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1.0 Introduction

1.1 South East Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee

1.1.1 On 5th July 2011 the South East Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee Order 2011 came into force (2011 No.1455). This Order establishes a Joint Strategic Planning Committee (Joint Committee) for the areas of Boston Borough and South Holland District (known collectively as South East Lincolnshire). The constituent authorities are Lincolnshire County Council, Boston Borough Council and South Holland District Council.

1.1.2 Article 3 of the Order constitutes the Joint Committee as the local planning authority for South East Lincolnshire for the purposes of Part 2 (local development) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, as amended, (the 2004 Act). Together with article 4 it provides for the Joint Committee to exercise the functions of a local planning authority in relation to:

- the preparation, submission, adoption, monitoring and revision of joint local development documents identified in a joint local development scheme; and
- the preparation, submission, adoption, monitoring and revision of a joint local development scheme, in respect of those documents.
Figure 1.1: Map of South East Lincolnshire
1.2 The South East Lincolnshire Local Plan

1.2.1 In light of the above considerations a joint Local Plan for South East Lincolnshire (the Local Plan) is being produced. Over time the Local Plan will replace the saved policies in the extant Boston Borough and South Holland Local Plans. The Local Plan will attempt to give an effective spatial expression to the vision and aspirations of South East Lincolnshire’s local communities and to those elements of the relevant strategies and programmes which relate to the development and use of land in the area. This should be coupled with a local interpretation of the requirements of the national planning policies, particularly the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

1.2.2 The Local Plan will, in essence, comprise two parts: Part 1 will be entitled Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document (DPD); and Part 2 will be entitled: Site Allocations DPD. The Strategy and Policies DPD will be the principal document in the Local Plan. It will contain the Joint Committee’s spatial vision and strategic priorities for South East Lincolnshire; a spatial strategy, ‘core’ policies and broad locations for growth for delivering the vision and priorities; and a monitoring and implementation framework with clear objectives for achieving delivery. In addition, it will contain a limited number of generic development control policies, against which planning applications for the development and use of land and buildings will be considered. All subsequent DPDs and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) must be consistent with it until such time as it is intended to supersede part or all of it. On adoption, it will be supported by an adopted proposals map which will be updated on each occasion a new or revised DPD is adopted.

1.3 NPPF, Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA)

1.3.1 The NPPF outlines a number of tests of soundness that an independent inspector will take into account when judging whether a Local Plan is ‘sound’ – namely that it is:

- ‘Positively prepared’ – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;
- ‘Justified’ – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternative, based on proportionate evidence;
- ‘Effective’ – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and
- ‘Consistent with national policy’ – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.’

1.3.2 SA is a statutory requirement for DPDs and is the means by which a plan can demonstrate the ‘justified’ test of soundness outlined in the NPPF. It should be noted that SA fully incorporates the requirements of the European Directive on Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA Directive 2001/21/EC). The first step in the SA process is to prepare a Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, which sets the scope of the appraisal. Detailed information on the overall approach to the SA of
the Strategy and Policies DPD can be found within the Strategy and Policies DPD Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, which was completed in July 2012. The approach to SA in respect of this Preferred Options Document is outlined below in sections 1.4 and 1.5.

1.3.3 It is a requirement of Article 6 of the EC Habitats Directive 1992 and Regulation 48 of the Conservation (Natural Habitats &c) Regulations 1994 (as amended) that ‘land use plans’, including local authority Local Plans, are subject to a HRA, commonly known as ‘Appropriate Assessment’ (AA), if it is likely that they will lead to significant adverse effects on a Natura 2000 site. These are Special Areas of Conservation, (SACs) and Special Protection Areas, (SPAs). As a matter of UK Government policy Ramsar sites, candidate SACs and proposed SPAs are given equivalent status for the purpose of HRA. Initial scoping information related to HRA is outlined in the Strategy and Policies DPD Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report. The approach to HRA in respect of this Preferred Options Document is outlined below in section 1.5.

1.4 Approach to the Preparation of the Strategy and Policies DPD

1.4.1 The established approach to preparing DPDs as part of a Local Development Framework (LDF) under the provisions of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and accompanying regulations was to prepare ‘Issues and Options’ for public consultation, followed by seeking representations on ‘Preferred Options’ and finally preparing, and seeking representations on, a Submission Draft of the DPD. This approach was designed to ‘front-load’ community involvement and was also intended to facilitate the appraisal of options (primarily through the SA process), which was an important factor in terms of soundness at Local Plan Examination.

1.4.2 The emergence of the Localism Act, the NPPF and the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 have heralded a return to the phrase ‘Local Plan’, rather than ‘Local Development Framework’. The regulations also seemingly present a more relaxed route to the adoption of DPDs in terms of community involvement. The Regulations allow for a single round of consultation during the plan preparation process, which on the face of it seems to suggest that the ‘Issues and Options’ and ‘Preferred Options’ stages are no longer required and that it would be possible to draft a pre-2004 style Local Plan in its entirety to consult upon once prior to submission for Examination. However, in light of the provisions of both the SEA Directive and the NPPF it is clear that this approach would risk the plan being found ‘unsound’ at Examination. This is because it is a requirement of both the SEA Directive and the NPPF that ‘reasonable alternatives’ are considered in the plan-preparation process. The SEA Directive requires that ‘the likely significant effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme, and reasonable alternatives taking into account the objectives and the geographical scope of the plan or programme, are identified, described and evaluated’. The NPPF highlights that one of the tests of soundness at Local Plan Examination will be that it is ‘justified’ i.e. that ‘the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence’.

1.4.3 In order to expedite the preparation of a Local Plan for South East Lincolnshire, but also to be mindful of the legal requirements of the SEA Directive and the NPPF tests of soundness, a new approach has been devised. In recent times, emerging DPDs have been accompanied by standalone SAs that have in many cases been very lengthy and inaccessible documents. The alternative approach presented here
embraces the spirit of SA and integrates it into the process of identifying and appraising reasonable options in order to formulate a set of preferred policy approaches which will be the subject of statutory public consultation. This ensures that the processes of SA and the exploration of reasonable alternatives are combined and clearly articulated to consultees in one all-encompassing document.

1.4.4 The following topics form the basis of the SA Framework: Air Quality; Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure; Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation); Community, Health and Well-Being; Economy and Employment; Flood Risk; Historic Environment; Housing; Land and Waste; Landscape; Transport; and, Water. Each reasonable option is appraised against each of these topic areas. Further information related to this process is outline in the SA Scoping Report. Guidance of the sustainability topics and on SA scoring are available in Appendix 1 of this report.

1.4.5 The following section outlines in more detail how this method works in practice and explains the layout of this Preferred Options Report.

1.5 The Combined Preferred Options and SA Report

1.5.1 Following on from this introduction, a spatial portrait, vision and strategic priorities are presented. These are followed by a series of chapters covering the following themes:

- Housing Growth and Flood Risk
- Sustainable Development and Spatial Strategy
- Housing
- Economy
- Environment
- Community, Health and Well-being
- Transport
- Delivery

1.5.2 Within each of the above chapters the relevant policy context and evidence related to each theme are presented. This enables the identification of ‘key issues’ that require a policy response. By presenting this information in one document as a means of generating issues and options, it is easy to provide an audit trail to ensure that emerging policies are consistent with national policy and are based on proportionate evidence, both key to the NPPF tests of soundness. Also outlined is where issues are dealt with by other policies, either saved existing Local Plan policies, policies within the forthcoming Site Allocations DPD, or other policies within this Preferred Options Report. Section 1.6 provides further information on retained policies.

1.5.3 Following on from this, a series of ‘approaches’ are outlined in response to the identified key issues. For each approach ‘reasonable’ and ‘unreasonable’ policy options are discussed. The reasonable policy options are then taken forward and put through the SA process (full detail on the approach to SA is outlined within the standalone SA Scoping Report, whilst key elements related to the approach to scoring are appended to this document). Clear reasons for unreasonable options being discarded are outlined. In line with the requirements of the SEA Directive, reasonable options are considered against the baseline situation as documented in the SA Scoping Report. However, the relative positive and negative impact of options is also discussed. Any issues related to delivery and the relative advantages/disadvantages of different options in this respect are then considered.
Based on the findings of the SA and issues related to delivery, a preferred option is then outlined.

1.5.4 The Planning Advisory Service (PAS) advises that every option generated should be assessed for reasonableness prior to being taken forward for consultation or SA. This involves considering a series of questions:

- will implementation of the option assist in fulfilling the objectives of the plan?
- is the option sufficiently detailed – taking into account the nature of the DPD in question – to enable meaningful community involvement, SA and HRA?
- is it a genuine option (for example, ask whether or not it has been included in order to make other options ‘look better’)?
- will the necessary resources be available to deliver the option (consider the commitment of delivery partners)?
- will there be sufficient time within the plan period to implement the option?
- is there an unacceptable risk that the option will not be fully implemented for one reason or another (ask ‘what can I think of that might go wrong with this option’)?
- is the option sufficiently flexible to accommodate changing circumstances?
- does the option generally conform with higher level policy?

1.5.5 Following on from the series of approaches, a reason for the ‘preferred policy approach’ is detailed. This details how the preferred option(s) will be expressed through policy. The preferred policy approaches are then presented. For each policy approach a HRA/AA Assessment Screening is carried out to determine whether the policy approach should be taken forward and assessed through the full HRA/AA process in due course. Where required, this will be carried out alongside production of the submission version of the Strategy and Policies DPD. Information relating to the methodology for HRA/AA is outlined in the SA Scoping Report.

1.5.6 Finally, each policy approach is subject to an Equalities Assessment. The Equality Act 2010 sets out a public sector Equality Duty which requires public bodies to consider how different people will be affected by their activities, helping them to deliver policies and services which are: efficient and effective; accessible to all; and which meet different people’s needs. In order to fulfil this Duty, an analysis is carried out on each preferred policy approach to assess how it will affect different sections of the community. This analysis considers whether the preferred policy approach could affect some groups in society differently (either directly or indirectly), and whether the policy will promote equal opportunities. The groups who are considered are:

- children, adults and the elderly (AGE);
- disabled and able-bodied people (DISABILITY);
- people in the process of transitioning from one gender to another (GENDER RE-ASSIGNMENT);
- people who are married, in a civil partnership and single people (MARRIAGE AND CIVIL PARTNERSHIP);
- pregnant women and mothers (PREGNANCY AND MATERNITY);
- people from different ethnic backgrounds (RACE);
- people from different faith groups and people without a belief (RELIGION OR BELIEF);
- men or women (SEX); and
- lesbian, gay, bisexual and straight people (SEXUAL ORIENTATION)
1.5.7 The approach outlined above is felt to be the most expedient way of achieving a ‘sound’ DPD, in that it seeks not only to reduce the burden of several rounds of consultation, but also to address the legal requirement to consider reasonable alternatives in the preparation of a Local Plan. This enables a clear audit trail to be presented as to how, from a blank canvass, preferred policy approaches have been determined. It also goes some way to demonstrating the ‘justified’, ‘effective’ and ‘consistent with national policy’ tests of soundness as outlined in the NPPF.

1.5.8 By demonstrating a clear audit trail of reasonable and unreasonable options and the means by which they have been generated, discarded, appraised and, ultimately, how a preferred policy approach has been chosen, consultees should be able to appreciate the process taken and be well placed to raise issues, questions and alternative approaches for consideration. This should pay dividends as progress is made towards a final submission draft of the Strategy and Policies DPD.

1.6 Saved Policies

1.6.1 Upon adoption of the Strategy and Policies DPD a number of ‘saved’ extant Local Plan policies will be superseded. However, pending the adoption of the Site Allocation DPD a number of policies will continue to be saved. A schedule of these policies will be outlined in detail in the submission version of the Strategy and Policies DPD. However, where appropriate, within each chapter of this document, policies that will likely need to be saved beyond adoption of the Strategy and Policies DPD are highlighted in the ‘Other Policies’ section.

1.7 Consultation

1.7.1 This document is the subject of public consultation in accordance with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. Representations are invited on all aspects of the document, in particular the preferred policy approaches outlined throughout the document and the manner in which reasonable and unreasonable options have been derived and subsequently appraised through the SA process. We would also welcome representations on where it is felt other reasonable options have not been explored.

1.7.2 The statutory consultation period shall run from May 3rd 2013 – 28th June 2013, lasting a total of 8 weeks.- to be confirmed

1.8 Next Steps

1.8.1 Following on from the consultation process, all representations will be taken into account and will inform the production of the submission version of the Strategy and Policies DPD that will be the subject of independent examination. This will be accompanied by a final SA report and final HRA/AA report.
2.0 Spatial Portrait

2.1 South East Lincolnshire (the combined Council areas of Boston Borough and South Holland District) lies to the west and south-west of the Wash estuary. It is an area where land and coast has shaped communities and the economy for many centuries and this proximity continues to exert its influence today. A huge part of the area has been reclaimed through a vast network of drainage systems and coastal defences that have created some of the richest and most extensive horticultural resources in the country. The farmland of South East Lincolnshire accounts for over 50% of all horticultural crops (vegetables, peas, beans, salad produce and bulbs and flowers) and 40% of the potatoes produced in the East Midlands. At an estimated annual value of £470 million (2010) the horticultural business in the East Midlands is the second-most important in the United Kingdom.

2.2 The landscape of South East Lincolnshire, despite its very open and rural character, is shaped and dominated by agricultural and horticultural activity. Field hedgerows and wooded areas are untypical unless lining the route of a highway or nearing a settlement. This means that extensive views and large open skies are common vistas. It is a landscape where vertical structures like churches, pylons and wind-energy generators can draw the eye. Churches and established landmarks such as the ‘Boston Stump’ define man’s historical influence on the area. Structures such as pylons and wind farms are more modern visual features.

2.3 The flat character of the land and its proximity to the coast (the Wash estuary) also mean that the main watercourses, such as the River Witham, River Welland, River Nene and connected drainage channels are tidal. The Wash itself is a natural habitat of international importance and the interlinked waterways are part of the rich ecological network supporting the biodiversity of the area. Historically these watercourses were the main transport corridors for trade with inland Lincolnshire and beyond. Today, they are a resource with a, largely, unrealised potential for recreation but which require everyday management through the operation of pumping stations and sluices. Climate change, particularly associated with the predicted effects on sea level rise, brings the threat of extensive flooding that could be a danger to life affecting whole settlements. Such an extreme consequence would come about as a result of the highest tides (predicted to be common in 100 years’ time) coupled with storm surge conditions causing major breaches in coastal and/or tidal defences. Even a minor flood event has the potential to inundate valuable farmland with saline water and negate productivity for many years after.

2.4 The Plan area is sparsely populated with about 153,000 people (Census 2011) living in some 1,100 square kilometres. However the Plan area has seen one of the largest increases in population over the last 10 years, nationally. The population of Boston Borough has increased by 15.9% (to 64,600) since 2001, and in the same period South Holland has seen an increase of 15.4% (to 88,300). As the population growth for the County of Lincolnshire has been 10.4%, the growth for the Plan area is significant, particularly given its relatively marginalised location away from the conurbations of the East Midlands. Furthermore, the Plan area attracts some 14,000 seasonal workers in horticulture and crop processing annually.

2.5 Most of the population and the 64,600 households are located in some 70 recognised settlements. The resident population of the sub-regional centres of Boston and Spalding are about 33,000 and 29,000 respectively. In South Holland,
there are also five ‘area centres’ recognised in the current Local Plan: the towns of Holbeach, Crowland, Long Sutton and Sutton Bridge and the village of Donington. Holbeach, with a 2011 population of over 8,000, is the largest of the area centres. In Boston Borough, the outlying settlements are smaller with Kirton, Swineshead, Butterwick, Old Leake, Wrangle and Sutterton being the largest. South East Lincolnshire’s network of larger settlements and a substantial number of smaller villages and hamlets has significant consequences in terms of access to services, connectivity and bringing about sustainable futures.

2.6 The Plan area is located at the south-eastern limit of coastal Lincolnshire which is recognised as being poorly connected, especially by the highway network, to the rest of the region. Just three Principal A Roads connect the Plan area north, south, east and west. A substantial amount of HGV and slow-moving traffic use these routes, particularly, farm vehicles and caravans. Haven Bridge in Boston is one of the most heavily-used parts of the highway network in the County. Passenger transport access to places outside the Plan area is mainly by rail with services to Grantham and beyond, Peterborough and beyond, at hourly intervals or longer.

2.7 Within South East Lincolnshire access to places of employment is primarily by car or van (2011). In South Holland, travel to work by car or van is, respectively, about 8% and 4% higher than the national (35%) and Lincolnshire (40%) averages. Boston Borough has a rate that is marginally below the Lincolnshire average but marginally above the national. Public transport usage for both parts of South East Lincolnshire is well below the County average, which at 2% is itself over 8% less than public transport use within England and Wales. Access by bicycle or walking to places of work is relatively high in Boston Borough with nearly double the rate of cycling compared with Lincolnshire and four times the National rate. Across South Holland access by bicycle is about the County average. The number of people working from home in South East Lincolnshire roughly aligns with both County and national rates (7%) although South Holland has marginally higher rates.

2.8 South East Lincolnshire has a long history with some of its archaeological remains dating back to Roman times. Salt manufacture was an important Roman industry in the south of the area. Agriculture also has ancient roots and managing tidal inundation to protect farmland is evident in banks and ditches dating from Anglo-Saxon times. Boston has been a major centre as a port and commercial area since the middle ages and later played a significant role in the saga of the Pilgrim Father’s journey to the new world and the founding of the USA. The area has 24 Conservation Areas (13 of which are in South Holland) and over 1000 Listed Buildings. The town of Boston has 3 Conservation areas and its built heritage is regarded as being of national significance by English Heritage. Lincolnshire (and nearby Norfolk) have established tourist economies in terms of both historical places of interest and seaside resorts. Boston and Spalding retain a strong commercial function within their historic cores that attracts visitors generated by the wider tourist economies.

2.9 For a sparsely populated, predominantly rural area, South East Lincolnshire, surprisingly, is of great importance in the national context. It is a huge resource as regards food production and food security and is at the forefront of meeting the challenge of climate change. This is in terms of both managing the potential adverse consequences and conserving scarce resources and developing sustainable energy solutions.
3.0 Vision and Strategic Priorities

3.1 A Vision for South East Lincolnshire

3.1.1 A vision has been prepared to guide sustainable development in South East Lincolnshire over the plan period to 2031. Whilst it is important that any vision has a local ‘flavour’ and is aspirational, ultimately it must be realistic and deliverable over the plan period. The vision statement is as follows:

South East Lincolnshire is a fenland landscape, predominantly rural in nature, comprising a collection of locally distinctive historic market towns and villages, agricultural land of national importance and internationally protected wildlife habitats. It is recognised as an important centre for food production, processing and distribution around which the local economy has developed.

Our Vision for South East Lincolnshire:

By 2031 South East Lincolnshire’s settlements and rural hinterland will have developed in response to the challenges of climate change, and particularly in respect of flood risk concerns, to have grown in a more sustainable manner to provide more diverse, prosperous, resilient and self-sustaining communities.

This will have been achieved by the delivery of new sustainably designed and constructed homes and employment opportunities to meet the needs of the whole population, supported by the necessary facilities, services and infrastructure.

The economic base of the area will have been strengthened by supporting existing businesses and by providing new opportunities that will build upon current strengths in food production, processing and distribution.

The delivery of key infrastructure, including highway improvements and measures to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding, will have kept pace with levels of growth to ensure that new development is both sustainable and deliverable.

The natural, built and historic environment will have been protected and enhanced, where appropriate, to ensure that their inherent social, economic and environmental qualities are retained and that opportunities for sustainable tourism can be realised. In meeting the needs of development, every effort will have been made to minimise the loss of high-quality agricultural land.

3.2 Strategic Priorities for South East Lincolnshire

3.2.1 It is a requirement of the NPPF that local planning authorities set out strategic priorities for the area covered by the Local Plan. The following strategic priorities for South East Lincolnshire are the main principles that will be followed to deliver the vision. They also set the broad direction for the detailed preferred policy approaches outlined in this document and in due course the policies that will be in the adopted Local Plan. They will also be used to help monitor the success of the Local Plans implementation. In light of this fact it is important that they, as with the vision, must be realistic and deliverable over the plan period.
Sustainable Development

1. To ensure that growth in South East Lincolnshire delivers sustainable development that seeks to meet the social and economic needs of the area, whilst protecting and enhancing its environment for the enjoyment of future generations.

2. To deliver development in sustainable locations that seeks to meet the needs of the whole area through the identification of a strategic planning framework that takes account of flood risk to guide the scale, distribution and nature of new development across South East Lincolnshire.

Housing

3. To seek to meet the housing needs of the whole of South East Lincolnshire's population, including the provision of an appropriate proportion of affordable housing for those in need.

Economy

4. To provide the right conditions and sufficient land in appropriate locations to diversify and strengthen the economic base of South East Lincolnshire to meet the needs of existing companies, to attract new businesses and sources of employment, and to take advantage of historic and environmental assets to maximise the potential for sustainable tourism.

5. To create a mutually-supportive hierarchy of vibrant self-contained centres providing employment, retailing and services for South East Lincolnshire by encouraging an appropriate scale of retail, leisure and other town-centre development and by maximising opportunities for regeneration.

Communities, Health and Well-Being

6. To seek to improve the quality of life for everyone who lives, visits, works and invests in South East Lincolnshire by protecting and enhancing access to homes, employment, retail, education, healthcare, community and leisure facilities, and open space.
3.3 Compatibility of the Strategic Priorities and SA Topics

3.3.1 It is necessary to carry out a compatibility test of the Strategy and Policies DPD ‘Strategic Priorities’ and the SA topics. Each of the above objectives is appraised against the SA topic areas, which are as follows: Air Quality (A); Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure (B); Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)(C); Community, Health and Well-Being (D); Economy and Employment (E); Flood Risk (F); Historic Environment (G); Housing (H); Land and Waste (I); Landscape (J); Transport (K); and, Water (L). The key to the following table is as follows:

- ✓ - Compatible
- X - Potentially in conflict
- ? – Uncertain
- 0 – No direct relationship or clear link

Environment

7. To protect and enhance, where appropriate, South East Lincolnshire’s natural, built and historic environment.

8. To adapt to, and mitigate against the effects of, climate change by reducing exposure to flood risk, minimising carbon emissions through the sustainable location, design and construction of new development, promoting energy efficiency and renewable energy, enhancing the green infrastructure network, and by minimising the need to travel.

9. To ensure that land is used efficiently and that the loss of South East Lincolnshire’s high-quality agricultural land resource is minimised by developing in sustainable locations, at appropriate densities and by prioritising the reuse of previously-developed land.

Transport

10. To improve accessibility for all to jobs, services and facilities, thereby minimising the need to travel.

11. To maximise the potential for modal shift to sustainable forms of transport, whilst recognising the importance of the private car in rural areas, by seeking to improve South East Lincolnshire’s highway infrastructure and thereby minimising congestion, improving road safety and aiding economic development.

Delivery

12. To ensure that development contributes to the provision of necessary physical, social and green infrastructure to deliver planned levels of growth and mitigate its impacts on existing communities and the environment.
Table 3.1: Compatibility testing of Strategic Priorities and SA Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Priorities / SA Topics</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.2 Broadly-speaking the Strategic Priorities for South East Lincolnshire are compatible with the SA topics. There are potentially a number of conflicts, primarily arising from the fact that new development of any sort will by its nature have an impact upon the environment. However, there are opportunities through policy to mitigate against these impacts. This will be considered more fully through the full SA report that will accompany the submission draft version of the Strategy and Policies DPD.
4.0 Housing Growth and Flood Risk

4.0.1 The Local Plan will cover the period from 2011 to 2031. This first chapter deals with the development of preferred policy options for the scale of additional housing development to be accommodated in South East Lincolnshire over the period of the Local Plan and the role of the flood-risk concept of flood hazard in influencing its location. These preferred policy options provide an essential context for the preparation of the rest of the proposals set out in the chapters which follow.

4.1 Policy Context

Local Plan Strategic Priorities

4.1.1 The following Local Plan strategic priorities are relevant:

- To ensure that growth in South East Lincolnshire delivers sustainable development that seeks to meet the social and economic needs of the area, whilst protecting and enhancing its environment for the enjoyment of future generations.
- To deliver development in sustainable locations that seeks to meet the needs of the whole area through the identification of a strategic planning framework that takes account of flood risk to guide the scale, distribution and nature of new development across South East Lincolnshire.
- To seek to meet the housing needs of the whole of South East Lincolnshire’s population, including the provision of an appropriate proportion of affordable housing for those in need.
- To adapt to, and mitigate against the effects of, climate change by reducing exposure to flood risk, minimising carbon emissions through the sustainable location, design and construction of new development, promoting energy efficiency and renewable energy, enhancing the green infrastructure network, and by minimising the need to travel.

National Planning Policy Framework

Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes

4.1.2 ‘To boost significantly the supply of housing, local planning authorities should:

- use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in this Framework; 
- identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites...sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirements with an additional buffer of 5% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land...';

1 To be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years and in particular that development of the site is viable. Sites with planning permission should be considered deliverable until permission expires, unless there is clear evidence that schemes will not be implemented within five years, for example they will not be viable, there is no longer a demand for the type of units or sites have long term phasing plans.

2 The buffer should be 20% if there has been a record of persistent underdelivery.
Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

4.1.3 ‘Inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk, but where development is necessary, making it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Local Plans should be supported by Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and develop policies to manage flood risk from all sources, taking account of advice from the Environment Agency and other relevant flood risk management bodies, such as lead local flood authorities and internal drainage boards. Local Plans should apply a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development to avoid where possible flood risk to people and property and manage any residual risk, taking account of the impacts of climate change, by:

- applying the Sequential Test;
- if necessary, applying the Exception Test;
- safeguarding land from development that is required for current and future flood management;
- using opportunities offered by new development to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding; and
- where climate change is expected to increase flood risk so that some existing development may not be sustainable in the long-term, seeking opportunities to facilitate the relocation of development, including housing, to more sustainable locations.’

4.1.4 ‘The aim of the Sequential Test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower probability of flooding. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment will provide the basis for applying this test. A sequential approach should be used in areas known to be at risk from any form of flooding. If, following application of the Sequential Test, it is not possible, consistent with wider sustainability objectives, for the development to be located in zones with a lower probability of flooding, the Exception Test can be applied if appropriate. For the Exception Test to be passed:

- it must be demonstrated that the development provides wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk, informed by a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment where one has been prepared; and
- a site-specific flood risk assessment must demonstrate that the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall.

4.1.5 Both elements of the test will have to be passed for development to be allocated or permitted.’

Using a proportionate evidence base

4.1.6 ‘Local planning authorities should have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area. They should:

- prepare a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) to assess their full housing needs, working with neighbouring authorities where housing market areas cross administrative boundaries. The SHMA should identify the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures that the local population is likely to need over the plan period which:
o meets household and population projections, taking account of migration and demographic change;
o addresses the need for all types of housing, including affordable housing and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes); and caters for housing demand and the scale of housing supply necessary to meet this demand;
o prepare a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) to establish realistic assumptions about the availability, suitability and the likely economic viability of land to meet the identified need for housing over the plan period.

4.1.7 ‘Local Plans may require a variety of other environmental assessments, including under the Habitats Regulations where there is a likely significant effect on a European wildlife site (which may not necessarily be within the same local authority area), Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and assessments of the physical constraints on land use… . Wherever possible, assessments should share the same evidence base and be conducted over similar timescales, but local authorities should take care to ensure that the purposes and statutory requirements of different assessment processes are respected.’

4.1.8 ‘Shoreline Management Plans should inform the evidence base for planning in coastal areas. The prediction of future impacts should include the longer term nature and inherent uncertainty of coastal processes (including coastal landslip), and take account of climate change.’

Technical Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework

4.1.9 ‘As set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk, but where development is necessary, making it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere. For these purposes:

- “areas at risk of flooding” means land within Flood Zones 2 and 3; or land within Flood Zone 1 which has critical drainage problems and which has been notified to the local planning authority by the Environment Agency;
- “flood risk” means risk from all sources of flooding - including from rivers and the sea, directly from rainfall on the ground surface and rising groundwater, overwhelmed sewers and drainage systems, and from reservoirs, canals and lakes and other artificial sources.’

4.1.10 ‘As set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, the aim of the Sequential Test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding. The flood zones (see table 4.1) are the starting point for this sequential approach. Zones 2 and 3 are shown on the flood map with Flood Zone 1 being all the land falling outside Zones 2 and 3. These flood zones refer to the probability of sea and river flooding only, ignoring the presence of existing defences.’

---

3 The planning policy for traveller sites sets out how travellers’ accommodation should also be assessed.
4 To access the flood map, see the Environment Agency’s website at: [http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/homeandleisure/floods/default.aspx](http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/homeandleisure/floods/default.aspx)
4.1.11 ‘Strategic Flood Risk Assessments...refine information on the probability of flooding, taking other sources of flooding and the impacts of climate change...into account. They provide the basis for applying the Sequential Test, on the basis of the flood zones in table 4.1. Where table 4.1 indicates the need to apply the Exception Test (as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework), the scope of a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment will be widened to consider the impact of the flood risk management infrastructure on the frequency, impact, speed of onset, depth and velocity of flooding within the flood zones considering a range of flood risk management maintenance scenarios. Where a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment is not available, the Sequential Test will be based on the Environment Agency flood zones.’

4.1.12 ‘The overall aim should be to steer new development to Flood Zone 1. Where there are no reasonably available sites in Flood Zone 1, local planning authorities allocating land in local plans or determining planning applications for development at any particular location should take into account the flood risk vulnerability of land uses (see table 4.2) and consider reasonably available sites in Flood Zone 2, applying the Exception Test if required... Only where there are no reasonably available sites in Flood Zones 1 or 2 should the suitability of sites in Flood Zone 3 be considered, taking into account the flood risk vulnerability of land uses and applying the Exception Test if required.’

Table 4.1: Flood Zones
(Note: These flood zones refer to probability of river and sea flooding, ignoring the presence of defences)

**Zone 1 – low probability**

**Definition**
This zone comprises land assessed as having a less than 1 in 1,000 annual probability of river or sea flooding (<0.1%).

**Appropriate uses**
All uses of land are appropriate in this zone.

**Flood risk assessment requirements**
For development proposals on sites comprising one hectare or above the vulnerability to flooding from other sources as well as from river and sea flooding, and the potential to increase flood risk elsewhere through the addition of hard surfaces and the effect of the new development on surface water run-off, should be incorporated in a flood risk assessment. This need only be brief unless the factors above or other local considerations require particular attention.

**Policy aims**
In this zone, developers and local authorities should seek opportunities to reduce the overall level of flood risk in the area and beyond through the layout and form of the development, and the appropriate application of sustainable drainage systems.\(^5\)

---

\(^5\) Sustainable drainage systems cover the whole range of sustainable approaches to surface drainage management. They are designed to control surface water run off close to where it falls and mimic natural drainage as closely as possible.
Zone 2 – medium probability

Definition
This zone comprises land assessed as having between a 1 in 100 and 1 in 1,000 annual probability of river flooding (1% - 0.1%), or between a 1 in 200 and 1 in 1,000 annual probability of sea flooding (0.5% - 0.1%) in any year.

Appropriate uses
Essential infrastructure and the water-compatible, less vulnerable and more vulnerable uses…are appropriate in this zone. The highly vulnerable uses are only appropriate in this zone if the Exception Test is passed.

Flood risk assessment requirements
All development proposals in this zone should be accompanied by a flood risk assessment.

Policy aims
In this zone, developers and local authorities should seek opportunities to reduce the overall level of flood risk in the area through the layout and form of the development, and the appropriate application of sustainable drainage systems.

Zone 3a – high probability

Definition
This zone comprises land assessed as having a 1 in 100 or greater annual probability of river flooding (>1%), or a 1 in 200 or greater annual probability of flooding from the sea (>0.5%) in any year.

Appropriate uses
The water-compatible and less vulnerable uses of land…are appropriate in this zone. The highly vulnerable uses should not be permitted in this zone. The more vulnerable uses and essential infrastructure should only be permitted in this zone if the Exception Test is passed. Essential infrastructure permitted in this zone should be designed and constructed to remain operational and safe for users in times of flood.

Flood risk assessment requirements
All development proposals in this zone should be accompanied by a flood risk assessment.

Policy aims
In this zone, developers and local authorities should seek opportunities to:
- reduce the overall level of flood risk in the area through the layout and form of the development and the appropriate application of sustainable drainage systems;
- relocate existing development to land in zones with a lower probability of flooding; and
- create space for flooding to occur by restoring functional floodplain and flood flow pathways and by identifying, allocating and safeguarding open space for flood storage.
Zone 3b – the functional floodplain

Definition
This zone comprises land where water has to flow or be stored in times of flood.

Local planning authorities should identify in their Strategic Flood Risk Assessments areas of functional floodplain and its boundaries accordingly, in agreement with the Environment Agency. The identification of functional floodplain should take account of local circumstances and not be defined solely on rigid probability parameters. But land which would flood with an annual probability of 1 in 20 (5%) or greater in any year, or is designed to flood in an extreme (0.1%) flood, should provide a starting point for consideration and discussions to identify the functional floodplain.

Appropriate uses
Only the water-compatible uses and the essential infrastructure listed in...that has to be there should be permitted in this zone. It should be designed and constructed to:
- remain operational and safe for users in times of flood;
- result in no net loss of floodplain storage;
- not impede water flows; and
- not increase flood risk elsewhere.

Essential infrastructure in this zone should pass the Exception Test.

Flood risk assessment requirements
All development proposals in this zone should be accompanied by a flood risk assessment.

Policy aims
In this zone, developers and local authorities should seek opportunities to:
- reduce the overall level of flood risk in the area through the layout and form of the development and the appropriate application of sustainable drainage systems;
- relocate existing development to land with a lower probability of flooding.
Table 4.2: Flood risk vulnerability classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential infrastructure</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Essential transport infrastructure (including mass evacuation routes) which has to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cross the area at risk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Essential utility infrastructure which has to be located in a flood risk area for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operational reasons, including electricity generating power stations and grid and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>primary substations; and water treatment works that need to remain operational in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>times of flood.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wind turbines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly vulnerable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Police stations, ambulance stations and fire stations and command centres and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>telecommunications installations required to be operational during flooding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Emergency dispersal points.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Basement dwellings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Caravans, mobile homes and park homes intended for permanent residential use3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Installations requiring hazardous substances consent. (Where there is a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demonstrable need to locate such installations for bulk storage of materials with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>port or other similar facilities, or such installations with energy infrastructure or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carbon capture and storage installations, that require coastal or water-side</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>locations, or need to be located in other high flood risk areas, in these instances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the facilities should be classified as “essential infrastructure”)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More vulnerable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hospitals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Residential institutions such as residential care homes, children’s homes, social</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>services homes, prisons and hostels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Buildings used for dwelling houses, student halls of residence, drinking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>establishments, nightclubs and hotels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Non–residential uses for health services, nurseries and educational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>establishments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Landfill and sites used for waste management facilities for hazardous waste6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sites used for holiday or short-let caravans and camping, subject to a specific</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warning and evacuation plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less vulnerable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Police, ambulance and fire stations which are not required to be operational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>during flooding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

6 Notes to table 4.2:

a. This classification is based partly on Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs and Environment Agency research on Flood Risks to People (FD2321/TR2) and also on the need of some uses to keep functioning during flooding.

b. Buildings that combine a mixture of uses should be placed into the higher of the relevant classes of flood risk sensitivity. Developments that allow uses to be distributed over the site may fall within several classes of flood risk sensitivity.

c. The impact of flood on the particular uses identified within this flood risk vulnerability classification will vary within each vulnerability class. Therefore, the flood risk management infrastructure and other risk mitigation measures needed to ensure the development is safe may differ between uses within a particular vulnerability classification.
• Buildings used for shops, financial, professional and other services, restaurants and cafes, hot food takeaways, offices, general industry, storage and distribution, non–residential institutions not included in “more vulnerable”, and assembly and leisure.
• Land and buildings used for agriculture and forestry.
• Waste treatment (except landfill and hazardous waste facilities).
• Minerals working and processing (except for sand and gravel working).
• Water treatment works which do not need to remain operational during times of flood.
• Sewage treatment works (if adequate measures to control pollution and manage sewage during flooding events are in place).

Water-compatible development
• Flood control infrastructure.
• Water transmission infrastructure and pumping stations.
• Sewage transmission infrastructure and pumping stations.
• Sand and gravel working.
• Docks, marinas and wharves.
• Navigation facilities.
• Ministry of Defence defence installations.
• Ship building, repairing and dismantling, dockside fish processing and refrigeration and compatible activities requiring a waterside location.
• Water-based recreation (excluding sleeping accommodation).
• Lifeguard and coastguard stations.
• Amenity open space, nature conservation and biodiversity, outdoor sports and recreation and essential facilities such as changing rooms.
• Essential ancillary sleeping or residential accommodation for staff required by uses in this category, subject to a specific warning and evacuation plan.

East Midlands Regional Plan

4.1.13 The East Midlands Regional Plan (the Regional Plan) notes that the panel conducting the Regional Plan Examination considered the regeneration and development needs of coastal settlements together with the increasing risk of future flooding, both from the sea and from rivers, which may result from coastal change. They concluded that there was a need for a coastal strategy to be prepared to provide a long-term strategic vision for the three coastal districts (i.e. the areas administered by Boston Borough, East Lindsey District and South Holland District Councils), outlining a strategy for integrating spatial and maritime planning to inform the next review of the Regional Plan. It would be important for this coastal strategy to provide a considerably longer-term perspective - beyond that typically covered by a Regional Plan - taking into consideration:
• strategic flood risk assessments;
• catchment management plans and shoreline management plans;
• economic strategies;
• protection of environmental and natural assets;
• the particular needs of European designated sites; and
• integration with coastal and flood management strategies in adjacent regions.
4.1.14 It should cover not only the infrastructure needs related to flood defences and flood mitigation measures around major settlements but also the protection of high-grade agricultural land. As part of the assessment, the future development and regeneration needs of the area should be considered, including the needs of the local economy and port developments. Accordingly, work commenced in 2008 on the preparation of what was to be known as the ‘Lincolnshire Coastal Study’ with a view to it being a key input to the coastal strategy that would be included in the next review of the Regional Plan (which was originally timetabled for completion in the autumn of 2011). In the meantime, it was intended that East Midlands Regional Plan Policy 5 (Strategy for Lincolnshire Coastal Districts), see Appendix 2, would provide a contingency whereby should the coastal strategy be agreed before the publication of the next Regional Plan, the coastal strategy should provide interim guidance for local plan preparation. Any such guidance should adopt a precautionary approach that seeks to meet local needs in a sustainable manner with due regard to flood risk and appropriate flood mitigation measures as appropriate. Until the strategy was agreed, housing provision in the three Coastal Districts was to be limited to the housing provision set out in Policy 13a [Regional Housing Provision (excluding Northamptonshire)] and, as the policy states, the housing provision figures in the three coastal districts should be regarded as ceilings. An abbreviated version of this policy to cover the two districts forming South East Lincolnshire (i.e. Boston Borough and South Holland District) is set out in Table 4.3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority area</th>
<th>Annual Apportionment From 2006</th>
<th>Total Housing Provision 2006-2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston Borough</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Holland District</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>7,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for South East Lincolnshire</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>10,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.15 Other relevant content includes:

- Boston and Spalding are defined as Sub-Regional Centres on the basis of their size, the range of services they provide and their potential to accommodate further growth; and their capacity to support sustainable development objectives (Policies 3 and 4 and their justification);
- Crowland, Holbeach, Long Sutton and Sutton Bridge are defined as Small Towns on the basis that they provide a more limited range of convenience shopping, education, community and health facilities and are suitable for development that meets local needs (Policies 3 and 4 and their justification).
- Policy 35 (A Regional Approach to Flood Risk) states that ‘Local Development Frameworks and the strategies of relevant public bodies should take account of the potential impact of climate change on flooding and land drainage. In particular, they should:
  - be informed by Strategic Flood Risk Assessments in order to evaluate actual flood risk. Priority areas for assessment include the built up areas of Derby, Nottingham and Newark;
o include policies which prevent inappropriate development either in, or where there would be an adverse impact on, the coastal and fluvial floodplain areas;
o deliver a programme of flood management schemes that also maximise biodiversity, provide townscape enhancement and other public benefits; and
o require sustainable drainage in all new developments where practicable.

4.1.16 Development should not be permitted if, alone or in conjunction with other new development, it would:
• be at unacceptable risk from flooding or create such an unacceptable risk elsewhere;
• inhibit the capacity of the floodplain to store water;
• impede the flow of floodwater in a way which would create an unacceptable risk elsewhere;
• have a detrimental impact upon infiltration of rainfall to ground water storage;
• otherwise unacceptably increase flood risk; and
• interfere with coastal processes.

4.1.17 However, such development may be acceptable on the basis of conditions or agreements for adequate measures to mitigate the effects on the overall flooding regime, including provision for the maintenance and enhancement of biodiversity. Any such measures must accord with the flood management regime for that location.

4.1.18 Following its formulation in May, 2010, the Coalition Government announced its intention to abolish all Regional Plans in England and return decision-making powers on housing and planning to local councils. This would result in decisions on housing supply (including the provision of travellers’ sites) resting with local planning authorities without the framework of regional numbers and plans. In the light of this announcement, work on the review of the East Midlands Regional Plan was discontinued, including preparation of a coastal strategy. In spite of the early intentions of the Coalition Government, none of the Regional Plans have yet been formally revoked. This means that the East Midlands Regional Plan remains part of the development plan for South East Lincolnshire. Another consideration is that the new NPPF represents updated national planning policy guidance which takes precedence and would reduce the weight that could be given to the content of the East Midlands Regional Plan in the circumstances where a conflict in policy approach is evident.

4.1.19 In response to the previously-mentioned Regional Plan Examination Panel’s request for a coastal strategy to be prepared which would inform preparation of the next review of the Regional Plan, the Lincolnshire Coastal Study Group (the Group) was formed in 2008, consisting of:
• Lincolnshire County Council;
• the coastal local authorities (Boston Borough, East Lindsey District and South Holland District Councils);
• the Government Office for the East Midlands (GOEM);
• East Midlands Development Agency (emda);
• the Environment Agency;

7http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/letterabolitionstrategies
• Natural England;
• East Midlands Regional Assembly; and
• the Internal Drainage Boards.

4.1.20 In 2008 the Group commissioned Atkins to prepare a Lincolnshire Coastal Study (the Coastal Study) with a view to making a fresh assessment of the future needs of the coastal area and to assist in providing a longer-term perspective for planning. For the purposes of the Coastal Study the ‘study area’ was defined as the areas administered by Boston Borough Council, East Lindsey District Council (excluding the Wolds) and South Holland District Council. The Coastal Study was completed in March 2010 (see Evidence Base).

