIGATION	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
MONITORING	176
4 CONCLUSION	187
5 REFERENCES	20
APPENDIX 1	21

NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY

Introduction

1. This section of the report provides a non-technical summary of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the Main Modifications to the East Lindsey Settlement Proposals Main Modifications. 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; and together with the Core Strategy forms the Local Plan for East Lindsey.

2. This document provides a supplement to the East Lindsey Settlement Proposals Sustainability Appraisal Report, which was submitted for examination alongside the East Lindsey Settlement Proposals in April 2017. This supplementary report is required to assess the social, environmental and economic effects of the Main Modifications proposed to the Settlement Proposals following the Local Plan Examination hearing sessions.

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 earlier Sustainability Appraisal Report considered, in detail, the requirements of the SEA Directive; the methodology to be used; the relationship to other Plans and Programmes; the environmental and sustainability context (known as the baseline information); the sustainability issues; the assessment of the objectives of the Local Plan; a review of the options considered; and an assessment of the allocations and notations in the Settlement Proposals. It is not considered necessary to repeat this at this stage; instead this report focuses on the changes to the policies.

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. Through out the appraisal of the various iterations of the Plan, the policies and proposals have been assessed against the following sustainability objectives, drawn from the Scoping Report.

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	Landscape and Cultural

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

Conclusion

6. The Core Strategy sets a policy of directing growth the inland towns and large villages in the District. Therefore, the SA of the Settlement Proposals focused on appraising only those settlements in where growth will take place. Where the Main Modification do not result in any change to the SA outcome, the original assessment can be found in full appraisal tables for the each of the sites in Appendix 1 to the original main report. Below is a summary of the findings pertaining to the modifications.

7. The modifications largely seek to provide clarity to the proposals that were set out in the Settlement Proposals. However, there are a number of significant changes emerging from the modifications. The changes and the outcomes are set out below.

Binbrook

No change from the Main Report.

Burgh le Marsh

Following the Local Plan examination hearing sessions site BLM310 was removed from the allocation on ground of biodiversity impact. No

alternative site has been allocated and so there is no change from the Main Report

Coningsby and Tattershall

No change from the Main Report.

Friskney

Additional text has been added in relation to FRI317 due to the proximity of heritage assets. This has not changed the findings of the Main Report.

Grainthorpe

Following the Local Plan examination hearing sessions, it was decided to delete site GRA211 on flood risk grounds, this was already highlighted in the Main Report so there is no change.

Hogsthorpe

The capacities of both HOG306 and HOG have been reduced and additional text has been added referring to the school. None of these modifications change the Main Report.

Holton le Clay

There have been minor changes to the capacity of two of the sites but these do not change the findings of the Main Report.

Horncastle

Text has been added pertaining to the allocated employment site but this does not require change from the Main Report.

Huttoft

No change from the Main Report.

Legbourne

No change from the Main Report.

Louth

Text has been added pertaining to the allocated employment site and Gipsy and Traveller Site but this does not require change to the Main Report.

Manby and Grimoldby

No change from the Main Report.

Mareham le Fen

Text has been added to two sites pertaining to water management, and to the general text for the village, but these do not require change to the Main Report.

Marshchapel

Following the Local Plan examination hearings, the sites at Marshchapel have been removed from the Plan on flood risk grounds. No additional sites have been allocated and this does not change the assessment through the sustainability appraisal.

North Thoresby

No change from the Main Report.

Partney

No change from the Main Report.

Sibsey

There has been addition to the text relating to sites SIB303 and SIB406 relating to heritage assets. This was identified through the Main Report and no change is needed.

Spilsby

Text has been added pertaining to the employment site and bringing the sites allocated to the east of the town together into one site allocation. This large site SPY310 was not separately assessed in the Main Report, so a revised table for Spilsby has been included.

Stickney

No change from the Main Report.

Tetford

No change from the Main Report.

Tetney

Following the Local Plan examination hearing sessions, site TNY308 has now been deleted on the grounds of flood risk and additional text has been added in relation to TNY311 and TNY320 regarding the need for one to provide access to the other. No additional sites have been allocated and none of these modifications change the assessment through the Main Report.

Wainfleet

No modifications for Wainfleet, however, the assessment for site WAI407 was excluded from the Main Report, so a revised table for Wainfleet has been included.

Wragby

No change from the Main Report.

8. 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 Settlement Proposals is being consulted on alongside this document and further amendments may be made as a result of these consultations.

1 Introduction

1.1 This document provides a supplement to the East Lindsey Settlement Proposals Sustainability Appraisal Report, submitted for examination alongside the East Lindsey Settlement Proposals in April 2017. 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; and together with the Core Strategy forms the Local Plan for East Lindsey. This supplementary report is required to assess the social, environmental and economic effects of the Main Modifications proposed to the Settlement Proposals following the Local Plan Examination hearing sessions, conducted by a Government Inspector, and are based on the preliminary conclusions emerging from those hearing sessions. It is required that these modifications are subject to the same assessment as the submitted proposals to ensure that the potential social, environmental and economic effects are reported on.

Assessing Sustainability

1.2 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

1.3 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)

1.4 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.

1.5 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.

1.6 The different stages of the SEA are similar to the SA stages and 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.

1.7 The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report of the East Lindsey Settlement Proposals, which forms part of the Local Plan for East Lindsey, contains the baseline characteristics in East Lindsey and sets out the SA methodology. It also examines the relationship with other plans and programmes; sets the environmental and sustainability context (known as the baseline information); identifies the sustainability issues; and reviews the options considered and assesses the sites specific notations and allocations in the document. It goes on to outline the findings of the SA and explains the issues which require mitigation and how this will be addressed. It is not considered necessary to repeat this at this stage. The original report is available on the Council's website for those who wish to familiarise themselves with it. This report focuses on the changes to the policies.

Habitats Regulations Assessment

1.8 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. An assessment has been prepared and was submitted alongside the Plan, prior to examination. The effects of the Main Modifications have also been considered and are published in a separate document (CD96a), available on the Council's website.

Consultation

1.9 This document is subject to consultation alongside the Main Modifications and responses should be submitted to the Council as prescribed in relation to the Main Modifications.

2 The Appraisal Methodology

2.1 The Sustainability Appraisal Report, submitted in April 2017, sets out the full Appraisal Methodology. Despite the name, the Main Modifications contain a significant number of changes that amount to minor alterations to wording and which do not necessarily involve a change of policy direction or a significant alteration the strategy. There are a number of changes to the Settlement Proposals which involve adding text which repeats the housing figures in the Core Strategy. These do not require additional appraisal, as they do not change any of the assessments already carried out. The assessment of the settlement specific modifications can be seen in paragraphs 3.3 – 3.27 below.

2.2 The modifications did require the inclusion of site specific assessment of two additional sites; at Spilsby and Wainfleet. These have been included, along with the assessment of the other sites in these villages, at Appendix 1 within this report. The full settlement assessment has been included so it can be seen how the additional sites relate to the other sites within the settlement. The tables in appendix 1 are assessed in the following way:

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

Degree of Impact

√√ significant positive impact	The option or policy is likely to lead to a significant improvement or support in achieving or working towards the achievement of the objective.
√ positive impact	The option or policy is likely to lead to some improvement to the current baseline in respect of the objective being appraised.
○ neutral impact	That there are no effects upon the sustainability objective being appraised. This may mean that there is no relationship between the two or that there is no discernible harm caused to the objective.
✗ negative impact	The option or policy is likely to lead to moderate damage or loss, or other negative effects on the objective.
✘ 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)

2.3 Through out the Sustainability Appraisal process, the various iterations of the Local Plan have been assessed against the same set of sustainability objectives, determined by the Scoping Report. These are set out in table 2.1 below.

Table 2.1 – Sustainability Objectives

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

	infrastructure for healthy lifestyles	
13	Positively plan for, and minimise the effects of, climate change	All SEA topics

2.4 The SA guidance requires that options are put forward and tested to see how they perform, relative to each other and against the sustainability objectives. Options have been tested at a number of stages through the evolution of the Settlement Proposals and reported on previously. In the case of the Main Modifications, the alternatives have already been considered through these previous assessment stages and debated at the hearing sessions. This appraisal therefore focuses on the outcomes of these modifications.