The Wash Shoreline Management Plan 2

4.1.21 The Wash Shoreline Management Plan (SMP2) assesses the best ways to manage the risks of flooding and coastal erosion over the next 100 years. SMP2 aims to further the management of the shoreline to achieve a balance between the issues surrounding flood and erosion defence and the social, economic and environmental activities and values around the shoreline. Divided into the short, medium, and long term, the SMP2 uses the following time periods: epoch 1 (up to 2025), epoch 2 (2025 to 2055) and epoch 3 (2055 to 2105). Acknowledging the limitations imposed by current knowledge, uncertainty will mean that, over time, the intent of management policies will be less fixed. In the epoch up to 2025 the policy approach is to hold the defences in the current position and sustain their function so as to safeguard the existing level of flood risk. In the medium and long term, 2025 to 2105, the current alignment might be possible to hold, or localised landward realignment may be needed for part of the frontages around the Wash. Where necessary the timing, location and extent of realignment will be based on optimising defence sustainability, allowing time for adaptation, and compensating for affected habitats.

River Catchment Management Plans

4.1.22 The River Witham Catchment Flood Management Plan (2009), River Welland Catchment Flood Management Plan (2009) and River Nene Catchment Flood Management Plan (2009) provide an overview of flood risk in the respective catchments and set out preferred plans for sustainable flood risk management over the next 50 to 100 years. The approved Catchment Flood Management Plan policies across the Fens and at Spalding are premised on taking further action to sustain the current level of flood risk into the future, in response to the potential increase in risk from urban development, land use change and climate change. For Boston, an area of moderate to high flood risk, the general policy is to take further action to reduce flood risk. The most effective way to manage flood risk will be to improve the existing defences or create new ones and develop flood awareness and emergency response plans. Future development should be targeted to previously developed land. At Surfleet, an area of moderate to high flood risk, the general policy is to take further action to reduce flood risk by improving flood warning, resilience and awareness to the community, and to relocate vulnerable development.
Local Authority Corporate Plans and other Strategies

4.1.23 Boston Borough Council’s:

- Community Plan 2008-2018 includes the aim of maximising the opportunity for people to live in decent and affordable homes.
- Corporate Plan 2012-2015 supports helping to maintain and develop rural communities by permitting development for housing wherever possible, and working with the Homes and Communities Agency, housing providers and private developers to deliver new homes that meet local needs.
- Housing Strategy 2012 – 2017 identifies the following four strategic priorities:
  - Providing more homes;
  - Improving existing homes;
  - Living safely in your home; and
  - Facilitating access to your home.

4.1.24 South Holland District Council’s:

- Corporate Plan 2011-2015 identifies the provision of more affordable homes as one of its seven priorities.
- Housing Strategy 2006-2011 identifies the provision of more high-quality affordable housing and working with others in support of meeting the housing needs of the District as two of its four key priorities.

4.1.25 Lincolnshire-wide:

- The Lincolnshire Housing Strategy 2009-2014 identifies increasing the supply of affordable housing across Lincolnshire and increasing the supply of affordable homes in rural communities as two of its four priorities.

4.2 Evidence Base

Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report

4.2.1 Evidence from the Scoping Report highlights a number of key issues and problems in relation to housing in South East Lincolnshire:

- a general lack of delivery of affordable housing across the area;
- house prices are relatively low;
- Boston Borough Council has an estimated 3.6-year supply of deliverable sites; and
- South Holland District has in excess of the required 5.25-year supply of deliverable sites.

4.2.2 Evidence from the Scoping Report highlights a number of key issues and problems in relation to flood risk in South East Lincolnshire:

- a significant proportion of the area is at risk of hazard from coastal flooding, particularly in Boston Borough;
- there is also risk in certain areas from fluvial flooding; and
- a number of planning permissions has been granted contrary to Environment Agency (EA) advice. However, on the whole, these have related to minor developments.
4.2.3 Key relevant findings for Boston Borough include:
- a housing requirement for the period 2010-2031 constrained to East Midlands Regional Plan dwelling delivery of 5,500 dwellings (262 dpa); and
- a housing requirement for the period 2010-2033 derived from DCLG 2008-based household projections of 5,200 dwellings (226 dpa).

4.2.4 Key relevant findings for South Holland District include:
- annual need to provide 587 additional affordable housing units up to 2026;
- growth in household numbers derived from Office for National Statistics (ONS) 2008-based population projections results in a requirement for 470 additional dpa;
- growth based on East Midlands Regional Plan figures results in a requirement for 540 dpa; and
- growth based on the abandoned ‘Revised Draft East Midlands Regional Plan (Partial Review)’8 housing provision figures results in a requirement for 705 dpa.

4.2.5 The Lincolnshire Coastal Study9 addresses coastal flooding issues and puts forward a set of Principles for spatial development which would allow communities in the study area to develop and have a viable and prosperous future. The flood modelling and mapping used in the Coastal Study is restricted to flooding from the sea and estuaries (tidal flooding) and does not take into account other forms of flooding such as that from rivers. This is because the potential impact and consequences of a major tidal flood event (such as the tidal flooding that occurred in 1953) forms the largest type of flood risk to human life, property and agricultural land in the study area. Crucially, the Coastal Study follows the Wash Shoreline Management policies in relation to the line and standard of protection of coastal flood defences. The Coastal Study is therefore concerned with ‘residual flood risk’10.

4.2.6 The Coastal Study’s tidal flood maps illustrate the hazard due to flooding. The definition of flood hazard zones used in the Coastal Study follows the definition used

---

8 This document, prepared by the East Midlands Regional Assembly, was submitted to the Secretary of State on the 26 March 2010, in accordance with the provisions of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Following the formulation of the Coalition Government in May 2010, further work on its preparation was abandoned.

9 The full Coastal Study and its Summary Report can be viewed at: http://www.lincolnshire.gov.uk/residents/environment-and-planning/environment/lincolnshire-coastal-study/

10 Residual flood risk is based on the following assumptions:
- Use of a 1 in 200 year return period event (0.5% annual probability event);
- Use of Defra’s guidance of October 2006 on sea level rise, which for the Lincolnshire Coast is a 1.13m rise in mean relative sea level between 2006 and 2115;
- Modelling based on breaches of defences occurring as indicated (i.e. 100% defence failure probability at the 1 in 200 year water level). This takes a precautionary view; and
- Use of modelling based on existing defences.
by Defra\textsuperscript{11} and the Environment Agency. The classification is split into four categories, defined by the depth and velocity of flood waters and the related ability of people to evacuate the area once a flood occurs (Defra and Environment Agency, 2008). The ‘white’ zone (little or no hazard) was added for the purposes of the Coastal Study. See Appendix 3 for a description of the flood-hazard zones.

4.2.7 The Coastal Study Principles provide a set of strategic aims for spatial development that apply across the study area (see Appendix 4: Lincolnshire Coastal Study Principles). Principles 1 and 2 deal explicitly with two approaches to reducing the risks associated with flooding:

- managing the level of development in hazardous locations; and
- mitigating the consequences of flooding.

4.2.8 The Coastal Study is also concerned with the full range of sustainability issues, of which flood risk is one important part. Therefore, Principle 3 is focussed on improving socio-economic and environmental conditions in the area through spatial planning. In respect of the delivery of the Principles, the Coastal Study proposes that:

- major housing development will be largely delivered outside the three most severe forecast flood hazard zones (coloured red, orange and yellow – the ‘ROY’ zones); see Appendix 5: Residual coastal flood-hazard map;
- major housing development may be permitted in the low hazard zone (coloured green) subject to the mitigation of flood risk through flood-resilient design and emergency planning measures;
- other development, including housing to meet local housing needs, employment and business-related development, community infrastructure and buildings for use in emergencies may be permitted in the ROY zones subject to the mitigation of flood risk;
- the key to the delivery of buildings in the flood hazard zones is the implementation of flood-resilient design and emergency planning measures;
- measures to reduce risk to people in all flood hazard zones through emergency planning and flood resilience and to improve wider socio-economic conditions in the Coastal Study area can be delivered in a variety of ways and should involve national government and government agencies, regional organisations, local authorities and private sector businesses.

4.2.9 Owing to the previously-mentioned situation regarding the Government’s intentions to revoke Regional Plans, the Coastal Study was not used to inform a review of the East Midlands Regional Plan and remains a body of evidence which can be used to inform local plan work in the three Lincolnshire coastal districts. This was confirmed in a joint statement agreed in August 2010 (see Appendix 6: Joint Statement 2010) which was revised in September 2011 (see Appendix 7: Joint Statement 2011). A revised version of the Coastal Study Principles titled \textit{Planning for Coastal Flood Risk in South East Lincolnshire} was agreed in January 2012 (see Appendix 8). This paper seeks to clarify and refine the planning aims for areas at risk from coastal flooding in South East Lincolnshire, promoting sustainable development that reduces the number of people at risk of flood hazard.

\textsuperscript{11} Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
Demographic Projections for Coastal Districts in Lincolnshire

4.2.10 Following consideration of *Planning for Coastal Flood Risk in South East Lincolnshire*, officers determined that it was necessary to undertake detailed research into estimating both the current and forecast number of residents in those parts of South East Lincolnshire that are shown as being located in the ROY flood-hazard zones in order to enhance their understanding of the potential impact of restricting housing development in areas subject to significant flood hazard. Accordingly, Lincolnshire County Council, on behalf of the South East Lincolnshire Joint Policy Unit and East Lindsey District Council, commissioned Edge Analytics Ltd to prepare a study titled *Demographic Projections for Coastal Districts in Lincolnshire*. The purpose of this piece of work was to provide evidence-based sub-district population and household projections split between the combined ROY flood-hazard zones and the rest of the districts. These were labelled - for ease of reference only - 'wet' and 'dry' areas respectively.

4.2.11 Completed in March 2012, the principal outputs of this study were the preparation of population and household forecasts for the wet and dry areas of the three coastal districts up to 2031, based on the following six growth scenarios:

1) Trend projection A (2010-base, using the latest mid-year estimate revisions) - Migration–led A;
2) Trend projection B (2010-base, constrained to latest ONS sub-national projections) - Migration–led B;
3) Historical build rate scenario (based on recent housing completions) - CR 10-Year;
4) RSS scenario (based on targets in the East Midlands Regional Plan) - RSS;
5) Zero-dwelling growth scenario - Zero dwelling; and
6) Zero population growth scenario - Zero population.

4.2.12 The population estimates indicated that in 2010, 85% of Boston Borough’s population and 19% of South Holland District’s population lived in the so-called wet areas. Overall, 47% of South East Lincolnshire’s population were resident in wet areas. The Study found that scenarios 1) - 6) create annual requirements for additional dwellings in the four different parts of South East Lincolnshire as set out in Table 4.4 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Average number of dwellings per year 2011-2031</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boston Wet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration–led A</td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration–led B</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 10-Year</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSS</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero dwelling</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero Population</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4: Dwelling Projections for Coastal Districts in Lincolnshire

Strategic Flood Risk Assessments (SFRAs) relevant to the preparation of the Local Plan

4.2.13 The principal outputs from Boston Borough Council’s SFRA 2010 Update found:
- the majority of the Borough’s area is within Flood Zone 3 across all ROY flood-hazard categories;
- Boston town has a range of assessments for the probability of flooding with the historic core subject to high probability but large areas assessed as being at medium or low probability;
- Bicker and Swineshead have the least flood-risk issues including the majority of land categorised as subject to low flood hazard and low probability; and
- The rest of the Borough’s settlements, including Wrangle, Sutterton, Kirton, Butterwick, Fishtoft, Freiston and Old Leake, have land categorised as subject to flood hazard but with a low probability of flooding.

4.2.14 The principal outputs for South Holland District Council’s SFRA 2010 Update found:
- the majority of the District is within Flood Zone 3;
- the majority of the District has a medium to low probability of flooding but extensive areas of land around Spalding and Sutton Bridge\footnote{NB: Only the areas of Sutton Bridge and Spalding were subject to flood-hazard assessment in the South Holland District SFRA 2010 Update.} are categorised as subject to flood hazard;
- the area to the west of Spalding is less constrained by land categorised as subject to flood hazard and it has a low or medium probability of flooding; and
- Sutton Bridge and its surroundings are categorised as subject to flood hazard but with a high probability of flooding.

South East Lincolnshire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

4.2.15 Initial results from the preparation of the SHLAA indicate that there are deliverable and developable\footnote{To be considered developable, sites should be in a suitable location for housing development and there should be a reasonable prospect that the site is available and could be viably developed at the point envisaged.} sites that could accommodate approximately 6,000 dwellings in Boston Borough and 14,000 dwellings in South Holland District (see Appendix 9). However, it should be noted that the initial assessment of a site’s ‘developability’ has not been informed by the application of the ‘sequential approach’ in respect of flood risk or by detailed information contained in the relevant SFRAs. It should also be noted that the initial results for Boston Borough indicate that sites situated in areas not categorised as one of the ROY flood-hazard zones (the ‘Dry’ areas identified in Demographic Projections for Coastal Districts in Lincolnshire) account for only 242 of the identified 6,000 or so dwellings.

Housing completion data for South East Lincolnshire

4.2.16 Appendix 10 and Appendix 11 set out the annual dwelling completions recorded in the period 1976-2012 for Boston Borough and South Holland District respectively. Consideration of this long-term period allows the many ‘booms and busts’ in the housing market to be ‘averaged out’ into a more realistic annual completion rate. The cyclical nature of housing delivery is noticeable, particularly the impact of the current recession on housing delivery, which has resulted in the lowest annual completions in both Boston Borough and South Holland District since 1976. The
average annual rate of completions over the period 1976-2012 (the ‘historic rate’) for the two areas are:

- for Boston Borough: **263** dpa; and
- for South Holland District: **414** dpa.

4.2.17 The average annual completion figure for Boston Borough is just under the corresponding current Regional Plan annual provision of 270 dwellings from 2006. However, the average annual figure for South Holland District is well under the Regional Plan provision of 540 dwellings from 2006 (see Table 4.4).

### 4.3 Key Issues

4.3.1 The following key issues emerging from the policy context and evidence base require a policy response:

- The need to provide a strategic response to the issue of flood risk that: ensures that new development has flood resistance and resilience measures appropriate to its proposed use, location and for the lifetime of the development; ensures that future development does not increase the probability and severity of flooding; and reduces the probability of flooding in South East Lincolnshire through the development of infrastructure and strategic approaches to land use.

- In the proposed absence of a regionally-imposed target, there is a need to identify a requirement for housing growth in South East Lincolnshire up to 2031. Given that Boston Borough and South Holland District Councils retain their separate roles as local planning authorities for development management purposes, this requirement needs to be based on separate specified targets for Boston Borough and South Holland District - in order to address the issues arising from the requirement in the NPPF that local planning authorities maintain a supply of deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5-years worth of housing against requirements with an additional buffer\(^{15}\) for flexibility; and

- In view of the distribution of flood hazard in South East Lincolnshire and national planning policy that indicates that additional housing may be necessary in flood-risk areas to support sustainable development, there is a need to determine an approach to the provision of housing in those parts of South East Lincolnshire which are categorised as flood-hazard zone Red, Orange or Yellow (i.e. Danger for All, Danger for Most or Danger to Some), and together are described as the ‘ROY zones’.

### 4.4 Other Policies

4.4.1 This chapter is concerned with a strategic approach to flood risk and identifying the separate requirements for housing provision in Boston Borough and South Holland District and determining an approach to the provision of housing in the ROY zones. Other matters relating to the general distribution of housing development across South East Lincolnshire and the identification of broad locations for accommodating such development will be addressed in later chapters of this Preferred Options document. All site-specific allocations will be set out in the Site Allocations DPD. Matters related to flood risk are also incorporated into the Sustainable Development and Spatial Strategy and Environment chapters.

\(^{15}\) The buffer should amount to 5% or 20% if there has been a record of persistent under-delivery.
Approach to Flood Risk

4.5 Introduction

4.5.1 It is essential to outline an approach to flood risk. South East Lincolnshire has a significant number of communities and services in vulnerable but sustainable locations where flood risk is a significant threat. Such areas are dependent upon existing flood management measures to reduce the probability of this threat. In particular the sub-regional centre of Boston is not only the place of choice for a substantial proportion of the Plan areas residents and workers but also one of the major economic, social and service hubs for South East Lincolnshire. The need for new development of all types will arise in areas at risk from flooding and the Local Plan will need to ensure that, where justified, such development is provided in the safest locations and in itself does not increase the threat of flooding.

4.6 Reasonable Policy Options

4.6.1 It is considered that there is only one reasonable policy approach and that is one that gives clear guidance on how sustainable development, particular in respect of essential infrastructure, highly and more vulnerable development, will be managed through the local plan process and how the local plan process can contribute to improving the long term prospects of South East Lincolnshire in terms of its vulnerability to flood risk.

4.6.2 Option A: To produce a policy that sets out the strategic flood risk in South East Lincolnshire.

4.7 Unreasonable Policy Options

4.7.1 It is deemed unreasonable to not have a policy approach on flood risk and to instead rely upon the NPPF. South East Lincolnshire has particular challenges and needs related to flood risk and clear guidance is needed to provide certainty and confidence.

4.7.2 Similarly, to have a policy approach which seeks to impose guidelines to restrict development in respect of development in flood risk areas that were not supported by the NPPF would lead to fundamental challenge to the Plan and so is also deemed unreasonable.
### 4.8 Sustainability Appraisal

#### Table 4.5: SA – Flood Risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Key</th>
<th>Scoring for Topic Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major positive (√√)</td>
<td>Option A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor positive (√)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral (0)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Negative (X)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Negative (XX)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed (e.g. √√/X, √/X)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain (?)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.8.1 Air Quality: Option A will have a neutral impact.

#### 4.8.2 Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure: Option A will have a neutral impact.

#### 4.8.3 Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation): Option A will have a minor positive impact. Addressing the impacts of flood risk will help in adapting and mitigating against climate change.

#### 4.8.4 Community, Health and Well-being: Option A will have a neutral impact.

#### 4.8.5 Economy and Employment: Option A will have a neutral impact.

#### 4.8.6 Flood Risk: Option A will have a major positive impact. This is because it seeks to provide a positive approach to reducing the probability and consequences of flood risk.

#### 4.8.7 Historic Environment: Option A will have a neutral impact.

#### 4.8.8 Housing: Option A will have a neutral impact.
4.8.9 **Land and Waste:** Option A will have a neutral impact.

4.8.10 **Landscape:** Option A will have a neutral impact.

4.8.11 **Transport:** Option A will have a neutral impact.

4.8.12 **Water:** Option A will have a neutral impact.

4.8.13 **Conclusion:** Whilst in the main Option A will have a neutral impact, by providing a strategic approach to flood risk there are benefits in terms of flood risk and climate change.

4.9 **Delivery**

4.9.1 The policy option will be delivered through the Local Plan process; through decisions on strategic directions for growth and identification of options for flood risk management; the development management process; and, through the Site Allocations DPD.

4.10 **Preferred Option**

4.10.1 **Option A** is the only reasonable option and has sustainability benefits in terms of flood risk and climate change.

**Approach to Identifying the Quantity of Additional Housing to be Provided in South East Lincolnshire up to 2031**

4.11 **Introduction**

4.11.1 It is essential to identify a dwelling target aimed at meeting the housing needs of South East Lincolnshire which specifies separate targets for Boston Borough and South Holland District. Distinct targets are necessary for the purpose of enabling individual ‘five-year housing land supply’ arrangements to be created, and then managed by Boston Borough Council and South Holland District Council as separate local planning authorities for development management purposes.

4.12 **Reasonable Policy Options**

4.12.1 **Option A:** One approach to setting these targets is, in accordance with the NPPF, to use the objectively-assessed housing needs set out in the respective SHMAs covering Boston Borough and South Holland District.

4.12.2 **Option B:** A second reasonable option is to use the ‘Annual (housing) Apportionment from 2006’ contained in the East Midlands Regional Plan and to extend it up to 2031.

4.13 **Unreasonable Policy Options**

4.13.1 In view of the more recent population/household estimates which have informed the preparation of *Demographic Projections for Coastal Districts in Lincolnshire*, it could be argued that two further options could be formulated to take into account housing
targets based on the two migration-led scenarios (‘A’ and ‘B’) set out in the study\textsuperscript{16}. These additional options have been identified as:

- **Option C**: Use the ‘Migration-led A’ scenario set out in \textit{Demographic Projections for Coastal Districts in Lincolnshire} to inform housing targets for South East Lincolnshire.
- **Option D**: Use the ‘Migration-led B’ scenario set out in \textit{Demographic Projections for Coastal Districts in Lincolnshire} to inform housing targets for South East Lincolnshire.

4.13.2 A further unreasonable option would be ‘zero population growth’ (Option E). This scenario assumes that total population remains constant throughout the projection period (2011-2031). There is no population growth but the age profile of the population is allowed to change. It represents a precise interpretation of Principle 1 of the Lincolnshire Coastal Study to keep the population of these zones broadly stable. This scenario would result in annual housing growth amounting to 77 dwellings in Boston Borough and 129 dwellings in South Holland District.

4.13.3 The five different options for housing provision are set out in Table 4.6 below for information. However, when the earlier-recorded historic rate of completions is considered against them, it is clear that Options C and D would appear to be undeliverable, and therefore unreasonable, based on the experience of the last 35 years or so. Option E is deemed unreasonable as it does not meet the objectively assessed housing need for the area and is, therefore, contrary to the provisions of the NPPF.

\begin{table}
\centering
\caption{Table 4.6: Policy Options for determining a housing target for South East Lincolnshire}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Area} & \textbf{Dwellings per annum (2011-2031)} & & & & \\
 & \textbf{Option A} & \textbf{Option B} & \textbf{Option C} & \textbf{Option D} & \textbf{Option E} \\
\hline
\textit{Boston Borough} & 226 & 270 & 553 & 520 & 77 \\
\hline
\textit{South Holland District} & 470 & 540 & 683 & 627 & 129 \\
\hline
\textit{Total for South East Lincolnshire} & 696 & 810 & 1,236 & 1,147 & 206 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{16} These two scenarios are described in detail on page 12 of the study.
4.14 Sustainability Appraisal

Table 4.7: SA – Quantity of Additional Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Key</th>
<th>Major positive (✓✓)</th>
<th>Minor positive (✓)</th>
<th>Neutral (0)</th>
<th>Minor Negative (X)</th>
<th>Major Negative (XX)</th>
<th>Mixed (e.g. ✓✓/X, ✓/X)</th>
<th>Uncertain (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Scoring for Topic Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>X/?</td>
<td>X/?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity, Geodiversity &amp; Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>✓/?</td>
<td>✓/?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)</td>
<td>X/?</td>
<td>X/?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, Health and Well-being</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy and Employment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Risk</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Environment</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Waste</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>X/?</td>
<td>X/?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.14.1 Air Quality: Both options will have a mixed minor negative/uncertain impact on air quality as any new development will likely lead to increased air pollution, primarily due to increased road traffic. This may have a direct negative impact on the two identified Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) in the area. However, there is an element of uncertainty as a result of the undetermined nature of the spatial strategy and of the detailed locations for housing development. This will be dealt with later in this document and in the subsequent Site Allocations DPD.

4.14.2 Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure: Both options will have a mixed minor positive/uncertain impact. Any new development has the potential to impact upon protected sites of nature conservation importance. However, until site specifics are known (through the Site Allocations DPD) there will be uncertainty as to the nature of the impact. With any new development there is the potential positive impact of being able to ‘design in’ green infrastructure.

4.14.3 Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation): Both options will have a mixed minor negative/uncertain impact. Any new development is likely to increase greenhouse gas emissions, both directly and indirectly. There are potential positive impacts through the opportunities to require new energy-efficient design and construction and to require that all housing proposals in flood-hazard areas will only be considered for approval subject to the mitigation of flood risk through flood-resilient design and
emergency planning. However, there is an element of uncertainty as a result of the undetermined nature of the spatial strategy and of the detailed locations for housing development. This will be dealt with later in this document and in the subsequent Site Allocations DPD.

4.14.4 Community, Health and Well-being: Both options will have a minor positive impact. The provision of additional housing will have a positive impact on both health and equality. There is also the potential for new development to support the funding of new community infrastructure.

4.14.5 Economy and Employment: Both options will have a minor positive impact. More housing will give rise to a larger population which has the potential to broaden the diversity of skills on offer and, in turn, support business diversification and growth. Specifically, the provision of additional housing will help to maintain employment in the construction sector and related industries.

4.14.6 Flood Risk: Both options will have an uncertain impact until policy approaches about the distribution and design/construction of additional housing in respect of flood-risk considerations are finalised. However, there is a potential opportunity to require that all housing proposals in flood-hazard areas will only be considered for approval subject to the mitigation of flood risk through flood-resilient design and emergency planning.

4.14.7 Historic Environment: Both options will have an uncertain impact. This is because site specifics will be considered at a later date through the production of the Site Allocations DPD and through the development management process.

4.14.8 Housing: Both options will have a major positive impact as they will, to varying degrees, help to meet housing needs across South East Lincolnshire.

4.14.9 Land and Waste: Both options will have a minor negative impact. Any new greenfield development will result in permanent loss of agricultural land. New development will also likely lead to greater levels of waste generation.

4.14.10 Landscape: Both options will have a minor negative impact. Any new development on greenfield land will inevitably impact upon landscape but the precise nature of that impact will be dependent on the design, layout and landscaping of a particular development.

4.14.11 Transport: Both options will have a mixed minor negative/uncertain impact. Any new development is likely to lead to higher levels of road traffic and could exacerbate perceived congestion problems. However, there is an element of uncertainty as a result of the undetermined nature of the spatial strategy and of the detailed locations for housing development. This will be dealt with later in this document and in the subsequent Site Allocations DPD.

4.14.12 Water: Both options will have a minor negative impact. Any new development is likely to increase pressure on water resources.

4.14.13 Conclusion: Whilst there is some uncertainty over the impacts of these options and potential for minor negative impacts, they both have a major positive impact in seeking to meet the housing needs of South East Lincolnshire. The precise nature of some of the impacts will be dependent on the distribution of development set out
in the spatial strategy, policy approaches on other housing matters and proposals in the Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD).

4.15 Delivery

4.15.1 The delivery of both options will be guided by the framework provided by the spatial strategy, other housing-related policies, the Site Allocations DPD where appropriate, and the development management process. Most significant housing proposals will require appropriate supporting infrastructure which will be identified through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).

4.15.2 Given the historic rate of housing delivery in South East Lincolnshire and the uncertainty surrounding the economic situation looking ahead over the next few years at least, it is considered that the lower housing target represented by Option A is the most deliverable. The delivery of overall targets for additional dwellings will be monitored through an annual 'Monitoring Report'.

4.16 Preferred Option

4.16.1 Option A is the preferred option because it is considered deliverable when compared with historic building rates. If a higher growth target were to be identified (e.g. Option B), there is an increased likelihood of the local planning authorities being unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites and consequent fears about 'unplanned growth'.

4.16.2 Although the period of the Local Plan extends up to 2031, revisions in respect of factors such as housing land supply will be necessary at timely intervals before that date. The housing needs, indicated by the SHMAs, are considered to be the most objective and comprehensive assessments for the short to medium term. It is also the case that in the actual identification of broad locations for housing development (where much of the housing needs could be met) there will be considerable flexibility to provide for accelerated annual completion rates according to market conditions.

Approach to the Provision of Additional Housing in Those Parts of South East Lincolnshire that are Categorised as Either Flood-Hazard Zone Red, Orange or Yellow

4.17 Introduction

4.17.1 In the light of the substantial and varied policy and evidential background relating to the issue of housing development in areas at risk from flooding, there is a need to develop an approach which indicates what quantity of additional housing – if any – could be provided in areas categorised as a Red, Orange or Yellow flood-hazard zone in the Coastal Study subject to satisfying other relevant planning considerations.

4.17.2 Although the Local Plan presents an opportunity to look at a broadly strategic approach to housing delivery and flood risk across both Boston Borough and South Holland District, this has its complexities.

4.17.3 Firstly, both areas have different housing market areas (as evidenced in the SHMAs) and, therefore, there is some uncertainty as to whether increasing the apportionment
in one area can meet the housing needs in the other. This is especially the case where the delivery of market housing may be needed to support the provision of affordable housing.

4.17.4 Secondly, there is a significant contrast between the two sub-regional centres of Boston and Spalding with regard to flood risk. Boston is almost entirely categorised as a Red, Orange or Yellow flood-hazard zone with some parts having a high or medium probability of flooding, whereas Spalding is far less affected by flood hazard and has a medium to low probability of flooding. However, for reasons stated in the previous paragraph, it is highly uncertain whether a strategic approach that attempted to deliver a substantial proportion of the housing needs for Boston, in Spalding, would work.

4.18 Reasonable Policy Options

4.18.1 **Option A**: One reasonable approach is to set separate limits on the number of additional dwellings provided in the Red, Orange and Yellow flood-hazard zones (the ROY zones) for Boston Borough and South Holland District based on the approach outlined in Principal 1 in *Planning for Coastal Flood Risk in South East Lincolnshire* (see Appendix 8).

4.18.2 The limits would be calculated in each case by multiplying the proposed housing target for the area by the proportion of its total population resident in the ROY zones as at 2010\(^\text{17}\). The formulation of separate limits for Boston Borough and South Holland District provides a ‘combined cap’ which is lower than that of a single limit calculated for South East Lincolnshire as a whole. See Figure 4.1 below which is based on the Preferred Option A housing targets (see Table 4.6 above).

**Figure 4.1**: Potential Housing Limit in ROY zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Limit for Boston Borough</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Target (dwellings per annum [dpa])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Population in the ROY zones:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= 192 dpa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Limit for South Holland District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Target (dpa):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Population in the ROY zones:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= 89 dpa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.18.3 **Option B**: Another reasonable approach, and one that reflects the spirit and purpose of the Lincolnshire Coastal Study, would be to reduce the dwelling limits for both the

\(^{17}\) See page 12 of *Demographic Projections for Coastal Districts in Lincolnshire*. 
Boston Borough ROY zones and the South Holland District ROY zones set out in Option A by a small proportion having regard to the following considerations:

- Although the great majority of the town of Boston is categorised as either a Red, Orange or Yellow flood-hazard zone, its role as a sub-regional centre and the largest settlement in South East Lincolnshire means that it remains strongly-suited as a location for accommodating growth. Accordingly, only a small reduction in the limit for Boston Borough from 192 to 180 dpa is considered to be realistic (effectively a reduction from 85% to 80%).

- It is still possible to meet a desire to accommodate some limited housing growth in the towns of Long Sutton and Sutton Bridge, both of which are totally categorised as either a Red, Orange or Yellow flood-hazard zone, and facilitate higher growth in Holbeach, which is significantly affected by such zones, whilst reducing the limit for South Holland District from 89 dpa to 60 dpa (effectively a reduction from 19% to 13%).

### 4.19 Unreasonable Policy Options

4.19.1 A further option could involve preventing any housing growth in areas categorised as one of the ROY zones. However, it would be unreasonable to prevent any additional housing growth in the ROY zones as the Demographic Projections for Coastal Districts in Lincolnshire indicates that this would result in an estimated population decline of 3,791 people in such areas across South East Lincolnshire over the 21-year period: 2010-2031. The town of Boston would be the settlement most affected by population loss through this policy approach and since it would be unable to assist in meeting the previously-identified preferred housing target for Boston Borough, this approach could raise concerns about the town’s future role and function as a sub-regional centre.

4.19.2 In reality, an approach that prevented housing growth in ROY zones would be impractical. There would be no support in terms of national planning policy for such an approach, and, even if broad locations were not facilitated in such areas, planning applications would still have to be determined for residential development, probably on the basis that a 5.25-year supply of deliverable housing sites was not provided, particularly, in Boston Borough. Furthermore, both Boston Borough and South Holland District have seen considerable population growth in the last 10 years, some of which would appear to have been uninfluenced by housing-building rates.

4.19.3 Another option could assume that the total population in the ROY zones remains constant throughout the plan period (2011-2031). There is no population growth but the age profile of the population is allowed to change. It represents a precise interpretation of Principle 1 of the Lincolnshire Coastal Study which seeks to keep the population of these zones broadly stable. As with the option above, the impact of this approach on Boston Borough would be very significant. The Demographic Projections for Coastal Districts in Lincolnshire study indicates that this would result in a limit of 62 dwellings per year in the Boston Borough ROY zones. Such a figure bears no comparison with Options A and B and is, therefore, considered unreasonable.

4.19.4 Finally, with respect to each district housing target, no limit on housing growth in areas categorised as ROY zones could be applied. However, even assuming that all additional dwellings in such areas would be subject to the mitigation of flood risk through flood-resilient design and emergency planning, it would be unreasonable to consider an approach which makes no attempt to reflect concerns, expressed in the
Lincolnshire Coastal Study in particular, about the threat posed to the safety of people by the risk of flood hazard. Such an approach would also be contrary to national planning policy considerations.

4.20 Sustainability Appraisal

Table 4.8: SA – Additional Housing in ROY zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Key</th>
<th>Major positive (✓✓)</th>
<th>Minor positive (✓)</th>
<th>Neutral (0)</th>
<th>Minor Negative (X)</th>
<th>Major Negative (XX)</th>
<th>Mixed (e.g. ✓/X, ✓/X)</th>
<th>Uncertain (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring for Topic Areas</th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>X/?</td>
<td>X/?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity, Geodiversity &amp; Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>✓/?</td>
<td>✓/?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)</td>
<td>X/?</td>
<td>X/?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, Health and Well-being</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy and Employment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Risk</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Environment</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Waste</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>X/?</td>
<td>X/?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.20.1 Air Quality: Both options will have a mixed minor negative/uncertain impact on air quality as any new development will likely lead to increased air pollution, primarily due to increased road traffic. This may have a direct negative impact on the two identified Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) in the area. However, there is an element of uncertainty as a result of the undetermined nature of the spatial strategy and of the detailed locations for housing development. This will be dealt with later in this document and in the subsequent Site Allocations DPD.

4.20.2 Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure: Both options will have a mixed minor positive/uncertain impact. Any new development has the potential to impact upon protected sites of nature conservation importance. However, until site specifics are known (through the Site Allocations DPD) there will be uncertainty as to the nature of the impact. With any new development there is the potential positive impact of being able to ‘design in’ green infrastructure.

4.20.3 Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation): Both options will have a mixed minor negative/uncertain impact. Any new development is likely to increase greenhouse
gas emissions, both directly and indirectly. Any new development is likely to increase greenhouse gas emissions, both directly and indirectly. There are potential positive impacts through the opportunities to require new energy-efficient design and construction and to require that all housing proposals in flood-hazard areas will only be considered for approval subject to the mitigation of flood risk through flood-resilient design and emergency planning. However, there is an element of uncertainty as a result of the undetermined nature of the spatial strategy and of the detailed locations for housing development. This will be dealt with later in this document and in the subsequent Site Allocations DPD.

4.20.4 Community, Health and Well-being: Both options will have a minor positive impact. The provision of additional housing will have a positive impact on both health and equality. There is also the potential for new development to support the funding of new community infrastructure.

4.20.5 Economy and Employment: Both options will have a minor positive impact. More housing will give rise to a larger population which has the potential to broaden the diversity of skills on offer and, in turn, support business diversification and growth. Specifically, the provision of additional housing will help to maintain employment in the construction sector and related industries.

4.20.6 Flood Risk: Both options will have a minor negative effect in providing for additional dwellings in areas categorised as Red, Orange or Yellow flood-hazard zone. However, both options represent a cap on housing growth in these areas. Furthermore, there is the opportunity to require that all housing proposals in flood-hazard areas will only be permitted subject to the mitigation of flood risk through flood-resilient design and emergency planning. There is also the potential for new development to support the funding of new flood-defence-related infrastructure.

4.20.7 Historic Environment: Both options will have an uncertain impact. This is because site specifics will be considered at a later date through the production of the Site Allocations DPD and through the development management process.

4.20.8 Housing: Both options will have a major positive impact as they will, to varying degrees, help to meet housing needs across South East Lincolnshire.

4.20.9 Land and Waste: Both options will have a minor negative impact. Any new greenfield development will result in permanent loss of agricultural land. New development will also likely lead to greater levels of waste generation.

4.20.10 Landscape: Both options will have a minor negative impact. Any new development on greenfield land will inevitably impact upon landscape but the precise nature of that impact will be dependent on the design, layout and landscaping of a particular development.

4.20.11 Transport: Both options will have a mixed minor negative/uncertain impact. Any new development is likely to lead to higher levels of road traffic and could exacerbate existing congestion problems. However, there is an element of uncertainty as a result of the undetermined nature of the spatial strategy and of the detailed locations for housing development. This will be dealt with later in this document and in the subsequent Site Allocations DPD. Whilst there is uncertainty as a result of the undetermined nature of the spatial strategy, both options would support a concentration of housing growth in both Boston and Spalding. More concentrated
housing growth could create the potential positive impact of providing the critical mass required to sustain or enhance public transport services and to offer or improve opportunities for cycling and walking. There is also the potential for new housing development to support the funding of new transport infrastructure.

4.20.12 Water: Both options will have a minor negative impact. Any new development is likely to increase pressure on water resources.

4.20.13 Conclusion: Whilst there is some uncertainty over the impacts of these options and potential for minor negative impacts, they both have a major positive impact in seeking to meet the housing needs of South East Lincolnshire. In overall terms, whilst there is no difference in the score relative to the baseline situation, relatively speaking, Option B represents a slightly more sustainable approach than Option A in respect of flood-hazard concerns. This is because it places a greater restriction on the number of additional dwellings that could be provided in areas categorised as either Red, Orange or Yellow flood-hazard zones.

4.21 Delivery

4.21.1 The results of the SHLAA indicate that there are sufficient alternative sites available in Boston Borough to support the restrictions on housing development in the ROY zones represented by Options A and B and enable the overall housing target for the Borough to be met.

4.21.2 The delivery of both options will be guided by the framework provided by the spatial strategy, other housing-related policies, the Site Allocations DPD where appropriate, and the development management process. Most significant housing proposals will require appropriate supporting infrastructure which will be identified through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).

4.21.3 There are no significant relative delivery benefits between Options A and B. The location of the delivery of additional dwellings will be monitored through an annual Monitoring Report.

4.22 Preferred Option

4.22.1 Option B is considered to be the most reasonable option as it seeks to provide for a lower level of housing growth in the Red, Orange and Yellow flood-hazard zones.

4.22.2 It should also be noted that, in applying Option B, a sequential approach will be applied to selecting the broad locations at least hazard and/or probability of flooding which is an additional refinement to the approach taken in assessing whether or not locations are situated in one of the ROY zones. Whereas housing delivery within South East Lincolnshire will need to take place in areas at risk of flooding, the plan-making process will also create betterment through a strategic approach to the provision of flood-mitigation measures.

4.23 Reason for Preferred Policy Approaches

4.23.1 This chapter has been prepared in response to the uncertainty arising out of the preparation of the current East Midlands Regional Plan regarding the scale of housing growth that should be accommodated in the Lincolnshire coastal districts due to concerns about the increasing risk of future flooding. It is clear from the
information presented that there are limited reasonable options for dealing with the
three key issues resulting from the policy context and evidence base. Based on the
above conclusions, it is proposed to take forward two preferred policy approaches.
The first will provide a strategic approach to flood risk. The second will cover the
scale of housing growth to be accommodated separately in the Boston Borough and
South Holland District parts of South East Lincolnshire and will also state, separately
for Boston Borough and South Holland District, the maximum number of additional
dwellings that could be provided in areas categorised as either Red, Orange or
Yellow flood-hazard zones.

4.23.2 These preferred policy approaches will provide the platform for the development of
other preferred policy approaches dealing with the distribution and scale of
development across South East Lincolnshire.

4.24 Preferred Policy Approaches

**Strategic Approach to Flood Risk**

Major development shall be located in areas at the lowest hazard or probability of flooding
and shall not, in itself, increase flood risk. Where the development would be for uses
defined as Essential Infrastructure, Highly Vulnerable or More Vulnerable it will be a
requirement to show why the need for the development is exceptional where the hazard or
probability of flooding of the sequentially selected areas is constrained. Any mitigation for
flood risk required by such development will be provided for the lifetime of the
development.

Flood risk management infrastructure shall be provided at the strategic level, where
development opportunities allow, to reduce the hazard and probability of flooding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening of Preferred Policy Approach (✓/X)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the policy lead to development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the policy specify a quantity or type of development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the policy specify a location for development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the policy implemented through other policies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the policy concentrate development in urban areas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the policy steer development away from European or Ramsar sites?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the policy protect the natural environment?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.24.1 This policy approach seeks to provide a strategic response to flood risk. It is not
directly concerned with levels or locations of growth. Therefore, it is considered that
this policy can be screened out of the Habitats Regulations Assessment process.
Table 4.10: Equalities Assessment – Strategic Approach to Flood Risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equalities Analysis of Preferred Policy Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(✓ - may benefit) (0 – neutral) (X – adverse impact)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Gender re-assignment</th>
<th>Marriage &amp; civil partnership</th>
<th>Pregnancy &amp; maternity</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Religion or belief</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Sexual orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.24.2 The provisions of this policy will have the same impact on all groups.

Provision for Housing

Provision will be made for a net increase of at least 13,920 dwellings in South East Lincolnshire in accordance with the requirements set out in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority area</th>
<th>Annual Apportionment From 2011</th>
<th>Total Housing Provision 2011-2031</th>
<th>Maximum number of dwellings provided in areas categorised as Red, Orange or Yellow flood-hazard zones (as defined in the Lincolnshire Coastal Study)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston Borough</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>4,520</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Holland District</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>9,400</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Lincolnshire</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>13,920</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 4.11**: HRA/AA Screening – Provision for Housing

| Screening of Preferred Policy Approach (✓/X) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Does the policy lead to development? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | X | X |

4.24.3 Given that this policy approach is concerned with levels and broad locations of development, it is considered that there is potential for significant effects on a European or Ramsar site. As such, it should be screened by the Habitats Regulations Assessment process.

**Table 4.12**: Equalities Assessment – Provision for Housing

| Equalities Analysis of Preferred Policy Approach (✓ - may benefit) (0 – neutral) (X – adverse impact) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Age | Disability | Gender re-assignment | Marriage & civil partnership | Pregnancy & maternity | Race | Religion or belief | Sex | Sexual orientation |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

4.24.4 The provisions of this policy will have the same impact on all groups.
5.0 **Sustainable Development and Spatial Strategy**

5.0 This chapter focuses on sustainable development and policy options for the distribution of development across South East Lincolnshire. It has been prepared having regard to the previous chapter on housing growth and flood risk and, in particular, the preferred policy approach to development in the Red, Orange and Yellow (ROY) flood hazard zones.

5.1 **Policy Context**

**Local Plan Strategic Priorities**

5.1.1 The following Local Plan strategic priorities are relevant:

- To ensure that growth in South East Lincolnshire delivers sustainable development that seeks to meet the social and economic needs of the area, whilst protecting and enhancing its environment for the enjoyment of future generations.
- To deliver development in sustainable locations that seeks to meet the needs of the whole area through the identification of a strategic planning framework that takes account of flood risk to guide the scale, distribution and nature of new development across South East Lincolnshire.

**National Planning Policy Framework**

**Achieving sustainable development**

5.1.2 ‘There are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. These dimensions give rise to the need for the planning system to perform a number of roles:

- **an economic role** – contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure;
- **a social role** – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community’s needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being; and
- **an environmental role** – contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy.’

5.1.3 ‘These roles should not be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependent. Economic growth can secure higher social and environmental standards, and well-designed buildings and places can improve the lives of people and communities. Therefore, to achieve sustainable development, economic, social and environmental gains should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system. The planning system should play an active role in guiding development to sustainable solutions.’
5.1.4 ‘Pursuing sustainable development involves seeking positive improvements in the quality of the built, natural and historic environment, as well as in people’s quality of life, including (but not limited to):

- making it easier for jobs to be created in cities, towns and villages;
- moving from a net loss of bio-diversity to achieving net gains for nature;
- replacing poor design with better design;
- improving the conditions in which people live, work, travel and take leisure; and
- widening the choice of high quality homes.’

5.1.5 ‘Plans and decisions need to take local circumstances into account, so that they respond to the different opportunities for achieving sustainable development in different areas.’

The presumption in favour of sustainable development

5.1.6 ‘At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking. For plan-making this means that:

- local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area;
- Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, unless:
  - any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or
  - specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.

5.1.7 For decision-taking this means:

- approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and
- where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless:
  - any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or
  - specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.’

5.1.8 ‘Policies in Local Plans should follow the approach of the presumption in favour of sustainable development so that it is clear that development which is sustainable can be approved without delay. All plans should be based upon and reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development, with clear policies that will guide how the presumption should be applied locally.’

Core planning principles

5.1.9 ‘Within the overarching roles that the planning system ought to play, a set of core land-use planning principles should underpin both plan-making and decision-taking. These 12 principles are that planning should:

- be genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings, with succinct local and neighbourhood plans setting out a positive vision for
the future of the area. Plans should be kept up-to-date, and be based on joint
working and co-operation to address larger than local issues. They should
provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications
can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency;

- not simply be about scrutiny, but instead be a creative exercise in finding
  ways to enhance and improve the places in which people live their lives;
- proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver
  the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local
  places that the country needs. Every effort should be made objectively to
  identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of
  an area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth. Plans
  should take account of market signals, such as land prices and housing
  affordability, and set out a clear strategy for allocating sufficient land which is
  suitable for development in their area, taking account of the needs of the
  residential and business communities;
- always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for
  all existing and future occupants of land and buildings;
- take account of the different roles and character of different areas, promoting
  the vitality of our main urban areas, protecting the Green Belts around them,
  recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and
  supporting thriving rural communities within it;
- support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate, taking full
  account of flood risk and coastal change, and encourage the reuse of existing
  resources, including conversion of existing buildings, and encourage the use
  of renewable resources (for example, by the development of renewable
  energy);
- contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing
  pollution. Allocations of land for development should prefer land of lesser
  environmental value, where consistent with other policies in this Framework;
- encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously
  developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental
  value;
- promote mixed use development, and encourage multiple benefits from the
  use of land in urban and rural areas, recognising that some open land can
  perform many functions (such as for wildlife, recreation, flood risk mitigation,
  carbon storage, or food production);
- conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that
  they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future
  generations;
- actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public
  transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations
  which are or can be made sustainable; and
- take account of and support local strategies to improve health, social and
  cultural wellbeing for all, and deliver sufficient community and cultural facilities
  and services to meet local needs.

East Midlands Regional Plan

5.1.10 Policy 1 of the Regional Plan outlines a number of ‘Regional Core Objectives’ as
follows:

- ‘to ensure that the existing housing stock and new affordable and market
  housing address need and extend choice in all communities in the region;
to reduce social exclusion;
• to protect and enhance the environmental quality of urban and rural settlements;
• to improve the health and mental, physical and spiritual well being of the Region’s residents;
• to improve economic prosperity, employment opportunities and regional competitiveness;
• to improve accessibility to jobs, homes and services;
• to protect and enhance the environment;
• to achieve a ‘step change’ increase in the level of the Region’s biodiversity;
• to reduce the causes of climate change;
• to reduce the impacts of climate change; and
• to minimise adverse environmental impacts of new development and promote optimum social and economic benefits.’

5.1.11 Policy 3 (Distribution of New Development) outlines that appropriate development of a lesser scale should be located in the Sub-Regional Centres e.g. Boston and Spalding. It also states that ‘the development needs of other settlements and rural areas should also be provided for. New development in these areas should contribute to:
• maintaining the distinctive character and vitality of rural communities;
• shortening journeys and facilitating access to jobs and services;
• strengthening rural enterprise and linkages between settlements and their hinterlands; and
• respecting the quality of tranquillity, where that is recognised in planning documents.’

5.1.12 Policy 4 (Development in the Eastern Sub-area) includes the following relevant requirements:
• consolidate and where appropriate strengthen the Sub-Regional Centres of Boston, Grantham and Spalding;
• maintain and enhance the roles of the defined Main and Small Towns as locally significant service and employment centres through the protection of existing retail and community facilities, and sustainably located new housing and local employment generating development;
• strengthen the role of the food production and distribution industry;
• promote sustainable patterns of development in those parts of the Sub-area bordering major urban areas in other regions, in particular Peterborough; and
• protect and enhance the natural and historic environment of the coastal margin including the Wash.

Local Authority Corporate Plans and other Strategies

5.1.13 Boston Borough Council’s:
• Community Plan 2008-2018 sets out a number of ambitions that will contribute to sustainable development and actions to achieve them. However, there is no overall ambition relating to sustainable development.
• Corporate Plan 2012-2015 makes no specific reference to sustainable development but does include a number of ambitions that will contribute to it.
5.1.14 South Holland District Council’s:

- Corporate Plan 2011-2015 has many priorities relating to specific sustainability outcomes but no overall approach on sustainable development.

5.2 Evidence Base

Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report

5.2.1 The Scoping Report provides a comprehensive body of evidence across the whole spectrum of what constitutes sustainable development.

Boston Borough and South Holland Local Plans

5.2.2 The adopted Boston Borough Local Plan (1999) does not include a settlement hierarchy but there is a presumption against development in the countryside (Policy CO1). The Interim Plan adopts the same approach to development in the countryside but identifies a spatial strategy in the form of a settlement hierarchy as a way of governing the distribution and level of housing development including: Boston (the town of Boston and urban parts of Fishtoft and Wyberton wards) as the Urban Area, and in the rural area, Kirton as a Main Service Centre and Butterwick, Old Leake, Sutterton and Swineshead as Service Villages and a further 22 named Other Villages’ (Algarkirk, Amber Hill, Benington, Bicker, Fishtoft, Fosdyke, Frampton, Frampton West, Freiston, Haltoft End, Holland Fen, Hubberts Bridge, Kirton End, Kirton Holme, Langrick Bridge, Leake Commonside, Leverton, Swineshead Bridge, Wigtoft, Wrangle, Wrangle Common and Wyberton).

5.2.3 The adopted South Holland Local Plan (2006) includes the following settlement hierarchy (Policy SG3):

- ‘Main Town – Spalding is defined as the District’s principal urban settlement. It will be the main location for new development.
- Area Centres - the towns of Holbeach, Long Sutton, Sutton Bridge and Crowland and the main village of Donington are defined as Area Centres. They will continue to provide for housing, employment and commercial development to support their roles as service centres for surrounding rural areas.
- Group Centres - the villages of Cowbit, Deeping St Nicholas, Fleet Hargate, Gedney Hill, Gosberton, Moulton, Moulton Chapel, Pinchbeck, Sutton St James, Weston and Whaplode will act as local service centres for the surrounding rural area. New development in these settlements should support or improve their role as a focus for local social and economic activity, having regard to their role within clusters or groups of settlements.
- Other Rural Settlements - in all other rural settlements only a very limited amount of new development will be permitted and only in exceptional circumstances to meet demonstrated local needs and where the location of the development is well related to the built up area of the settlement. The named other rural settlements are as follows: Fleet Church End, Gedney Black Lion, Gedney Church End, Gedney Dawsmere, Gedney Drove End, Gedney Dyke, Gosberton Clough/Risegate, Holbeach Drove, Holbeach Hurn, Holbeach St Johns, Holbeach St Marks, Little Sutton, Lutton & Lutton Gowts, Moulton Seas End, Nene Terrace, Northgate/West Pinchbeck, Quadring, Saracens Head & Holbeach Clough & Bank, Shepeau Stow, Surfleet, Surfleet Seas End, Sutton St Edmund, Throckenholt, Tongue End, Tydd Gote, Tydd St
5.2.4 Policy SG4 (Development in the Countryside) states that ‘Planning permission will only be granted for development in the open countryside which is essential in the proposed location and cannot reasonably be accommodated within defined settlement limits. Development proposals that would result in an unacceptable impact upon the landscape character of an area, either individually or cumulatively, will only be permitted where: 1) the need for the development in that location outweighs its impact; and 2) no other site or solution exists to accommodate the proposed development.’

5.2.5 For the purposes of moving forward with the local plan process a baseline settlement hierarchy for South East Lincolnshire has been produced by harmonising the existing local plan hierarchies. This process has included deleting the Other Rural Settlements in South Holland, which are considered to be in the open countryside as they have no defined settlement boundary. The previously-identified Other Villages in Boston Borough, which do have a defined settlement boundary, have been retained.

Baseline Settlement Hierarchy:

- **Sub-Regional Centres**: Boston and Spalding
- **Main Service Centres**: Crowland, Donington, Holbeach, Kirton, Long Sutton, Sutton Bridge
- **Service Villages**: Butterwick, Cowbit, Deeping St. Nicholas, Fleet Hargate, Gedney Hill, Gosberton, Moulton, Moulton Chapel, Old Leake, Pinchbeck, Sutterton, Sutton St. James, Swineshead, Weston, Whaplode
- **Other Villages**: Algarkirk, Amber Hill, Benington, Bicker, Fishtoft, Fosdyke, Frampton, Frampton West, Freiston, Haltoft End, Holland Fen, Hubberts Bridge, Kirton End, Kirton Holme, Langrick Bridge, Leake Commonside, Leverton, Swineshead Bridge, Wigtoft, Wrangle, Wrangle Commonside, Wyberton.

Assessment of the Sustainability of Rural Settlements

5.2.6 This evidence base document contains an assessment of the 72 settlements in South East Lincolnshire excluding Boston and Spalding. This was carried out in 2011 and, therefore, presents a point-in-time analysis. The assessment covers 3 essential sustainability-related themes: access to services and facilities (e.g. shops, schools, healthcare etc.); public transport provision; and access to employment opportunities. The assessment produced a scoring mechanism that shows a broad indication of which settlements offer the most sustainable locations and which settlements are most dependent on other locations for services and facilities. The results of this study are currently being refined. However, in terms of using this information to formulate policy it is important to recognise the fact that it only provides a broad indication of settlement ‘sustainability’ at a single point in time.

Lincolnshire Coastal Study

5.2.7 Analysis of the ROY zones outlined in the Lincolnshire Coastal Study reveals that the following settlements are not situated entirely within one or more of the ROY zones
and, therefore, they have the potential to provide development opportunities for housing that would not be subject to the ‘cap’ proposed in the Housing Growth and Flood Risk chapter.

- **Sub-Regional Centres**: Boston and Spalding.
- **Main Service Centres**: Crowland, Donington, Holbeach, Kirton, Long Sutton
- **Service Villages**: Cowbit, Deeping St. Nicholas, Fleet Hargate, Gedney Hill, Gosberton, Moulton, Moulton Chapel, Pinchbeck, Sutterton, Sutton St. James, Swineshead, Weston and Whaplode.
- **Other Villages (Boston Borough)**: Algarkirk, Amber Hill, Bicker, Fishtoft, Holland Fen, Kirton End, Leake Commonside, Swineshead Bridge, Wigtoft, Wrangle and Wrangle Common.
- **Other Rural Settlements (South Holland District)**: Fleet Church End, Gedney Dyke, Gosberton Clough/Risegate, Holbeach Drove, Holbeach Hurn, Holbeach St Johns, Moulton Seas End, Nene Terrace, Northgate/West Pinchbeck, Quadring, Saracens Head & Holbeach Clough & Bank, Shepeau Stow, Surfleet, Surfleet Seas End, Sutton St Edmund, Throckenholt, Tongue End, Tydd Gote, Tydd St Mary, Weston Hills – Austendyke, Weston Hills – St Johns, Whaplode Drove and Whaplode St Catherine.

### 5.3 Key Issues

5.3.1 The following key issues emerging from the policy context and evidence base require a policy response:

- the need to ensure that the emerging Local Plan is in conformity with the presumption in favour of sustainable development outlined in the NPPF;
- the need to determine a spatial strategy that will guide the distribution and scale of development across South East Lincolnshire in a sustainable manner, reflecting the needs, roles and functions of settlements and the rural area having particular regard to the issue of flood risk;
- the need to ensure that the three dimensions to sustainable development (economic, social and environmental) are taken into account when allocating sites for development; and
- the need for an overarching policy to guide decision-taking through the development management process.

### 5.4 Other Policies

5.4.1 Sustainable development is a theme that must run through the full suite of policies in the DPD, and together these policies provide the interpretation of what sustainable development means in the context of South East Lincolnshire. An overarching policy approach to help decision-takers will draw on and complement other policy approaches throughout the Local Plan.

5.4.2 The housing and flood risk chapter provides the context to this section in terms of the suitability of the ROY zones to contribute to the delivery of new housing development. This chapter is chiefly concerned with the broad distribution of development in the context of the housing growth and flood risk chapter via a spatial strategy. More specific matters relating to the distribution of new development, including broad locations, will be addressed in both the housing and economy chapters. All site-specific allocations will be dealt with through the Site Allocations DPD in due course.
5.4.3 Existing settlement boundaries as outlined in the Boston Borough (1999) and South Holland (2006) Local Plans will be retained and reviewed through the Site Allocations DPD.

**Approach to the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development**

5.5 Introduction

5.5.1 It is necessary to determine an approach to implementing the presumption in favour of sustainable development locally, as outlined in the NPPF.

5.6 Reasonable Policy Options

5.6.1 It is considered that there is only one reasonable option relating to this issue, which is to formulate a policy that seeks to implement the presumption in favour of sustainable development that ensures that other locally-derived policies are able to be given appropriate weight in the development management process. The Planning Inspectorate (PINS) has produced a model policy which is designed to carry out this function.

5.6.2 **Option A**: To include the PINS model policy in the Strategy and Policies DPD.

5.7 Unreasonable Policy Options

5.7.1 It is considered unreasonable not to include a policy that seeks to implement the presumption in favour of sustainable development. To do so would run the risk of the local plan not being in conformity with the NPPF and would fail to make clear that development which is sustainable can be approved without delay.
5.8 Sustainability Appraisal

Table 5.1: SA – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Key</th>
<th>Major positive (✓✓)</th>
<th>Minor positive (✓)</th>
<th>Neutral (0)</th>
<th>Minor Negative (X)</th>
<th>Major Negative (XX)</th>
<th>Mixed (e.g. ✓✓/X, ✓/X)</th>
<th>Uncertain (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring for Topic Areas</th>
<th>Option A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity, Geodiversity &amp; Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, Health and Well-being</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy and Employment</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Risk</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Environment</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Waste</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.8.1 Conclusion: Overall it is considered that Option A has an uncertain impact. When compared to the baseline situation it is unclear what the result of having this policy will be. The purpose of this policy is to ensure that the local plan is in conformity with the presumption in favour of sustainable development as outlined in the NPPF, rather than to deliver sustainable development itself. That is the role of the comprehensive suite of policies within the local plan.

5.9 Delivery

5.9.1 As there is only one option, there are no relative delivery benefits of other approaches. This policy ensures that the local plan is in conformity with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as outlined in the NPPF. Sustainable development will be delivered through the comprehensive suite of policies contained within the local plan.

5.10 Preferred Option

5.10.1 Option A is the only reasonable option.
Approach to the Distribution of Development Between Settlements

5.11 Introduction

5.11.1 It is necessary to determine a spatial strategy that distributes development in a sustainable manner throughout South East Lincolnshire reflecting the needs, roles and functions of settlements in the context of the preferred policy approach set out in the housing growth and flood risk chapter.

5.12 Reasonable Policy Options

5.12.1 It is considered that, in the context of the preferred policy approach to development in the ROY zones, there are only two reasonable options in terms of a spatial strategy for the general distribution and scale of development across South East Lincolnshire’s settlements. The first is to continue with the existing baseline settlement hierarchy, as outlined in paragraph 5.2.5, focussing development in the Sub-Regional and Main Service Centres, with a restricted amount of new development in the Service Villages and Other Villages.

5.12.2 A second reasonable option is a more dispersed approach to development which seeks to accommodate a greater level of development in the Service Villages. In conjunction with this, a select number of other villages (Boston Borough) and other rural settlements (South Holland District) would be promoted to service centres where they have the potential to deliver housing in non-ROY zone areas (see paragraph 5.2.7) and have access to some services and facilities. This approach would also delete the Other Villages category from the hierarchy and treat these as ‘countryside’, thus addressing the existing inconsistency between these and the ‘other rural settlements’ category in the South Holland Local Plan, which are already classed as countryside.

5.12.3 Option A: To continue with the current baseline settlement hierarchy, focussing development in the Sub-Regional and Main Service Centres as outlined in paragraph 5.2.5, with restricted growth in the Service Villages and Other Villages.

5.12.4 Option B: To increase the proportion of development in the Service Villages and using the availability of non-ROY land for development as a reason for the promotion of settlements to Service Villages; and to treat all settlements below Service Villages as countryside. The promoted settlements are:

- Algarkirk, Bicker, Fishtoft, Kirton End, Leake Commonside, Quadring, Surfleet, Swineshead Bridge, Tydd St Mary, Wigtoft and Wrangle.

5.13 Unreasonable Policy Options

5.13.1 It is unreasonable to determine a spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy that does not take into account the preferred policy approach to development in the ROY zones as outlined in the housing growth and flood risk chapter. It is also unreasonable to restrict development in all settlements situated entirely within the ROY zones as the required housing target would be undeliverable, given the extent of the ROY zones, particularly in Boston Borough. This approach would also be contrary to the preferred approach on housing development in the ROY zones outlined in the housing growth and flood risk chapter. Given this local context, an entirely dispersed spatial strategy is also deemed unreasonable.
5.13.2 It is unreasonable not to provide a spatial strategy or settlement hierarchy (a laissez-faire approach). This would be contrary to the NPPF expectation that local plans express what sustainable development means within the local context.

5.13.3 It is unreasonable to designate a new settlement to meet future development needs, as given the infrastructure requirements and lead-in time, it is considered that this would be undeliverable in the plan period.

5.14 Sustainability Appraisal

Table 5.2: SA – Distribution of Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Key</th>
<th>Major positive (✓✓)</th>
<th>Minor positive (✓)</th>
<th>Neutral (0)</th>
<th>Minor Negative (X)</th>
<th>Major Negative (XX)</th>
<th>Mixed (e.g. ✓✓/X, ✓/X)</th>
<th>Uncertain (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring for Topic Areas</th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>X/?</td>
<td>X/?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity, Geodiversity &amp; Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>X/?</td>
<td>X/?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)</td>
<td>X/?</td>
<td>X/?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, Health and Well-being</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓/?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy and Employment</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Risk</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Environment</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Waste</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>X/?</td>
<td>X/?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.14.1 Air Quality: Both options will have a mixed minor negative/uncertain impact on air quality as any new development will likely lead to increased air pollution, primarily due to increased road traffic. This may have a direct negative impact on the two identified Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) in the area. However, there is an element of uncertainty until detailed locations for development are determined through the housing and economy chapters of this document and the Site Allocations DPD. Relatively speaking option B (a potentially more dispersed pattern of growth) may have a worse impact as sustainable modes of transport could be more difficult to deliver in smaller, lower-order settlements.

5.14.2 Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure: Both options will have a mixed minor negative/uncertain impact. Any new development has the potential to impact
upon protected sites of nature conservation importance. However, until site specifics are known (through the Site Allocations DPD) there will be uncertainty as to the nature of the impact. With any new development there is the potential positive impact of being able to ‘design in’ green infrastructure.

5.14.3 Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation): Both options will have a mixed minor negative/uncertain impact. Any new development is likely to increase greenhouse gas emission, both directly and indirectly. There are potential positive impacts through the opportunities to require new energy-efficient design and construction and to require that all new housing proposals in flood hazard areas will only be considered for approval subject to the mitigation of flood risk through flood-resilient design and emergency planning. However, there is an element of uncertainty until detailed locations for development are determined through the housing and economy chapters of this document and the Site Allocations DPD.

5.14.4 Community, Health and Well-being: Option A will have a minor positive impact, whilst option B will have a minor positive/uncertain impact. The provision of additional development, in particular housing and employment opportunities, as well as new services and facilities will have a positive impact on both health and equality in both cases. There is also potential for new development to support the funding of new infrastructure. However, option B (a potentially more dispersed pattern of growth) could struggle to provide the critical mass required to deliver the required community infrastructure to support new development.

5.14.5 Economy and Employment: Both options will have a major positive impact, as they both seek to deliver new employment opportunities, albeit via a different manner of distribution.

5.14.6 Flood Risk: Both options will have a minor negative impact as they both seek to provide development in the ROY zones. However, relatively speaking option B goes further than option A in seeking to increase the contribution of settlements outside of the ROY zones to meet development, particularly housing, needs. Furthermore, there is an opportunity to require that all housing growth in the ROY zones will only be permitted subject to the mitigation of flood risk through flood-resilient design and emergency planning. There is also potential for new development to support the funding of new flood-defence-related infrastructure.

5.14.7 Historic Environment: Both options will have an uncertain impact. This is because site specifics will be considered at a later date through the production of the Site Allocations DPD and through the development management process.

5.14.8 Housing: Both options will have a major positive impact, as they both seek to deliver new housing development, albeit via a different manner of distribution.

5.14.9 Land and Waste: Both options will have a minor negative impact. Any new greenfield development will result in a permanent loss of agricultural land. However, relatively speaking option B (a potentially more dispersed pattern of growth) may provide fewer opportunities for brownfield development. New development will also likely lead to greater levels of waste generation.

5.14.10 Landscape: Both options will have a minor negative impact. Any new development on greenfield land will inevitably impact upon landscape but the precise nature of that impact will be dependent on the design, layout and landscaping of a particular
development. However, relatively speaking option B (a potentially more dispersed pattern of growth) may lead to a perceived greater level of development in the countryside and, therefore, landscape change.

5.14.11 Transport: Both options will have a mixed minor negative/uncertain impact. Any new development is likely to lead to higher levels of road traffic and could exacerbate perceived congestion problems. However, there is an element of uncertainty until detailed locations for development are determined through the housing and economy chapters of this document and the Site Allocations DPD. Relatively speaking option B (a potentially more dispersed pattern of growth) may have a worse impact as sustainable modes of transport could be more difficult to deliver in smaller, lower-order settlements.

5.14.12 Water: Both options will have a minor negative impact. Any new development is likely to increase pressure on water resources.

5.14.13 Conclusion: Both options score similarly in terms of their overall sustainability. However, relatively speaking a more dispersed distribution of growth (option B) is likely to be deemed less sustainable in terms of the potential to provide sustainable transport. It may also be more difficult to achieve the critical mass in lower order settlements to provide infrastructure to support sustainable communities. However, option B does specifically seek to support growth in areas at a lower level of flood risk (non-ROY zone areas) and so in this respect a more dispersed distribution of growth is deemed more sustainable.

5.15 Delivery

5.15.1 The delivery of both options will be guided by the distribution of specific types of development in other housing and employment-related policies, the Site Allocations DPD where appropriate, and the development management process.

5.15.2 Most significant proposals will require appropriate supporting infrastructure which will be identified through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). It is likely that a more dispersed pattern of development may be less likely to deliver the critical mass to provide the required infrastructure.

5.16 Preferred Option

5.16.1 Option B is the preferred option. Whilst a more dispersed pattern of growth could be deemed less sustainable, this option is specifically concerned with seeking to enable development to occur in the non-ROY zones with a view to successfully delivering the 'capped' approach to housing development in the ROY zones as outlined in the housing growth and flood risk chapter.

Approach to Development in the Countryside

5.17 Introduction

5.17.1 It is necessary to determine an approach to development in the countryside in the context of the housing growth and flood risk chapter.
5.18 Reasonable Policy Options

5.18.1 The only reasonable option is to outline a policy approach to development in the countryside that restricts development in the countryside, whilst outlining the types of development that are deemed suitable in rural areas. This should take account of the need to ensure sustainable development, promote the rural economy and protect the countryside and rural activities, e.g. agriculture, as outlined in the NPPF.

5.18.2 Option A: To set out a policy approach that restricts development in general in areas designated as ‘Countryside’, but also outlines what development is appropriate for the purpose of supporting the rural economy.

5.19 Unreasonable Policy Options

5.19.1 It is deemed unreasonable not to have a policy detailing what development is appropriate in the Countryside, as this could lead to uncontrolled development in rural areas, which is contrary to the NPPF. For the same reasons, it is unreasonable to develop a policy that seeks to promote large-scale development in rural areas.

5.20 Sustainability Appraisal

Table 5.3: SA – Development in the Countryside

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Key</th>
<th>Major positive (✓✓)</th>
<th>Minor positive (✓)</th>
<th>Neutral (0)</th>
<th>Minor Negative (X)</th>
<th>Major Negative (XX)</th>
<th>Mixed (e.g. ✓✓/X, ✓/X)</th>
<th>Uncertain (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring for Topic Areas</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Option A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity, Geodiversity &amp;</td>
<td>0/X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change (adaptation and</td>
<td>0/X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mitigation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, Health and Well-</td>
<td>✓✓/X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy and Employment</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Risk</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Environment</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Waste</td>
<td>✓✓/X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>✓✓/X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>✓✓/X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.20.1 Air Quality: Option A has a mixed neutral/minor negative impact. Whilst restricting development in the countryside will not have a negative impact upon air quality, it will
not improve air quality. However, allowing any element of development e.g. tourism in the countryside has the potential to increase levels of traffic and therefore impact negatively upon air quality.

5.20.2 Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure: Option A will have an uncertain impact. By restricting development in the countryside any potential likelihood of a negative impact is reduced. However, there is a degree of uncertainty as any rural development e.g. tourism could have a negative impact dependant upon the location.

5.20.3 Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation): Option A will have a mixed neutral/minor negative impact. Whilst restricting development in the countryside will not lead to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions, it will not reduce it either. However, allowing any element of development e.g. tourism in the countryside has the potential to increase emissions, thus having a negative impact.

5.20.4 Community, Health and Well-being: Option A will have a mixed minor positive/minor negative impact. Restricting development, particularly housing, could be argued to lead to the decline of rural communities. However, a policy approach that supports appropriate development to support community facilities and the rural economy will have a positive impact.

5.20.5 Economy and Employment: Option A will have a major positive impact, as it seeks to allow appropriate development to support the rural economy.

5.20.6 Flood Risk: Option A will have an uncertain impact. This is because whilst some development may be appropriate in the countryside, the impact on flood risk will be dependent upon the location, scale and type of development.

5.20.7 Historic Environment: Option A has an uncertain impact. This is because whilst some development may be appropriate in the countryside, the impact on the historic environment will be dependent upon the location, scale and type of development.

5.20.8 Housing: Option A will have a negative impact, as this option is actively seeking to restrict housing development in the countryside.

5.20.9 Land and Waste: Option A will have a mixed minor positive/minor negative impact. By seeking to restrict large-scale development in the open countryside, agricultural land is protected. However, even by just approving limited development, there is a negative impact in terms of the loss of greenfield land and an increase in levels of waste generation.

5.20.10 Landscape: Option A will have a mixed minor positive/minor negative impact. By seeking to restrict large-scale development in the open countryside, landscape character will be protected. However, even by just approving limited development, there is a potential negative impact in terms of the loss of greenfield land and local changes to the landscape.

5.20.11 Transport: Option A will have a minor positive/minor negative impact. Whilst restricting development in the countryside will not have a negative impact upon levels of traffic, it will not improve them. However, focussing development in urban areas provides greater potential for delivering sustainable modes of transport, which is a positive impact of restricting development in the countryside. Nevertheless,
allowing any element of development e.g. tourism in the countryside has the potential to increase levels of traffic and therefore impact negatively.

5.20.12 Water: Option A will have a minor negative impact. Any new development is likely to increase pressure on water resources.

5.20.13 Conclusion: Option A seeks to limit development in the countryside which has a positive impact in terms of preserving the countryside and high-quality agricultural land. By supporting the rural economy this also has a positive impact in terms of economic sustainability.

5.21 Delivery

5.21.1 This option will be delivered via other policies within the housing and employment chapters of this document and the development management process. As there are no other reasonable options, there are no relative delivery benefits.

5.22 Preferred Option

5.22.1 Option A is the only reasonable option and has a number of positive outcomes in terms of sustainability.

Approach to Site Allocations

5.23 Introduction

5.23.1 It is necessary to ensure that the approach to the allocation of sites for development will help to deliver sustainable development.

5.24 Reasonable Policy Options

5.24.1 It is considered that there is only one reasonable option to the approach of setting out how sites will be allocated. This approach involves detailing the criteria that will need to be taken into account when sites are selected through the Site Allocation DPD to ensure that the most sustainable sites are chosen. This option provides the policy link, or ‘hook’, between the Strategy and Policies DPD and the Site Allocations DPD.

5.24.2 Option A: To set out a criteria-based policy to guide the site allocations process, ensuring that the most sustainable sites come forward in line with the preferred approach to the distribution and scale of development, including housing development in the ROY zones.

5.25 Unreasonable Policy Options

5.25.1 It is considered unreasonable not to have a policy that addresses this issue. A policy hook is required in the Strategy and Policies DPD to provide the context for allocating sites in the subsequent Site Allocations DPD.
5.26 Sustainability Appraisal

Table 5.4: SA – Site Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Key</th>
<th>Major positive (✓✓)</th>
<th>Minor positive (✓)</th>
<th>Neutral (0)</th>
<th>Minor Negative (X)</th>
<th>Major Negative (XX)</th>
<th>Mixed (e.g. ✓✓/X, ✓/X)</th>
<th>Uncertain (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring for Topic Areas</th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>✓/X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity, Geodiversity &amp; Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, Health and Well-being</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy and Employment</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Risk</td>
<td>✓/X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Environment</td>
<td>✓/?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Waste</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>✓/X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>✓/X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.26.1 **Air Quality**: Option A will have a mixed minor positive/minor negative impact. Whilst new development will likely lead to an increase in air pollution overall, primarily due to increased road traffic, by seeking to allocate sites in the most sustainable locations the potential for the use of sustainable modes of transport are increased.

5.26.2 **Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure**: Option A will have a minor positive impact by setting criteria for the allocation of sites that seek to protect sites of nature conservation importance and seek to provide the required supporting infrastructure (which can include green infrastructure).

5.26.3 **Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)**: Option A will have a minor negative impact as any new development will likely lead to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions, both directly and indirectly. Nevertheless, there are opportunities to mitigate this impact through other policies within the plan.

5.26.4 **Community, Health and Well-being**: Option A will have a minor positive impact as it will seek to allocate development in the most sustainable locations and seek to provide the required supporting infrastructure, including community facilities where appropriate.
5.26.5 **Economy and Employment:** Option A will have a major positive impact as it is actively seeking to allocate sustainable sites for development including, where appropriate, sites for employment uses.

5.26.6 **Flood Risk:** Option A will have a mixed minor positive/minor negative impact. Given the preferred approach to the distribution of development, including that within ROY zones, development is likely to occur in zones of higher flood risk. However, there is an opportunity to ensure that a sequential approach is taken to the allocation of sites in flood risk areas and to ensure appropriate mitigation in terms of flood-resilient design and emergency planning.

5.26.7 **Historic Environment:** Option A will have a mixed minor positive/uncertain impact. Whilst sites can be allocated taking historic character and assets into account, by concentrating development in and around existing urban areas, there is potential to directly and indirectly impact negatively upon such assets.

5.26.8 **Housing:** Option A will have a major positive impact as it is actively seeking to allocate sustainable sites for development, including housing.

5.26.9 **Land and Waste:** Option A will have a minor negative impact, as the allocation of new sites inevitably includes the loss of greenfield land (including high quality agricultural land). Any development will also likely lead to greater levels of waste generation.

5.26.10 **Landscape:** Option A will have a minor positive/minor negative impact. Whilst any new greenfield development will lead to a change in the landscape, there is the potential to ‘design in’ measures to protect and enhance landscape character.

5.26.11 **Transport:** Option A will have a mixed minor positive/minor negative impact. Whilst new development will likely lead to an increase in levels of road traffic, by seeking to allocate sites in the most sustainable locations the potential for the use of sustainable modes of transport is increased.

5.26.12 **Water:** Option A will have a minor negative impact. Any new development is likely to increase pressure on water resources.

5.26.13 **Conclusion:** Whilst there are a number of potential negative impacts that come about as a result of development, these can be minimised by seeking to ensure an approach that allocates development in the most sustainable locations available.

5.27 **Delivery**

5.27.1 This option will be delivered through the Site Allocations DPD. It provides the link between that document and the Strategy and Policies DPD. As there are no other reasonable options, there are no relative delivery benefits.

5.28 **Preferred Option**

5.28.1 **Option A** is the only reasonable option and has a number of positives in terms of sustainability.
Approach to Development Management

5.29 Introduction

5.29.1 It is necessary to outline an approach to a development management to help guide decision-takers in the determination of planning applications.

5.30 Reasonable Policy Options

5.30.1 It is considered that there are two reasonable options relating to a preferred policy approach to development management. The first is to produce an overarching development management policy, relevant to any type of proposal, which draws on the other policies within the Local Plan to help decision-takers, and applicants alike, to focus on the type of factors that will be assessed in considering development proposals. The second approach is to not have an overarching development management policy and instead rely on the other policies within the Local Plan.

5.30.2 **Option A**: To produce a policy approach that provides an overarching development management policy.

5.30.3 **Option B**: Do not produce a policy approach to development management and rely on other policies in the Local Plan.

5.31 Unreasonable Policy Options

5.31.1 There are no unreasonable options in respect of this issue.
5.32 **Sustainability Appraisal**

Table 5.5: SA – Development Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Key</th>
<th>Major positive (✓✓)</th>
<th>Minor positive (✓)</th>
<th>Neutral (0)</th>
<th>Minor Negative (X)</th>
<th>Major Negative (XX)</th>
<th>Mixed (e.g. ✓✓/X, ✓/X)</th>
<th>Uncertain (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity, Geodiversity &amp; Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, Health and Well-being</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy and Employment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Risk</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Environment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Waste</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.32.1 **Conclusion:** Whilst option A seeks to provide an overarching policy approach to ensure that the full range of sustainability considerations are taken into account in the determining of planning applications, other policies within the plan already provide the same function (option B). As such, both options score positively in terms of sustainability.

5.33 **Delivery**

5.33.1 Both options would be delivered through the development management process. Option A has the operational benefit of bringing together sustainability considerations into one overarching policy. The counter to this is that there is an element of duplication with other policies within the plan, which could lead to confusion for decision-takers and applicants and dilute the importance of these other policies.

5.34 **Preferred Option**

5.34.1 **Option A** is the preferred option as providing an overarching development management policy has the operational benefit of highlighting the particular sustainable development consideration that will be taken into account by decision-takers when determining planning applications.
5.35 Reason for Preferred Policy Approaches

5.35.1 It is clear from the information presented that there are limited reasonable options for dealing with the key issues arising from the policy context and evidence base. Based on the above conclusions, it is proposed to take forward four preferred policy approaches. The first will cover the preferred approach to implementing the NPPF’s presumption in favour of sustainable development and will include the model policy created by PINS. The second incorporates the preferred options for the distribution and scale of development and for development in the Countryside in order to express a preferred spatial strategy for South East Lincolnshire. The third provides the policy hook between the Strategy and Policies DPD and the Site Allocations DPD and is the preferred approach to site allocations. The fourth provides an overarching policy statement highlighting the particular sustainable development considerations that will be taken into account by decision-takers when determining planning applications.

5.36 Preferred Policy Approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When considering development proposals the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. It will always work proactively with applicants jointly to find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning applications that accord with the policies in this Local Plan (and, where relevant, with polices in neighbourhood plans) will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where there are no policies relevant to the application or relevant policies are out of date at the time of making the decision then the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise – taking into account whether:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework taken as a whole; or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• specific policies in that Framework indicate that development should be restricted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.6: HRA/AA Screening – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening of Preferred Policy Approach (✓/X)</th>
<th>Does the policy lead to development?</th>
<th>Does the policy specify a quantity or type of development?</th>
<th>Does the policy specify a location for development?</th>
<th>Is the policy implemented through other policies?</th>
<th>Does the policy concentrate development in urban areas?</th>
<th>Does the policy steer development away from European or Ramsar sites?</th>
<th>Does the policy protect the natural environment?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.36.1 This policy is concerned with ensuring that the local plan is in conformity with the NPPF’s presumption in favour of sustainable development. It is not the purpose of this policy to directly lead to development or outline levels or locations of growth. It is therefore considered that this policy can be screened out of the Habitats Regulations Assessment process.

Table 5.7: Equalities Assessment – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equalities Analysis of Preferred Policy Approach (✓ - may benefit) (0 – neutral) (X – adverse impact)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.36.2 The provisions of this policy will have the same impact on all groups.
Spatial Strategy

South East Lincolnshire comprises four types of place:

- **Sub-Regional Centres**: Boston and Spalding
  
  These will be the main locations for new development.

- **Main Service Centres**: Crowland, Donington, Holbeach, Kirton, Long Sutton and Sutton Bridge
  
  These will continue to provide for significant housing, employment and commercial development to support their roles as service centres for surrounding rural areas.

- **Service Villages**: Algarkirk, Bicker, Butterwick, Cowbit, Deeping St. Nicholas, Fishtoft, Fleet Hargate, Gedney Hill, Gosberton, Kirton End, Leake Commonside, Moulton, Moulton Chapel, Old Leake, Pinchbeck, Quadring, Sutterton, Sutton St. James, Surfleet, Tydd St Mary, Swineshead, Swineshead Bridge, Weston, Whaplode, Wigtoft and Wrangle
  
  These will act as local service centres for the surrounding rural area. Limited new development should support or improve their role as a focus for social and economic activity.

- **The Countryside**: the rest of South East Lincolnshire, including all settlements not listed above, within which development will be restricted to the following categories in accordance with other local plan policies:
  - agriculture;
  - forestry;
  - the preservation of Listed Buildings;
  - the reuse and adaptation of buildings for appropriate purposes;
  - coastal and flood protection;
  - rural exceptions affordable housing;
  - the extension and replacement of dwellings;
  - sites for Gypsy and Travellers and travelling showpeople;
  - new-build employment generating proposals where there is a particular environmental or operational justification;
  - the diversification of rural enterprises;
  - community services and facilities meeting a proven local need;
  - development by statutory undertakers or public utility providers;
  - recreation and tourism
  - renewable energy projects;
  - transport;
  - mineral extraction; and
  - waste management facilities.
Table 5.8: HRA/AA Screening – Spatial Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening of Preferred Policy Approach (✓/X)</th>
<th>Does the policy lead to development?</th>
<th>Does the policy specify a quantity or type of development?</th>
<th>Does the policy specify a location for development?</th>
<th>Is the policy implemented through other policies?</th>
<th>Does the policy concentrate development in urban areas?</th>
<th>Does the policy steer development away from European or Ramsar sites?</th>
<th>Does the policy protect the natural environment?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.36.3 Given that this policy approach is concerned with distributing development, it is considered that there is potential for significant effects on a European or Ramsar site. As such, it should be screened by the Habitats Regulations Assessment process.

Table 5.9: Equalities Assessment – Spatial Strategy

| Equalities Analysis of Preferred Policy Approach (✓ - may benefit) (0 – neutral) (X – adverse impact) |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Age                                            | Disability                                      | Gender re-assignment                            | Marriage & civil partnership                      | Pregnancy & maternity                           | Race                                            | Religion or belief                               | Sex                                             | Sexual orientation                              |
| 0                                              | 0                                               | 0                                               | 0                                                | 0                                              | 0                                               | 0                                               | 0                                               | 0                                               |

5.36.4 The provisions of this policy will have the same impact on all groups.
Site Allocations in South East Lincolnshire

In allocating sites for development, the following criteria will be taken into account in addition to other policies within the local plan:

- sites will be located in or adjacent to the existing built-up area of the settlement;
- sites will be accessible and well-related to existing services and facilities;
- sites will be accessible by public transport or demonstrate that the provision of such services can be viably provided and sustained;
- sites will not place undue burdens on existing infrastructure or will be able to demonstrate that appropriate new infrastructure can be provided to address sustainability issues;
- sites will not have adverse impacts on South East Lincolnshire’s natural, built and historic assets and landscape character that cannot be adequately mitigated against;
- sites will not lead to the loss of locally-important open space, other green infrastructure or community facilities, unless adequately replaced elsewhere; and
- sites will have been subject to appropriate sequential testing and other planning policy requirements in relation to flood risk.

Table 5.10: HRA/AA Screening – Site Allocations in South East Lincolnshire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening of Preferred Policy Approach (✓/X)</th>
<th>Does the policy lead to development?</th>
<th>Does the policy specify a quantity or type of development?</th>
<th>Does the policy specify a location for development?</th>
<th>Is the policy implemented through other policies?</th>
<th>Does the policy concentrate development in urban areas?</th>
<th>Does the policy steer development away from European or Ramsar sites?</th>
<th>Does the policy protect the natural environment?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.36.5 This policy is concerned with providing a link between the Strategy and Policies DPD and the Site Allocations DPD. It provides criteria for allocating land for new development and therefore has the potential to significantly affect a European or Ramsar site. As such, it should be screened by the Habitats Regulations Assessment process.
Table 5.11: Equalities Assessment – Site Allocations in South East Lincolnshire

Equalities Analysis of Preferred Policy Approach
(✓ - may benefit) (0 – neutral) (X – adverse impact)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Gender re-assignment</th>
<th>Marriage &amp; civil partnership</th>
<th>Pregnancy &amp; maternity</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Religion or belief</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Sexual orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.36.6 The provisions of this policy will have the same impact on most groups. However, its provisions concerned with:

- ensuring that sites will be accessible and well-related to existing services and facilities may particularly benefit the elderly, the disabled and people with children in prams or pushchairs; and
- ensuring that sites will be accessible by public transport may particularly benefit young people by enabling independent travel.

Development Management

Proposals requiring planning permission for development will be permitted subject to them meeting sustainable development considerations, in particular in relation to:

- their size, scale, layout, density and impact on the amenity, character and appearance of the area and the relationship to existing development and land uses;
- their quality of design and orientation;
- maximising the use of sustainable materials and resources;
- access and vehicle generation levels;
- the capacity of existing community services and infrastructure;
- impact upon neighbouring land uses by reason of noise, disturbance or visual intrusion;
- sustainable drainage and flood risk; and
- impact upon areas of natural habitats and historical buildings and heritage.
Table 5.12: HRA/AA Screening – Development Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening of Preferred Policy Approach (✓/X)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the policy lead to development?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the policy specify a quantity or type of development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the policy specify a location for development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the policy implemented through other policies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the policy concentrate development in urban areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the policy steer development away from European or Ramsar sites?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the policy protect the natural environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.36.7 This policy is concerned with providing an overarching statement highlighting the particular sustainable development considerations that will be taken into account by decision-takers when determining planning applications. Therefore, it is considered that this policy can be screened out of the Habitats Regulations Assessment process.