3 Proposed Main Modifications Assessment

3.1 The main Settlement Proposals Sustainability Appraisal Report contains a full assessment of all the sites considered within those settlements where allocations were being made. Where the Main Modification do not result in any change to the SA outcome, the original assessment can be found in full appraisal tables for the each of the sites in Appendix 1 to the original main report.

3.2 Below is a summary of the Main Modifications for each settlement along with an assessment of the impact this has on the on the Sustainability Appraisal.

3.3 There are a number of general modifications to the Settlement Proposals which provide the link to the Core Strategy in terms of housing numbers; a table of allocated housing sites; a policy for the employment allocations and a policy for the Gypsy and Traveller sites. The changes themselves do not affect the assessment of the Plan. These matters have been assessed as part of the Core Strategy and do not need additional assessment here.

Binbrook

3.3 There are no modifications relating to Binbrook, so there is no change from the Main Report.

Burgh le Marsh

3.4 Following the Local Plan examination hearing sessions site BLM310 was removed from the allocation on ground of biodiversity impact. No alternative site has been allocated, so no additional assessment needs to be undertaken and there is no change from the Main Report; the site was already identified as having a negative impact for biodiversity. The deletion of the site means that less housing will be delivered to meet local housing need but as this is only 11 short of the target, it is not considered that this requires a negative outcome. Text has been also been added pertaining to the allocation of a transit Gypsy and Traveller site. The assessment of this site was included in the Main Report so needs no further assessment.

Coningsby and Tattershall

3.5 Text has been added to the Settlement Proposals pertaining to the allocated Employment Site, but the site was assessed in the Main Report so there is no change from the Main Report.

Friskney

3.6 Additional text has been added in relation to FRI317 due to the proximity of designated heritage assets. This text requires that care is taken in the design of ensuing development to reduce its impact on these neighbouring heritage assets. The site is identified as having a negative impact against the landscape sustainability objective in the main report. Although this modification will draw attention to the sensitivity of the site, and hopefully improve outcomes through the planning application stage, it does not change the fact that site abuts a Scheduled Ancient Monument

and has potential implications for its setting. Therefore, this has not changed the findings of the Main Report.

Grainthorpe

3.7 Following the Local Plan examination hearing sessions, it was decided to delete site GRA211 on flood risk grounds. No alternative site has been allocated in its place. The site was already identified as strongly negative on flood risk grounds and so there are no changes to the Main Report. In deleting the site, Grainthorpe will only be receiving half the allocation identified for the community. The flood risk issues there mean that it is not possible to find additional housing land. This will affect the ability to meet local housing need, particularly as the flood risk issues already meant that Grainthorpe was delivering less housing than that assigned to it through the plan, and opportunities to build vibrant communities. However, this is countered through the positive outcomes for avoiding flood risk and the safety aspect of SA objective 9 that come from not putting allocations in these areas. The plan also allows opportunities for community facilities, retail and employment that are considered to benefit and support these communities despite the restriction on housing.

Hogsthorpe

3.8 The capacities of both HOG306 and HOG309 have been reduced. In the former case this is to take account of the granting of planning permission for a smaller scheme which has left no access to the remainder of the site. In the latter case this is due to flood risk. These changes are not so strategic as to affect the assessment. Additional text has also been added referring to the school. None of these modifications change the Main Report.

Holton le Clay

3.9 There have been minor changes to the capacity of two of the sites (HLC206 and HLC030) due to the subsequent granting of planning permission. Some additional text has been added for site HLC206 relating to ownership and availability of the site. However, these do not change the findings of the Main Report.

Horncastle

3.10 Text has been added pertaining to the allocation of land for employment in Horncastle but the allocation had already been assessed and this does not require change from the Main Report.

Huttoft

3.11 There have been no modifications relating to Huttoft, so there is no change from the Main Report.

Legbourne

3.12 There have been no modifications relating to Legbourne, so there is no change from the Main Report.

Louth

3.13 There has been a small deletion of text relating to secondary shopping in the town and text has also been added pertaining to the

allocated employment site and Gipsy and Traveller Site. However, these does not require change to the Main Report, these sites were assessed previously and do not require reassessment following the modifications.

Manby and Grimoldby

3.14 There have been no modifications relating to Manby and Grimoldby so there is no change from the Main Report.

Mareham le Fen

3.15 Additional text regarding surface water issues has been added to the general text for the village. Text has also been added for two sites MLF305 and MLF328 pertaining to water management. These additions do not require change to the Main Report.

Marshchapel

3.16 Following the Local Plan examination hearings, all the allocated housing sites at Marshchapel have been removed from the Plan on flood risk grounds. No additional sites have been allocated. The modifications do not change the site assessment through the sustainability appraisal. However, this has wider implications for the effects of the settlement proposals, given that no housing will be allocated in the settlement. The settlement will no longer benefit from the positive attributes of the proposed development in terms of meeting local housing need and building vibrant communities. However, there are policies in the Core Strategy on community facilities, retail and employment that are considered to benefit and support these communities despite the restriction on housing. There are also benefits accruing from the fact that no development will now be affected by flood risk. The fact that all the sites are to be deleted means that there is more of a cumulative effect and these are drawn out below in the cumulative assessment in paragraph 3.30.

North Thoresby

3.17 There have been no modifications relating to North Thoresby so there is no change from the Main Report.

Partney

3.18 There have been no modifications relating to Partney so there is no change from the Main Report.

Sibsey

3.20 There has been a change to the general text for the village referring to the listed Sibsey Trader Mill, similarly a reference has been added for SIB406 which affects its setting. Text relating to the effect of site SIB303 on Sibsey House and Coach House, which are listed, along with water issues, has also been added. Both sites were identified as having negative impact on landscape, which includes the impact on heritage assets. The text only refers to the need to be sensitive to the setting of heritage assets. In the case of Sibsey House and Coach House, the heritage asset is immediately adjacent to the allocated site. Although the modification draws attention to the sensitivity needed with these sites, until the design and layout are known, the risk of negative impact from the development

still exists and it is not considered that there should be a change from the Main Report.

Spilsby

3.21 Text has been added pertaining to the employment site. Similarly, new text has also been added for site SPY310, which brings together a number of contiguous sites allocated to the east of the town into one housing allocation. SPY310 had been appraised as part of its component parts but an assessment of the whole area, as one site, had not been included. The appraisal for Spilsby therefore requires the addition of this site and the revised Spilsby Summary sheet can be seen in Appendix 1 to this report.

Stickney

3.22 There have been no modifications relating to Stickney so there is no change from the Main Report.

Tetford

3.23 There have been no modifications relating to Tetford so there is no change from the Main Report.

Tetney

3.24 Following the Local Plan examination hearing sessions, site TNY308 has been deleted on the grounds of flood risk. The site was identified as a negative impact against the flood risk objective through the sustainability appraisal. No additional site has been allocated. This leaves Tetney with 9 plots short of the number assigned to it through the Plan which will have affect the ability to meet local housing need. However, this is countered through the positive outcomes for avoiding flood risk and the safety aspect of SA objective 9 that come from not including the allocation. The plan also allows opportunities for community facilities, retail and employment that are considered to benefit and support these communities despite the restriction on housing. Additional text has been added in relation to TNY311 and TNY320 regarding the need for one site to provide access to the other; this was also highlighted through the Sustainability Appraisal. The reference to the mutuality of the sites, in terms of access, will help this issue but until such time as a scheme is submitted with the joint access, site TNY320 still does not have an access. None of these modifications change the assessment through the Main Report.

Wainfleet

3.25 There have been no modifications relating to Wainfleet so there is no change from the Main Report. However, Site WAI407 was omitted from the previous Sustainability Appraisal Report and should be added to the assessment for Wainfleet. The revised Wainfleet Summary sheet can be seen in Appendix 1 to this report.