Table 5.13: Equalities Assessment – Development Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equalities Analysis of Preferred Policy Approach (✓ - may benefit) (0 – neutral) (X – adverse impact)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender re-assignment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage &amp; civil partnership</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy &amp; maternity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion or belief</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.36.8 The provisions of this policy will have the same impact on all groups.
6.0 Housing

6.0.1 This chapter deals with strategic housing policies governing the distribution, scale and phasing of additional housing and more detailed development-management-type policies concerning specific housing matters.

6.1 Policy Context

Local Plan Strategic Priorities

6.1.1 The following Local Plan strategic priorities are relevant:

- To seek to meet the housing needs of the whole of South East Lincolnshire’s population, including the provision of an appropriate proportion of affordable housing for those in need.
- To seek to improve the quality of life for everyone who lives, visits, works and invests in South East Lincolnshire by enhancing access to homes, employment, retail, education, healthcare, community and leisure facilities, and open space.
- To ensure that development contributes to the provision of necessary physical, social and green infrastructure to deliver planned levels of growth and mitigate its impacts on existing communities and the environment.

National Planning Policy Framework

Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes

6.1.2 ‘To boost significantly the supply of housing, local planning authorities should:

- use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in this Framework, including identifying key sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period;
- identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable\(^\text{18}\) sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirements with an additional buffer of 5% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land. Where there has been a record of persistent under delivery of housing, local planning authorities should increase the buffer to 20% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to provide a realistic prospect of achieving the planned supply and to ensure choice and competition in the market for land;
- identify a supply of specific, developable\(^\text{19}\) sites or broad locations for growth, for years 6-10 and, where possible, for years 11-15;

\(^{18}\) To be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years and in particular that development of the site is viable. Sites with planning permission should be considered deliverable until permission expires, unless there is clear evidence that schemes will not be implemented within five years, for example they will not be viable, there is no longer a demand for the type of units or sites have long term phasing plans.

\(^{19}\) To be considered developable, sites should be in a suitable location for housing development and there should be a reasonable prospect that the site is available and could be viably developed at the point envisaged.
for market and affordable housing, illustrate the expected rate of housing delivery through a housing trajectory for the plan period and set out a housing implementation strategy for the full range of housing describing how they will maintain delivery of a five-year supply of housing land to meet their housing target; and

set out their own approach to housing density to reflect local circumstances.’

6.1.3 ‘Local planning authorities may make an allowance for windfall sites in the five-year supply if they have compelling evidence that such sites have consistently become available in the local area and will continue to provide a reliable source of supply. Any allowance should be realistic having regard to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends, and should not include residential gardens.’

6.1.4 ‘To deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities, local planning authorities should:

plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes);

identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular locations, reflecting local demand; and

where they have identified that affordable housing is needed, set policies for meeting this need on site, unless off-site provision or a financial contribution of broadly equivalent value can be robustly justified (for example to improve or make more effective use of the existing housing stock) and the agreed approach contributes to the objective of creating mixed and balanced communities. Such policies should be sufficiently flexible to take account of changing market conditions over time.’

6.1.5 ‘Local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings in line with local housing and empty homes strategies and, where appropriate, acquire properties under compulsory purchase powers. They should normally approve planning applications for change to residential use and any associated development from commercial buildings (currently in the B use classes) where there is an identified need for additional housing in that area, provided that there are not strong economic reasons why such development would be inappropriate.’

6.1.6 ‘The supply of new homes can sometimes be best achieved through planning for larger scale development, such as new settlements or extensions to existing villages and towns that follow the principles of Garden Cities. Working with the support of their communities, local planning authorities should consider whether such opportunities provide the best way of achieving sustainable development…..’

6.1.7 ‘In rural areas, exercising the duty to cooperate with neighbouring authorities, local planning authorities should be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs, particularly for affordable housing, including through rural exception sites where appropriate…..’
6.1.8 ‘To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. For example, where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby.’

**Local Plans**

6.1.9 ‘Crucially, Local Plans should:

- indicate broad locations for strategic development on a key diagram and land-use designations on a proposals map;
- allocate sites to promote development and flexible use of land, bringing forward new land where necessary, and provide detail on form, scale, access and quantum of development where appropriate’.

**Using a proportionate evidence base**

6.1.10 ‘Local planning authorities should have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area. They should:

- prepare a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) to assess their full housing needs, working with neighbouring authorities where housing market areas cross administrative boundaries. The SHMA should identify the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures that the local population is likely to need over the plan period which:
  - meets household and population projections, taking account of migration and demographic change;
  - addresses the need for all types of housing, including affordable housing and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes);’
  - and
  - caters for housing demand and the scale of housing supply necessary to meet this demand;
- prepare a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) to establish realistic assumptions about the availability, suitability and the likely economic viability of land to meet the identified need for housing over the plan period.’

6.1.11 ‘Pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan-making and decision-taking. Plans should be deliverable. Therefore, the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable.’

6.1.12 ‘Local planning authorities should set out their policy on local standards in the Local Plan, including requirements for affordable housing. They should assess the likely cumulative impacts on development in their area of all existing and proposed local standards, supplementary planning documents and policies that support the

---

20 The planning policy for traveller sites sets out how travellers’ accommodation should also be assessed.'
development plan, when added to nationally required standards. In order to be appropriate, the cumulative impact of these standards and policies should not put implementation of the plan at serious risk, and should facilitate development throughout the economic cycle. Evidence supporting the assessment should be proportionate, using only appropriate available evidence.'

Planning policy for traveller sites

6.1.13 ‘The Government’s overarching aim is to ensure fair and equal treatment for travellers, in a way that facilitates the traditional and nomadic way of life of travellers while respecting the interests of the settled community. To help achieve this, Government’s aims in respect of traveller sites are:

- that local planning authorities should make their own assessment of need for the purposes of planning;
- to ensure that local planning authorities, working collaboratively, develop fair and effective strategies to meet need through the identification of land for sites;
- to encourage local planning authorities to plan for sites over a reasonable timescale that plan-making and decision-taking should protect Green Belt from inappropriate development;
- to promote more private traveller site provision while recognising that there will always be those travellers who cannot provide their own sites;
- that plan-making and decision-taking should aim to reduce the number of unauthorised developments and encampments and make enforcement more effective;
- for local planning authorities to ensure that their Local Plan includes fair, realistic and inclusive policies;
- to increase the number of traveller sites in appropriate locations with planning permission, to address under provision and maintain an appropriate level of supply;
- to reduce tensions between settled and traveller communities in plan-making and planning decisions;
- to enable provision of suitable accommodation from which travellers can access education, health, welfare and employment infrastructure; and
- for local planning authorities to have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.’

6.1.14 Policy A: Using evidence to plan positively and manage development states that: ‘In assembling the evidence base necessary to support their planning approach, local planning authorities should:

a) pay particular attention to early and effective community engagement with both settled and traveller communities (including discussing travellers’ accommodation needs with travellers themselves, their representative bodies and local support groups)
b) co-operate with travellers, their representative bodies and local support groups, other local authorities and relevant interest groups to prepare and maintain an up-to-date understanding of the likely permanent and transit accommodation needs of their areas over the lifespan of their development plan working collaboratively with neighbouring local planning authorities
c) use a robust evidence base to establish accommodation needs to inform the preparation of local plans and make planning decisions.’

6.1.15 Policy B: Planning for traveller sites states that: ‘Local Plans must be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development. To this end, they should be consistent with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework, including the presumption in favour of sustainable development and the application of specific policies in the Framework and this planning policy for traveller sites.’

6.1.16 ‘Local planning authorities should set pitch targets for gypsies and travellers and plot targets for travelling showpeople21, which address the likely permanent and transit site accommodation needs of travellers in their area, working collaboratively with neighbouring local planning authorities.’

6.1.17 ‘Local planning authorities should, in producing their Local Plan:

   a) identify and update annually, a supply of specific deliverable sites22 ‘sufficient to provide five years’ worth of sites against their locally set targets
   b) identify a supply of specific, developable23 ‘sites or broad locations for growth, for years six to ten and, where possible, for years 11-15
   c) consider production of joint development plans that set targets on a cross-authority basis, to provide more flexibility in identifying sites, particularly if a local planning authority has special or strict planning constraints across its area (local planning authorities have a duty to cooperate on planning issues that cross administrative boundaries)
   d) relate the number of pitches or plots to the circumstances of the specific size and location of the site and the surrounding population’s size and density
   e) protect local amenity and environment’

6.1.18 ‘Criteria should be set to guide land supply allocations where there is identified need. Where there is no identified need, criteria-based policies should be included to provide a basis for decisions in case applications nevertheless come forward. Criteria based policies should be fair and should facilitate the traditional and nomadic life of travellers while respecting the interests of the settled community.

6.1.19 ‘Local planning authorities should ensure that traveller sites are sustainable economically, socially and environmentally. Local planning authorities should, therefore, ensure that their policies:

   a) promote peaceful and integrated co-existence between the site and the local community

21 See Annex A of DCLG policy for definitions of ‘pitch’ and ‘plot’.
22 To be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that development will be delivered on the site within five years and in particular that development of the site is viable. Sites with planning permission should be considered deliverable until permission expires, unless there is clear evidence that schemes will not be implemented within five years, for example they will not be viable, there is no longer a demand for the type of units or sites have long term phasing plans.
23 To be considered developable, sites should be in a suitable location for traveller site development and there should be a reasonable prospect that the site is available and could be viably developed at the point envisaged.
b) promote, in collaboration with commissioners of health services, access to appropriate health services

c) ensure that children can attend school on a regular basis

d) provide a settled base that reduces the need for long-distance travelling and possible environmental damage caused by unauthorised encampment

e) provide for proper consideration of the effect of local environmental quality (such as noise and air quality) on the health and well-being of any travellers that may locate there or on others as a result of new development

f) avoid placing undue pressure on local infrastructure and services;

i) do not locate sites in areas at high risk of flooding, including functional floodplains, given the particular vulnerability of caravans

j) reflect the extent to which traditional lifestyles (whereby some travellers live and work from the same location thereby omitting many travel to work journeys) can contribute to sustainability.

East Midlands Regional Plan

6.1.20 Relevant content includes:

• Boston and Spalding are defined as Sub-Regional Centres on the basis of their size, the range of services they provide and their potential to accommodate further growth; and their capacity to support sustainable development objectives (Policies 3 and 4 and their justification);

• Crowland, Holbeach, Long Sutton and Sutton Bridge are defined as Small Towns on the basis that they provide a more limited range of convenience shopping, education, community and health facilities and are suitable for development that meets local needs (Policies 3 and 4 and their justification).

• Boston Borough Council’s:

• Community Plan 2008-2018 includes the aim of maximising the opportunity for people to live in decent and affordable homes.

• Corporate Plan 2012-2015 supports helping to maintain and develop rural communities by permitting development for housing wherever possible, and working with the Homes and Communities Agency, housing providers and private developers to deliver new homes that meet local needs.

• Housing Strategy 2012-2017 identifies the following four strategic priorities:
  o Providing more homes;
  o Improving existing homes;
o Living safely in your home; and
o Facilitating access to your home.

6.1.22 South Holland District Council’s:

- Corporate Plan 2010-2015 identifies the provision of more affordable homes as one of its seven priorities.
- Housing Strategy 2006-2011 identifies the provision of more high-quality affordable housing and working with others in support of meeting the housing needs of the District as two of its four key priorities.

6.1.23 Lincolnshire-wide:

- The Lincolnshire Housing Strategy 2009-2014 identifies increasing the supply of affordable housing across Lincolnshire and increasing the supply of affordable homes in rural communities as two of its four priorities.

**Lincolnshire County Council 3rd Local Transport Plan: 2011/12 to 2012/13 (LTP3)**

**Relevant provisions for Boston**

6.1.24 ‘As part of the development of the Local Development Framework, Boston Borough Council are identifying areas of land to be allocated for future development which will help facilitate the possibility of a distributor road to the west of Boston. This forms an important part of the longer term highway improvements within the adopted Transport Strategy and the County Council will continue to work closely with the Borough Council on this during the 3rd LTP period.’

**Relevant provisions for Spalding**

6.1.25 ‘Of major concern for the future economy of Spalding town centre is the proposal by Network Rail to route additional freight trains along an upgraded GN/GE Joint Line through the town. Traffic modelling has shown that the increased down time at level crossings will result in severe road network disruption. In addition, there are proposals to create a Freight Hub to the west of Spalding near the old A16. Whilst this will have significant benefits in terms of transferring freight from road to rail, it will also increase the rail traffic through the town making it imperative that some infrastructure improvements are carried out.’

6.1.26 ‘As a result of the above and the recent planning permission for 2,500 homes to the west of Spalding, a Western Relief Road is being promoted. A section of the proposed development road will form the first part of the Western Relief Road and it is intended to apply for planning permission for the section between the end of the development road and the A151 Bourne Road in late 2011/early 2012. The remaining section from the A151 to the B1356 Spalding Road will follow at a later date.’
6.2 Evidence Base

Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report

6.2.1 Evidence from the Scoping Report highlights a number of key issues and problems in relation to housing in South East Lincolnshire:

- a general lack of delivery of affordable housing across the area;
- house prices are relatively low;
- Boston Borough Council has an estimated 3.6-year supply of deliverable sites; and
- South Holland District has in excess of the required 5.25-year supply of deliverable sites.

Strategic Housing Market Assessments (SHMAs) relevant to the preparation of the Local Plan

A) Coastal Lincolnshire SHMA 2012 (covers household projections up to 2031/3) and is accompanied by an Economic Viability Assessment.

6.2.2 Key relevant findings for Boston Borough include:

Table 6.1: 2010-2031 Constrained to RSS Dwelling Delivery

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market housing</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate housing</td>
<td>(600)</td>
<td>(10.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-rented housing</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Requirement</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2: 2010-2031 Unconstrained 2008-based Household Projections

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market housing</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate housing</td>
<td>(600)</td>
<td>(11.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-rented housing</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Requirement</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a surplus of ‘intermediate housing’ due to the availability of cheap private sector housing filling the gap which would otherwise require intermediate housing;
- the modelled findings identify a high requirement for 1-bed social-rented dwellings which is driven by a projected growth in single person households in Coastal Lincolnshire. However, under new Local Housing Allowance rules, this need is likely to result in a rise in the demand for shared accommodation rather than for self-contained dwellings;
the achievement of delivery targets will be influenced by a number of issues including those related to the viability of housing delivery in lower value areas. Sensitivity testing of the results around dwelling delivery shows that:

- providing fewer dwellings in any area will marginally reduce the requirement for social and intermediate housing, but will mainly impact on the market housing requirement; and
- a lower level of completions will not significantly impact upon the requirements of those seeking affordable housing.

- the estimated requirement for extra care housing (including both market and affordable options) represents a significant proportion of the total housing requirement;
- the combined evidence of the SHMA and Viability assessment would support a higher target for affordable housing in rural areas. This is due to the fact that higher house prices are achieved in rural areas; and
- A specific issue affecting Boston Borough is that it is possible that official statistics have underestimated the number of Portuguese and Eastern European people who have moved to the Borough in the first part of the decade to work in the agriculture and packaging sectors.

B) Peterborough Sub-Region SHMA; August 2010 Update (covers household projections up to 2026)

6.2.3 Key relevant findings for the South Holland District part of the SHMA include:

Split between market and affordable housing

6.2.4 By following the CLG’s housing needs model it is suggested that for all needs to be met, over 100% of additional housing would need to be affordable (i.e. there is an annual need to provide 587 additional affordable housing units up to 2026 compared with a notional annual housing provision of 540 dwellings). Using the longer-term housing market model it is suggested that up to 58% of housing would be required to be affordable up to 2026. On this basis the requirement for market housing would only be in the range of 0% to 42%.

6.2.5 However, it is noted that these figures cannot be directly translated into policy and that the main aim of the SHMA is to quantify demand for various types of market housing and the need for affordable housing - the SHMA is part of the evidence base for decision-making through the LDF process.

Profile of household types requiring market housing

6.2.6 The SHMA studies requirements for market housing by looking at both short-term demands by household type and a longer-term view on the sizes of accommodation required based on demographic projections and likely build rates of housing up to 2026.

6.2.7 This analysis suggested that across the District around 27% of the demand will be from households containing children, 28% from single-person households and the remaining 45% from childless couples and other multi-adult households.
6.2.8 In the longer term, the analysis suggested that the majority of market demand would be for larger units – particularly three-bedroom homes and only about 1% of the demand would be for flats/maisonettes.

**Type and size of affordable housing**

6.2.9 The analysis also confirms the potential for intermediate housing to form a large proportion of the affordable housing provision (about 23% based on the CLG housing needs model and 31% based on the housing market model). The analysis of housing need also revealed that much of the need for intermediate housing is for households with limited access to capital. This suggests that products such as intermediate rent might be preferred to products such as discounted sale housing – shared ownership (depending on terms) may be suitable for households with both higher and lower levels of capital.

6.2.10 In terms of the sizes of affordable housing required, the housing needs model suggests that around 24% should be larger (3+ bedroom) accommodation with the housing market model suggesting a higher figure of 37%. The figure from the housing needs model demonstrates particular short-term pressures of housing need and is based on a strict bedroom standard.

**Thresholds**

6.2.11 Given the levels of housing need evidenced in this report it is suggested that opportunities to provide affordable housing should be maximised and therefore site thresholds below 15 dwellings may be appropriate in most locations. South Holland currently sets a threshold of 3 dwellings in both urban and rural areas and the evidence in the SHMA would support this position. Given that the evidence suggests a significant need in rural areas and the fact that such areas often have smaller site sizes consideration could be given to having no threshold at all in the most rural of areas (e.g. areas with a population of 3,000 or less). As with targets, decisions on thresholds will need to take account of viability and the sizes of sites likely to come forward for housing in the future.

**Summary**

6.2.12 Bringing together the results from the study and in particular the outputs of the housing needs and housing market models it is suggested that between 58% and 100% of additional housing would need to be affordable if all needs are to be met. In reality, the private rented sector will continue to be used to meet some of this need whilst targets will be constrained by the viability of individual sites. It will therefore be for the council to take a view on realistic targets based on economic viability as well as the level of housing need. In the affordable sector the data suggests that between 23% and 31% of additional housing should be intermediate with a particular focus on intermediate rent for households with limited levels of capital. In the market sector it is concluded that around 69% of additional homes should be larger (3 and 4+ bedroom) units with the opposite being true for affordable housing (between 63% and 76% smaller (1 and 2 bedroom) units).

6.2.13 Overall, the levels of both demand and need in the District are significant:

- growth in household numbers derived from Office for National Statistics (ONS) 2008-based population projections results in a requirement for 470
additional dpa, with a recommendation that 38% of the dwellings should be affordable housing;

- growth based on East Midlands Regional Plan figures results in a requirement for 540 dpa with a recommendation that 35% of the dwellings should be affordable housing;

- growth based on the abandoned ‘Revised Draft East Midlands Regional Plan (Partial Review)’ housing provision figures results in a requirement for 705 dpa with a recommendation that 31% of the dwellings should be affordable housing;

South East Lincolnshire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

6.2.14 Initial results from the preparation of the 2012 South East Lincolnshire SHLAA indicate that, in Boston Borough, there are available sites for 5,097 dwellings situated outside ROY zones out of a total of 26,995 dwellings across the Borough.

6.2.15 In South Holland District, there are available sites for 29,355 dwellings situated outside ROY zones out of a total of 41,224 dwellings across the District.

6.2.16 A breakdown of available SHLAA sites by settlement, split down into ROY and non-ROY land is available in Appendix 9.

Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople’s Accommodation Needs Assessment (2012)

6.2.17 The principal findings are set out below.

Residential Demand

6.2.18 ‘Demand is evident for up to 34 additional residential pitches on Traveller owned sites. This can best be met by expansion of existing small family owned sites to accommodate additional pitches for households of their extended family or the establishment of new small scale sites in largely rural settings. However, account must also be taken of the intended relocation of the 10 pitch unauthorised site at Five Acre Park, Gosberton Clough. Evidence indicates that only 7 pitches are permanently occupied and this is reflected in the demand calculation. South Holland DC is currently seeking suitable land on which a site can be developed for a land swap arrangement to be negotiated with the owners of pitches at Five Acre Park. Certain of the existing pitches are very large and, for example, it is known that one pitch is occupied by five households of an extended family. All 10 pitches are owned by Travellers and any new site provision must take this into account when establishing the required number of pitches.’

6.2.19 ‘Projecting newly forming households solely from the age profile is difficult given the number of respondents that failed to provide age details for their children. It is therefore suggested that a figure for household formation of 3% per annum compound is applied for years 6-10 and 11-15 as suggested by CLG. This calculation identifies a further need for 15 additional residential pitches in years 6-10 and 17 pitches in years 11-15. The majority of pitches will be required on privately

---

24 This document, prepared by the East Midlands Regional Assembly, was submitted to the Secretary of State on the 26 March 2010, in accordance with the provisions of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Following the formulation of the Coalition Government in May 2010, further work on its preparation was abandoned.
owned residential sites. Those arising from the local authority rented site could probably be met through vacancies arising over the periods concerned, but it is impractical to determine with any precision the likely split between site types that far in the future. Whilst there is minimal indication that newly forming households desire to leave the area at present this position could alter in the future.'

Need for Plots at Permanent Residential and Seasonal Sites for Showpeople

6.2.20 ‘It was not possible during the survey to make contact with Show or Circus People as their sites are used for Winter quarters only. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the present provision for Travelling Showpeople is adequate to meet their needs, but this may need further investigation should any planning application for Showpeople’s plots be made at a future date.’

Need for Transit or Stopping-Place Pitches

6.2.21 ‘Taking account of the strongly held views of the Travellers that fully serviced transit sites were not liked, the need appears to be for provision of pitches at simple stopping places with basic amenity provision.’

6.2.22 ‘The information gathered during the study indicates a relatively low level of incidence of unauthorised encampments. Development of the 10 pitch stopping place at Sutton Bridge for which planning permission has been obtained should meet the needs arising from travels to and from Cambridgeshire and Norfolk for the foreseeable future. This will meet the requirement in Planning Policy for Traveller Sites for a 5 year supply of such sites. The research indicates this as the most popular route for Traveller movements through South East Lincolnshire. The stopping place is most likely to be used throughout the summer season and perhaps during Easter.’

6.2.23 ‘Clay Lake Caravan Park acts as a private transit site and is owned and managed by a locally influential Romany Gypsy family. Entry to the site is at the behest of the owner and not everyone is accepted. Fluctuations in vacancy levels were observed at Clay Lake across the study period. However, there was at every visit capacity to absorb further caravans at short notice. The site provides for accommodating travellers from the East Midlands using the A1/A16 routes via Stamford.’

6.2.24 ‘Although there is no provision for stopping places in and around Boston to serve the A1/A17 routes via Newark or A1/A52 route via Grantham, the town is a relatively short travel distance by vehicle from Clay Lake or Sutton Bridge using the A16 and A17 respectively. These two sites should therefore meet the need for transit and stopping place provision for the foreseeable future, unless travel patterns change significantly. If the Sutton Bridge site is not developed there will be a need for a stopping place of similar size at an alternative location, perhaps nearby or in Whaplode or in the vicinity of Boston. There may still be the odd occasion when large groups of Travellers converge on one place, but this is a rare occurrence in South East Lincolnshire and is impossible to plan for.’
The Housing Implications of Employment Land in the Peterborough Sub-Region (2009)

6.2.25 The broad conclusions drawn from the study are:

- there is likely to be a requirement for the provision of additional housing in response to additional employment achieved as the employment land comes forward;
- there must be a diverse, high quality housing offer across the sub-region to improve the prospects of attracting and retaining those persons attracted by job opportunities provided on the employment land; and
- for many newly forming households, or households moving into the area, levels of earnings in some industries and occupations that will potentially locate on the identified employment land may not permit the households to achieve owner occupation unless they had existing equity. Hence the provision of affordable housing, as part of balanced housing offer, will be an important component of long term growth.

Assessment of the Sustainability of Rural Settlements

6.2.26 This evidence base document contains an assessment of the 72 settlements in South East Lincolnshire excluding Boston and Spalding. This was carried out in 2011 and, therefore, presents a point-in-time analysis. The assessment covers 3 essential sustainability-related themes: access to services and facilities (e.g. shops, schools, healthcare etc.); public transport provision; and access to employment opportunities. The assessment produced a scoring mechanism that shows a broad indication of which settlements offer the most sustainable locations and which settlements are most dependent on other locations for services and facilities. The results of this study are currently being refined. However, in terms of using this information to formulate policy it is important to recognise the fact that it only provides a broad indication of settlement ‘sustainability’ at a single point in time.

Draft version of the South East Lincolnshire Whole Plan Viability Assessment (2012)

6.2.27 The findings of the Draft Assessment can be summarised as:

- ‘That national policy requires local authorities to undertake whole plan viability assessment and that is it no longer possible to compartmentalise different policy requirements.
- Our assessment has been undertaken during a backdrop of economic and housing market instability. Thus future policy based on this study will need to be crafted in such way as to allow for flexibility to reflect fluctuations in the housing market.
- That both sales values and land values have fallen considerably in the area; and as result, there is a unique housing market, one that is served almost entirely by local developers and contractors. The national developers are unable to make schemes viable.
- That some important decisions are required on priorities of how to spend the limited developer’s residual pot.
- That although the affordable housing need is great, at present, 20% affordable housing is likely to be viable, with some infrastructure or flood mitigation measures. However, site specific negotiations may be required on some schemes.
• There is no need for a size threshold for the affordable housing requirement, and we suggest a commuted sum range of between £20K to £30K to charge schemes where it is not appropriate to provide on site affordable housing.
• The range of mix of private – affordable housing mix required to cross-subsidise affordable housing delivery on exceptions sites. We suggest a range of 45 – 60% affordable housing (depending on site specifics).
• That the local authorities and their elected members will need to make important decisions between different competing priorities, particularly in the current economic climate.
• Once these decisions have been made on priorities, then we shall provide further fine grained evidence to inform a Community Infrastructure Levy charging schedule.

South East Lincolnshire Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) Baseline Study

6.2.28 The final Strategy and Policies DPD will be accompanied by an IDP. A baseline report on infrastructure will be prepared to accompany this Preferred Options document. At present this is still emerging, but it is not envisaged that its contents will impact on the generation of options, as it will simply provide information related to the baseline situation in terms of infrastructure provision.

6.2.29 However, in due course, information relating the deliverability and viability of any critical pieces of infrastructure to support the strategy outlined on the Local Plan will need to be determined. This evidence will need to demonstrate how such infrastructure will be funded. Evidence relating to development viability will be important in this respect, as it will help to determine the capacity of development to contribute to the delivery of such infrastructure. There needs to be a reasonable degree of confidence in the availability of funding for the infrastructure included in the IDP, especially where a piece of infrastructure is identified as critical.

The context provided by the relevant preferred policy approaches are set out in previous chapters of this document

6.2.30 The Provision for Housing and Spatial Strategy preferred policy approaches are relevant to this subject.
Provision for Housing

Provision will be made for a net increase of at least 13,920 dwellings in South East Lincolnshire in accordance with the requirements set out in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority area</th>
<th>Annual Apportionment From 2011</th>
<th>Total Housing Provision 2011-2031</th>
<th>Maximum number of dwellings provided in areas categorised as Red, Orange or Yellow flood-hazard zones (as defined in the Lincolnshire Coastal Study)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston Borough</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>4,520</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Holland District</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>9,400</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Lincolnshire</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>13,920</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spatial Strategy

South East Lincolnshire comprises four types of place:

• **Sub-Regional Centres**: Boston and Spalding.
  
  These will be the main locations for new development.

• **Main Service Centres**: Crowland, Donington, Holbeach, Kirton, Long Sutton and Sutton Bridge
  
  These will continue to provide for significant housing, employment and commercial development to support their roles as service centres for surrounding rural areas.

• **Service Villages**: Algarkirk, Bicker, Butterwick, Cowbit, Deeping St. Nicholas, Fishtoft, Fleet Hargate, Gedney Hill, Gosberton, Kirton End, Leake Commonside, Moulton, Moulton Chapel, Old Leake, Pinchbeck, Quadring, Sutterton, Sutton St. James, Surfleet, Tydd St Mary, Swineshead, Swineshead Bridge, Weston, Whaplode, Wigtoft and Wrangle
  
  These will act as local service centres for the surrounding rural area. Limited new development should support or improve their role as a focus for social and economic activity.

• **The Countryside**: the rest of South East Lincolnshire, including all settlements not listed above, within which development will be restricted to the following categories in accordance with other local plan policies:
  
  • agriculture;
  • forestry;
  • the preservation of Listed Buildings;
  • the reuse and adaptation of buildings for appropriate purposes;
  • coastal and flood protection;
  • rural exceptions affordable housing;
  • the extension and replacement of dwellings;
  • sites for Gypsy and Travellers and travelling showpeople;
  • new-build employment generating proposals where there is a particular environmental or operational justification;
  • the diversification of rural enterprises;
  • community services and facilities meeting a proven local need;
  • development by statutory undertakers or public utility providers;
  • recreation and tourism;
  • renewable energy projects;
  • transport;
  • mineral extraction; and
  • waste management facilities.
Assessment of Broad Locations for Growth at Boston and Spalding (2012)

6.2.31 This is a background paper which forms Appendix 12 to this document. It has been prepared for the purpose of informing the preparation of a preferred policy approach to the promotion of ‘broad locations’ around Boston and Spalding for the accommodation of significant levels of housing growth. It utilises a set of criteria to determine ‘reasonable’ and ‘unreasonable’ options and then subjects the reasonable options to the SA process.

6.2.32 In respect of Boston, particular regard is paid to the issues of flood risk and developer interest in guiding the identification of potential broad locations. This results in a single reasonable option to the south-west of Boston.

6.2.33 In respect of Spalding, particular regard is paid to these same issues plus the potential to benefit from, and contribute to funding, the delivery of the Spalding Western Relief Road. This results in three potential reasonable options located to the west and north-west of Spalding.

Spalding Western Relief Road Technical Note: Core Strategy Option Testing (March 2013)

6.2.34 Mouchel Limited, working as Lincolnshire County Council Highways Alliance, was commissioned to use the updated SATURN traffic model for the Spalding area to test a number of further forecasting scenarios which incorporate various sections of the proposed Spalding Western Relief Road (SWRR) and possible and permitted residential developments across Spalding. It should be noted that the ‘possible’ developments featured in the Technical Note are drawn from the three ‘reasonable options’ for broad locations for housing growth in Spalding identified in ‘Assessment of Broad Locations for Growth at Boston and Spalding’ (see Appendix 12 of this document).

6.2.35 The conclusions set out on page 25 state:

‘The results indicate that many of the key town centre junctions are already predicted to operate above their practical capacity in the do-minimum situation, with the exception of Junction 1 (Spalding Rd/Wardentree Lane) and Junction 7 (A151 Monks House Lane).

6.2.36 Furthermore, the introduction of one or more phases of the SWRR is generally offset by the committed and aspirational development. The only scenario which appears to show some benefit compared with the do-minimum is Scenario 4, which comprises the full build out of the SWRR and minimum development assumptions. However, it is considered that the level of benefit is not significant and the results should be treated with caution.

6.2.37 The proposed junctions which tie in either end of the scheme to the existing network are generally predicted to operate comfortably, and it is considered that their operation could be improved by amendments to their design.’

6.2.38 Although the evidence is not conclusive, further scrutiny of the modelling suggests that the most beneficial impact on transport conditions in seeking to deliver the required housing provision and new road infrastructure in Spalding by 2030 is achieved through the completion of:
all three phases of the SWRR;
outstanding housing commitments at Wygate Park;
the Holland Park urban extension; and
up to 3,750 dwellings in a broad location to the north of the Vernatt’s Drain.

A Strategic Plan for Holbeach Parish 2013-2033 (Draft version; 2013)

6.2.39 Relevant Strategic Priority: ‘To promote the delivery of a new roundabout at the A151/A17 junction in association with the development of the allocated land to the west of Holbeach.’

Historic Rates of Housing Development

6.2.40 In Boston Borough, evidence from development rates for housing over the last 35 years shows that completions in the Boston urban area have equated to approximately 65% of dwellings built. Kirton has accommodated some 12% of dwelling completions. No other settlements in the Borough have seen residential development that could be considered to be significant in a strategic sense.

6.2.41 In South Holland District, development rates over the last 8 years show that completions at Spalding have amounted to approximately 51% of dwellings built. Holbeach has accommodated 7%, Sutton Bridge - 6%, Long Sutton - 3% and Crowland - 3%.

6.3 Key Issues

6.3.1 The following key issues emerging from the policy context, evidence base and preceding chapters require a policy response:

- the need to identify the broad distribution and scale of housing provision across South East Lincolnshire to meet the housing target in the period up to 2031 in a manner that recognises the limit on the number of dwellings that can be developed in ROY zones;
- the need to demonstrate how the above housing provision will be accommodated through the identification of broad locations for growth, sites with planning permission and the Site Allocations DPD;
- the need to make provision for 34 additional residential pitches for Gypsies and Travellers in the period 2012-17 and the current lack of a 5-year supply of specific deliverable sites to meet this target;
- the need to integrate the planning of the LTP3 proposal for a SWRR with the required housing provision for Spalding (Lincolnshire County Council has indicated that it expects developer contributions to fund the SWRR and it is considered that such funding is best facilitated through a commitment to use this road to service housing growth in Spalding extending some time beyond the plan period);
- set out a housing implementation strategy to maintain a minimum of a 5.25-year supply of specific deliverable sites against the Boston Borough and South Holland District housing targets;
- meeting the need for affordable housing; and
- the size, type and density of additional housing.
6.4 Other Policies

6.4.1 The Housing Growth and Flood Risk and Sustainable Development and Spatial Strategy chapters provide the context for this section in terms of the determination of the target for housing provision in South East Lincolnshire, the suitability of the ROY zones for accommodating new housing development and the broad distribution of development.

6.4.2 All site-specific housing allocations will be dealt with through the Site Allocations DPD in due course.

6.4.3 In the period up to the adoption of that document, all housing-related boundaries (including settlement boundaries) and housing allocations in extant Local Plans will be retained.

6.4.4 There are links with the Environment chapter in terms of the design of new housing development.

Approach to Identifying the Distribution and Scale of Additional Housing to be Provided in South East Lincolnshire up to 2031

6.5 Introduction

6.5.1 It is necessary to determine an approach that guides the distribution and scale of additional housing in accordance with the preferred policy approaches relating to the ‘Spatial Strategy’ and ‘Provision for Housing’ which, in turn, are underpinned by the two strategic priorities relating to sustainable development. Another factor which should inform the determination of the approach are the emerging results of the 2012 SHLAA exercise which, it should be noted, have not been informed by the Spatial Strategy and Provision for Housing preferred policy approaches.

6.5.2 It is considered appropriate to prepare a separate policy approach governing the distribution and scale of housing development for Boston Borough and South Holland District for the following reasons:

- the separate housing targets set out in the Provision for Housing preferred policy approach; and
- the differing circumstances relating to these two areas (e.g. the great majority of Boston Borough, including all of its principal settlement, Boston, is covered by the ROY flood-hazard zones [the ‘ROY zones’] whereas such zones cover less than half of South Holland District, and Boston Borough only has two higher-order settlements compared with South Holland District’s six).

6.5.3 Given the number of dwellings and designated settlements involved in this process, it is clear that a significant number of options for assigning dwellings to settlements could be generated in both Boston Borough and South Holland District. In order to keep this process manageable, a limited number of reasonable options for both Boston Borough and South Holland District are considered below, with a view to promoting further consideration of this matter through formal public consultation.

6.5.4 The preferred housing provision, as outlined in the Housing Growth and Flood Risk chapter, is intended to be met through extant planning permission (at 31st March 2012) and new allocations. Regardless of future ‘windfall’ planning permissions, it is
intended that the full amount of new allocations will still be brought forward. This will be delivered through the identification of broad locations in the Strategy and Policies DPD and further allocations through the Site Allocations DPD.

6.6 Options for Boston Borough

6.6.1 The preferred housing provision for Boston Borough is a minimum of 4,520 dwellings of which a maximum of 3,600 can be provided on sites in ROY zones. The preferred spatial strategy identifies fourteen designated settlements.

6.6.2 In Boston Borough, evidence of development rates for housing over the last 35 years shows that completions in the Boston urban area have amounted to approximately 65% of dwellings built. Kirton has accommodated some 12% of dwelling completions. No other settlements in the Borough have seen residential development that could be considered to be significant in a strategic sense.

a) Sub-Regional Centre of Boston

6.7 Reasonable Policy Options

6.7.1 In order to reconcile the intention to restrict the number of additional dwellings in identified ROY zones with the recognition of the large size of Boston and its important role in relation to the rest of the Borough, it is considered reasonable to apportion in the order of two-thirds of the Borough’s dwelling provision (i.e. 2,900 dwellings) to the town, all of which may be located in ROY zones. This level of provision is consistent with the historical proportion of the Borough’s housing growth accommodated by the town of Boston and is supported by available sites within the SHLAA. This dwelling provision will be delivered through the identification of broad locations through the Strategy and Policies DPD and further allocations through the Site Allocations DPD.

6.7.2 Option A: To provide 2,900 dwellings in Boston, all of which may be located in ROY zones.

6.8 Unreasonable Policy Options

6.8.1 Given Boston’s role and function as a sub-regional centre and its historic rates of residential development, it is thought unreasonable to appraise any option that considers the provision of less than 2,900 of Boston Borough’s additional housing provision in the town itself. An option which seeks a lower proportion would be inconsistent with the historical proportion of the Borough’s housing growth accommodated by Boston, and might impact upon the ability of the town to continue its current role and function as a sub-regional centre.

6.8.2 Given the preferred policy approach to the ‘cap’ in ROY zones (as outlined in the Housing Growth and Flood Risk chapter), it is also unreasonable to seek a higher proportion. To do so, would impact on the ability to distribute a reasonable amount of dwelling provision in the Borough’s other settlements, where there are opportunities to develop sites situated outside the ROY zones.
6.9 Sustainability Appraisal

Table 6.3: SA – Housing in Boston

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Key</th>
<th>Major positive (✓ ✓)</th>
<th>Minor positive (✓)</th>
<th>Neutral (0)</th>
<th>Minor Negative (X)</th>
<th>Major Negative (XX)</th>
<th>Mixed (e.g. ✓✓/X, ✓/X)</th>
<th>Uncertain (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Scoring for Topic Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic Area</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity, Geodiversity &amp; Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>X/?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, Health and Well-being</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy and Employment</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Risk</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Environment</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Waste</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>X/?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.9.1 **Air Quality**: Option A will have a minor negative impact on air quality as any new development will likely lead to increased air pollution, primarily due to increased road traffic. This may have a direct negative impact on the two identified Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) in the town of Boston.

6.9.2 **Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure**: Option A will have a mixed minor negative/uncertain impact. Any new development has the potential to impact upon protected sites of nature conservation importance. However, until broad locations are considered later in this chapter and site specifics are known (through the Site Allocations DPD) there will be uncertainty as to the nature of the impact. With any new development there is the potential positive impact of being able to ‘design-in’ green infrastructure.

6.9.3 **Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)**: Option A will have a minor negative impact. Any new development is likely to increase greenhouse gas emissions, both directly and indirectly. There are potential positive impacts through the opportunities to require new energy-efficient design and construction and to require that all housing proposals in flood-hazard areas will only be considered for approval subject to the mitigation of flood risk through flood-resilient design and emergency planning. However, all new development at Boston will be within the ROY zones.
6.9.4 **Community, Health and Well-being:** Option A will have a minor positive impact. The provision of additional housing will have a positive impact on both health and equality. There is also the potential for new development to support the funding of new community infrastructure.

6.9.5 **Economy and Employment:** Option A will have a minor positive impact. More housing will give rise to a larger population which has the potential to broaden the diversity of skills on offer and, in turn, support business diversification and growth. Specifically, the provision of additional housing will help to maintain employment in the construction sector and related industries.

6.9.6 **Flood Risk:** Option A will have a minor negative impact in providing for additional dwellings in areas categorised as either a Red, Orange or Yellow flood-hazard zone. However, there is the opportunity to require that all housing proposals in flood-hazard areas will only be permitted subject to the mitigation of flood risk through flood-resilient design and emergency planning. There is also the potential for new development to support the funding of new flood-defence-related infrastructure.

6.9.7 **Historic Environment:** Option A will have an uncertain impact. This is because site specifics will be considered, initially, through the identification of broad locations for housing development considered later in this chapter and, then, at a later date through the production of the Site Allocations DPD and through the development management process.

6.9.8 **Housing:** Option A will have a major positive impact as it will help to meet the housing needs of Boston Borough.

6.9.9 **Land and Waste:** Option A will have a minor negative impact. Any new greenfield development will result in permanent loss of agricultural land. New development will also likely lead to greater levels of waste generation.

6.9.10 **Landscape:** Option A will have a minor negative impact. Any new development on greenfield land will inevitably impact upon landscape but the precise nature of that impact will be dependent on the design, layout and landscaping of a particular development.

6.9.11 **Transport:** Option A will have a mixed minor negative/uncertain impact. Any new development is likely to lead to higher levels of road traffic and could exacerbate perceived congestion problems. There is potential to provide the critical mass of development required in a larger existing centre to promote sustainable modes of transport. However, there is an element of uncertainty until broad locations for housing development are considered later in this chapter and detailed locations for housing development are dealt with in the subsequent Site Allocations DPD.

6.9.12 **Water:** Option A will have a minor negative impact. Any new development is likely to increase pressure on water resources.

6.9.13 **Conclusion:** Whilst there is some uncertainty over the impacts of Option A and potential for minor negative impacts, particularly in terms of flood risk, it has a major positive impact in seeking to meet the housing needs of Boston Borough in particular. It also seeks to support the role and function of Boston as a sub-regional centre. The precise nature of some of the impacts will be dependent on the proposals in terms of broad locations for development and the Site Allocations DPD.
6.10 Delivery

6.10.1 This option will be delivered through the preferred policy approach to Broad Locations for Housing, the Site Allocations DPD and development management processes. As there are considered to be no other reasonable options at present, there are no relative delivery benefits. Significant housing development will require appropriate supporting infrastructure, which will be identified through the IDP.

6.10.2 The delivery of overall targets for additional dwellings will be monitored through an annual 'Monitoring Report'.

6.11 Preferred Option

6.11.1 Option A is the preferred option because it offers the opportunity to deliver additional housing growth in Boston Borough, specifically in the town of Boston, with a view to supporting its role and function as a sub-regional centre.

b) Main Service Centre of Kirton

6.12 Reasonable Policy Options

6.12.1 Notwithstanding the prevalence of ROY zones in the area, as the only Main Service Centre in Boston Borough, it is considered reasonable to apportion some 420 dwellings to Kirton to be delivered through the Site Allocations DPD. This amounts to a slight reduction compared to historic proportions of the Borough’s development in Kirton. This reflects the amount of the centre being classed as ROY land. This level of development is supported by available sites within the SHLAA.