Wragby

3.26 There have been no modifications relating to Wragby so there is no change from the Main Report.

Secondary, Cumulative and Synergistic Effects

3.28 The SEA Directive requires the assessment of secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects.

3.29 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. However, these have been identified through the Main Report. In terms of the modifications, most of the changes are relatively minor in nature and will not contribute to any of the above effects.

3.30 In respect of the sites being deleted through the modifications, these sites are not geographically close and so the cumulative impacts are considered to be limited to the joint contribution that they make to meeting local housing need across the District. However, the number of plots lost is relatively small compared to the total housing target and the positive outcomes in respect of flood risk and the safety aspects of SA objective 9 (in the case of Grainthorpe and Tetney) and biodiversity (in the case of Burgh le Marsh) are considered to outweigh the affect on housing provision; meaning the impact is neutral. The exception to this, and biggest cumulative change, is the deletion of all the allocated housing sites at Marshchapel. This means that the settlement will no longer benefit from the positive attributes of the proposed development. However, conversely, the cumulative negative outcomes that were identified will not materialise, primarily on landscape impact, use of greenfield land and flood risk. This is a similar situation to those communities affected by the coastal policy (the SA for which can be seen in the Core Strategy report). Although the allocations are absent, there are benefits accruing from policies in the Core Strategy on community facilities, retail and employment that are considered to benefit and support these communities despite the restriction on housing. Similarly, these are other policies such as sport and recreation, green infrastructure, landscape and biodiversity that provide other social and environmental benefits. On balance, it is considered that the cumulative impact is of this change is neutral.

Mitigation

3.31 Mitigation includes changes to policy or implementation which seek to prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse effects on the sustainability objectives; as identified through the Sustainability Appraisal. Mitigation can also assist in achieving better outcomes where positive outcomes have been identified but changes could enhance this further. This can take a number of forms, such as the selection of suitable options; introducing site specific requirements to overcome localised outcomes; compensatory measures; or monitoring where effects are uncertain. A number of the modifications following the hearing session are in themselves mitigation that were considered necessary to conform to national policy, to best reflect the circumstances of the District and to address the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal. The most significant mitigation introduced by the modifications are:

- The deletion of sites at Burgh le Marsh; Grainthorpe; and Marshchapel;

- The addition of text requiring the design of new development to respect the presence of designated heritage assets at Friskney and Sibsey; and
- The addition of text referring to the proximity of a site of biodiversity interest alongside a site in Spilsby.

Monitoring

3.32 SA monitoring seeks to identify the causal links between the plan and the receptors being monitored. These tie into the sustainability objectives and the baseline. Guidance on SA states that information and indicators can be drawn from existing sources to avoid unnecessary duplication for example, the Authority Monitoring Report produced by the Council. The parent Sustainability Appraisal Report should be viewed for information about monitoring; this sets out the monitoring framework and already covers issues raised through the modifications. No additional monitoring is required for the modification.

4 Conclusion

4.1 The purpose of carry out an SA is to identify the significant effects of the plan. The sites and proposals in the Settlement Proposals have already been subject to appraisal against the Sustainability Objectives and this is set out in the Main Report available on the Council's website.

4.2 As this report is a Sustainability Appraisal of the modifications to the Settlement Proposals the full assessment for each settlement has not been repeated and the conclusions below relate only to the modifications themselves.

Binbrook

4.3 No change from the Main Report.

Burgh le Marsh

4.4 Following the Local Plan examination hearing sessions site BLM310 was removed from the allocation on ground of biodiversity impact. No alternative site has been allocated and so there is no change from the Main Report.

Coningsby and Tattershall

4.5 No change from the Main Report.

Friskney

4.6 Additional text has been added in relation to FRI317 due to the proximity of heritage assets. This has not changed the findings of the Main Report.

Grainthorpe

4.7 Following the Local Plan examination hearing sessions, it was decided to delete site GRA211 on flood risk grounds, this was already highlighted in the Main Report so there is no change.

Hogsthorpe

4.8 The capacities of both HOG306 and HOG have been reduced and additional text has been added referring to the school. None of these modifications change the Main Report.

Holton le Clay

4.9 There have been minor changes to the capacity of two of the sites but these do not change the findings of the Main Report.

Horncastle

4.10 Text has been added pertaining to the allocated employment site but this does not require change from the Main Report.

Huttoft

4.11 No change from the Main Report.

Legbourne

4.12 No change from the Main Report.

Louth

4.13 Text has been added pertaining to the allocated employment site and Gipsy and Traveller Site but this does not require change to the Main Report.

Manby and Grimoldby

4.14 No change from the Main Report.

Mareham le Fen

4.15 Text has been added to two sites pertaining to water management, and to the general text for the village, but these do not require change to the Main Report.

Marshchapel

4.16 Following the Local Plan examination hearings, the sites at Marshchapel have been removed from the Plan on flood risk grounds. No additional sites have been allocated and this does not change the assessment through the sustainability appraisal.

North Thoresby

4.17 No change from the Main Report.

Partney

4.18 No change from the Main Report.

Sibsey

4.19 There has been addition to the text relating to sites SIB303 and SIB406 relating to heritage assets. This was identified through the Main Report and no change is needed.

Spilsby

4.20 Text has been added pertaining to the employment site and bringing the sites allocated to the east of the town together into one site allocation. This large site SPY310 was not separately assessed in the Main Report, so a revised table for Spilsby has been included.

Stickney

4.21 No change from the Main Report.

Tetford

4.22 No change from the Main Report.

Tetney

4.23 Site TNY308 has now been deleted on the grounds of flood risk and additional text has been added in relation to TNY311 and TNY320 regarding the need for one to provide access to the other. No additional sites have been allocated and none of these modifications change the assessment through the Main Report.

Wainfleet

4.24 No modifications for Wainfleet, however, the assessment for site WAI407 was excluded from the Main Report, so a revised table for Wainfleet has been included.

Wragby

4.25 No change from the Main Report.

4.26 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 Settlement Proposals is being consulted on alongside this document and further amendments may be made as a result of these consultations.

5 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)

Appendix 1 – Changes to the Sustainability Appraisal Report following the Modifications

Spilsby – Although site SPY310 had been assessed in its component parts (SPY301, SPY303, SPY304, SPY305 and SPY306) it was not included as a full site assessment so SPY310 has been added to the assessment of Spilsby.

Spilsby	SPY022	SPY203	SPY301	SPY302	SPY303	SPY304	SPY305	SPY306	SPY310
Sustainability Objectives (abbreviated)									
1. Biodiversity & geodiversity	X	O	✓	?	✓	O	✓	✓	✓
2. Landscapes/historic environment	X	✓	?	X	X	?	X	X	X
3. Natural resources	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
4. Flood Risk	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
5. Economic growth	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	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
8. Recycling and waste minimisation	O	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	O
12. Facilities and infrastructure for healthy lifestyles	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
13. Positively plan for, and minimise the effects of, climate change	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Summary	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								

	<p>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 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; this is assessed under site SPY310. These effects need not all 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>
--	--

Wainfleet – Site WAI407 was omitted from the previous Sustainability Appraisal Report and should be added to the assessment for Wainfleet.

Wainfleet										
Sustainability Objectives (abbreviated)	WAI302	WAI305	WAI306	WAI307	WAI308	WAI308B	WAI401	WAI404	WAI405	WAI407
1. Biodiversity & geodiversity	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
2. Landscapes/ historic environment	X	X	XX	X	XX	XX	X	✓	X	X
3. Natural resources	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o
4. Flood Risk	X	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	o
5. Economic growth	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o
6. Previously developed land and loss of agricultural	X	X	X	X	o	X	X	X	o	X

land and greenfield sites										
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	<p>Flood Risk is a significant issue in Wainfleet, with both fluvial and 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, WAI401 and WAI407, which 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.</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 seven sites under consideration for allocation through the Plan; WAI305, WAI307, WAI308, WAI308B, WAI401, WAI405 and WAI407. 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</p>									

	<p>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>
--	--