6.12.2 Option A: To provide 420 dwellings in Kirton, of which no more than 400 may be located in ROY zones.

6.13 Unreasonable Policy Options

6.13.1 Given Kirton’s role and function as a main service centre and proximity to the town of Boston, it is thought unreasonable to appraise any option that considers the provision of less than 400 dwellings of Boston Borough’s additional housing within it. To do so would be inconsistent with the proportion of the Borough’s housing growth traditionally accommodated by Kirton and might undermine its role and function as a main service centre.

6.13.2 Given the preferred policy approach to the cap in ROY zones, it is also unreasonable to seek a higher proportion. To do so, would impact on the ability to distribute a reasonable amount of dwelling provision in the Borough’s other settlements, where there are opportunities to develop sites situated outside the ROY zones.
6.14 Sustainability Appraisal

Table 6.4: SA – Housing in Kirton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Key</th>
<th>Major positive (✓ ✓)</th>
<th>Minor positive (✓)</th>
<th>Neutral (0)</th>
<th>Minor Negative (X)</th>
<th>Major Negative (XX)</th>
<th>Mixed (e.g. ✓✓/X, ✓/X)</th>
<th>Uncertain (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring for Topic Areas</th>
<th>Option A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity, Geodiversity &amp; Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>X/?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, Health and Well-being</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy and Employment</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Risk</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Environment</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Waste</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.14.1 **Air Quality**: Option A will have a minor negative impact on air quality as any new development will likely lead to increased air pollution, primarily due to increased road traffic. Growth in this location may also lead to increased in-commuting to Boston for services and employment. This may have a direct negative impact on the two identified Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) in the town of Boston.

6.14.2 **Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure**: Option A will have a mixed minor negative/uncertain impact. Any new development has the potential to impact upon protected sites of nature conservation importance. However, until site specifics are known (through the Site Allocations DPD) there will be uncertainty as to the nature of the impact. With any new development there is the potential positive impact of being able to design-in green infrastructure.

6.14.3 **Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)**: Option A will have a minor negative impact. Any new development is likely to increase greenhouse gas emissions, both directly and indirectly. There are potential positive impacts through the opportunities to require new energy-efficient design and construction and to require that all housing proposals in flood-hazard areas will only be considered for approval subject to the mitigation of flood risk through flood-resilient design and emergency planning. However, the vast majority of new development at Kirton will be within the ROY zones.
6.14.4 **Community, Health and Well-being**: Option A will have a mixed minor positive impact. The provision of additional housing will have a positive impact on both health and equality. There is also the potential for new development to support the funding of new community infrastructure.

6.14.5 **Economy and Employment**: Option A will have a minor positive impact. More housing will give rise to a larger population which has the potential to broaden the diversity of skills on offer and, in turn, support business diversification and growth. Specifically, the provision of additional housing will help to maintain employment in the construction sector and related industries.

6.14.6 **Flood Risk**: Option A will have a minor negative impact in providing for additional dwellings in areas categorised as either a Red, Orange or Yellow flood-hazard zone. However, there is the opportunity to require that all housing proposals in flood-hazard areas will only be permitted subject to the mitigation of flood risk through flood-resilient design and emergency planning. There is also the potential for new development to support the funding of new flood-defence-related infrastructure.

6.14.7 **Historic Environment**: Option A will have an uncertain impact. This is because site specifics will be considered at a later date through the production of the Site Allocations DPD and through the development management process.

6.14.8 **Housing**: Option A will have a major positive impact as it will help to meet the housing needs of Boston Borough.

6.14.9 **Land and Waste**: Option A will have a minor negative impact. Any new greenfield development will result in permanent loss of agricultural land. New development will also likely lead to greater levels of waste generation.

6.14.10 **Landscape**: Option A will have a minor negative impact. Any new development on greenfield land will inevitably impact upon landscape but the precise nature of that impact will be dependent on the design, layout and landscaping of a particular development.

6.14.11 **Transport**: Option A will have a minor negative impact. Any new development is likely to lead to higher levels of road traffic and could exacerbate perceived congestion problems in nearby Boston as in-commuting occurs for services and employment.

6.14.12 **Water**: Option A will have a minor negative impact. Any new development is likely to increase pressure on water resources.

6.14.13 **Conclusion**: Whilst there is some uncertainty over the impacts of Option A and potential for minor negative impacts, particularly in terms of flood risk, it has a major positive impact in seeking to meet the housing needs of Boston Borough in particular. It also seeks to support the role and function of Kirton as a main service centre. The precise nature of some of the impacts will be dependent on the specific locations for development, which will be outlined in the subsequent Site Allocations DPD.
6.15 Delivery

6.15.1 This option will be delivered through the Site Allocations DPD and development management processes. As there are considered to be no other reasonable options at present, there are no relative delivery benefits. Significant housing development will require appropriate supporting infrastructure, which will be identified through the IDP.

6.15.2 The delivery of overall targets for additional dwellings will be monitored through an annual Monitoring Report.

6.16 Preferred Option

6.16.1 **Option A** is the preferred option because it offers the opportunity to deliver additional housing growth in Boston Borough, specifically at Kirton, with a view to supporting its role and function as a main service centre.

c) **Service Villages (Boston Borough)**

6.17 Reasonable Policy Options

6.17.1 Following the options for Boston and Kirton above, there are 1,200 dwellings to be distributed between Boston Borough’s twelve Service Villages, of which no more than 300 may be located in ROY zones. This provision will be delivered through the Site Allocations DPD.

6.17.2 The SHLAA indicates that all the Service Villages across Boston Borough have sites available for housing development with a total capacity ranging from fifty or so dwellings at the lower end to well over a thousand dwellings at the higher end. However, Bicker, Swineshead and Swineshead Bridge are the only designated settlements that are more or less free of coverage by ROY zones.

6.17.3 Having regard also to the findings of the Assessment of the Sustainability of Rural Settlements and the Boston SFRA, the village of Swineshead is considered to be particularly suited to accommodating a significant level of housing growth. As such, locating a greater proportion of the Borough’s new housing in Swineshead than has traditionally been the case is considered an appropriate option. This is supported by the findings of the SHLAA.

6.17.4 Accordingly, it is possible to recognise two policy options for the distribution and level of housing growth in Boston Borough’s Service Villages within the overall total of 1200 dwellings, based on the particular contribution to be made by Swineshead.

6.17.5 **Option A:** To deliver a scale and distribution of new housing development in the Service Villages across Boston Borough through allocations of 400 dwellings to the village of Swineshead and allocations to the other eleven Service Villages collectively not exceeding 800 dwellings (see Table 5 below). No more than 300 dwellings can be developed in ROY zones.

6.17.6 **Option B:** To deliver a scale and distribution of new housing development in the Service Villages across Boston Borough through allocations to each of the twelve Service Villages not exceeding 100 dwellings (see Table 5 below). No more than 300 dwellings can be developed in ROY zones.
6.18 Unreasonable Policy Options

6.18.1 It is unreasonable to determine an approach to the distribution and scale of additional housing across Boston Borough which includes no provision in the twelve Service Villages, especially given the availability of sites located outside ROY zones. To do so, would undermine delivery of the preferred policy approach relating to the cap on housing development in the ROY zones and, also, the successful delivery of the preferred housing growth target for the Borough. Furthermore, a moratorium on development in the service villages could undermine their long-term sustainability.

6.18.2 It is also unreasonable to seek a higher proportion of housing in the service villages as this would likely undermine the preferred spatial strategy and the expected role and function of Service Villages.

Table 6.5: Options for Service Village Dwelling Allocations in Boston Borough (2011-2031)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Village</th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swineshead</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>Up to 800 dwellings distributed between the eleven Service Villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algarkirk, Bicker, Fishtoft, Kirton End, Leake Commonside, Old Leake, Sutterton, Swineshead Bridge, Swineshead, Wigtoft and Wrangle</td>
<td>Up to 100 dwellings in each Service Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Village Total</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6.19 Sustainability Appraisal

#### Table 6.6: SA – Housing in Services Villages (Boston Borough)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Key</th>
<th>Major positive (√√)</th>
<th>Minor positive (√)</th>
<th>Neutral (0)</th>
<th>Minor Negative (X)</th>
<th>Major Negative (XX)</th>
<th>Mixed (e.g. √/√/X, √/X)</th>
<th>Uncertain (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scoring for Topic Areas</strong></td>
<td>Option A</td>
<td>Option B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity, Geodiversity &amp; Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>X/?</td>
<td>X/?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)</td>
<td>X/?</td>
<td>X/?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, Health and Well-being</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy and Employment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Risk</td>
<td>X/?</td>
<td>X/?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Environment</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>√√</td>
<td>√√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Waste</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.19.1 Air Quality: Both options will have a minor negative impact on air quality as any new development will likely lead to increased air pollution, primarily due to increased road traffic. Dispersed growth will also likely increase in-commuting to larger settlements, such as Boston, to access services and employment. This may have a direct negative impact on the two identified Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) in the town of Boston.

### 6.19.2 Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure: Both options will have a mixed minor negative/uncertain impact. Any new development has the potential to impact upon protected sites of nature conservation importance. However, until site specifics are known (through the Site Allocations DPD) there will be uncertainty as to the nature of the impact. With any new development there is the potential positive impact of being able to design-in green infrastructure.

### 6.19.3 Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation): Both options will have a mixed minor negative/uncertain impact. Any new development is likely to increase greenhouse gas emissions, both directly and indirectly. There are potential positive impacts through the opportunities to require new energy-efficient design and construction and to require that all housing proposals in flood-hazard areas will only be considered for approval subject to the mitigation of flood risk through flood-resilient design and emergency planning. However, there is an element of uncertainty as a result of the
undetermined nature of the detailed locations for housing development. This will be dealt with later through the subsequent Site Allocations DPD. However, by virtue of increasing the proportion of development at Swineshead (which lays predominantly outside of the ROY zone), relatively-speaking, option A is seen to have a lesser negative impact.

6.19.4 **Community, Health and Well-being**: Both options will have a minor positive impact. The provision of additional housing will have a positive impact on both health and equality. However, relatively-speaking there is also the potential for new development to support the funding of new community infrastructure which is more likely with the larger allocations possible under Option A.

6.19.5 **Economy and Employment**: Both options will have a minor positive impact. More housing will give rise to a larger population which has the potential to broaden the diversity of skills on offer and, in turn, support business diversification and growth. Specifically, the provision of additional housing will help to maintain employment in the construction sector and related industries.

6.19.6 **Flood Risk**: Both options will have a minor negative/uncertain effect in providing for additional dwellings in areas categorised as either a Red, Orange or Yellow flood-hazard zone. However, there is the opportunity to require that all housing proposals in flood-hazard areas will only be permitted subject to the mitigation of flood risk through flood-resilient design and emergency planning. However, there is an element of uncertainty as a result of the undetermined nature of the detailed locations for housing development. This will be dealt with later through the subsequent Site Allocations DPD. However, by virtue of increasing the proportion of development at Swineshead (which lays predominantly outside of the ROY zone), relatively-speaking, option A is seen to have a lesser negative impact. There is also the potential for new development to support the funding of new flood-defence-related infrastructure.

6.19.7 **Historic Environment**: Both options will have an uncertain impact. This is because site specifics will be considered at a later date through the production of the Site Allocations DPD and through the development management process.

6.19.8 **Housing**: Both options will have a major positive impact as it will help to meet the housing needs of Boston Borough. Housing development in lower-order settlements will also seek to ensure their continued sustainability.

6.19.9 **Land and Waste**: Both options will have a minor negative impact. Any new greenfield development will result in permanent loss of agricultural land. New development will also likely lead to greater levels of waste generation.

6.19.10 **Landscape**: Both options will have a minor negative impact. Any new development on greenfield land will inevitably impact upon landscape but the precise nature of that impact will be dependent on the design, layout and landscaping of a particular development.

6.19.11 **Transport**: Both options will have a minor negative impact. Any new development is likely to lead to higher levels of road traffic in order to access services and employment and could exacerbate perceived congestion problems in larger service centres, such as Boston.
6.19.12 Water: Both options will have a minor negative impact. Any new development is likely to increase pressure on water resources.

6.19.13 Conclusion: Whilst there is some uncertainty over the impacts of both options and potential for minor negative impacts, particularly in terms of flood risk, it has a major positive impact in seeking to meet the housing needs of Boston Borough in particular. It also seeks to support the role and function of Service Villages. The precise nature of some of the impacts will be dependent on the specific locations for development, which will be outlined in the subsequent Site Allocations DPD. Option A will be result in fewer dwellings being developed in ROY zones.

6.20 Delivery

6.20.1 Both options will be delivered by the Site Allocations DPD and development management processes. Most significant housing proposals will require appropriate supporting infrastructure which will be identified through the IDP.

6.20.2 The delivery of overall targets for additional dwellings will be monitored through an annual Monitoring Report.

6.21 Preferred Option

6.21.1 Option A is the preferred option because it offers the opportunity to deliver additional housing growth in Boston Borough with less chance of it being located in a ROY zone.

6.22 Options for South Holland District

6.22.1 The preferred housing provision for South Holland District is a minimum of 9,400 dwellings, of which a maximum of 1,600 can be provided on sites in ROY zones. The preferred spatial strategy identifies twenty designated settlements.

6.22.2 In South Holland District, evidence of development rates for housing over the last 8 years shows that completions at Spalding have amounted to approximately 51% of dwellings built. Holbeach has accommodated some 7%, Sutton Bridge - 6%, Long Sutton - 3% and Crowland – 3%.

a) Sub-Regional Centre of Spalding

6.23 Reasonable Policy Options

6.23.1 In recognition of Spalding’s role as a Sub-Regional Centre and the fact that it is significantly less constrained by ROY zone considerations, it is considered reasonable to apportion in the order of two-thirds of the District’s dwelling provision (i.e. 6,000 dwellings) to the town. This figure is supported by evidence of available sites within the SHLAA. As a proportion on the District’s total provision this is slightly greater than past contributions to housing growth. This reflects the availability on ‘non-ROY’ land around Spalding and the requirement to provide a Spalding Western Relief Road (SWRR) to support growth and address increased rail downtime issues, resulting from the upgrade to the ‘Joint Line’. This dwelling provision will be delivered through the identification of broad locations through the Strategy and Policies DPD and further allocations through the Site Allocations DPD.
6.23.2 **Option A:** To provide 6,000 dwellings in Spalding, none of which will be located in ROY zones.

6.24 **Unreasonable Policy Options**

6.24.1 Given Spalding’s role and function as a sub-regional centre and historic rate of residential development, it is thought unreasonable to appraise any option that considers the provision of a lower proportion of South Holland District’s additional housing in the town itself. This would undermine the potential delivery of the SWRR and would increase pressure on lower-order settlements outside of the ROY zones to fulfil the District’s housing requirement.

6.24.2 It is also deemed unreasonable to seek a higher proportion of growth in Spalding as this would impact upon the ability of lower-order settlements to deliver a limited amount of additional housing in keeping with their role and function. It would also probably lead to significant impacts in terms of new infrastructure requirements.

6.25 **Sustainability Appraisal**

**Table 6.7:** SA – Housing in Spalding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Key</th>
<th>Major positive (✓ ✓)</th>
<th>Minor positive (✓)</th>
<th>Neutral (0)</th>
<th>Minor Negative (X)</th>
<th>Major Negative (XX)</th>
<th>Mixed (e.g. ✓/✓/X, ✓/X)</th>
<th>Uncertain (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring for Topic Areas</th>
<th>Option A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity, Geodiversity &amp; Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>X/?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, Health and Well-being</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy and Employment</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Risk</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Environment</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Waste?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>X/?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.25.1 **Air Quality:** Option A will have a minor negative impact on air quality as any new development will likely lead to increased air pollution, primarily due to increased road
traffic, which could be exacerbated by future increases in rail-crossing downtime due to the planned upgrade of the Joint Line.

6.25.2 **Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure:** Option A will have a mixed minor negative/uncertain impact. Any new development has the potential to impact upon protected sites of nature conservation importance. However, until broad locations for housing development are considered later in this chapter and site specifics are known (through the Site Allocations DPD) there will be uncertainty as to the nature of the impact. With any new development there is the potential positive impact of being able to ‘design-in’ green infrastructure.

6.25.3 **Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation):** Option A will have a minor negative impact. Any new development is likely to increase greenhouse gas emissions, both directly and indirectly. There are potential positive impacts through the opportunities to require new energy-efficient design and construction.

6.25.4 **Community, Health and Well-being:** Option A will have a minor positive impact. The provision of additional housing will have a positive impact on both health and equality. There is also the potential for new development to support the funding of new community infrastructure.

6.25.5 **Economy and Employment:** Option A will have a minor positive impact. More housing will give rise to a larger population which has the potential to broaden the diversity of skills on offer and, in turn, support business diversification and growth. Specifically, the provision of additional housing will help to maintain employment in the construction sector and related industries.

6.25.6 **Flood Risk:** Option A will have a neutral impact in providing for additional dwellings outside areas categorised as either a Red, Orange or Yellow flood-hazard zone.

6.25.7 **Historic Environment:** Option A will have an uncertain impact. This is because site specifics will be considered, initially, through the identification of broad locations for housing development considered later in this chapter and, then, through the production of the Site Allocations DPD and through the development management process.

6.25.8 **Housing:** Option A will have a major positive impact as it will help to meet the housing needs of South Holland District.

6.25.9 **Land and Waste:** Option A will have a minor negative impact. Any new greenfield development will result in permanent loss of agricultural land. New development will also likely lead to greater levels of waste generation.

6.25.10 **Landscape:** Option A will have a minor negative impact. Any new development on greenfield land will inevitably impact upon landscape but the precise nature of that impact will be dependent on the design, layout and landscaping of a particular development.

6.25.11 **Transport:** Option A will have a mixed minor negative/uncertain impact. Any new development is likely to lead to higher levels of road traffic and could exacerbate perceived congestion problems, particularly in light of future increases in rail crossing downtime due to the planned upgrade of the ‘Joint Line’. There is potential to provide the critical mass of development required in a larger existing centre to
promote sustainable modes of transport. However, there is an element of uncertainty until the determination of broad locations for housing development and more detailed plans for a SWRR, which are considered later in this chapter, and detailed locations for housing development are dealt with in the subsequent Site Allocations DPD.

6.25.12 Water: Option A will have a minor negative impact. Any new development is likely to increase pressure on water resources.

6.25.13 Conclusion: Whilst there is some uncertainty over the impacts of Option A and potential for minor negative impacts, it has a major positive impact in seeking to meet the housing needs of South Holland District in particular. It also seeks to support the role and function of Spalding as a sub-regional centre. The precise nature of some of the impacts will be dependent on the proposals relating to the broad locations for development and the Site Allocations DPD.

6.26 Delivery

6.26.1 This option will be delivered through the preferred policy approach to Broad Locations for Housing, the Site Allocations DPD and development management processes. As there are considered to be no other reasonable options at present, there are no relative delivery benefits. Significant housing development will require appropriate supporting infrastructure, which will be identified through the IDP.

6.26.2 The delivery of overall targets for additional dwellings will be monitored through an annual 'Monitoring Report'.

6.27 Preferred Option

6.27.1 Option A is the preferred option because it offers the opportunity to deliver housing growth in South Holland District, specifically in the town of Spalding, with a view to supporting its role and function as a sub-regional centre.

b) Main Service Centre Holbeach

6.28 Reasonable Policy Options

6.28.1 Notwithstanding the prevalence of ROY zones in the north and east of the town, as clearly the largest of the Main Service Centres in South Holland District, it is considered reasonable to apportion some 1,000 dwellings to Holbeach to be delivered through the Site Allocations DPD. This is supported by available sites within the SHLAA. This represents a modest increase in the proportion of the District’s housing growth compared with recent experience. This reflects Holbeach’s status as South Holland District’s second-largest settlement and the availability of non-ROY land for development.

6.28.2 Option A: To provide 1,000 dwellings in Holbeach, of which no more than 900 may be located in ROY zones.
6.29 Unreasonable Policy Options

6.29.1 Given Holbeach’s role and function as a main service centre and as the second largest settlement in South Holland District, as well as the existence of a significant undeveloped South Holland Local Plan housing allocation which retains local community support, it is thought unreasonable to appraise any option that considers the provision of less than 1000 dwellings of South Holland District’s additional housing in the town. To do so may undermine its role and function as a main service centre.

6.29.2 Given the preferred policy approach to the cap in ROY zones (as outlined in the Housing Growth and Flood Risk chapter), it is also unreasonable to seek a higher proportion. To do so, could have an impact upon the ability to distribute a reasonable amount of growth in the District’s other main service centres.

6.30 Sustainability Appraisal

Table 6.8: SA – Housing in Holbeach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Key</th>
<th>Major positive (✓✓)</th>
<th>Minor positive (✓)</th>
<th>Neutral (0)</th>
<th>Minor Negative (X)</th>
<th>Major Negative (XX)</th>
<th>Mixed (e.g., ✓✓/✓, ✓✓/X)</th>
<th>Uncertain (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scoring for Topic Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity, Geodiversity &amp; Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>X/?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)</td>
<td>X/?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, Health and Well-being</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy and Employment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Risk</td>
<td>X/?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Environment</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Waste</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>X/?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.31.1 Air Quality: Option A will have a minor negative impact on air quality as any new development will likely lead to increased air pollution, primarily due to increased road traffic.

6.31.2 Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure: Option A will have a mixed minor negative/uncertain impact. Any new development has the potential to impact upon
protected sites of nature conservation importance. However, until site specifics are known (through the Site Allocations DPD) there will be uncertainty as to the nature of the impact. With any new development there is the potential positive impact of being able to design-in green infrastructure.

6.31.3 Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation): Option A will have a mixed minor negative/uncertain impact. Any new development is likely to increase greenhouse gas emissions, both directly and indirectly. There are potential positive impacts through the opportunities to require new energy-efficient design and construction and to require that all housing proposals in flood-hazard areas will only be considered for approval subject to the mitigation of flood risk through flood-resilient design and emergency planning. However, there is an element of uncertainty as a result of the undetermined nature of the detailed locations for housing development. This will be dealt with later through the subsequent Site Allocations DPD.

6.31.4 Community, Health and Well-being: Option A will have a minor positive impact. The provision of additional housing will have a positive impact on both health and equality. There is also the potential for new development to support the funding of new community infrastructure.

6.31.5 Economy and Employment: Option A will have a minor positive impact. More housing will give rise to a larger population which has the potential to broaden the diversity of skills on offer and, in turn, support business diversification and growth. Specifically, the provision of additional housing will help to maintain employment in the construction sector and related industries.

6.31.6 Flood Risk: Option A will have a mixed minor negative/uncertain impact in providing for additional dwellings in areas categorised as either a Red, Orange or Yellow flood-hazard zone. However, there is the opportunity to require that all housing proposals in flood-hazard areas will only be permitted subject to the mitigation of flood risk through flood-resilient design and emergency planning. However, there is an element of uncertainty as a result of the undetermined nature of the detailed locations for housing development. This will be dealt with later through the subsequent Site Allocations DPD. There is also the potential for new development to support the funding of new flood-defence-related infrastructure.

6.31.7 Historic Environment: Option A will have an uncertain impact. This is because site specifics will be considered at a later date through the production of the Site Allocations DPD and through the development management process.

6.31.8 Housing: Option A will have a major positive impact as it will help to meet the housing needs of South Holland District.

6.31.9 Land and Waste: Option A will have a minor negative impact. Any new greenfield development will result in permanent loss of agricultural land. New development will also likely lead to greater levels of waste generation.

6.31.10 Landscape: Option A will have a minor negative impact. Any new development on greenfield land will inevitably impact upon landscape but the precise nature of that impact will be dependent on the design, layout and landscaping of a particular development.
6.31.11 Transport: Option A will have a mixed minor negative/uncertain impact. Any new development is likely to lead to higher levels of road traffic but could result in improvements to the A151/A17 ‘Peppermint Junction’, dependent upon the location of new development.

6.31.12 Water: Option A will have a minor negative impact. Any new development is likely to increase pressure on water resources.

6.31.13 Conclusion: Whilst there is some uncertainty over the impacts of Option A and potential for minor negative impacts, particularly in terms of flood risk, it has a major positive impact in seeking to meet the housing needs of South Holland District in particular. It also seeks to support the role and function of Holbeach as a main service centre. The precise nature of some of the impacts will be dependent on the specific locations for development, which will be outlined in the subsequent Site Allocations DPD.

6.32 Delivery

6.32.1 This option will be delivered through the Site Allocations DPD and development management processes. As there are considered to be no other reasonable options at present, there are no relative delivery benefits. Significant housing development will require appropriate supporting infrastructure, which will be identified through the IDP.

6.32.2 The delivery of overall targets for additional dwellings will be monitored through an annual Monitoring Report.

6.33 Preferred Option

6.33.1 Option A is the preferred option because it offers the opportunity to deliver housing growth in South Holland District, specifically in the town of Holbeach, with a view to supporting its role and function as a main service centre.

c) Main Service Centres of Long Sutton and Sutton Bridge

6.34 Reasonable Policy Options

6.34.1 Given the total coverage of these towns by ROY zones, it is considered reasonable to apportion only 150 dwellings to each of the Main Service Centres of Long Sutton and Sutton Bridge to be delivered through the Site Allocations DPD. This is supported by evidence of available sites in the SHLAA. Also as a proportion of the District's housing provision, the figure for Long Sutton is consistent with past contributions. In respect of Sutton Bridge, the figure represents a slight decrease in the proportion of growth. This is considered to be reasonable given the potential severity of flood hazard in the Sutton Bridge area.

6.34.2 Option A: To provide 150 dwellings in each of Long Sutton and Sutton Bridge, all of which may be located in ROY zones.

6.35 Unreasonable Policy Options

6.35.1 Given the role and function of Long Sutton and Sutton Bridge as main service centres, it is thought unreasonable to appraise any option that considers the
provision of less than 150 dwellings of South Holland’s additional housing with each of these towns. To do so may undermine their role and function as main service centres.

6.35.2 Given the preferred policy approach to the cap in ROY zones (as outlined in the Housing Growth and Flood Risk chapter), it is also unreasonable to seek a higher proportion. To do so, could have an impact upon the ability to distribute a reasonable amount of growth in the District’s other main service centres.

6.36 Sustainability Appraisal

Table 6.9: SA – Housing in Long Sutton and Sutton Bridge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Key</th>
<th>Major positive (✓✓)</th>
<th>Minor positive (✓)</th>
<th>Neutral (0)</th>
<th>Minor Negative (X)</th>
<th>Major Negative (XX)</th>
<th>Mixed (e.g. ✓✓/X, ✓/X)</th>
<th>Uncertain (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Scoring for Topic Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic Area</th>
<th>Option A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity, Geodiversity &amp; Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>X/?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, Health and Well-being</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy and Employment</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Risk</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Environment</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Waste</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.36.1 Air Quality: Option A will have a minor negative impact on air quality as any new development will likely lead to increased air pollution, primarily due to increased road traffic. Given the role and function of the two settlements and their location, new development may also increase out-commuting for services and employment to nearby larger centres, such as Wisbech and King’s Lynn.

6.36.2 Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure: Option A will have a mixed minor negative/uncertain impact. Any new development has the potential to impact upon protected sites of nature conservation importance. However, until site specifics are known (through the Site Allocations DPD) there will be uncertainty as to the nature of the impact. With any new development there is the potential positive impact of being able to design-green infrastructure.
6.36.3 Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation): Option A will have a minor negative impact. Any new development is likely to increase greenhouse gas emissions, both directly and indirectly. There are potential positive impacts through the opportunities to require new energy-efficient design and construction and to require that all housing proposals in flood-hazard areas will only be considered for approval subject to the mitigation of flood risk through flood-resilient design and emergency planning.

6.36.4 Community, Health and Well-being: Option A will have a minor positive impact. The provision of additional housing will have a positive impact on both health and equality. There is also the potential for new development to support the funding of new community infrastructure.

6.36.5 Economy and Employment: Option A will have a minor positive impact. More housing will give rise to a larger population which has the potential to broaden the diversity of skills on offer and, in turn, support business diversification and growth. Specifically, the provision of additional housing will help to maintain employment in the construction sector and related industries.

6.36.6 Flood Risk: Option A will have a minor negative impact in providing for additional dwellings in areas categorised as either a Red, Orange or Yellow flood-hazard zone. However, there is the opportunity to require that all housing proposals in flood-hazard areas will only be permitted subject to the mitigation of flood risk through flood-resilient design and emergency planning. There is also the potential for new development to support the funding of new flood-defence-related infrastructure.

6.36.7 Historic Environment: Option A will have an uncertain impact. This is because site specifics will be considered at a later date through the production of the Site Allocations DPD and through the development management process.

6.36.8 Housing: Option A will have a major positive impact as it will help to meet the housing needs of South Holland District.

6.36.9 Land and Waste: Option A will have a minor negative impact. Any new greenfield development will result in permanent loss of agricultural land. New development will also likely lead to greater levels of waste generation.

6.36.10 Landscape: Option A will have a minor negative impact. Any new development on greenfield land will inevitably impact upon landscape but the precise nature of that impact will be dependent on the design, layout and landscaping of a particular development.

6.36.11 Transport: Option A will have a minor negative impact. Any new development is likely to lead to higher levels of road traffic and could exacerbate perceived congestion problems elsewhere. Given the role and function of the two settlements and their location, new development may also increase out-commuting for services and employment to nearby larger centres, such as Wisbech and King’s Lynn.

6.36.12 Water: Option A will have a minor negative impact. Any new development is likely to increase pressure on water resources.

6.36.13 Conclusion: Whilst there is some uncertainty over the impacts of Option A and potential for minor negative impacts, particularly in terms of flood risk, it has a major positive impact in seeking to meet the housing needs of South Holland District in
particular. It also seeks to support the role and function of Long Sutton and Sutton Bridge as main service centres. The precise nature of some of the impacts will be dependent on the specific locations for development, which will be outlined in the subsequent Site Allocations DPD.

6.37 Delivery

6.37.1 This option will be delivered through the Site Allocations DPD and development management processes. As there are considered to be no other reasonable options at present, there are no relative delivery benefits. Significant housing development will require appropriate supporting infrastructure, which will be identified through the IDP.

6.37.2 The delivery of overall targets for additional dwellings will be monitored through an annual 'Monitoring Report'.

6.38 Preferred Option

6.38.1 Option A is the preferred option because it offers the opportunity to deliver housing growth in South Holland District, specifically in the towns of Long Sutton and Sutton Bridge, with a view to supporting their role and function as main service centres.

d) Main Service Centres of Crowland and Donington

6.39 Reasonable Policy Options

6.39.1 Since they are free of any coverage by ROY zones, it is considered reasonable to apportion 300 dwellings to each of the Main Service Centres of Crowland and Donington to be delivered through the Site Allocations DPD. This is supported by evidence of available sites in the SHLAA. Although no information is available for Donington, the proportion of the District’s housing growth promoted at Crowland is consistent with past contributions.

6.39.2 Option A: To provide 300 dwellings in each of Crowland and Donington, none of which will be located in ROY zones.

6.40 Unreasonable Policy Options

6.40.1 Given the role and function of Crowland and Donington as main service centres, it is thought unreasonable to appraise any option that considers the provision of less than 300 dwellings of South Holland’s additional housing with each of these towns. To do so may undermine their role and function as main service centres, and in the case of Crowland would be inconsistent with levels of growth in the recent past.

6.40.2 It is also deemed unreasonable to provide a greater proportion of housing, despite both settlements being outside of the ROY zone, given their relatively lower provision of services and facilities compared with Holbeach.
6.41 Sustainability Appraisal

### Table 6.10: SA – Housing in Crowland and Donington

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Key</th>
<th>Major positive (✓)</th>
<th>Minor positive (✓)</th>
<th>Neutral (0)</th>
<th>Minor Negative (X)</th>
<th>Major Negative (XX)</th>
<th>Mixed (e.g. ✓/✓/X, ✓/X)</th>
<th>Uncertain (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Scoring for Topic Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic Area</th>
<th>Scoring for Topic Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity, Geodiversity &amp; Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>X/?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, Health and Well-being</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy and Employment</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Risk</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Environment</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>✓/✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Waste</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.41.1 **Air Quality**: Option A will have a minor negative impact on air quality as any new development will likely lead to increased air pollution, primarily due to increased road traffic. Given the role and function of the two settlements and their location, new development may also increase out-commuting for services and employment to nearby larger centres, such as Spalding, Boston, Grantham and Peterborough.

6.41.2 **Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure**: Option A will have a mixed minor negative/uncertain impact. Any new development has the potential to impact upon protected sites of nature conservation importance. However, until site specifics are known (through the Site Allocations DPD) there will be uncertainty as to the nature of the impact. With any new development there is the potential positive impact of being able to design-in green infrastructure.

6.41.3 **Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)**: Option A will have a minor negative impact. Any new development is likely to increase greenhouse gas emissions, both directly and indirectly. There are potential positive impacts through the opportunities to require new energy-efficient design and construction.

6.41.4 **Community, Health and Well-being**: Option A will have a minor positive impact. The provision of additional housing will have a positive impact on both health and
equality. There is also the potential for new development to support the funding of new community infrastructure.

6.41.5 **Economy and Employment:** Option A will have a minor positive impact. More housing will give rise to a larger population which has the potential to broaden the diversity of skills on offer and, in turn, support business diversification and growth. Specifically, the provision of additional housing will help to maintain employment in the construction sector and related industries.

6.41.6 **Flood Risk:** Option A will have a neutral impact in providing for additional dwellings outside areas categorised as either a Red, Orange or Yellow flood-hazard zone.

6.41.7 **Historic Environment:** Option A will have an uncertain impact. This is because site specifics will be considered at a later date through the production of the Site Allocations DPD and through the development management process.

6.41.8 **Housing:** Option A will have a major positive impact as it will help to meet the housing needs of South Holland District.

6.41.9 **Land and Waste:** Option A will have a minor negative impact. Any new greenfield development will result in permanent loss of agricultural land. New development will also likely lead to greater levels of waste generation.

6.41.10 **Landscape:** Option A will have a minor negative impact. Any new development on greenfield land will inevitably impact upon landscape but the precise nature of that impact will be dependent on the design, layout and landscaping of a particular development.

6.41.11 **Transport:** Option A will have a minor negative impact. Any new development is likely to lead to higher levels of road traffic and could exacerbate perceived congestion problems elsewhere. Given the role and function of the two settlements and their location, new development may also increase out-commuting for services and employment to nearby larger centres, such as Spalding, Boston, Grantham and Peterborough.

6.41.12 **Water:** Option A will have a minor negative impact. Any new development is likely to increase pressure on water resources.

6.41.13 **Conclusion:** Whilst there is some uncertainty over the impacts of Option A and potential for minor negative impacts, it has a major positive impact in seeking to meet the housing needs of South Holland District in particular. It also seeks to support the role and function of Crowland and Donington as a main service centres. The precise nature of some of the impacts will be dependent on the specific locations for development, which will be outlined in the subsequent Site Allocations DPD.

6.42 **Delivery**

6.42.1 This option will be delivered through the Site Allocations DPD and development management processes. As there are considered to be no other reasonable options at present, there are no relative delivery benefits. Significant housing development will require appropriate supporting infrastructure, which will be identified through the IDP.
6.42.2 The delivery of overall targets for additional dwellings will be monitored through an annual Monitoring Report.

6.43 Preferred Option

6.43.1 **Option A** is the preferred option because it offers the opportunity to deliver additional housing growth in South Holland District, specifically in the towns of Crowland and Donington, with a view to supporting their role and function as main service centres.

e) Service Villages (South Holland District)

6.44 Reasonable Policy Options

6.44.1 As at 31 March, 2012, after the first year of the Plan period, housing provision across the District (by way of completions and planning permissions) had already been made for 2,103 dwellings. This provision coupled with the housing allocations for Spalding and the five Main Service Centres made above amounts to over 10,000 dwellings. This is in excess of the proposed minimum requirement of 9,400 dwellings and before any consideration is given to housing allocations in Service Villages.

6.44.2 Given that the role of Service Villages is to accommodate limited new development which maintains or enhances their role as a focus for social and economic activity, it is not appropriate that significant numbers of additional dwellings should be accommodated in the Service Villages. However, the 2012 SHLAA indicates that all the Service Villages across South Holland District, with the exception of Deeping St Nicholas, have sites available for housing development with a total capacity ranging from over 200 dwellings at the lower end to just under a thousand dwellings at the higher end, and all of them are either completely or partially free of coverage by ROY zones.

6.44.3 In view of this situation, two policy options for the apportionment of housing growth in South Holland District’s Service Villages have been generated, based on differing overall quantities of housing. This approach differs to that relating to Service Villages in Boston Borough. This is primarily because of the need in Boston Borough to accommodate more development in these settlements by virtue of the cap on housing in the ROY zones and the location of the Borough’s higher order settlements within them. In both cases, this dwelling provision will be delivered through the Site Allocations DPD.

6.44.4 **Option A**: To deliver a scale of new housing development to each of South Holland District’s fourteen Service Villages not exceeding **25 dwellings**, none of which will be located in ROY zones (see Table 6 below).

6.44.5 **Option B**: To deliver a scale of new housing development to each of South Holland District’s fourteen Service Villages not exceeding **50 dwellings**, none of which will be located in ROY zones (see Table 6 below).

6.45 Unreasonable Policy Options

6.45.1 It is unreasonable to determine an approach to the distribution and scale of additional housing across South Holland District which includes no residential allocations in the fourteen Service Villages, especially given the availability of sites located outside ROY zones. Furthermore, a moratorium on development in the
Service Villages could undermine their ability to become more inclusive and mixed communities.

6.45.2 It is also unreasonable to seek a higher proportion in the Service Villages as this would undermine the preferred spatial strategy and the intended role and function of Service Villages.

Table 6.11: Options for Service Village Dwelling Allocations in South Holland District (2011-2031)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Villages</th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cowbit, Deeping St Nicholas, Fleet Hargate, Gedney Hill, Gosberton, Moulton, Moulton Chapel, Pinchbeck, Quadring, Sutton St James, Surfleet, Tydd St Mary, Weston and Whaplode</td>
<td>Up to 25 dwellings in each Service Village</td>
<td>Up to 50 dwellings in each Service Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Service Village Total</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.46 Sustainability Appraisal

Table 6.12: SA – Service Villages (South Holland)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Key</th>
<th>Major positive (✓✓)</th>
<th>Minor positive (✓)</th>
<th>Neutral (0)</th>
<th>Minor Negative (X)</th>
<th>Major Negative (XX)</th>
<th>Mixed (e.g. ✓✓/X, ✓/X)</th>
<th>Uncertain (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scoring for Topic Areas</td>
<td>Option A</td>
<td>Option B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity, Geodiversity &amp; Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>X/?</td>
<td>X/?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, Health and Well-being</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy and Employment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Risk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Environment</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Waste</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>X/?</td>
<td>X/?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.46.1 **Air Quality:** Both options will have a minor negative impact on air quality as any new development will likely lead to increased air pollution, primarily due to increased road traffic. Dispersed growth will also likely increase in-commuting to larger settlements, such as Boston, to access services and employment.

6.46.2 **Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure:** Both options will have a mixed minor negative/uncertain impact. Any new development has the potential to impact upon protected sites of nature conservation importance. However, until site specifics are known (through the Site Allocations DPD) there will be uncertainty as to the nature of the impact. With any new development there is the potential positive impact of being able to design-in green infrastructure.

6.46.3 **Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation):** Both options will have a minor negative impact. Any new development is likely to increase greenhouse gas emissions, both directly and indirectly. There are potential positive impacts through the opportunities to require new energy-efficient design and construction.

6.46.4 **Community, Health and Well-being:** Both options will have a minor positive impact. The provision of additional housing will have a positive impact on both health and equality.

6.46.5 **Economy and Employment:** Both options will have a minor positive impact. More housing will give rise to a larger population which has the potential to broaden the diversity of skills on offer and, in turn, support business diversification and growth. Specifically, the provision of additional housing will help to maintain employment in the construction sector and related industries.

6.46.6 **Flood Risk:** Both options will have a neutral impact in providing for additional dwellings outside areas categorised as either a Red, Orange or Yellow flood-hazard zone.

6.46.7 **Historic Environment:** Both options will have an uncertain impact. This is because site specifics will be considered at a later date through the production of the Site Allocations DPD and through the development management process.

6.46.8 **Housing:** Both options will have a major positive impact as they will help to meet the housing needs of South Holland District. Limited housing development in lower-order settlements will also serve to enhance their ability to become more inclusive and mixed communities.

6.46.9 **Land and Waste:** Both options will have a minor negative impact. Any new greenfield development will result in permanent loss of agricultural land. New development will also likely lead to greater levels of waste generation.

6.46.10 **Landscape:** Both options will have a minor negative impact. Any new development on greenfield land will inevitably impact upon landscape but the precise nature of that impact will be dependent on the design, layout and landscaping of a particular development.

6.46.11 **Transport:** Both options will have a mixed minor negative/uncertain impact. Any new development is likely to lead to higher levels of road traffic in order to access services and employment and could exacerbate perceived congestion problems in larger service centres, such as Spalding.
6.46.12 Water: Both options will have a minor negative impact. Any new development is likely to increase pressure on water resources.

6.46.13 Conclusion: Whilst there is some potential for minor negative impacts, both options have a major positive impact in seeking to meet the housing needs of South Holland District in particular. They also seek to support the role and function of Service Villages. The precise nature of some of the impacts will be dependent on the specific locations for development, which will be outlined in the subsequent Site Allocations DPD, but it is probable that Option A, due to its smaller dwelling total, will result in less overall environmental impact.

6.47 Delivery

6.47.1 Both options will be delivered by the Site Allocations DPD and development management processes. Most significant housing proposals will require appropriate supporting infrastructure which will be identified through the IDP.

6.47.2 The delivery of overall targets for additional dwellings will be monitored through an annual 'Monitoring Report'.

6.48 Preferred Option

6.48.1 Option A is the preferred option because it should result in less overall environmental impact, which could occur with a greater level of dispersed growth.

Approach to Identifying Broad Locations for Accommodating Housing Growth at Boston and Spalding

6.49 Introduction

6.49.1 It is considered that the significant number of additional dwellings that have been attributed to the Sub-Regional Centres of Boston and Spalding previously in this chapter can be best achieved through planning for larger-scale developments in these settlements. Accordingly, it is necessary to determine an approach for the identification of ‘broad locations’ for accommodating this housing growth which can be promoted through the Strategy and Policies DPD. By this means, sufficient opportunity will be created to enable the full requirements of these new developments, particularly in respect of the mitigation of flood risk, to be considered and incorporated into detailed proposals for inclusion in the subsequent Site Allocations DPD.

6.49.2 In order to assist this exercise, a background paper entitled ‘Assessment of Broad Locations for Growth at Boston and Spalding’ has been prepared (see Appendix 12). This document considers a number of sites promoted through the SHLAA process and concludes with the identification of reasonable options (which have been subject to sustainability appraisal) for determining broad locations for housing growth. These reasonable options are considered further in this chapter.

6.49.3 It should be noted that Appendix 12 has been prepared on the basis of information available at the time. It is accepted that new information on the availability of land may come to light through formal public consultation on the
Combined Preferred Options and Sustainability Appraisal Report which will enable its conclusions to be reviewed.

a) Options for Boston

6.50 Introduction

6.50.1 As proposed earlier in this chapter, the preferred housing provision for Boston is 2,900 dwellings, all of which may be located in ROY zones.

6.51 Reasonable Policy Options

6.51.1 Appendix 12 identifies only one reasonable option for a broad location in Boston, known as ‘B8 (Wyberton West Road/Chain Bridge Road/Seineshead Road)’. This is based on a SHLAA site with an approximate capacity of 1,900 dwellings.

6.51.2 NB: This leaves the location of a further 1,000 dwellings to be determined. Since Appendix 1 has defined a capacity of ‘at least 1,000 dwellings’ for the potential identification of a broad location, this outstanding provision could be realised though the identification of a second broad location should new information come to light during the preparation of the Strategy and Policies DPD. Otherwise, the location of the outstanding 1,000 dwellings will be addressed through the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD.

6.51.3 Option A: To identify a broad location for the development of approximately 1,900 dwellings in the Wyberton West Road/Chain Bridge Road/Seineshead Road area.

6.52 Unreasonable Policy Options

6.52.1 It is considered unreasonable not to have a policy identifying a broad location or locations for accommodating housing growth in Boston. Given the planning issues pertaining to the town, such a policy is an essential element in seeking to provide a clear strategic framework within which to prepare more detailed proposals in the Site Allocations DPD.

6.52.2 It is also unreasonable to include an option deemed ‘unreasonable’ through the process undertaken in Appendix 12. Whilst these other sites are not entirely ruled out for the purpose of identifying a single broad location to deliver a significant amount of housing, they are currently deemed unreasonable on the basis of the probability of flood risk and/or delivery.

6.53 Sustainability Appraisal

6.53.1 The sustainability appraisal for this site is set out in Appendix 12.

6.54 Delivery

6.54.1 This option will be delivered through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process or the development management process alone. If planning applications are not forthcoming prior to the production of the Site Allocations DPD, specific site boundaries and planning requirements will be identified in that development plan document. As there are no other reasonable options, there are no
relative delivery benefits. Significant development will require appropriate supporting infrastructure, which will be identified through the IDP.

6.55 Preferred Option

6.55.1 Option A is the only reasonable option and has positive sustainability impacts in terms of housing provision and community, health and well-being.

b) Options for Spalding

6.56 Introduction

6.56.1 As proposed earlier in this chapter, the preferred housing provision for Spalding is 6,000 dwellings, none of which will be located in ROY zones. Given that the ‘Holland Park urban extension’, situated to the south-west of Spalding, has outline planning permission for 2,250 dwellings but has yet to be commenced, there is only a need to identify additional provision for 3,750 dwellings in Spalding.

6.57 Reasonable Policy Options

6.57.1 Appendix 12 identifies three reasonable options for broad locations in Spalding, known as:

- ‘S8’ (Land between Holland Park and the A151) which includes SHLAA sites amounting to 1,179 dwellings;
- ‘S9’ (Land between the Vernatt’s Drain and the A151) which includes SHLAA sites amounting to 1,697 dwellings; and
- ‘S10’ (Land to the North of the Vernatt’s Drain) which includes SHLAA sites amounting to 6,965 dwellings.

6.57.2 For the purpose of identifying a broad location or locations for accommodating the outstanding requirement for 3,750 dwellings in Spalding, the reasonable options identified in Appendix 12, above, enable consideration of revised options based on:

- the area S10 alone;
- a combination of areas S8 and S9; and
- a combination of smaller versions of these two options.

6.57.3 As outlined in the SA of S10 in Appendix 12, this option has the potential to impact upon the settlement of Pinchbeck. Therefore, any consideration of an option based on S10 must ensure that there is no real coalescence of Spalding with Pinchbeck and that a significant landscape buffer between the broad location for development and the village is achieved.

6.57.4 Option A: To identify a broad location for the development of approximately 3,750 dwellings to the north of the Vernatt’s Drain and the line of the proposed SWRR with vehicular access onto the SWRR. However, this area is to be completely separate from Pinchbeck.

6.57.5 Option B: To identify a broad location for the development of approximately 3,750 dwellings lying to the north and south of the A151 with vehicular access onto the SWRR.
6.57.6 **Option C**: To identify two broad locations for housing growth, each for the development of approximately 1,875 dwellings, based on smaller versions of Options A and B above, with vehicular access onto the SWRR.

6.58 **Unreasonable Policy Options**

6.58.1 It is considered unreasonable not to have a policy identifying a broad location or locations for accommodating housing growth in Spalding. Given the planning issues pertaining to the town, such a policy is an essential element in seeking to provide a clear strategic framework within which to prepare more detailed proposals in the Site Allocations DPD.

6.58.2 It is also unreasonable to include an option deemed ‘unreasonable’ through the process undertaken in Appendix 12. Whilst these other sites are not entirely ruled out for the purpose of identifying a single broad location to deliver a significant amount of housing, they are currently deemed unreasonable on the basis of one or more of the following: probability of flood risk; delivery; and the potential to deliver a SWRR.

6.59 **Sustainability Appraisal**

Table 6.13: SA – Broad Locations in Spalding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Key</th>
<th>Major positive (✓✓)</th>
<th>Minor positive (✓)</th>
<th>Neutral (0)</th>
<th>Minor Negative (X)</th>
<th>Major Negative (XX)</th>
<th>Mixed (e.g. ✓✓/X, ✓/X)</th>
<th>Uncertain (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scoring for Topic Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Option A</td>
<td>Option B</td>
<td>Option C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity, Geodiversity &amp; Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>✓/X</td>
<td>✓/X</td>
<td>✓/X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)</td>
<td>✓/X</td>
<td>✓/X</td>
<td>✓/X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, Health and Well-being</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy and Employment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Risk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Environment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Waste</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>X/✓</td>
<td>X/✓</td>
<td>X/✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.59.1 **Air Quality**: All three options will have a minor negative impact on air quality as any new development will likely lead to increased air pollution, primarily due to increased
road traffic. However, large-scale development does offer the opportunity to ‘design-in’ and establish critical mass for sustainable modes of transport. Furthermore, all options are seeking to deliver a SWRR, which will seek to mitigate congestion in Spalding town centre, which could be exacerbated by future increases in rail downtime due to the planned upgrade of the ‘Joint’ Line.

6.59.2 Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure: All options will have a mixed minor positive/minor negative impact. With any new large-scale greenfield development, some habitat loss is unavoidable. However, there is potential to design-in green infrastructure as part of new development. No area has any identified natural-environment constraints.

6.59.3 Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation): All options will have a mixed minor positive/minor negative impact. Any new development is likely to increase greenhouse gas emissions, both directly and indirectly. There are potential positive impacts through the opportunities to require new energy-efficient design and construction. None of the locations is at significant risk from flooding.

6.59.4 Community, Health and Well-being: All options will have a major positive impact. The provision of additional housing will have a positive impact on both health and equality. There is also potential for new development to support the funding of new community infrastructure.

6.59.5 Economy and Employment: All options will have a minor positive impact. More housing will give rise to a larger population which has the potential to broaden the diversity of skills on offer and, in turn, support business diversification and growth. Specifically, the provision of additional housing will help to maintain employment in the construction sector and related industries.

6.59.6 Flood Risk: All options will have a neutral impact. None of the locations is at significant risk from flooding.

6.59.7 Historic Environment: Options B and C will have a minor negative impact, whilst Option A will have a neutral impact. There are recorded historic assets at Options B and C, whilst there are none at Option A. However, there is potential to address this issue in a manner which delivers conservation benefits as part of the overall planning of new development.

6.59.8 Housing: All options will have a major positive impact as they will help to meet the housing needs of South Holland District.

6.59.9 Land and Waste: All options will have a minor negative impact. Greenfield development by its nature often involves the loss of agricultural land; however, to meet housing needs greenfield sites are required. There are opportunities to design-in green infrastructure and ensure access to useable open space. New development will also result in greater levels of waste generation.

6.59.10 Landscape: All options will have a minor negative impact. Large greenfield development by its nature will impact upon landscape and townscape. However, there are opportunities to ensure that any development is sympathetic to its surroundings. In relative terms, Option A has the potential to cause a perceived coalescence with Pinchbeck, which could be argued to be a negative impact upon landscape and townscape.
6.59.11 **Transport:** All options will have a mixed minor positive/minor negative impact. Large-scale greenfield development will inevitably lead to greater levels of car use and, therefore, increased congestion. However, large-scale development does offer the opportunity to design-in and establish critical mass for sustainable modes of transport. Furthermore, all options provide the opportunity to contribute to the delivery of the SWRR, which will have the benefit of minimising increases in congestion within Spalding as a result of planned increases in rail-crossing downtime. Modelling work undertaken to date suggests that Option A appears to offer the most beneficial impact on transport conditions in Spalding, especially if associated with the delivery of the entire SWRR during the plan period, as opposed to only Phase 3 (Pinchbeck Road up to, but not crossing, the Vernatt’s Drain) and Phase 1 (Holland Park to the B1172) in that time. Importantly, in response to the predicted increase in rail-crossing downtime, Option A provides the opportunity for the construction of a bridge over the railway at an earlier point in time than Option B.

6.59.12 **Water:** All options will have a minor negative impact. Any new development is likely to increase pressure on water resources.

6.59.13 **Conclusion:** The above considerations show that there is a mixed impact in terms of sustainability. Any large-scale new development has the potential to impact on the environment, although there are measures to minimise this. However, there are positive impacts in terms of social and economic considerations, such as access to housing. All options score similarly when compared against the baseline situation of no growth in these locations. Relatively-speaking, Option A has the potential to impact on the landscape setting of Pinchbeck; however, this concern can be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD at a later date.

6.59.14 **Crucially, Option A appears to offer the most beneficial impact on transport conditions in Spalding (preferably in association with the completion of the SWRR rather than the completion of Phases 1 and 3 only), and for this reason it is deemed the most preferable.**

6.60 **Delivery**

6.60.1 The preferred option will be delivered through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process or the development management process alone. If planning applications are not forthcoming prior to the production of the Site Allocations DPD, specific site boundaries and planning requirements will be identified in that development plan document. There are no relative delivery benefits between Options A and B. Significant development will require appropriate supporting infrastructure, which will be identified through the IDP. However, Option C is deemed more likely to raise greater issues in terms of delivery. Given the likely level of development required to deliver critical infrastructure, for example, a planned phase of the SWRR, it is considered that either Option A or Option B provides the best means of delivering this. By splitting the requirement between two broad locations (Option C), the level of housing in each area would be reduced but the cost of each particular SWRR phase would remain the same. This would probably introduce more uncertainty into the planned delivery of Phases 2 and 3 of the SWRR.

6.60.2 The delivery of overall targets for additional dwellings will be monitored through an annual Monitoring Report.
6.60.3 On present understanding, it should be noted that, in the longer term, the 3,750 dwellings represented by Option B will need to be developed for the purpose of funding, perhaps retrospectively, the completion of the SWRR.

6.60.4 Notwithstanding the funding issue, Option B’s general suitability for development enables early identification of housing land supply for the purpose of rolling forward housing provision into the post-2031 period.

6.61 Preferred Option

6.61.1 Option A is the preferred option given that it provides greater transport management benefits.

Approach to Providing Accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

X.XX Introduction

X.XX The key points arising from the 2012 Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Needs Assessment for South East Lincolnshire indicate that:

- in years 1-5 (2012-2017) there is a need for 34 additional residential pitches for Gypsies and Travellers;
- at present, a five-year supply of deliverable sites, both for residential and transit sites or stopping places, as required by the Government’s ‘Planning policy for traveller sites’ has not been identified; and
- in years 6-10, a further 15 residential pitches for Gypsies and Travellers could be required and during years 11-15, a further 17 pitches might be required.

X.XX Therefore, it is necessary to seek sites for the provision of at least 34 additional residential pitches for Gypsies and Travellers through the Site Allocations DPD. In advance of this work, it is necessary to prepare a criteria-based policy for travellers\textsuperscript{25} sites to act as a basis for:

- land supply allocations; and
- decisions should applications be submitted in the absence of a five-year supply of specific deliverable sites being identified.

X.XX Reasonable Policy Options

X.XX It is considered that there is only one reasonable option relating to this issue, namely to include a criteria-based policy which seeks to address the likely permanent residential, transit site and stopping place accommodation needs of Travellers in South East Lincolnshire.

X.XX Option A: To include a criteria-based policy to address the likely permanent residential, transit site and stopping place accommodation needs of Travellers in South East Lincolnshire.

\textsuperscript{25} Travellers means ‘Gypsies and Travellers’ and ‘Travelling Showpeople’
**X.XX** Unreasonable Policy Options

It is considered unreasonable not to include a policy in respect of planning for Traveller sites in the light of evidence that a five-year supply of specific deliverable sites for Gypsies and Travellers cannot be identified at the present time. To do otherwise would be contrary to the provisions of the NPPF and the Planning policy for traveller sites.

**X.XX** Sustainability Appraisal

**Table XX:** SA – Accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring for Topic Areas</th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Biodiversity, Geodiversity &amp; Green Infrastructure</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Community, Health And Well-being</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>Economy and Employment</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>Flood Risk</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>Historic Environment</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>✓ ✓</th>
<th>Land and Waste</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Transport</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**X.X.X** Air Quality: Option A will have a minor negative impact on air quality as any new development will likely lead to increased air pollution, primarily due to increased road traffic.

**X.X.X** Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure: Option A will have an uncertain impact. Any new development has the potential to impact upon protected sites of nature conservation importance. However, until site specifics are known (primarily through the Site Allocations DPD) there will be uncertainty as to the nature of the impact. With any new development there is the potential positive impact of being able to design-in green infrastructure.
Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation): Option A will have a minor negative impact. Any new development is likely to increase greenhouse gas emissions, both directly and indirectly.

Community, Health and Well-being: Option A will have a minor positive impact. The provision of additional accommodation will have a positive impact on both health and equality. It will help to promote more inclusive communities and improve accessibility to essential services and facilities.

Economy and Employment: Option A will have a neutral impact.

Flood Risk: Option A will have an uncertain impact depending upon its location to be, in general, determined through the Site Allocations DPD. There is an opportunity to require that development in the ROY zones will only be permitted subject to the mitigation of flood risk through flood-resilient design and emergency planning.

Historic Environment: Option A will have an uncertain impact. This is because site specifics will be considered at a later date through the production of the Site Allocations DPD and through the development management process.

Housing: Option A will have a major positive impact as it will help to meet the Traveller accommodation needs of South East Lincolnshire Holland District.

Land and Waste: Option A will have a minor negative impact. Any new development will likely be on greenfield land and will therefore result in the permanent loss of agricultural land. New development will also likely lead to greater levels of waste generation.

Landscape: Option A will have a minor negative impact. Any new development will likely be on greenfield land and will therefore impact upon landscape. However, the precise nature of that impact will be dependent on the design, layout and landscaping of a particular development.

Transport: Option A will have a minor negative impact. Any new development is likely to lead to higher levels of road traffic in order to access services and employment.

Water: Option A will have a minor negative impact. Any new development is likely to increase pressure on water

Conclusion: Whilst there is some potential for minor negative impacts, Option A has a major positive impact in seeking to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers in South East Lincolnshire. It also seeks to assist in creating more inclusive and mixed communities. The precise nature of some of the impacts will be dependent on the specific locations for development, most, if not all, of which will be outlined in the subsequent Site Allocations DPD.

Delivery

This option will be delivered through the Site Allocations DPD and development management process.
The delivery of overall targets for additional pitches for Gypsies and Travellers and plots for Travelling Showpeople will be monitored through an annual Monitoring Report.

Preferred Option

Option A is the only reasonable option.

Approach to the Size, Type and Density of Additional Housing

Introduction

It is necessary to determine an approach to the size, type and density of additional housing.

Reasonable Policy Options

It is considered that there is only one reasonable option relating to the issues of size and type of additional housing and that is to accord with what the best available and up-to-date evidence supports, for example that which is outlined in the SHMA.

In terms of density it is considered that there are two reasonable options. The first is to include a minimum density, for example 30 dwellings per hectare (the former national minimum policy). The second option is to not include a minimum density and instead to deal with each proposal on a case-by-case through general principles of what constitutes ‘good design’ in any given context e.g. that it respects neighbouring buildings and surrounding areas.

The tenure of new housing is dealt with in the approach to affordable housing

Option A: To produce a policy approach that seeks to deliver the size and type of additional housing in accordance with up-to-date evidence and with guidance on a minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare.

Option B: To produce a policy approach that seeks to deliver the size and type of additional housing in accordance with up-to-date evidence, but with no prescriptive guidance on density requirements.

Unreasonable Policy Options

It is considered unreasonable to not produce a policy approach relating to the size and type of additional housing. To do so would be contrary to the provisions of the NPPF.

It is possible to produce a number of different options as relates to density. However, in the absence of any evidence related to any other value than the previous national minimum (30 dph), it is deemed unnecessary to do so.
### Sustainability Appraisal

#### Table XX: SA – Size, Type and Density of Additional Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Key</th>
<th>Major positive (✓✓)</th>
<th>Minor Positive (✓)</th>
<th>Neutral (0)</th>
<th>Minor Negative (X)</th>
<th>Major Negative (XX)</th>
<th>Mixed (eg. ✓✓/X, ✓/X)</th>
<th>Uncertain (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Scoring for Topic Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity, Geodiversity &amp; Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, Health And Well-being</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy and Employment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Risk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Environment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Waste</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**XX.XX** Air Quality: Both options will have a neutral impact.

**XX.XX** Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure: Both options will have a neutral impact.

**XX.XX** Climate Change: Both options will have a neutral impact.

**XX.XX** Community, Health and Well-Being: Both options will have major positive impact. Ensuring an appropriate mix of housing will be to the benefit of all members of the community.

**XX.XX** Economy and Employment: Both options will have a neutral impact.

**XX.XX** Flood Risk: Both options will have a neutral impact.

**XX.XX** Historic Environment: Both options will have a neutral impact.

**XX.XX** Housing: Both options will have a major positive impact through the delivery of a suitable mix of housing.
Land and Waste: Both options will have an uncertain impact. All new development will likely lead to greater levels of waste generation, however, in terms of impact upon land, this would depend upon whether development is on brownfield or greenfield land.

Landscape: Both options will have an uncertain impact dependant upon whether development is on brownfield or greenfield land. Relatively-speaking a fixed minimum density would likely have a more negative impact than a flexible one, which would be more able to respond to particular local landscape circumstances.

Transport: Option A will have a neutral impact.

Water: Option A will have a neutral impact.

Conclusion: Overall, both options have a neutral impact in the majority of cases, as this policy approach is concerned with types of housing rather than the amount or location. Both options have a positive impact in terms of delivering the mix of housing required, which will be to the benefit of all members of the community. Relatively-speaking an approach which offers more flexibility in terms of density (option B) can better respond to local circumstances to ensure that development is more sympathetic to its surroundings.

Delivery

Both options will be delivered through the development management process.

It is considered that a flexible approach to density could lead to confusion and a lack of clarity ‘on the ground’ with developers and could also lead to less certainty in terms of planning for infrastructure.

Preferred Option

Option A is the preferred option in that it provides certainty to developers in terms of planning for density and also in delivering infrastructure. Whilst a minimum is set, it does offer flexibility should a case be made for a lower density.

Approaches to Affordable Housing and Phasing/Implementation (to be completed)

Reason for Preferred Policy Approach

Based on the above conclusions, it is proposed to take forward a number of preferred policy approaches.

***To be completed***
### Distribution and Scale of Housing Development across South East Lincolnshire (2011-2031)

<p>| Settlement | Dwellings | | | | |
|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------|
|            | Completions at 31 March 2012 | Permitted at 31 March 2012 | New Allocations | Total |
| <strong>Boston (including Fishtoft Urban &amp; Wyberton)</strong> | 86 | 557 | 2,900 (max. of 2,900 on ROY sites) | 3,543 |
| <strong>Kirton</strong> | 0 | 12 | 420 (max. of 400 on ROY sites) | 432 |
| <strong>Swineshead</strong> | 1 | 53 | 400 | 454 |
| <strong>Rest of Service Villages (Algarkirk, Bicker, Butterwick, Fishtoft, Kirton End, Leake Commonside, Old Leake, Sutterton, Swineshead Bridge, Wigtoft and Wrangle)</strong> | 3 | 188 | 800 (max. of 300 on ROY sites) | 991 |
| <strong>All parishes except Boston</strong> | 1 | 46 | | 47 |
| <strong>Boston Borough Total</strong> | 91 | 856 | 4,520 | 5,467 |
| <strong>Spalding</strong> | 73 | 1,064 | 6,000 | 7,137 |
| <strong>Crowland</strong> | 11 | 78 | 300 | 389 |
| <strong>Donington</strong> | 27 | 81 | 300 | 408 |
| <strong>Holbeach</strong> | 6 | 313 | 1,000 (max. of 900 on ROY sites) | 1,319 |
| <strong>Long Sutton</strong> | 4 | 176 | 150 ROY (max. of 150 on ROY sites) | 330 |
| <strong>Sutton Bridge</strong> | 4 | 29 | 150 ROY (max. of 150 on ROY sites) | 183 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>2011-2012 Completions</th>
<th>Existing Commitments as of 31 March 2012</th>
<th>Total Developments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cowbit, Deeping St Nicholas, Fleet Hargate, Gedney Hill, Gosberton, Moulton, Moulton Chapel, Pinchbeck, Quadring, Surfleet, Sutton St James, Tydd St Mary, Weston and Whaplode</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All areas except Spalding and Crowland, Donington, Holbeach, Long Sutton and Sutton Bridge parishes</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>1,936</td>
<td>10,353</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1) The 6,000 dwelling provision for Spalding includes the Holland Park urban extension, for which outline planning permission was granted in 2012.

2) In Boston Borough, completions for the period 2011-2012 and existing commitments as of 31 March 2012 (totalling 947 dwellings) do not count towards the cap on development on ROY sites.

3) In South Holland District, completions for the period 2011-2012 and existing commitments as of 31 March 2012 (2,103 dwellings) do not count towards the cap on development on ROY sites.
Table X.XX: HRA/AA Screening – Distribution and Scale of Housing Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening of Preferred Policy Approach (√/X)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the policy lead to development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the policy specify a quantity or type of development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the policy specify a location for development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the policy implemented through other policies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the policy concentrate development in urban areas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the policy steer development away from European or Ramsar sites?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the policy protect the natural environment?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | X |

X.XXX.X Given that this policy approach is concerned with promoting development, it is considered that there is potential for significant effects on a European or Ramsar site. As such, it should be screened by the Habitats Regulations Assessment process.

Table X.XX: Equalities Assessment – Distribution and Scale of Housing Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equalities Analysis of Preferred Policy Approach (√ - may benefit) (0 – neutral) (X – adverse impact)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X.XXX.X The provisions of this policy will have the same impact on all groups.

Broad Locations for Housing Development in Boston and Spalding

In the broad locations identified on the key diagram insets for Boston and Spalding, areas of land will be released in the plan period to facilitate the delivery of major housing schemes on the following basis:

Boston

- Land in the Wyberton West Road/Chain Bridge Road/Swineshead Road area sufficient to deliver approximately 1,900 dwellings.

Spalding

- Land to the north of the Vernatt’s Drain, situated no closer to the village of Pinchbeck than 500 metres west of the Joint Line, sufficient to deliver approximately 3,750 dwellings and the Spalding Western Relief Road between Pinchbeck Road and the Vernatts Drain (to include a bridge over the railway).
Figure XX: Broad Location for Housing Development at Boston

Legend:
- Green: Broad Location for Housing Development
- Gray: Town Area
- Red: Road
- Orange: Railway
- Blue: River/Watercourse
Figure XX: Broad Location for Housing Development at Spalding
Table X.XX: HRA/AA Screening – Broad Locations for Housing Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening of Preferred Policy Approach (√/X)</th>
<th>Does the policy lead to development?</th>
<th>Does the policy specify a quantity or type of development?</th>
<th>Does the policy specify a location for development?</th>
<th>Is the policy implemented through other policies?</th>
<th>Does the policy concentrate development in urban areas?</th>
<th>Does the policy steer development away from European or Ramsar sites?</th>
<th>Does the policy protect the natural environment?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X.XXX.X Given that this policy approach is concerned with promoting development, it is considered that there is potential for significant effects on a European or Ramsar site. As such, it should be screened by the Habitats Regulations Assessment process.

Table X.XX: Equalities Assessment – Broad Locations for Housing Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equalities Analysis of Preferred Policy Approach</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Gender re-assignment</th>
<th>Marriage &amp; civil partnership</th>
<th>Pregnancy &amp; maternity</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Religion or belief</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Sexual orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(√ - may benefit) (0 – neutral) (X – adverse impact)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X.XXX.X The provisions of this policy will have the same impact on all groups.
**Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople**

The following criteria should be satisfied in determining the suitability of land for use as a Traveller site:

- the proposal will help to meet a clear and evidenced need as demonstrated in an up-to-date Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Needs Assessment for South East Lincolnshire;
- the site, if for permanent residential use, is well-related to local services and facilities including shops, schools and doctors’ surgeries as well as employment opportunities;
- the site should respect the scale of the nearest settled community and should avoid placing undue pressure on the local infrastructure;
- the site would not have a significant adverse effect on the amenities of existing local residents or adjoining land uses;
- the site is already, or is capable of being, successfully assimilated into both its immediate environs and the wider landscape and would not adversely affect heritage assets or areas of importance to nature conservation;
- the use of the site would not prejudice highway safety or give rise to problems of parking or highway access;
- the site would have adequate connections to appropriate services including drinking-water supply and waste-water treatment; and
- the site, if for permanent residential use, is not situated in a ROY zone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening of Preferred Policy Approach (√/X)</th>
<th>Does the policy lead to development?</th>
<th>Does the policy specify a quantity or type of development?</th>
<th>Does the policy specify a location for development?</th>
<th>Is the policy implemented through other policies?</th>
<th>Does the policy concentrate development in urban areas?</th>
<th>Does the policy steer development away from European or Ramsar sites?</th>
<th>Does the policy protect the natural environment?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**X.XXX.X** This policy guides the location of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople’s accommodation. It does protect the nature conservation and therefore, it is considered that this policy can be screened out of the Habitats Regulations Assessment process.
Table XX: Equalities Assessment – Accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equalities Analysis of Preferred Policy Approach</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Gender re-assignment</th>
<th>Marriage &amp; civil partnership</th>
<th>Pregnancy &amp; maternity</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Religion or belief</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Sexual orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(✓ - may benefit) (0 – neutral) (X – adverse impact)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The provisions of this policy will have the same impact on all groups.

Size, Type and Density of Additional Housing

Development densities in all housing developments should normally be no lower than an average 30 dwellings per hectare net. Lower development densities will need to be justified taking into account individual site circumstances.

New housing development will be sought which adequately addresses the housing needs of South East Lincolnshire, namely:

- Family homes of 3 bedrooms or more
- Smaller homes of 2 bedrooms or less
- Extra care and other homes for the elderly and disabled population.

An appropriate mix of housing types will be secured to reflect local housing need. Such a mix will be dependent on the local circumstances of the site, the viability of the development and any localised housing need information.

Table XX: HRA/AA Screening – Size, Type and Density of Additional Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening of Preferred Policy Approach (✓/X)</th>
<th>Does the policy lead to development?</th>
<th>Does the policy specify a quantity or type of development?</th>
<th>Does the policy specify a location for development?</th>
<th>Is the policy implemented through other policies?</th>
<th>Does the policy concentrate development in urban areas?</th>
<th>Does the policy steer development away from European or Ramsar sites?</th>
<th>Does the policy protect the natural environment?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This policy is not concerned with development per se, but with the housing mix. Therefore, it is considered that this policy can be screened out of the Habitats Regulations Assessment process.
### Table XX: Equalities Assessment – Size, Type and Density of Additional Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equalities Analysis of Preferred Policy Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(✓ - may benefit) (0 – neutral) (X – adverse impact)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Gender re-assignment</th>
<th>Marriage &amp; civil partnership</th>
<th>Pregnancy &amp; maternity</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Religion or belief</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Sexual orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X.X.X.X  The provisions of this policy will have the same impact on all groups.
7.0 Economy

7.1 Policy Context

Local Plan Strategic Priorities

7.1.1 The following Local Plan strategic priorities are relevant:

- To provide the right conditions and sufficient land in appropriate locations to diversify and strengthen the economic base of South East Lincolnshire to meet the needs of existing companies, to attract new businesses and sources of employment, and to take advantage of historic and environmental assets to maximise the potential for sustainable tourism.

- To create a mutually-supportive hierarchy of vibrant self-contained centres providing employment, retailing and services for South-East Lincolnshire by encouraging an appropriate scale of retail, leisure and other town-centre development and by maximising opportunities for regeneration.

National Planning Policy Framework

Building a strong, competitive economy

7.1.2 ‘In drawing up Local Plans, local planning authorities should:

- set out a clear economic vision and strategy for their area which positively and proactively encourages sustainable growth;

- set criteria, or identify strategic sites, for local and inward investment to match the strategy and to meet anticipated needs over the plan period;

- support existing business sectors, taking account of whether they are expanding or contracting and, where possible, identify and plan for new or emerging sectors likely to locate in their area. Policies should be flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated in the plan and to allow a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances;

- plan positively for the location, promotion and expansion of clusters or networks of knowledge driven, creative or high technology industries;

- identify priority areas for economic regeneration, infrastructure provision and environmental enhancement; and facilitate flexible working practices such as the integration of residential and commercial uses within the same unit.’

Ensuring the viability of town centres

7.1.3 ‘In drawing up Local Plans, local planning authorities should:

- recognise town centres as the hearts of their communities and pursue policies to support their viability and vitality;

- define a network and hierarchy of centres that is resilient to anticipated future economic changes;

- define the extent of town centres and primary shopping areas, based on a clear definition of primary and secondary frontages in designated centres, and set policies that make clear which uses will be permitted in such locations;

- promote competitive town centres that provide customer choice and a diverse retail offer and which reflect the individuality of town centres;

- retain and enhance existing markets and, where appropriate, re-introduce or create new ones, ensuring that markets remain attractive and competitive;
• allocate a range of suitable sites to meet the scale and type of retail, leisure, commercial, office, tourism, cultural, community and residential development needed in town centres. It is important that needs for retail, leisure, office and other main town centres uses are met in full and are not compromised by limited site availability. Local planning authorities should therefore undertake an assessment of the need to expand town centres to ensure a sufficient supply of suitable sites;
• allocate appropriate edge of centre sites for main town centre uses that are well connected to the town centre where suitable and viable town centre sites are not available. If sufficient edge of centre sites cannot be identified, set policies for meeting the identified needs in other accessible locations that are well connected to the town centre;
• set policies for the consideration of proposals for main town centre uses which cannot be accommodated in or adjacent to town centres;
• recognise that residential development can play an important role in ensuring the viability of centres and set out policies to encourage residential development on appropriate sites; and
• where town centres are in decline, local planning authorities should plan positively for their future to encourage economic activity.’

Supporting a prosperous rural economy

7.1.4 ‘To promote a strong rural economy, local and neighbourhood plans should:
• support the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise in rural areas, both through the conversion of existing buildings and well designed new buildings;
• promote the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses;
• support sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments that benefit businesses in rural areas, communities and visitors, and which respect the character of the countryside. This should include supporting the provision and expansion of tourist and visitor facilities in appropriate locations where identified needs are not met by existing facilities in rural service centres; and
• promote the retention and development of local services and community facilities in villages, such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public house and places of worship.’

Promoting sustainable transport

7.1.5 ‘Local authorities should work with neighbouring authorities and transport providers to develop strategies for the provision of viable infrastructure necessary to support sustainable development, including large scale facilities, such as rail freight interchanges, roadside facilities for motorists or transport necessary to support strategies for the growth of ports, airports or other major generators of travel demand in their areas. The primary function of roadside facilities for motorists should be to support the safety and welfare of the road user.’

East Midlands Regional Plan

7.1.6 The Regional Plan states that ‘it will be especially important to raise skill levels, develop the service sector and high value manufacturing and create innovative businesses, so that the region is better placed to maintain economic
In terms of regeneration (Policy 19), the regional priority is to focus on areas of greatest need, within which Sub-Regional Centres (e.g. Boston and Spalding) and ‘economically lagging’ rural areas (e.g. South Holland) are mentioned. The regional priority for employment land (Policy 20) is to undertake and keep up-to-date employment land reviews to inform the allocation of a range of sites at sustainable locations. In terms of strategic distribution (Policy 21), local authorities should give priority to sites which can be served by rail freight, and operate as inter-modal terminals. In terms of town centres and retail development, the regional priority is to promote the vitality and viability of existing town centres, including those in rural towns (Policy 22). Where town centres are under-performing, action should be taken to promote investment through design-led initiatives and the development and implementation of town centre strategies. The regional priorities for rural diversification (Policy 24) are to promote the continued diversification and further development of the rural economy, where this is consistent with a sustainable pattern of development and the environmentally-sound management of the countryside. The regional priority for tourism (Policy 42) is to ‘seek to identify areas of potential tourism growth which maximise economic benefit whilst minimising adverse impact on the environment and local amenity’. The Regional Freight Strategy (Policy 55) also includes a number of key priorities: reducing the environmental impact of all freight; improving the efficiency of the road haulage industry in ways that will also reduce the impact of the environment; expanding the usage of inland waterways and coastal navigation; achieving a significant modal shift from road to rail; identifying new strategic distribution sites, where these can be justified in line with Policy 21 (Strategic Distribution); supporting the sustainable growth of airfreight at EMA by improving rail freight connectivity and identifying opportunities for modal shift from air to rail; promoting a greater use of pipelines; and, ensuring integration with land-use planning, environmental and economic strategies.

Local Authority Corporate Plans and other Strategies

7.1.7 Boston Borough Council’s:
- Community Plan 2008-2018 sets out a number of ambitions and actions to achieve them. The following relate to the economy: ‘assessing the priorities contained in the Boston Town Centre Study recommendations to produce an action plan for town centre improvements’; ‘supporting a Boston Improvement Area in the town centre’; ‘improving the market place’; ‘making Boston a special and distinctive destination for visitors, commerce, industry and shoppers’; ‘developing Boston’s heritage, tourism and Cultural Quarter to bring more tourists to the town’; ‘raising the town’s profile as a tourist destination for shoppers and visitors across the UK’; ‘branding and marketing Boston, including lesser known attractions to make the most of our heritage and tourism opportunities’; ‘promoting green tourism, including The Wash reserves’; ‘supporting a new quality hotel development’; ‘increasing the range of shops to improve retail offer by redeveloping the area between West Street and the river’; ‘attracting new investment’; ‘completing the first phase of the Fens Waterway Link’; and ‘supporting the expansion of the Port of Boston.’
- Corporate Plan 2012-2015 includes a priority to ‘revitalise and promote our town and rural borough’. The Council highlights the need to bring more businesses and employment opportunities into the town and borough to create jobs and prosperity.
• Economic Development Strategy 2011-2013 has four priorities: ‘to develop the business environment; improve the built environment; develop the skills base; and improve the transport infrastructure’.

7.1.8 South Holland District Council’s:
• Corporate Plan 2011-2015 includes a priority ‘To Support Our Local Economy’. The Council will actively support local businesses to encourage the creation of jobs and boost the local economy. It notes that one of the areas upon which the Council will place particular focus in 2011 - 2012 will be to influence and encourage private sector regeneration in respect of the ‘Road Rail Hub (Food Port)’.
• Economic Development Strategy 2010-2015 has three priorities: ‘to help create an environment in which new businesses can start and existing businesses can grow; to generate a high quality of life so that people will want to both live and work in the district; and work with partners to tackle issues holding back economic growth and to minimise the impact of the recession’. The strategy notes that the most important business sectors for the District ‘are still the traditional ones of agriculture, horticulture, food production, retailing and short-break tourism’.

7.2 Evidence Base

Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report

7.2.1 Evidence from the Scoping Report highlights a number of key issues and problems in relation to the economy and employment of South East Lincolnshire:
• the area has below-average economic performance;
• the area has a low-wage economy;
• the economy is focussed on a limited number of sectors (i.e. agriculture, food processing and transport);
• there are a high proportion of people with lower/no qualifications, particularly in Boston Borough;
• levels of unemployment are below average;
• there is a significant amount of undeveloped allocated land available.

Boston Borough and South Holland Local Plans

Employment Land

7.2.2 Policy ED1 of the Boston Borough Local Plan (1999) identifies thirty-four historic areas of industry/commerce and a further nine proposed sites. A number of sites were put forward in the 2006 local plan, which was never formally adopted. Therefore, these sites carry no statutory weight. However, one of the most notable – the Kirton Distribution Park – has the benefit of planning permission. The latest annual Monitoring Report shows that as of 31st March 2012 there were 75.59 ha of undeveloped allocated employment land in Boston Borough.

7.2.3 Policy EC1 of the South Holland Local Plan (2006) identifies six major employment areas in the district, with accompanying allocations for employment use. In addition, land is allocated at Sutton Bridge for port-related uses. The latest annual Monitoring Report shows that as of 31st March 2012 there were 143.39 ha of undeveloped allocated employment land in South Holland.
7.2.4 The adopted Boston Borough Local Plan (1999) only defines one town centre in the form of a ‘General Business Area’ in Boston (Policy RTC1). Within this area ‘Prime Shopping Frontages’ and ‘Other Prime Shopping Frontages’ are identified (Policies RTC6 & RTC7). One out-of-centre retail area is also defined – the ‘Chain Bridge Retail Area’ (Policy RTC4). The adopted South Holland Local Plan (2006) identifies a number of ‘defined retail centres’ (Policy EC5) and ‘Primary Shopping Areas’ (Policy EC6).

South East Lincolnshire Employment Premises and Land Review

7.2.5 The South East Lincolnshire Employment Premises and Land Review (ELR) (2012) includes five different scenarios for estimating future employment space requirements. These scenarios have been derived from considerations relating to levels of economic growth, development trends and potential housing supply. The results indicate an estimated need ranging from 25.7 to 78.6 ha in the period up to 2031.

7.2.6 The study concludes that, in quantitative terms, there is a more-than-adequate supply of existing employment space to meet any of the estimates of future needs up to 2031. It is concluded that this situation would apply even if a number of significant sites do not come forward for development. The current supply is also deemed broadly appropriate in terms of quality and distribution. Overall, the study found that existing identified sites are likely to be adequate to meet future needs emerging in the plan period, and no further employment allocations are considered necessary for any settlements during the plan period. However, for Boston and Spalding towns it is recommended that the situation is monitored and that any need for an additional allocation is reviewed in 5-10 years time. Given the large supply of existing employment land, it is considered that sites could be reviewed for release to other uses should this be deemed appropriate.

Boston Town Centre Retail Study and South Holland District Council Retail Capacity Study

7.2.7 The Boston Town Centre Retail Study investigates retail capacity between 2006 and 2026. It offers no information relating to a hierarchy of retail centres in Boston Borough. The study considers the projected growth in expenditure capacity to support additional retail development in Boston over three periods: 2006-11, 2011-16 and 2016-26. The requirements are outlined in the following table. The two different figures outlined for both convenience and comparison floorspace are alternatives rather than cumulative totals.
Table 7.1: Boston Town Retail Floorspace Requirements 2006-2026

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Convenience floorspace requirement (sq m gross) NB: the below figures are an either/or depending upon the type of convenience development</th>
<th>Comparison floorspace requirement (sq m gross)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mainstream supermarket</td>
<td>Discount food store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-11</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>9,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-16</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>5,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-26</td>
<td>5,800</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.8 The South Holland District Council Retail Capacity Study investigates retail capacity between 2007 and 2021. The study suggests a retail hierarchy of the main town (Spalding) and area centres (Holbeach, Long Sutton, Sutton Bridge, Crowland and Donington). This accords with the settlement hierarchy outlined in the adopted South Holland Local Plan (2006). The study also highlights district-wide floorspace requirements between 2007 and 2021 as outlined in the following table. The study concludes that there is no need to plan for additional convenience floorspace through the identification of specific sites. In terms of comparison floorspace, it is concluded that additional floorspace should be directed to Spalding. Two scenarios are put forward for comparison floorspace: constant retention and rising contention. The study considers that the rising retention scenario is both a realistic and desirable planning policy objective. In terms of convenience floorspace, it is concluded that there is little scope to increase the existing retention rate.

Table 7.2: South Holland District Retail Floorspace Requirements 2007-2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Convenience floorspace requirement (sq m net sales area) NB: these are two separate scenarios</th>
<th>Comparison floorspace requirement (sq m net sales area)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constant Retention</td>
<td>Rising Retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-11</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>2,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-16</td>
<td>1,069</td>
<td>4,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-21</td>
<td>1,173</td>
<td>6,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-21</td>
<td>2,524</td>
<td>13,085</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.9 Given changes in the global economy since 2008 and that our monitoring systems have noted a number of gains and losses in terms of retail floorspace during this period, it is considered that a new retail study for South East Lincolnshire will be required to inform the final submission version of the DPD. However, for the purposes of the Preferred Options document, the figures in the current studies are relied upon.

7.2.10 The study estimates that spending on leisure services in the South Holland catchment area is forecast to grow by 42.5 per cent in the period up to 2021. How this growth might be expended locally depends very much on what opportunities the market supplies – thus, current spending patterns can only provide a guide to what might happen in the future. On current spending patterns in the District, almost two-thirds of this spending growth will go to eating and drinking outside the home (restaurants, cafés and bars). Capturing a sizeable proportion of this growth in
expenditure through the provision of a better and more appealing choice of restaurants, cafés and bars/pubs will be vital to the future health of the various centres within the study area. The rest of the expenditure growth will go to a wide mix of activities (for instance, bingo halls and cinemas), with no single activity capturing any significant market growth. As such, there may only be limited scope to provide additional entertainment-type leisure activities in the District over the period to 2021.

Assessment of the Sustainability of Rural Settlements

7.2.11 The results of the Assessment demonstrate that there is widespread distribution of small-scale employment land opportunities and services and facilities across South-East Lincolnshire.

Spalding Rail-Freight Interchange (RFI)

7.2.12 Research carried out by Intermodality (2009) highlights that there is a need/unmet demand for a rail-freight access in the Spalding area. As such, it was outlined that there is potential for providing a Rail-Freight Interchange (RFI) in the Spalding area measuring approximately 50-60 hectares. This would have the benefit of promoting modal shift of freight from road to rail in line with national and regional policies. It would also seek to anchor existing businesses in the Spalding area and decrease the risk of business moving to areas of greater connectivity. The delivery of such a facility would be made easier by incorporating some of the work into Network Rail’s planned upgrade of the ‘Joint Line’. Therefore, South Holland District Council’s Cabinet resolved, at its meeting in December 2009, that a ‘preferred site’ for a RFI be identified. The Council identified a preferred site to the south-west of Spalding and consulted the public on this and other options in March/April 2010. Four options were put forward in two broad locations. The preferred site was deemed to be the most appropriate given that it was on relatively lower grade agricultural land, was the most favoured in highway terms and did not involve the demolition of existing buildings. Subsequently, in June 2010, the Cabinet approved the identification of the preferred site.

7.2.13 Emerging evidence suggests that a potential developer and a potential operator have shown interest in the preferred site. It is considered that any initial planning application is likely to be in the form of a detailed application for the rail-freight terminal itself and an outline application for a wider associated development area. This is deemed to be significant evidence of the potential deliverability of the RFI.

7.2.14 The ELR concludes that any potential RFI facility of the size outlined in the Intermodality report appears unlikely to have major impacts on current employment land supply in South East Lincolnshire or necessarily give rise to a need to reduce the scale of existing employment land allocations in the area.

7.3 Key Issues

7.3.1 The following key issues emerging from the policy context and evidence base require a policy response:

- the lack of a need to identify further employment land allocations in the plan period to meet demand;
- the need to support both existing businesses and new inward investment;
• the need to identify an approach to town centre uses, to identify a network and hierarchy of centres, to define the extent of town centres, primary shopping areas and frontages and to address spare retail capacity;
• the need to determine an approach to the rural economy, including tourism; and
• the need to determine an approach in relation to a potential Spalding RFI.

7.4 Other Policies

7.4.1 It is not considered necessary to outline an approach to the rural economy that goes into any further detail than what is outlined in the NPPF, specifically section 3, titled ‘Supporting a prosperous rural economy’. It is considered that the preferred approach in the spatial strategy section of this document provides support for appropriate development in the countryside. Similarly, it is considered that the NPPF, the preferred spatial strategy and a more detailed town centre policy (as outlined below) provides a sufficient policy steer in respect of tourism-related matters.

7.4.2 All site-specific allocations will be dealt with through the Site Allocations DPD. In the period up to the adoption of that document all employment and retail-related boundaries and employment allocations in extant Local Plans will be retained. Furthermore, policies relating to primary shopping areas and primary and secondary shopping frontages will be retained and revisited through the Site Allocations DPD.

Approach to the Provision of New Employment Land

7.5 Introduction

7.5.1 It is necessary that a strategic approach to the provision of new employment land is set out. Given that extant employment land allocations will be reviewed through the Site Allocations DPD, the Strategy and Policies DPD preferred policy approach is primarily concerned with the overall levels and strategic distribution of employment land.

7.6 Reasonable Policy Options

7.6.1 It is considered that there is only one reasonable option related to the level of growth and distribution of new employment land. This is an approach that reflects the findings of the ELR, which concludes that there is no need for new allocations above and beyond further commitments at present. The location of existing commitments is broadly in conformity with the preferred spatial strategy outlined earlier in this document.

7.6.2 Option A: To seek to meet forecast demand for employment land through current commitments.

7.7 Unreasonable Policy Options

7.7.1 It is considered unreasonable to appraise an option that departs from the findings of the ELR. To seek to provide less land than is deemed necessary in the ELR would be contrary to the NPPF requirement to deliver ‘objectively assessed needs’. It is also considered unreasonable to seek to allocate further land irrespective of the
ELR’s conclusion that existing commitments are more than sufficient to meet demand in the plan period. To do so could serve to undermine the delivery of existing allocations. Given that the ELR also concludes that existing commitments are of sufficient quality and in the correct locations, it would be unreasonable to seek to replace existing employment land allocations.

7.8 Sustainability Appraisal

Table 7.3: SA – Provision of New Employment Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Key</th>
<th>Major positive (✓✓)</th>
<th>Minor positive (✓)</th>
<th>Neutral (0)</th>
<th>Minor Negative (X)</th>
<th>Major Negative (XX)</th>
<th>Mixed (e.g. ✓✓/X, ✓/X)</th>
<th>Uncertain (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring for Topic Areas</th>
<th>Option A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>✓/X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity, Geodiversity &amp; Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>✓/?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)</td>
<td>✓/X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, Health and Wellbeing</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy and Employment</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Risk</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Environment</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Waste</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>✓/X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.8.1 **Air Quality**: Option A will have a mixed minor positive/minor negative impact. Any new development will likely lead to increased air pollution, primarily due to increased road traffic. This may have a direct negative impact on the two identified Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) in the area. However, by concentrating development in existing centres of population there is the potential positive impact of providing the critical mass required to sustain public transport and offer opportunities for cycling and walking.

7.8.2 **Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure**: Option A will have a mixed minor positive/uncertain impact. Any new development has the potential to impact upon protected sites of nature conservation. However, there is also the potential positive impact of being able to ‘design in’ green infrastructure.

7.8.3 **Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)**: Option A will have a mixed minor positive/minor negative impact. Any new development is likely to increase
greenhouse gas emissions, both directly and indirectly. However, by concentrating development in existing centres of population and through new energy-efficient design and construction there are potential positive impacts of this policy approach.

7.8.4 Community, Health and Well-being: Option A will have a major positive impact. The provision of opportunities for employment will have a positive impact on both health and equality.

7.8.5 Economy and Employment: Option A will have a major positive impact. The approach provides the conditions for growth in businesses and employment through the provision of employment land.

7.8.6 Flood Risk: Option A will have an uncertain impact. This is because site specifics will be reviewed at a later date through the production of the Site Allocations DPD. There is the potential to ‘design-in’ flood resilience measures to all new development.

7.8.7 Historic Environment: Option A will have an uncertain impact. This is because site specifics will be reviewed at a later date through the production of the Site Allocations DPD. However, most existing allocations and commitments are out of town and as such, the potential for impact should be minimised.

7.8.8 Housing: Option A will have a neutral impact. The policy approach is concerned with the provision of land for employment land rather than housing.

7.8.9 Land and Waste: Option A will have a minor negative impact. Any new greenfield development will result in permanent loss of agricultural land. New development will also likely lead to greater levels of waste generation.

7.8.10 Landscape: Option A will have a minor negative impact. Any new development on greenfield land will inevitably impact upon landscape.

7.8.11 Transport: Option A will have a mixed minor positive/minor negative impact. Any new development is likely to lead to higher levels of road traffic. However, by concentrating development in existing centres of population there is potential positive impact of providing the critical mass required to sustain public transport and offer opportunities for cycling and walking.

7.8.12 Water: Option A will have a minor negative impact. Any new development is likely to increase pressure on water resources.

7.8.13 Conclusion: Whilst there is some uncertainty over the impacts of this option and potential for minor negative impacts, the option has major positives in relation to the economy and employment in that it seeks to provide for new employment land.

7.9 Delivery

7.9.1 The option will be delivered through the review of existing sites through the Site Allocations DPD and through the development management process. As there is only one reasonable option, there are no relative delivery benefits of another approach. The delivery of overall targets for employment land will be monitored through the annual Monitoring Report. Significant development will require appropriate supporting infrastructure, which will be indentified through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).
7.10 Preferred Option

7.10.1 Option A is the only reasonable option.

**Approach to Existing Employment Land and Premises**

7.11 Introduction

7.11.1 It is important to outline an approach to dealing with the protection and potential loss of existing employment land and premises to other uses in order to support existing businesses and inward investment.

7.12 Reasonable Policy Options

7.12.1 Option A: One approach to this issue is to seek to protect existing employment land through policy.

7.12.2 Option B: It is also reasonable not to protect existing employment land through policy and to leave redevelopment and change of use opportunities to the market.

7.13 Unreasonable Policy Options

7.13.1 It is considered unreasonable to actively promote the loss of existing employment land through policy. This would be contrary to the pro-economic growth messages outlined in the NPPF.
7.14 Sustainability Appraisal

Table 7.4: SA – Existing Employment Land and Premises

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Key</th>
<th>Major positive (✔✔)</th>
<th>Minor positive (✔)</th>
<th>Neutral (0)</th>
<th>Minor Negative (X)</th>
<th>Major Negative (XX)</th>
<th>Mixed (e.g. ✔✔/X, ✔/X)</th>
<th>Uncertain (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring for Topic Areas</th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity, Geodiversity &amp; Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?/✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, Health and Well-being</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy and Employment</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Risk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?/✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Environment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Waste</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?/✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?/✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?/X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.14.1 **Air Quality**: Option A has a neutral impact and option B has an uncertain impact. Whilst option A is considered to have a neutral impact, there is uncertainty related to option B in that the potential increased loss of employment land to other uses e.g. housing could have the impact of increasing levels of traffic overall, potentially in locations not well related to existing centres.

7.14.2 **Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure**: Both options are considered to have a neutral impact.

7.14.3 **Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)**: Option A has a neutral impact and option B has an uncertain/minor positive impact. Whilst option A is considered to have a neutral impact, there may be positive impacts through the redevelopment of existing employment land for other uses (option B) in that new sustainably designed and constructed buildings may lead to an overall reduction in carbon emissions. However, there is a great amount of uncertainty in this respect.

7.14.4 **Community, Health and Well-being**: Option A has a minor positive impact and option B has a minor negative impact. Option A scores positively in this respect as it seeks to retain employment land and therefore jobs, which has a positive effect on health and equality. The opposite is true of option B, which may result in the loss of employment opportunities, hence its negative scoring.
7.14.5 **Economy and Employment:** Option A has a minor positive impact and option B has a major negative impact. Option A has a positive impact in that it seeks to retain employment land and therefore jobs. On the other hand option B has a negative impact given that it may result in the loss of land for employment and in turn the ability to retain and attract new businesses and employment opportunities.

7.14.6 **Flood Risk:** Option A has a neutral impact and option B has an uncertain/minor positive impact. Whilst option A is considered to have a neutral impact, there is uncertainty related to option B. However, the redevelopment of existing sites may offer the opportunities to design in flood resistance/resilience, however, this would be dependant upon the location.

7.14.7 **Historic Environment:** Both options are considered to have a neutral impact.

7.14.8 **Housing:** Whilst option A has a neutral impact, there is potential through option B to deliver new dwellings through windfall development, therefore having a minor positive impact.

7.14.9 **Land and Waste:** Option A has a neutral impact and option B has an uncertain/minor positive impact. Whilst option A has a neutral impact, option B has the potential benefit of reducing the need for greenfield housing sites. However, there is uncertainty in this instance as to the amount of housing that would come forward; therefore, meaning the need to identify greenfield opportunities would still be required. There is uncertainty related to waste given the unknown potential levels of loss of employment land and what the replacement use might be.

7.14.10 **Landscape:** Option A has a neutral impact and option B has an uncertain/minor positive impact. Whilst option A has a neutral impact, there are potential benefits to the landscape of redeveloping employment uses for other uses, such as housing (Option B). However, there is uncertainty as to the level of change and the nature of redevelopment.

7.14.11 **Transport:** Option A has a neutral impact and option B has an uncertain/minor negative impact. Whilst option A has a neutral impact, there are potential negatives to option B in that redevelopment for housing could lead to greater levels of traffic movement, potentially in less sustainable locations. However, there is a great deal of uncertainty based on the specifics of the scheme in terms of location and the nature of redevelopment.

7.14.12 **Water:** Whilst option A has a neutral impact, there is uncertainty over the impact of option B, related to the level of change and the nature of redevelopment.

7.14.13 **Conclusion:** In general terms option A has a predominantly neutral impact, given that it arguably represents a baseline option. There is a great level of uncertainty related to option B, specifically related to the potential scale of the loss of employment land and what any replacement use might be. Overall, option A is deemed to be more sustainable as it seeks to protect employment land, whereas option B could lead to a significant impact in terms of the loss of employment land and the ability to retain and attract businesses and, therefore, jobs.
7.15 Delivery

7.15.1 In both cases the options would be delivered through the development management process. In relation to infrastructure delivery, option B could lead to significant higher-value windfall housing or commercial development coming forward. This would have the impact of increasing pressure on infrastructure in a piecemeal fashion, rather than in a planned manner through the allocation of sites through the development plan process.

7.16 Preferred Option

7.16.1 Option A is preferred given its relative positive SA score and benefits in terms of delivery.

Approach to Town Centre Uses

7.17 Introduction

7.17.1 It is necessary that a network and hierarchy of centres is defined and an overall approach to town centre uses is determined, including where there is a need for new floorspace. Site specific details, including potential new allocations and a review of the extent of town centres, primary shopping areas and frontages, including replacement policies on which uses will be permitted in primary shopping areas and primary and secondary frontages, will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD. Until then relevant boundaries and policies outlined in extant Local Plans will be saved. Furthermore, up-to-date information on need will be provided through an update of the retail studies prior to Examination. The preferred options will be based on information from existing retail studies.

7.18 Reasonable Policy Options

7.18.1 There are options related to how to address suitable locations for town centres uses, the identification of the network and hierarchy of centres, the amount of floorspace required and how to approach the sequential and impact tests.

7.18.2 It is considered that there is only one reasonable option in terms of addressing town centre uses, the identification of a network and hierarchy of centres and additional floorspace requirements. That is to broadly conform with the identified settlement hierarchy in the spatial strategy chapter of this document, as well as the evidence contained in the retail studies covering the area relating to hierarchy and floorspace requirements. In terms of options related to the application of the sequential test, the only reasonable way forward is to apply it in line with the NPPF.

7.18.3 There are reasonable options in terms of how to apply the impact test, as supported by the NPPF, which states that ‘when assessing applications for retail, leisure and office development outside of town centres, which are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan, local planning authorities should require an impact assessment if the development is over a proportionate, locally set floorspace threshold (if there is no locally set threshold, the default threshold is 2,500 sq m net floorspace)’. It is a reasonable option to explore a threshold lower than the NPPF default, particularly in terms of convenience and comparison floorspace, to take into account the smaller, more vulnerable nature of the majority of identified centres in South East
Lincolnshire, excluding Boston and Spalding. This would help to ensure their continued vitality and viability

7.18.4 Option A: To identify a hierarchy of centres, focussing retail development in larger settlements in accordance with the preferred spatial strategy. Also, to include the level of new development to be accommodated in the plan period in line with the findings of the retail studies, to outline an approach to the sequential test in line with the NPPF and to incorporate the NPPF default impact test threshold of 2,500 sq m net floorspace.

7.18.5 Option B: As option A but with a reduced impact test threshold of 500 sq m net convenience or comparison floorspace, except for Boston and Spalding, where the NPPF default threshold will apply.

7.19 Unreasonable Policy Options

7.19.1 It is considered unreasonable to depart from the preferred settlement hierarchy outlined earlier in this document and the evidence in the retail studies covering the area in terms of a network and hierarchy of retail centres. There is no evidence to suggest that a settlement is known to be out or under-performing in retail terms relative to its position in the settlement hierarchy, and as such to depart from the preferred settlement hierarchy, as outlined in the spatial strategy section of this document, is deemed unreasonable.

7.19.2 It is also unreasonable to depart from the evidence in the current retail studies (pending the completion of a more up-to-date version) in relation to the level and location of new floorspace requirements. To seek to provide less than required would be contrary to the NPPF in that it would not seek to meet the objectively assessed needs for the area. Seeking to provide more may undermine the existing retail offer. Given the relatively small nature of South East Lincolnshire’s retail centres, it is deemed unreasonable to adopt a higher impact test threshold than the NPPF default. It is likely that this would increase the risk of undermining the vitality and viability of retail centres in the area, which would be contrary to the NPPF.

7.19.3 Finally, it is considered unreasonable not to seek to address the issues highlighted through policy and to leave it to the market to meet retail needs. This approach would be contrary to the provisions on the NPPF.
7.20 Sustainability Appraisal

Table 7.5: SA – Town Centre Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Key</th>
<th>Major positive (✓✓)</th>
<th>Minor positive (✓)</th>
<th>Neutral (0)</th>
<th>Minor Negative (X)</th>
<th>Major Negative (XX)</th>
<th>Mixed (e.g. ✓✓/X, ✓/X)</th>
<th>Uncertain (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring for Topic Areas</th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>✓/?</td>
<td>✓/?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity, Geodiversity &amp; Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)</td>
<td>✓/X</td>
<td>✓/X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, Health and Well-being</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy and Employment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Risk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Environment</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Waste</td>
<td>✓/X</td>
<td>✓/X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>✓/?</td>
<td>✓/?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.20.1 **Air Quality:** Both option A and B will have a minor positive/uncertain impact. By concentrating town centre uses in accessible defined centres, there is the potential to promote sustainable modes of transport, thus reducing overall car travel and impacts upon air quality. However, concentrating development could result in congestion, which might impact negatively. There is uncertainty in this regard as to whether sustainable modes of transport can effectively be encouraged and delivered.

7.20.2 **Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure:** Both option A and B have a neutral impact.

7.20.3 **Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation):** Both option A and B have a mixed minor positive/minor negative impact. By concentrating town centre uses in accessible defined centres, there is the potential to promote sustainable modes of transport, thus reducing overall car travel and carbon emissions. However, new development is likely to lead to greater carbon emissions overall.

7.20.4 **Community, Health and Well-being:** Both options A and B have a major positive impact. The concentration of town centre uses at accessible locations should reduce the need to travel and help contribute to improved quality of life, which has positive health effects. Furthermore, identifying a network of centres to serve all of South East Lincolnshire’s communities promotes accessibility to all.
7.20.5 **Economy and Employment**: Whilst both option A and B have a positive impact, option B is deemed to be major. This is because the lower threshold (option B) relating to the impact test will lend greater support to the vitality and viability of existing town centres, when compared to the default higher threshold outlined in the NPPF (option A).

7.20.6 **Flood Risk**: Both option A and B are considered to have a neutral impact.

7.20.7 **Historic Environment**: Both option A and B are considered to have an uncertain impact. Whilst there is likely to be a concentration of listed buildings in existing town centres, where development is being concentrated, it would depend on the type and specific location of development coming forward as to whether the impact is positive or negative.

7.20.8 **Housing**: Both option A and B are considered to have a neutral impact.

7.20.9 **Land and Waste**: Both option A and B are considered to have a mixed minor positive/minor negative impact. This is because whilst the concentration of development in existing centres is likely to result in the re-use of previously-developed land, any new development is likely to lead to an increase in waste both in terms of construction and the ongoing final use.

7.20.10 **Landscape**: Both option A and B are considered to have a mixed minor positive/uncertain impact. This is because whilst concentrating development in existing centres will minimise greenfield development, it is uncertain how new development might impact on their historical cores, which may contain a number of historic assets.

7.20.11 **Transport**: Both option A and B have a significant (major) positive impact. Both options will locate facilities in existing centres where they are most accessible by public transport, thus reducing the need for car travel. Furthermore, identifying a network of centres to serve all of South East Lincolnshire’s communities promotes accessibility to all.

7.20.12 **Water**: Both option A and B have a minor negative impact. Both result in new development, which will inevitably impact upon water resources.

7.20.13 **Conclusion**: In general both options score similarly. However, option B scores slightly better by virtue of the fact that it seeks to provide further protection to the vitality and viability of existing centres by seeking to apply a more stringent threshold in terms of the impact test than the national default position (option A).

7.21 **Delivery**

7.21.1 The preferred policy approach will be delivered through determining the need and location of new allocations through the Site Allocations DPD process and through the development management process. There are no relative delivery benefits between options A and B. The delivery of overall targets for additional floorspace will be monitored through the annual Monitoring Report. Significant development will require appropriate supporting infrastructure, which will be identified through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).
 Preferred Option

7.22.1 **Option B** is the preferred option given that it seeks to provide greater protection to the vitality and viability of existing centres.

### Approach to the Identification of a Broad Location for a Spalding Rail Freight Interchange

#### Introduction

7.23.1 It is necessary to determine an approach for promoting the development of a Spalding RFI.

#### Reasonable Policy Options

7.24.1 Given the work already carried out in relation to the search for a preferred site for a Spalding RFI, it is considered that the only reasonable option is to determine a broad location in line with the Council-approved preferred site and the evidence contained within the Intermodality report. This is supported by the fact that a 'strategic sift' was undertaken through the preferred-site identification process. This process included public consultation.

7.24.2 **Option A**: To identify a broad location for a Spalding RFI of up to 60 hectares in the plan period in accordance with the findings of the Intermodality study and the Council's decision on a preferred location.

#### Unreasonable Policy Options

7.25.1 Given the work undertaken to date in the identification of a Spalding RFI and that the Council has already identified a preferred site that has been subject to public consultation, it is considered unreasonable to appraise an option that looks to re-open the debate on different sites. It is considered unreasonable to identify a site smaller or larger than the evidence outlined within the Intermodality report. To identify less land than the ‘objectively assessed need’ outlined by Intermodality would be contrary to the NPPF. Given uncertainties over the success of a RFI in this location, to identify more land than deemed necessary at this point in time could serve to undermine the successful development of existing employment land allocations elsewhere.

7.25.2 It is also considered unreasonable not to seek to identify a broad location through the Local Plan process. Given that the Council has identified a preferred site and given that there is developer interest, a decision not to identify a broad location could lead to an application coming forth in a less sustainable or appropriate location.
### 7.26 Sustainability Appraisal

#### Table 7.6: SA – Spalding Rail Freight Interchange

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Key</th>
<th>Major positive (✓✓)</th>
<th>Minor positive (✓)</th>
<th>Neutral (0)</th>
<th>Minor Negative (X)</th>
<th>Major Negative (XX)</th>
<th>Mixed (e.g. ✓✓/X, ✓/X)</th>
<th>Uncertain (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring for Topic Areas</th>
<th>Option A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>✓/X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity, Geodiversity &amp; Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)</td>
<td>✓/X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, Health and Well-being</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy and Employment</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Risk</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Environment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Waste</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>✓/X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.26.1 **Air Quality:** Option A will have a minor positive/minor negative impact. Any new development will likely lead to increased air pollution, primarily due to increased road traffic. However, the purpose of the RFI is to actively seek to promote the movement of freight by sustainable means (rail) and will consequently seek to reduce reliance on road-based transport.

7.26.2 **Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure:** Option A will have neutral impact as the preferred location for the RFI will not impact upon any protected sites of nature conservation.

7.26.3 **Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation):** Option A will have a mixed minor positive/minor negative impact. Any new development is likely to increase greenhouse gas emissions. However, the purpose of the RFI is to actively seek to promote the sustainable movement of freight by sustainable means (rail) and will consequently seek to reduce reliance on road-based transport.

7.26.4 **Community, Health and Well-being:** Option A will have a minor positive impact. The provision of opportunities for employment will have a positive impact on both health and equality.
7.26.5 **Economy and Employment**: Option A will have a major positive impact. The option directly provides land for employment development. Furthermore, part of the rationale for the RFI is to ‘anchor’ existing businesses in the area.

7.26.6 **Flood Risk**: Option A will have a minor negative impact. The site covers an area which is considered to vary between low to high residual risk of flooding at the present time (at a 1% fluvial/0.5% tidal event probability). However, it is considered to be a less vulnerable use and there is the potential to incorporate flood resilience measures as part of the development.

7.26.7 **Historic Environment**: Option A will have a neutral impact. There are no historic assets in the broad location identified.

7.26.8 **Housing**: Option A will have a neutral impact. The policy approach is concerned with the provision of land for employment purposes, rather than housing.

7.26.9 **Land and Waste**: Option A will have a minor negative impact. Any new development on greenfield land will result in a permanent loss of agricultural land. New development will also likely lead to greater levels of waste generation.

7.26.10 **Landscape**: Option A will have a minor negative impact. Any new development on greenfield land will inevitably impact upon landscape. However, there is the opportunity to incorporate appropriate landscaping to ensure that any impact is minimised.

7.26.11 **Transport**: Option A will have a mixed minor positive/minor negative impact. Whilst localised transport will likely increase due to the nature of the development, in a wider context one of the purposes of the RFI is to promote the movement of freight by sustainable means (rail), which will reduce reliance on road-based transport.

7.26.12 **Water**: Option A will have a minor negative impact. Any new development is likely to increase pressure on water resources.

7.26.13 **Conclusion**: Whilst there are a number of potential negative impacts that come about as a result of development, this development in particular seeks to provide directly for employment and to minimise the need for freight to be transported by less sustainable means.

7.27 **Delivery**

7.27.1 This option will be delivered through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. If a planning application is not forthcoming prior to the production of the Site Allocations DPD, specific site boundaries will be identified in that development plan document. As there are no other reasonable options, there are no relative delivery benefits. Significant development will require appropriate supporting infrastructure, which will be indentified through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). The ELR concludes that an RFI of this size, and in this location, will not undermine the delivery of existing employment land allocations.
7.28 Preferred Option

7.28.1 Option A is the only reasonable option and has positive impacts in terms of economic development and sustainable transport.

7.29 Reason for Preferred Policy Approaches

7.29.1 It is clear from the information presented that there are limited reasonable options for dealing with the key issues arising from the policy context and evidence base. Based on the above conclusions it is proposed to take forward three preferred policy approaches. The first will cover economy in its broadest sense, including the provision of employment land, as well as the preferred approach to dealing with existing employment sites/premises. The second will detail the preferred approach to dealing with town centre uses through an identified network and hierarchy of centres, including floorspace requirements and a local threshold for dealing with the impact test. The third will deal with the preferred broad location for a Spalding RFI.

7.30 Preferred Policy Approaches

**Employment Land and Premises**

To meet current forecast need for employment land in South East Lincolnshire, employment proposals will be directed to existing employment commitments and allocated sites identified in extant Local Plan policies. Allocations will be reviewed through the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD.

Proposals which lead to the loss of existing business, industrial or warehousing land to other uses, including retail, will not be permitted unless the overall benefit of the proposal outweighs the disadvantages of the loss of employment or potential employment on site.

**Table 7.7: HRA/AA Screening – Employment Land and Premises**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the policy lead to development?</th>
<th>Does the policy specify a quantity or type of development?</th>
<th>Does the policy specify a location for development?</th>
<th>Is the policy implemented through other policies?</th>
<th>Does the policy concentrate development in urban areas?</th>
<th>Does the policy steer development away from European or Ramsar sites?</th>
<th>Does the policy protect the natural environment?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.30.1 Given that this policy approach is concerned with levels and broad locations of development, it is considered that there is potential for significant effects on a European or Ramsar site. As such, it should be screened by the Habitats Regulations Assessment process.
### Table 7.8: Equalities Assessment – Employment Land and Premises

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equalities Analysis of Preferred Policy Approach</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Gender re-assignment</th>
<th>Marriage &amp; civil partnership</th>
<th>Pregnancy &amp; maternity</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Religion or belief</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Sexual orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(✓ - may benefit) (0 – neutral) (X – adverse impact)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.30.2 The provisions of this policy will have the same impact on all groups.
Town and Other Centres

Town and other centres will be promoted and enhanced as the primary location for main town centre uses including retail, leisure, tourism, cultural and office development. The following principles will apply:

a) A hierarchy of centres which guides decisions on the scale of development that will be permitted:

   i) The Large Town Centres of Boston and Spalding will be the primary focus for main town centres uses, in support of their sub-regional role and function.
   
   ii) The Small Town Centres of Crowland, Donington, Holbeach, Kirton, Long Sutton and Sutton Bridge, functioning as important service centres for the needs of their localised catchment areas, will provide a secondary focus for main town centre uses.
   
   iii) Service Villages and local centres in Boston and Spalding will provide for the daily retail needs of their populations through a range of small shops and other community services and facilities.

b) The hierarchy of centres above is not intended to be a sequential approach to the choice of sites. Development proposals for retail and/or other town centre uses will be focussed in the centres defined in this policy, and will be appropriate in scale and nature to the size and function of the relevant centre and to the maintenance of the hierarchy of centres. Development in out-of-centre and edge-of-centre locations will, except where for purely local need, be tightly controlled. Proposals in these locations will be required to demonstrate their suitability through a sequential site test in line with the NPPF.

c) Provision will be made for the following floorspace requirements:

   i) Boston Borough

     | Convenience floorspace requirement (sq m gross) | Comparison floorspace requirement (sq m gross) |
     |-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
     | Mainstream supermarket                        | Discount food store                            |
     | All comparison minus bulky goods              | Bulky goods (retail warehouse formats)         |
     | 2006-11                                       | 4,500                                         |
     | 2011-16                                       | 2,800                                         |
     | 2016-26                                       | 5,800                                         |

   ii) South Holland District

     | Convenience floorspace requirement (sq m net sales area) | Comparison floorspace requirement (sq m net sales area) |
     |--------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|
     | Constant Retention                                     | Rising Retention                                       |
     | 2007-11                                                | 282                                                   |
     | 2011-16                                                | 1,069                                                 |
     | 2016-21                                                | 1,173                                                 |
     | 2007-21                                                | 2,524                                                 |

   d) To protect the vitality and viability of defined centres, a robust assessment of impact on nearby centres will be required for any proposed convenience or comparison floorspace outside of town centres that is greater than 500 sq m net, except for Boston and Spalding, where the NPPF default threshold of 2,500 sq m net will apply.

The need for, and location of, allocations for town centre uses will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD. New policies guiding the scale of town centre floorspace permissible in the hierarchy of centres and the nature of development in primary shopping areas and primary and secondary frontages will be contained in the Site Allocations DPD. All existing retail-related boundaries will be reviewed through the Site Allocations DPD.
### Table 7.9: HRA/AA Screening – Town and Other Centres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening of Preferred Policy Approach (✓/X)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the policy lead to development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.30.3 Given that this policy approach is concerned with promoting development, it is considered that there is potential for significant effects on a European or Ramsar site. As such, it should be screened by the Habitats Regulations Assessment process.

### Table 7.10: Equalities Assessment – Town and Other Centres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equalities Analysis of Preferred Policy Approach (✓ - may benefit) (0 – neutral) (X – adverse impact)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.30.4 The provisions of this policy will have the same impact on all groups.
**Table 7.11: HRA/AA Screening – Spalding Rail Freight Interchange**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening of Preferred Policy Approach (✓/X)</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Does the policy lead to development? Does the policy specify a quantity or type of development? Does the policy specify a location for development? Is the policy implemented through other policies? Does the policy concentrate development in urban areas? Does the policy steer development away from European or Ramsar sites? Does the policy protect the natural environment?

7.30.5 Given that this policy approach is concerned with promoting development, particularly in a rural location, it is considered that there is potential for significant effects on a European or Ramsar site. As such, it should be screened by the Habitats Regulations Assessment process.

**Table 7.12: Equalities Assessment – Spalding Rail Freight Interchange**

| Equalities Analysis of Preferred Policy Approach (✓ - may benefit) (0 – neutral) (X – adverse impact) |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Age                                            | Disability                      | Gender re-assignment            | Marriage & civil partnership    | Pregnancy & maternity | Race            | Religion or belief | Sex             | Sexual orientation |
| 0                                              | 0                               | 0                               | 0                               | 0                | 0               | 0               | 0               | 0                |

7.30.6 The provisions of this policy will have the same impact on all groups.
8.0 Environment

8.1 Policy Context

Local Plan Strategic Priorities

8.1.1 The following Local Plan strategic priorities are relevant:

- To protect and enhance, where appropriate, South East Lincolnshire’s natural, built and historic environment.
- To adapt to, and mitigate against the effects of, climate change by reducing exposure to flood risk, minimising carbon emissions through the sustainable location, design and construction of new development, promoting energy efficiency and renewable energy, enhancing the green infrastructure network, and by minimising the need to travel.

National Planning Policy Framework

Requiring good design

8.1.2 ‘The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people.’

8.1.3 ‘It is important to plan positively for the achievement of high quality and inclusive design for all development, including individual buildings, public and private spaces and wider area development schemes.’

8.1.4 ‘Local and neighbourhood plans should develop robust and comprehensive policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area. Such policies should be based on stated objectives for the future of the area and an understanding and evaluation of its defining characteristics. Planning policies and decisions should aim to ensure that developments:

- will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;
- establish a strong sense of place, using streetscapes and buildings to create attractive and comfortable places to live, work and visit;
- optimise the potential of the site to accommodate development, create and sustain an appropriate mix of uses (including incorporation of green and other public space as part of developments) and support local facilities and transport networks;
- respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation;
- create safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion; and
- are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping.’

8.1.5 ‘Local planning authorities should consider using design codes where they could help deliver high quality outcomes. However, design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail and should concentrate on guiding the overall
scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally.’

8.1.6 ‘Planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. It is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.’

8.1.7 ‘Although visual appearance and the architecture of individual buildings are very important factors, securing high quality and inclusive design goes beyond aesthetic considerations. Therefore, planning policies and decisions should address the connections between people and places and the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment.’

Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

8.1.8 ‘Planning plays a key role in helping shape places to secure radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimising vulnerability and providing resilience to the impacts of climate change, and supporting the delivery of renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure. This is central to the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development.’

8.1.9 ‘Local planning authorities should adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change, taking full account of flood risk, coastal change and water supply and demand considerations.’

8.1.10 ‘To support the move to a low carbon future, local planning authorities should:

- plan for new development in locations and ways which reduce greenhouse gas emissions;
- actively support energy efficiency improvements to existing buildings; and
- when setting any local requirement for a building’s sustainability, do so in a way consistent with the Government’s zero carbon buildings policy and adopt nationally described standards.’

8.1.11 ‘To help increase the use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy, local planning authorities should recognise the responsibility on all communities to contribute to energy generation from renewable or low carbon sources. They should:

- have a positive strategy to promote energy from renewable and low carbon sources;
- design their policies to maximise renewable and low carbon energy development while ensuring that adverse impacts are addressed satisfactorily, including cumulative landscape and visual impacts;
- consider identifying suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy sources, and supporting infrastructure, where this would help secure the development of such sources;
- support community-led initiatives for renewable and low carbon energy, including developments outside such areas being taken forward through neighbourhood planning; and
- identify opportunities where development can draw its energy supply from decentralised, renewable or low carbon energy supply systems and for co-locating potential heat customers and suppliers.’
8.1.12 ‘Local Plans should take account of climate change over the longer term, including factors such as flood risk, coastal change, water supply and changes to biodiversity and landscape. New development should be planned to avoid increased vulnerability to the range of impacts arising from climate change. When new development is brought forward in areas which are vulnerable, care should be taken to ensure that risks can be managed through suitable adaptation measures, including through the planning of green infrastructure.’

Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

8.1.13 ‘The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

- protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils;
- recognising the wider benefits of ecosystem services;
- minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible, contributing to the Government’s commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures;
- preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability; and
- remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate.’

8.1.14 ‘In preparing plans to meet development needs, the aim should be to minimise pollution and other adverse effects on the local and natural environment. Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value, where consistent with other policies in this Framework.’

8.1.15 ‘Planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value. Local planning authorities may continue to consider the case for setting a locally appropriate target for the use of brownfield land.’

8.1.16 ‘Local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality.’

8.1.17 ‘Local planning authorities should set criteria based policies against which proposals for any development on or affecting protected wildlife or geodiversity sites or landscape areas will be judged. Distinctions should be made between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites, so that protection is commensurate with their status and gives appropriate weight to their importance and the contribution that they make to wider ecological networks.’

8.1.18 ‘Local planning authorities should:

- set out a strategic approach in their Local Plans, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure; and
• maintain the character of the undeveloped coast, protecting and enhancing its distinctive landscapes, particularly in areas defined as Heritage Coast, and improve public access to and enjoyment of the coast.”

8.1.19 ‘Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in all these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads.’

8.1.20 ‘To minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity, planning policies should:
• plan for biodiversity at a landscape-scale across local authority boundaries;
• identify and map components of the local ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity, wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them and areas identified by local partnerships for habitat restoration or creation;
• promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species populations, linked to national and local targets, and identify suitable indicators for monitoring biodiversity in the plan;
• aim to prevent harm to geological conservation interests; and
• where Nature Improvement Areas are identified in Local Plans, consider specifying the types of development that may be appropriate in these Areas.’

8.1.21 ‘Planning policies and decisions should also ensure that:
• the site is suitable for its new use taking account of ground conditions and land instability, including from natural hazards or former activities such as mining, pollution arising from previous uses and any proposals for mitigation including land remediation or impacts on the natural environment arising from that remediation;
• after remediation, as a minimum, land should not be capable of being determined as contaminated land under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990; and
• adequate site investigation information, prepared by a competent person, is presented.’

8.1.22 ‘Planning policies and decisions should aim to:
• avoid noise from giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life as a result of new development;
• mitigate and reduce to a minimum other adverse impacts on health and quality of life arising from noise from new development, including through the use of conditions;
• recognise that development will often create some noise and existing businesses wanting to develop in continuance of their business should not have unreasonable restrictions put on them because of changes in nearby land uses since they were established; and
• identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason.’

8.1.23 ‘Planning policies should sustain compliance with and contribute towards European Union (EU) limit values or national objectives for pollutants, taking into account the
presence of Air Quality Management Areas and the cumulative impacts on air quality from individual sites in local areas. Planning decisions should ensure that any new development in Air Quality Management Areas is consistent with the local air quality action plan.'

8.1.24 'By encouraging good design, planning policies and decisions should limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation.'

Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

8.1.25 'Local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. In doing so, they should recognise that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance. In developing this strategy, local planning authorities should take into account:

- the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring;
- the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness; and
- opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of a place.'

East Midlands Regional Plan

8.1.26 The Regional Plan explains that we should promote better design (Policy 2); protect, appropriately manage and enhance natural and cultural heritage (Policy 26); understand, conserve and enhance the historic environment (Policy 27); work with partners to deliver, protect and enhance environmental infrastructure to contribute towards a high quality natural and built environment, deliver increased biodiversity and increase woodland cover (Policies 28, 29 & 30)(Policy 30 identifies Boston Woods); work with partners to plan for the best use of water supplies and their augmentation (Policy 32); take account of the potential impact of climate change on flooding and land drainage (Policy 35); contribute to reducing air pollution and consider the effects of development on air quality (Policy 36); using the energy hierarchy seek to reduce energy usage and reduce energy need through planning the appropriate location, site layout and building design (Policy 39), promote Combined Heat and Power and District Heating and establish criteria for assessing on shore wind proposals and other forms of renewable energy (Policy 40).

Local Authority Corporate Plans and other Strategies

8.1.27 Boston Borough Council’s:

- Community Plan 2008-2018 sets out a number of ambitions. The following relate to the environment. ‘Creating a greener and sustainable future by: promoting green tourism development, including support for the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) reserves, continuing to encourage local green initiatives providing public amenity and wildlife spaces, and assessing actions to protect and enhance Local Wildlife Sites’.
Corporate Plan 2012-2015 includes a priority to ‘revitalise and promote our town and rural borough’ and to ‘promote greener and healthier communities’. It makes no specific reference to sustainable development but does include a number of ambitions that will contribute to it.

8.1.28 South Holland District Council’s:
- Corporate Plan 2011-2015 includes a priority to have pride in South Holland and in order to achieve this, the Council aim to ‘expand the provision of open space and play areas’, ‘reduce the carbon footprint of the council’ and ‘reduce our own greenhouse gas emissions’.

8.2 Evidence Base

Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report

8.2.1 Key issues and problems to emerge from the Scoping Report are:

Air Quality
- there are currently two AQMAs in South East Lincolnshire, both in Boston; and
- there are high levels of car ownership across the area, particularly in South Holland.

Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure
- that there are a number of protected sites/habitats within and surrounding the area, including The Wash, which is internationally protected; and
- in terms of open space, there is a current shortfall of allotments and some aspects of provision for outdoor sport.

Table 8.1: Nature Conservation Sites within South East Lincolnshire and within 15 Km of the South East Lincolnshire boundary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Designation</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ramsar</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Protection Area (SPA)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site of Special Scientific Importance (SSSI)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Nature Reserve (NNR)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Nature Reserve (LNR)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSPB managed/owned site</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)
- there is an increasing need for South East Lincolnshire to mitigate and adapt to climate change.

Historic Environment
- there are a significant number of historic environment records across the area, with an above-average proportion of Conservations Areas at risk in South Holland and an above-average proportion of Grade I and II* Listed Buildings at risk in both Boston Borough and South Holland.
• South East Lincolnshire contains:
  o 2 Registered Parks and Gardens;
  o 24 Conservation Areas;
  o 45 Scheduled Ancient Monuments; and
  o 1,023 Listed Buildings.

Land and Waste
• there are a number of contaminated sites across South East Lincolnshire. However, if these could be effectively remediated they could reduce pressure for the release of greenfield land to deliver new development;
• nearly all of South East Lincolnshire is covered by Grade 1 and Grade 2 agricultural land;
• the overall trend for the proportion of housing completions on brownfield sites has been increasing, although in recent times Boston Borough has performed better than South Holland; and
• the proportion of waste diverted from landfill to composting and recycling has been steadily improving across South East Lincolnshire. However, recycling rates are still below regional targets.

Landscape
• the landscape is low-lying and homogenous. However, there are a number of pressures on landscape character and additional greenfield development would add to this pressure.

Water
• the area is in the driest region in the country and is currently in drought;
• pressures on water supply are forecast to increase over time; and
• there are some concerns over water quality.

Boston Landscape Character Assessment
8.2.2 This study completed in 2009 seeks to provide information on the broad planning context, the landscape context and the physical and cultural influences that have shaped today's landscape. The landscape is subdivided into nine discrete areas. For each area key characteristics, landscape character, forces for change and potential sensitivity to change are described. In addition, the public consultation exercise revealed highly valued aspects are: ecological status abutting the Wash, watercourses, sea banks, trees and heritage features. Also views of flocks of migrating birds, framed views of the stump, views of boats on waterways, open views, big skies and wide horizons. Views over the coastal strip are valued for its vastness and wilderness and lack of light pollution.

South Holland Strategic Landscape Capacity Study
8.2.3 This study completed in 2003 subdivides the landscape into 3 sub areas and provides a description of the area including topography, dominant land cover and landscape elements, a visual assessment and the contribution of architecture. It also assesses the suitability of the landscape to accommodate wind farms by defining each grid square as: highly suitable, suitable, moderately suitable, unsuitable or highly unsuitable. The study was prepared to assess wind farms. Most of the district is deemed highly unsuitable or unsuitable for wind farms. Some areas are moderately suitable and a small area is suitable or highly suitable.
Boston Rural and Urban Historic Environment Baseline Studies

8.2.4 These studies seek to raise awareness of the nature and value of the Borough’s archaeological, historical and built heritage and its potential to contribute to a sustainable social and economic future for the Borough. The rural study indicates there are areas which have no recorded archaeological site. Without this information unknown archaeological sites may be under threat from development. There is also a lack of understanding and information of character, value, vulnerability of Listed Buildings and unlisted buildings. Earthwork sites have not been visited or surveyed since the late 1970’s. The urban study indicates there is a lack of understanding on many aspects of Boston’s archaeological heritage. Without this it is very difficult to manage effectively the impact of development on buried historic resource. Also there is a lack of information and understanding concerning the character, value, vulnerability of the historic built environment, thus making it difficult to effectively manage the impact of development on Boston’s built environment.

Lincolnshire Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP)

8.2.5 The BAP is produced by the Lincolnshire Biodiversity Partnership and seeks to improve a series of habitats and species which are locally important. It highlights that human activity is responsible for numerous threats to biodiversity and that habitat loss and fragmentation is one of the main reasons for biodiversity decline. This is compounded by changes to the landscape through agricultural intensification, urban extensions and infrastructure improvements. Another threat is climate change which can bring unpredictable and extreme weather, to which biodiversity cannot adapt in the way it may to gradual change. Moving may be the response to climate change but this is made more difficult through fragmentation. Other threats to biodiversity are invasion of non native species and disease.

The Wash and Fens Green Infrastructure Plan

8.2.6 Essentially the document is a very large compendium of information relating to the subject of green infrastructure in general and detailed map-based information setting out the location of different types of green infrastructure and judgements on potential for enhancement in the ‘Wash and Fens’ area. It also includes a number of suggested ‘actions’ to enhance the provision of green infrastructure and the various social, economic and environmental benefits to be obtained from it. One of these is to create and positively manage an integrated network of high quality and where practicable, multifunctional green infrastructure within urban and rural environments that delivers:

- Enriched and robust habitats with greater connectivity; and
- Enhanced and sustainable public access to the countryside and urban green space for the benefit of all who live, work in and visit The Wash and fens.

South East Lincolnshire Carbon Challenge

8.2.7 This is a document prepared in house by Boston Borough Council that investigates how South East Lincolnshire is performing against national targets for reducing greenhouse gases and renewable energy production. The Government has a domestic target of a 34% cut in all Green House Gases from 1990 levels by 2020 and an 80% cut in all Green House Gases by 2050 enshrined in the Climate Change Act 2008. The European Union have set the UK a target of achieving 15% of its energy use from renewable energy by 2020. The UK Renewable Energy Strategy

8.2.5 The BAP is produced by the Lincolnshire Biodiversity Partnership and seeks to improve a series of habitats and species which are locally important. It highlights that human activity is responsible for numerous threats to biodiversity and that habitat loss and fragmentation is one of the main reasons for biodiversity decline. This is compounded by changes to the landscape through agricultural intensification, urban extensions and infrastructure improvements. Another threat is climate change which can bring unpredictable and extreme weather, to which biodiversity cannot adapt in the way it may to gradual change. Moving may be the response to climate change but this is made more difficult through fragmentation. Other threats to biodiversity are invasion of non native species and disease.

The Wash and Fens Green Infrastructure Plan

8.2.6 Essentially the document is a very large compendium of information relating to the subject of green infrastructure in general and detailed map-based information setting out the location of different types of green infrastructure and judgements on potential for enhancement in the ‘Wash and Fens’ area. It also includes a number of suggested ‘actions’ to enhance the provision of green infrastructure and the various social, economic and environmental benefits to be obtained from it. One of these is to create and positively manage an integrated network of high quality and where practicable, multifunctional green infrastructure within urban and rural environments that delivers:

- Enriched and robust habitats with greater connectivity; and
- Enhanced and sustainable public access to the countryside and urban green space for the benefit of all who live, work in and visit The Wash and fens.

South East Lincolnshire Carbon Challenge

8.2.7 This is a document prepared in house by Boston Borough Council that investigates how South East Lincolnshire is performing against national targets for reducing greenhouse gases and renewable energy production. The Government has a domestic target of a 34% cut in all Green House Gases from 1990 levels by 2020 and an 80% cut in all Green House Gases by 2050 enshrined in the Climate Change Act 2008. The European Union have set the UK a target of achieving 15% of its energy use from renewable energy by 2020. The UK Renewable Energy Strategy
has a target of 30% of our electricity to come from renewable energy sources by 2020. The results are contained the following tables:

**Table 8.2**: Assessment of sectoral impacts and potential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Current Emissions (Tonnes)</th>
<th>Required 2020 Saving (Tonnes)</th>
<th>Required 2050 Savings (Tonnes)</th>
<th>Potential Savings (Tonnes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>325,820</td>
<td>146,619</td>
<td>296,496</td>
<td>193,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space heating existing stock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water heating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry and Commercial</td>
<td>426,220</td>
<td>0,000</td>
<td>149,177</td>
<td>214,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Transport</td>
<td>312,760</td>
<td>106,370</td>
<td>250,239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use, land use change and forestry</td>
<td>15,990</td>
<td>2,239</td>
<td>9,594</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Sequestration existing and Boston Woods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1,080,790</td>
<td>255,228</td>
<td>705,506</td>
<td>309,432</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8.3**: Assessment of potential energy supply against national targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Energy Use</th>
<th>Demand GWh</th>
<th>Supply GWh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Sources</td>
<td>3,392</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>509</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>811</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Renewables 68.3 MW</td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Renewables 33.8 MW (with PP)</td>
<td></td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential PV on suitable domestic roofs 127.9 MW</td>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Renewables 55 MW (no PP)</td>
<td></td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.2.8 If the proposals with planning permission or the potential photovoltaic (PV) on domestic roofs were implemented the 30% of electricity provided by renewable energy would be achieved. In order to meet the 15% of all energy use from renewable energy the proposed Sutton Bridge energy park would need to be built.

8.2.9 In relation to carbon dioxide the 2020 target is 255,228 tonnes and the potential savings to the housing stock would achieve much of this. If the existing and potential renewable energy capacity was achieved the total carbon savings would rise to over 519,000 tonnes, which is a significant proportion of the 2050 target of 705,506 tonnes. East Midlands Councils’ climate change training suggests achieving an 80% reduction in CO₂ emissions will require District Heating and Combined Heat and Power.
Low Carbon Energy Opportunities and Heat Mapping for Local Planning Areas across the East Midlands

8.2.10 This study was undertaken by Land Use Consultants on behalf of East Midlands Councils. It shows for South East Lincolnshire that most potential for electricity generation is from wind with numerous sources of biomass and building integrated solar PV also contributing. For heat it shows that most potential comes from heat pumps with solar thermal and biomass also contributing. Some of the suggested wind farm areas already have wind farms developed on them, but there are other areas which are not developed. The report looks at “Technical Potential” and therefore there may be reasons why the sites are unsuitable for development.

8.3 Key Issues

8.3.1 The following key issues emerging from the policy context and evidence base require a policy response:

• the need to identify an approach to the natural environment in its broadest sense, including the need to protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity, geodiversity and green infrastructure and the need to minimise the harmful effects of pollution on the environment in general;
• the need to identify an approach to the protection of the historic environment;
• the need to identify a positive approach to addressing issues arising from climate change, including the generation of renewable and low carbon energy; and
• the need to determine an approach to the design of new development.

8.4 Other Policies

8.4.1 There is a significant amount of overlap between the theme of environment and other chapters within this document. The Community, Health and Well-Being chapter deals with open space in respect of sport and recreation, although there is overlap with open space in this chapter as a protected environmental resource. Air quality as a discrete issue is dealt with in the transport chapter; however, this also forms part of this section in terms of the impacts of pollution on the natural environment. Flood risk is related to climate change, but is specifically dealt with in the Housing Growth and Flood Risk chapter. The delivery of infrastructure, for example green infrastructure, is dealt with in the Delivery chapter.

8.4.2 It is not considered necessary to save any extant Local Plan policies in terms of the Environment theme.

Approach to the Natural Environment

8.5 Introduction

8.5.1 It is necessary to outline an approach to dealing with the natural environment in its broadest sense, including the need to protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity, geodiversity and green infrastructure and the need to minimise the harmful effects of pollution on the environment in general.
8.6 Reasonable Policy Options

8.6.1 It is considered that there are two reasonable options related to the protection of the natural environment in its broadest sense. That is an approach that positively reinforces the NPPF by seeking to protect international, national and local nature conservation sites from development unless overriding reasons exist. This approach also seeks to protect and enhance green infrastructure networks and minimise pollution.

8.6.2 It is also reasonable not to produce a policy approach and to rely on national guidance on the natural environment outlined in the NPPF.

8.6.3 **Option A**: To produce a policy approach that seeks to protect and, where possible, enhance the natural environment.

8.6.4 **Option B**: Do not produce a policy approach to the natural environment and rely on national guidance in the NPPF.

8.7 Unreasonable Policy Options

8.7.1 It is considered unreasonable to produce a policy approach that actively seeks to ignore the importance of the natural environment. This would be contrary to the concept of sustainable development and the provisions of the NPPF.
8.8 Sustainability Appraisal

Table 8.4: SA – Natural Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Key</th>
<th>Major positive (✓✓)</th>
<th>Minor positive (✓)</th>
<th>Neutral (0)</th>
<th>Minor Negative (X)</th>
<th>Major Negative (XX)</th>
<th>Mixed (e.g. ✓✓/X, ✓/X)</th>
<th>Uncertain (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring for Topic Areas</th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option B</th>
<th>Option C</th>
<th>Option D etc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity, Geodiversity &amp; Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, Health and Well-being</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy and Employment</td>
<td>✓/?</td>
<td>✓/?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Risk</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Environment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Waste</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.8.1 **Air Quality**: Both options will have a minor positive impact. A positive approach to the protection of the natural environment includes seeking to minimise pollution, which will have a positive impact on air quality.

8.8.2 **Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure**: Option A will have a major positive impact, whilst option B will have a minor positive impact. Both options seek to protect biodiversity, geodiversity and green infrastructure. However, option A is actively seeking to enhance green infrastructure networks locally.

8.8.3 **Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)**: Both options will have a minor positive impact. A positive approach to the protection of the natural environment and minimising of pollution will aid in the adaptation to, and mitigation against, climate change.

8.8.4 **Community, Health and Well-being**: Both options will have a minor positive impact. Access to the natural environment promotes healthy lifestyles and can act as a direct community facility.

8.8.5 **Economy and Employment**: Both impacts have a minor positive/uncertain impact. A high quality natural environment may make the area more attractive in terms of investment. There is also potential for specific features to form the basis of tourist
opportunities, although there is an element of uncertainty as to whether these opportunities will be realised.

8.8.6 **Flood Risk:** Both options have an uncertain impact. Improved habitat and green infrastructure can reduce the probability or the severity of flooding events. However, this would be dependant upon the frequency and severity of such events.

8.8.7 **Historic Environment:** Both options have a neutral impact. This policy approach is concerned with the natural, rather than the historic environment.

8.8.8 **Housing:** Both policy options have a neutral impact.

8.8.9 **Land and Waste:** Both options will have a minor positive impact. A positive approach to the protection of the natural environment including seeking to minimise pollution will have a positive impact on the protection of high quality agricultural land and soil quality.

8.8.10 **Landscape:** Both options will have a minor positive impact. A positive approach to the natural environment includes ensuring that landscape character is protected where appropriate and that new development takes this into account.

8.8.11 **Transport:** Both options will have a neutral impact.

8.8.12 **Water:** Both options will have a minor positive impact. A positive approach to the natural environment, including minimising pollution will have a positive impact on the protection of water quality and resources.

8.8.13 **Conclusion:** Broadly-speaking both options score very similarly. Option A scores slightly more positively in terms of biodiversity, geodiversity and green infrastructure in that it offers the opportunity to enhance local green infrastructure networks.

8.9 **Delivery**

8.9.1 Both options will be delivered through the development management process. It is not considered that there are any relative delivery benefits to either option.

8.10 **Preferred Option**

8.10.1 **Option A** is the preferred option as a locally-derived policy allows for local flavour to be added to the NPPF context. As both options score similarly in terms of the SA appraisal, there are no negative impacts of a locally-derived policy approach relative to the NPPF position.

**Approach to the Historic Environment**

8.11 **Introduction**

8.11.1 It is important to outline an approach to dealing with the protection of the historic environment (Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings and Scheduled Ancient Monuments) given that there are a significant number of historic environmental records in South East Lincolnshire, with an above-average proportion of Conservation Areas at risk in South Holland District and an above-average
proportion of Grade I and II* Listed Buildings at risk in both Boston Borough and South Holland District.

8.12 Reasonable Policy Options

8.12.1 It is considered that there is only one reasonable option related to the protection of the historic environment. This is an approach that positively seeks to protect historic assets.

8.12.2 Option A: To produce a policy approach that seeks to protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment.

8.13 Unreasonable Policy Options

8.13.1 Given that the NPPF states that Local Planning Authorities should set out a positive strategy for the historic environment it is not a reasonable option to rely on guidance in the NPPF alone.

8.14 Sustainability Appraisal

Table 8.5: SA – Historic Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Key</th>
<th>Major positive</th>
<th>Minor positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Minor Negative</th>
<th>Major Negative</th>
<th>Mixed (e.g. ✓/X, ✓/X)</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring for Topic Areas</th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option B</th>
<th>Option C</th>
<th>Option D etc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity, Geodiversity &amp; Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, Health and Well-being</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy and Employment</td>
<td>✓/?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Risk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Environment</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Waste</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.14.1 Air Quality: Option A has a neutral impact.

8.14.2 Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure: Option A has a neutral impact.
8.14.3 Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation): Option A has a neutral impact.

8.14.4 Community, Health and Well-being: Option A has a minor positive impact. Access to certain historic assets can contribute to quality of life and therefore well-being.

8.14.5 Economy and Employment: Option A has a minor positive/uncertain impact. A high quality historic environment may make the area more attractive in terms of investment. There is also potential for specific features to form the basis of tourist opportunities, although there is an element of uncertainty as to whether these opportunities will be realised.

8.14.6 Flood Risk: Option A has a neutral impact.

8.14.7 Historic Environment: Option A has a major positive impact. The policy approach is directly seeking to protect historic assets.

8.14.8 Housing: Option A has a neutral impact.

8.14.9 Land and Waste: Option A has a neutral impact.

8.14.10 Landscape: Option A has a minor positive impact. The development or renovation of listed buildings and buildings within conservation areas will help protect and possibly enhance the townscape.

8.14.11 Transport: Option A has a neutral impact.

8.14.12 Water: Option A has a neutral impact.

8.14.13 Conclusion: Overall Option A scores either positively or neutrally. There are deemed to be no negative impacts of this policy approach.

8.15 Delivery

8.15.1 As there is only one reasonable option there are no relative delivery benefits of another approach. This option will be delivered through the development management process.

8.16 Preferred Option

8.16.1 Option A is the only reasonable option.

Approach to Climate Change and Renewable & Low Carbon Energy

8.17 Introduction

8.17.1 It is necessary to identify an approach to addressing issues arising from climate change, including the generation of renewable and low carbon energy.

8.18 Reasonable Policy Options

8.18.1 It is considered that there is only one reasonable approach to dealing with climate change and renewable and low carbon energy. That is to have a positively-worded
policy approach detailing how South East Lincolnshire will contribute to the need to adapt to, and mitigate against, climate change. This will also include an approach to renewable and low carbon energy and how such development will be dealt with through the development management process across South East Lincolnshire.

8.18.2 **Option A**: To produce a positive policy approach that seeks to adapt to and mitigate against climate change and support renewable and low carbon energy development subject to assessment criteria.

**8.19 Unreasonable Policy Options**

8.19.1 It is unreasonable not to produce a preferred policy approach and, instead, to rely on the NPPF. The NPPF requires local planning authorities to have a positive strategy to promote energy from renewable and low carbon sources and it is also important that any preferred policy approach reflects local circumstances and views. It is also unreasonable not to seek to address the issues arising from climate change or actively to discourage renewable and low carbon energy generation, as this would be contrary to the NPPF.

8.19.2 At present no evidence is available to suggest that there is a need to allocate any sites within South East Lincolnshire to deliver renewable and low carbon energy schemes. As such, it is unreasonable to outline a policy approach that seeks to identify a broad need for such schemes.

8.19.3 It is also unreasonable at present, and would run the risk of being out of conformity with the NPPF, to categorically rule out any particular type of renewable or low carbon energy. There is currently no evidence base to justify this position.
## 8.20 Sustainability Appraisal

### Table 8.6: SA – Climate Change and Renewable & Low Carbon Energy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Key</th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option B</th>
<th>Option C</th>
<th>Option D etc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major positive (✓✓)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor positive (✓)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Negative (X)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Negative (XX)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed (e.g. ✓✓/X, ✓/X)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scoring for Topic Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic Area</th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option B</th>
<th>Option C</th>
<th>Option D etc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity, Geodiversity &amp; Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>✓/?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, Health and Well-being</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy and Employment</td>
<td>✓/?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Risk</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Environment</td>
<td>X/?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Waste</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>X/?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.20.1 **Air Quality**: Option A will have a minor positive impact. Seeking to reduce the need to travel and promoting both sustainable transport and renewable/low carbon energy generation will have a positive impact on air quality.

8.20.2 **Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure**: Option A will have a minor positive/uncertain impact. Mitigating against the effects of climate change will have a positive impact on the natural environment in a broad sense. However, it is uncertain as to what specific local impacts will be.

8.20.3 **Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)**: Option A will have a major positive impact. The policy approach is chiefly concerned with adapting to, and mitigating against, climate change.

8.20.4 **Community, Health and Well-being**: Option A will have a minor positive impact. Seeking to reduce the need to travel and renewable/low carbon energy generation will have positive health and well-being benefits in terms of air quality and a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions.

8.20.5 **Economy and Employment**: Option A will have a minor positive impact/uncertain. The low carbon economy may provide new business or diversification opportunities. However, to what extent this may provide benefits is currently uncertain.
8.20.6 **Flood Risk:** Option A will have a minor positive impact. Adapting to, and mitigating against, climate change involves minimising the risk of flooding.

8.20.7 **Historic Environment:** Option A will have a mixed minor negative/uncertain impact. The switch towards greater renewable and low carbon energy generation may impact negatively upon the historic environment. For example wind turbines may be seen to impact negatively upon historic assets. However, the overall impact is uncertain and would depend upon the circumstances.

8.20.8 **Housing:** Option A will have a neutral impact.

8.20.9 **Land and Waste:** Option A will have a neutral impact.

8.20.10 **Landscape:** Option A will have a minor negative/uncertain impact. Certain types of renewable energy e.g. large-scale wind turbine installations may be deemed to have a negative impact upon landscape and townscape. However, the overall impact is uncertain and would depend upon the circumstances.

8.20.11 **Transport:** Option A will have a minor positive impact. Seeking to reduce the need to travel and promoting sustainable transport is a key plank of adapting to and mitigating against climate change.

8.20.12 **Water:** Option A will have a minor positive impact. A key plank in adapting to and mitigating against climate change is the protection and efficient use of water resources.

8.20.13 **Conclusion:** Overall the policy approach scores positively in terms of SA.

8.21 **Delivery**

8.21.1 As there is only one reasonable option there are no relative delivery benefits of another approach. This option will be delivered through the development management process. There will be overlap with other preferred policy approaches within this chapter and the wider document, for example relating to the natural environment, design, transport and flood risk.

8.22 **Preferred Option**

8.22.1 **Option A** is the only reasonable option

**Approach to the Design of New Development**

8.23 **Introduction**

8.23.1 It is necessary to determine a local approach to the design of new development. This approach is likely to draw on and overlap with a number of other preferred policy approaches within this document, e.g. flood risk, natural environment, historic environment, transport, climate change and renewable/low carbon energy and community, health and well-being.
8.24 Reasonable Policy Options

8.24.1 It is considered that there are two reasonable options related to design. The first is to produce a policy approach outlining what should be taken into account in terms of ensuring good design in South East Lincolnshire having regard to its local characteristics. The second is not to produce a design policy and rely on the NPPF.

8.24.2 **Option A**: To produce a preferred approach to design.

8.24.3 **Option B**: To not produce a preferred approach to design and rely on the NPPF.

8.25 Unreasonable Policy Options

8.25.1 It is unreasonable to produce a preferred policy approach that fails to recognise the importance of design as an important consideration in the development management process, as this would be contrary to the NPPF.

8.26 Sustainability Appraisal

**Table 8.7**: SA – Design of New Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Key</th>
<th>Major positive (✓ ✓)</th>
<th>Minor positive (✓)</th>
<th>Neutral (0)</th>
<th>Minor Negative (X)</th>
<th>Major Negative (XX)</th>
<th>Mixed (e.g. ✓/✓, ✓/X)</th>
<th>Uncertain (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring for Topic Areas</th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option B</th>
<th>Option C</th>
<th>Option D etc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity, Geodiversity &amp; Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, Health and Well-being</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy and Employment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Risk</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Employment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Waste</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.26.1 **Air Quality**: Both options have a minor positive impact. Good design offers the opportunity to ‘design in’ access to sustainable transport and renewable/low carbon energy, which both aid in improving air quality.
8.26.2 Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure: Both options have a minor positive impact. Good design offers the opportunity to ‘design in’ green infrastructure and have a positive impact on biodiversity.

8.26.3 Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation): Both options have a minor positive impact. Good design offers the opportunity to ‘design in’ measures to adapt to, and mitigate against, climate change e.g. through ensuring accessibility by a choice of sustainable transport modes, energy-efficient design and construction, the use of renewable/low carbon energy and the incorporation of green infrastructure.

8.26.4 Community, Health and Well-being: Both options have a minor positive impact. Good design offers the opportunity to ‘design in’ open space and other community facilities, facilitate sustainable modes of transport (e.g. cycling and walking) and help to reduce crime.

8.26.5 Economy and Employment: Both options will have a neutral impact.

8.26.6 Flood Risk: Both options have a minor positive impact. Good design offers the opportunity to ‘design in’ flood resistance and resilience measures.

8.26.7 Historic Environment: Both options have a minor positive impact. Good design offers the opportunity to ensure development is sensitive to surrounding historic assets.

8.26.8 Housing: Both options will have a neutral impact.

8.26.9 Land and Waste: Both options will have a neutral impact.

8.26.10 Landscape: Both options have a minor positive impact. Good design offers the opportunity to ‘design in’ open space and other landscaping measures to improve townscapes and ensure development is sensitive to surrounding landscapes.

8.26.11 Transport: Both options have a minor positive impact. Good design offers the opportunity to ‘design in’ opportunities for sustainable forms of transport.

8.26.12 Water: Both options have a minor positive impact. Good design offers the opportunity to ‘design in’ energy-efficiency measures, which help to make efficient use of water as a resource.

8.26.13 Conclusion: Both options score positively in terms of the SA appraisal compared to the baseline situation. However, relatively-speaking Option A is considered to be more sustainable in that it gives the opportunity to add local flavour to the policy approach.

8.27 Delivery

8.27.1 Both options will be delivered through the development management process. It is not considered that there are any relative delivery benefits to either option.

8.28 Preferred Option

8.28.1 Option A is the preferred option. Owing to the NPPF advising that it is important to plan positively for the achievement of high-quality inclusive design for all types and scales of development, including individual buildings and public and private spaces
and wider area development schemes, it is considered that a locally-derived design policy should be included.

8.29 Reason for Preferred Policy Approaches

8.29.1 It is clear from the above analysis that there are limited reasonable options for dealing with the key issues arising from the policy context and evidence base. Based on the above conclusions, it is proposed to take forward three preferred policy approaches. The first will cover the environment in its broadest sense, including the natural and historic environment and pollution. The second will cover climate change and renewable/low carbon energy and the third will be a design policy that will be informed by and overlap with other preferred policy approaches in this document.
8.30 Preferred Policy Approaches

**Environment**

All development proposals should:

- protect the biodiversity value of land and buildings and minimise fragmentation of habitats;
- maximise opportunities for restoration, enhancement and connection of natural habitats;
- incorporate beneficial biodiversity conservation features where appropriate; and
- maximise opportunities to enhance green infrastructure networks, including water networks.

Development proposals where the principal objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity or geodiversity interests will be supported in principle.

Development proposals that would cause a direct or indirect adverse impact on nationally-designated sites or other designated areas of nature conservation importance or protected species will not be permitted unless:

- they cannot be located on alternative sites that would cause less or no harm;
- the benefits of the development clearly outweigh the impacts on the features of the site and the wider network of natural habitats; and
- suitable prevention, mitigation and compensation measures are provided.

Development proposals that would be significantly detrimental to the nature conservation interests of internationally-designated sites will not be permitted.

Development proposals should conserve or enhance the character and appearance of designated historic assets and other important historic buildings, structures, monuments and landscapes and their settings through high-quality sensitive design. Development proposals that would have an adverse impact on their special historic or architectural interest will not be permitted.

The reuse of Listed Buildings will be encouraged. New uses which would result in harm to their fabric, character, appearance or setting will not be permitted.

Development proposals involving the demolition of non-listed buildings will be assessed against the contribution to the architectural or historic interest of the area made by each building. Buildings which make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of an area should be retained. Where a building makes little contribution to the area, consent will be given provided that, in appropriate cases, there are acceptable and detailed plans for any redevelopment or after-use.
### Environment (cont.)

All development proposals should minimise the emission of pollutants, including noise, odour, light and waste materials, and ensure no deterioration in water quality. Proposals will only be permitted where, individually or cumulatively, there are no unacceptable impacts on:

- the natural environment and general amenity;
- health and safety of the public;
- surface and groundwater quality; and
- land quality and condition.

Exceptions will only be made where it can be clearly demonstrated that the environmental benefits of the development and the wider social and economic needs for the development outweigh the adverse impact.

Development proposals on contaminated land, or where there is reason to suspect contamination, must include an assessment of the extent of contamination and any possible risks. Proposals will only be permitted where the land is, or is made, suitable for the proposed use.

---

### Table 8.8: HRA/AA Screening - Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening of Preferred Policy Approach (✓/X)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the policy lead to development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

8.30.1 The policy approach does not lead to development itself or specify a quantity or type of development. It seeks to protect the natural environment and steer development away from European and Ramsar sites. It also seeks to promote green infrastructure and open space so that networks are improved. There is no crossover between the European and Ramsar sites and the conservation areas, listed buildings/gardens and scheduled ancient buildings and as a result development of them will not affect European and Ramsar sites. Therefore, it is considered that this policy can be screened out of the Habitats Regulations Assessment process.
Table 8.9: Equalities Analysis – Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equalities Analysis of Preferred Policy Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(✓ - may benefit) (0 – neutral) (X – adverse impact)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.30.2 The provisions of this policy will have the same impact on all groups.

**Climate Change and Renewable & Low Carbon Energy**

Development proposals will be required to demonstrate that the issue of climate change has been addressed by:

- reducing the need to travel through locational decisions and, where appropriate, providing a mix of uses;
- the protection of the quality, quantity and availability of water resources, for example by the use of water conservation and recycling measures and minimising off-site water discharge through Sustainable Urban Drainage systems;
- incorporation of measures which promote and enhance the resilience of ecosystems and biodiversity networks within and beyond the site;
- measures to minimise and mitigate the risks to the development associated with expected climate change impact such as average temperature increases, extreme weather events and soil moisture decreases in the summer and autumn; and
- the adoption of the sequential approach and exceptions test to flood risk and the incorporation of flood-mitigation measures in design and construction to reduce the effects of flooding.

Proposals for the development of sustainable renewable and low carbon sources of energy will be supported and considered in the context of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development and meeting the challenge of climate change.

Proposals for renewable energy technology, associated infrastructure and integration of renewable technology on existing or proposed structures will be permitted provided, individually, or cumulatively, there would be no significant adverse impact on:

- the surrounding landscape, skyscape or built environment;
- residential amenity in respect of noise, fumes, odour, vibration, shadow flicker, broadcast interference and traffic;
- specific highway safety, nature conservation or historic environment considerations; and
- the visual dominance of St Botolph’s Church tower over the skyline of Boston;

and provision is made for the removal of the facilities and reinstatement of the site should any development cease to be operational.
Table 8.10: HRA/AA Screening – Climate Change and Renewable & Low Carbon Energy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening of Preferred Policy Approach (✓/X)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the policy lead to development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.30.3 The policy approach seeks to provide a strategic response to Climate Change and Renewable and Low Carbon Energy. It does not specify a quantity or type of development or its location and it does not concentrate development in urban areas or explicitly steer development away from European or Ramsar sites. As such, it should be screened by the Habitats Regulations Assessment process.

Table 8.11: Equalities Analysis – Climate Change and Renewable & Low Carbon Energy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equalities Analysis of Preferred Policy Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(✓ - may benefit) (0 – neutral) (X – adverse impact)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Gender re-assignment</th>
<th>Marriage &amp; civil partnership</th>
<th>Pregnancy &amp; maternity</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Religion or belief</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Sexual orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.30.4 The provisions of this policy will have the same impact on all groups.
**Design of New Development**

All development shall be of high quality and inclusive design and, where appropriate, make innovative use of local traditional styles and materials. Encouragement will be given to contemporary design that reflects local distinctiveness. Design which is inappropriate to the local area or which fails to maximise opportunities for improving the character and quality of an area will not be acceptable.

Development proposals will demonstrate how the following considerations have been taken into account:

- ensuring buildings are adaptable to a variety of uses and, along with public spaces, are accessible to all;
- crime prevention and community safety;
- the use or reuse of historic buildings;
- complementing the existing built heritage, historic landscape and landscape character of the location;
- respecting the density, scale and massing of neighbouring buildings and the surrounding area;
- the orientation of buildings to enable decentralised and renewable energy efficiencies for the lifetime of the development;
- the treatment of facades to public places and the design of shop frontages;
- distinguishing between private and public space;
- where appropriate, the mitigation of flood risk through flood resilient design and sustainable urban drainage systems;
- the use of landmarks and views;
- the provision and layout of car parking;
- residential amenity;
- accessibility by a choice of travel modes including the provision of public transport, footpath and cycle ways where appropriate;
- the use of landscaping and the enhancement of biodiversity and green infrastructure; and
- the lighting of public places.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening of Preferred Policy Approach (✓/X)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the policy lead to development ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8.12: HRA/AA Screening – Design of New Development**

8.30.5 The policy approach does not lead to development itself, specify a quantity or type of development or its location. Development is implemented through other policies and this policy seeks only to influence the design of that development. It does not concentrate development in urban areas or explicitly steer development away from
European or Ramsar sites. Therefore, it is considered that this policy can be screened out of the Habitats Regulations Assessment process.

Table 8.13: Equalities Analysis – Design of New Development

<p>| Equalities Analysis of Preferred Policy Approach (✓ - may benefit) (0 – neutral) (X – adverse impact) |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Gender re-assignment</th>
<th>Marriage &amp; civil partnership</th>
<th>Pregnancy &amp; maternity</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Religion or belief</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Sexual orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.30.6 The provisions of this policy will have the same impact on most groups. However its provision in respect of ease of movement may particularly benefit the elderly, the disabled and people with children in prams or push chairs.
9.0 Community, Health and Well-Being

9.1 Policy Context

Local Plan Strategic Priorities

9.1.1 The following Local Plan strategic priorities are relevant:

- To seek to improve the quality of life for everyone who lives, visits, works and invests in South East Lincolnshire by protecting and enhancing access to homes, employment, retail, education, healthcare, community and leisure facilities and open space.
- To ensure that development contributes to the provision of necessary physical, social and green infrastructure to deliver planned levels of growth and mitigate its impacts on existing communities and the environment.

National Planning Policy Framework

Promoting healthy communities

9.1.2 'The planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. Local planning authorities should create a shared vision with communities of the residential environment and facilities they wish to see. To support this, local planning authorities should aim to involve all sections of the community in the development of Local Plans and in planning decisions, and should facilitate neighbourhood planning. Planning policies and decisions, in turn, should aim to achieve places which promote:

- opportunities for meetings between members of the community who might not otherwise come into contact with each other, including through mixed-use developments, strong neighbourhood centres, and active street frontages which bring together those who work, live and play in the vicinity;
- safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion; and
- safe and accessible developments, containing clear and legible pedestrian routes, and high quality public space, which encourage the active and continual use of public areas.'

9.1.3 ‘To deliver the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning policies and decisions should:

- plan positively for the provision and use of shared space, community facilities (such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship) and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments;
- guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the community’s ability to meet its day-to-day needs;
- ensure that established shops, facilities and services are able to develop and modernise in a way that is sustainable, and retained for the benefit of the community; and
- ensure an integrated approach to considering the location of housing, economic uses and community facilities and services.’
9.1.4 ‘Access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities. Planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision. The assessments should identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area. Information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sports and recreational provision is required.’

9.1.5 ‘Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless:

• an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements;
• the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or
• the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the needs for which clearly outweighs the loss.’

East Midlands Regional Plan

9.1.6 Policy 1 indicates that ‘all strategies, plans and programmes … should meet the following core objectives: …

a) To reduce social exclusion through: …

• the reduction of inequalities in the location and distribution of employment, housing, health and other community facilities and services; and
• by responding positively to the diverse needs of different communities….

b) To improve the health and mental, physical and spiritual well-being of the Region’s residents through improvements in: … access to health, cultural, leisure and recreational facilities and services.’

9.1.7 Policy 2 indicates that ‘the layout, design and construction of new development should be continuously improved … by … design which helps to reduce crime and the fear of crime, supports community safety, … and benefits the quality of life of local people.’

9.1.8 Policy 28 indicates that local authorities should ‘increase access to green space that can be used for formal and informal recreation, educational purposes and to promote healthy lifestyles …’

Local Authority Corporate Plans and other Strategies

9.1.9 Boston Borough Council’s:

• Community Plan 2008-2018 includes a number of ambitions and actions to achieve them. The following relate to community, health and well-being issues:
  o ‘Generating prosperity’ by ‘more people taking part in learning and improving their skills’;
  o ‘Feeling safe and part of your community’ by ‘a shared sense of belonging and pride in our communities where everyone is respected’; ‘reduced fear
of crime and reports of anti-social behaviour, specifically linked to alcohol, environmental crimes and vandalism'; 'reduction in serious violent crime and reduced re-offending by both adults and young people'; 'reduction in burglary of dwellings and retail theft, tackling drug related crimes and improving the safety of our roads';
  - 'Being healthy' by 'promotion of healthy lifestyles and reduced incidence of cancers, strokes and heart disease'; 'increased resources targeted at health services in the Boston area with improved access to those services'.

- Corporate Plan 2012-2015 identifies the following priorities that are of particular relevance to community, health and well-being issues:
  - 'safe, secure homes and neighbourhoods'; and
  - 'promoting greener and healthier communities'.

9.1.10 South Holland District Council's:

- Corporate Plan 2011-2015 identifies the following priorities that are of particular relevance to community, health and well-being issues:
  - 'to enable our communities'; and
  - 'to develop stronger communities'.

**Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy for Lincolnshire 2013-2018**

9.1.11 The Strategy sets out five themes, each with related priorities. The themes, and the priorities which appear most potentially relevant to the Local Plan are set out below:

- Promoting healthier lifestyles:
  - reduce the number of people who smoke
  - reduce the number of adults who are overweight or obese
  - support people to be more active more often
  - support people to drink alcohol sensibly
  - improve people’s sense of mental wellbeing

- Improve the health and wellbeing of older people:
  - develop a network of services to help older people lead a more healthy and active life and cope with frailty
  - increase respect and support for older people within their communities

- Delivering high quality systematic care for major causes of ill health and disability

- Improve health and social outcomes for children and reduce inequalities:
  - improving educational attainment for all children
  - reduce childhood obesity
  - ensure children and young people feel happy, stay safe from harm and make good choices about their lives, particularly children who are vulnerable or disadvantaged

- Tackling the social determinants of health:
  - support more vulnerable people into good quality work
  - ensure that people have access to good quality, energy efficient housing that is both affordable and meets their needs.
9.2 Evidence Base


9.2.1 Evidence from the Scoping Report highlights a number of key issues and problems in relation to community, health and wellbeing in South East Lincolnshire:

- the area has a lower proportion of 2-29 year olds and a higher proportion of over 50s than the England average, which demonstrates an ageing population;
- the impact of recent inward migration from other EU countries is unknown;
- there is limited ethnic diversity across the area;
- there is a current shortfall of allotments and some aspects of provision for outdoor sport;
- health indicators show that, in general terms, the area performs below average nationally, particularly related to life expectancy and levels of obesity; and
- in terms of access to key services, on average, residents of Boston Borough are significantly better than those in South Holland District.

South East Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee Sports Provision and Open Space Assessment

9.2.2 The South East Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee Sports Provision and Open Space Assessment proposes local standards of provision for different aspects of sport and open space per 1,000 population. These are based on an assessment of current activity, as well as provision in neighbouring authorities and other English authorities with similar demographic characteristics. Using these standards the Assessment indicates that there is a shortfall in some aspects of open space and sports provision now and in 2031. This is shown in the tables below.

Table 9.1: Sports Facility Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of provision</th>
<th>Provision in 2012</th>
<th>Needs in 2012</th>
<th>Extra needs in 2031</th>
<th>Total needs in 2031</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sports halls</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming pools</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics tracks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthetic turf pitches</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor bowling greens</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor bowling greens</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor tennis courts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor tennis courts</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squash courts</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf courses</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and fitness facilities</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village and community halls</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 9.2: Playing Pitch Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pitch type</th>
<th>Provision in 2012</th>
<th>Needs in 2012</th>
<th>Extra needs in 2031</th>
<th>Total needs in 2031</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult football pitches</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior football pitches</td>
<td>18 (17.5)</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini-soccer pitches</td>
<td>20 (19.5)</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket pitches</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby pitches</td>
<td>11 (9.5)</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Assessment of the Sustainability of Rural Settlements

9.2.3 The results of the Assessment demonstrate that there is widespread distribution of services and facilities across South-East Lincolnshire.

### 9.3 Key Issues

9.3.1 The following key issues emerging from the policy context and evidence base potentially require a policy response:

- the need to ensure that all sections of the community have access to high quality open space and opportunities for sport and recreation;
- the need to ensure that safe and accessible environments are created, which discourage crime and disorder (and the fear of crime), and which encourage community use; and
- the need to ensure that all sections of the community have access to the services which are needed to support their education, health, and social, cultural and spiritual well-being.

### 9.4 Other Policies

9.4.1 There is an amount of overlap between the key issues in this chapter and those presented in the Environment chapter. This chapter is concerned with access to open space as a community facility and safe and accessible environments. The environment chapter outlines an approach to the natural environment, including the protection, and where possible enhancement, of sites of nature conservation and green infrastructure. It also includes an approach to design of new development, which overlaps with this chapter in terms of accessibility, as does the Transport chapter.

9.4.2 No policies in the extant Boston Borough Local Plan 1999 or South Holland District Local Plan 2006 need to be retained.

9.4.3 Any site specific allocations (e.g. where health, social care, education, cultural or other community organisations identify that they will need to provide additional infrastructure to meet the community’s needs) will be dealt with through the Site Allocations DPD. The Delivery chapter of this document deals with how infrastructure, which could include community facilities, are delivered through the planning system.
Approach to Open Space, Sport and Recreation

9.5 Introduction

9.5.1 It is necessary to outline an approach that seeks to ensure that all sections of the community have access to high quality open space and opportunities for sport and recreation.

9.6 Reasonable Policy Options

9.6.1 It is considered that there are two reasonable options related to the provision of open space, sport and recreation. The first is to have positive policy approach to protecting, and where possible, enhancing access to such community facilities. The second is not to produce a policy approach and rely on national guidance outlined in the NPPF.

9.6.2 Option A: To produce a policy approach that seeks to ensure that all sections of the community have access to high-quality open space and opportunities for sport and recreation by protecting and, where possible, enhancing such community facilities.

9.6.3 Option B: Do not produce a policy approach that seeks to ensure that all sections of the community have access to high quality open space and opportunities for sport and recreation but, instead, rely upon the provisions of the NPPF.

9.7 Unreasonable Policy Options

9.7.1 It is considered unreasonable to produce a policy approach that actively seeks to ignore the importance of protecting access to high-quality open space and opportunities for sport and recreation as this would be contrary to the concept of sustainable development and the provisions of the NPPF.
9.8 Sustainability Appraisal

Table 9.3: SA – Open Space, Sport and Recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Key</th>
<th>Major positive (✓✓)</th>
<th>Minor positive (✓)</th>
<th>Neutral (0)</th>
<th>Minor Negative (X)</th>
<th>Major Negative (XX)</th>
<th>Mixed (e.g. ✓✓/X, ✓/X)</th>
<th>Uncertain (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring for Topic Areas</th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option B</th>
<th>Option C</th>
<th>Option D etc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity, Geodiversity &amp; Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, Health and Well-being</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy and Environment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Risk</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Environment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Waste</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.8.1 **Air Quality**: Both options will have a minor positive impact. The protection and enhancement of open space helps to contribute to the provision of green infrastructure (including plants and trees), which can contribute to cleaning pollutants from the air and potentially minimise the noise impacts of developments.

9.8.2 **Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure**: Both options will have a minor positive impact. The protection and enhancement of open space contributes to the provision of green infrastructure, can potentially increase biodiversity and also can enhance the quality and connectivity of the public rights-of-way network.

9.8.3 **Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)**: Both options will have a minor positive impact. Open space can mitigate against climate change by acting as ‘carbon sinks’.

9.8.4 **Community, Health and Well-being**: Both options will have a major positive impact. The protection and enhancement of open spaces and facilities for sport and recreation seeks to address negative health indicators by promoting healthy lifestyles through accessible leisure and recreation facilities and also by helping to promote more cohesive communities through the direct provision of community facilities.
9.8.5 **Economy and Employment:** Both options will have a minor positive impact. The provision of community facilities e.g. sport and recreation provide direct employment opportunities. Also good access to community facilities can make an area more attractive to investors and investment.

9.8.6 **Flood Risk:** Both options will have a minor positive impact. Open spaces have the potential to absorb and store water, thus providing resistance and resilience to flood risk.

9.8.7 **Historic Environment:** Both options will have neutral impact.

9.8.8 **Housing:** Both options will have neutral impact.

9.8.9 **Land and Waste:** Both options will have neutral impact.

9.8.10 **Landscape:** Both options will have a minor positive impact. Open space can contribute positively to landscape and townscape quality.

9.8.11 **Transport:** Both options will have neutral impact.

9.8.12 **Water:** Both options will have neutral impact.

9.8.13 **Conclusion:** The two options score identically against the baseline situation. However, relatively-speaking, a locally-derived policy (Option A) is better able to reflect local circumstances in terms of current provision of open space and facilities for sport and recreation.

9.9 **Delivery**

9.9.1 Both options would be delivered through the development management process and through the emerging Infrastructure Delivery Plan where appropriate. It is considered that there are no relative delivery benefits between the two options.

9.10 **Preferred Option**

9.10.1 Although all the issues that might be contained in a Local Plan policy are already covered by the NPPF’s provisions, a Local Plan policy can:

- express them more directly;
- ensure that anyone who wishes to participate in the planning process in South East Lincolnshire is aware of these issues without needing to refer to the NPPF; and
- reflect the findings of the South East Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee Sports Provision and Open Space Assessment.

9.10.2 Consequently, **Option A** is the preferred option.
Approach to Safe and Accessible Environments

9.11 Introduction

9.11.1 It is necessary to outline an approach to ensure that safe and accessible environments are created, which discourage crime and disorder (and the fear of crime), and which encourage community use.

9.12 Reasonable Policy Options

9.12.1 It is considered that there are two reasonable options related to safe and accessible environments. The first is to have a positive policy approach that seeks to ensure that new development is safe and accessible. The second is not to produce a policy approach and rely on national guidance outlined in the NPPF.

9.12.2 Option A: To produce a policy approach that requires new development to create environments which are safe and accessible, which discourage crime and disorder (and the fear of crime), and which encourage community use.

9.12.3 Option B: Do not produce a policy approach which requires new development to create environments which are safe and accessible, which discourage crime and disorder (and the fear of crime), and which encourage community use but, instead, rely upon the provisions of the NPPF.

9.13 Unreasonable Policy Options

9.13.1 It is considered unreasonable to produce a policy approach that actively seeks to ignore the importance of safe and accessible environments, as this would be contrary to the provisions of the NPPF.
9.14 Sustainability Appraisal

Table 9.4: SA – Safe and Accessible Environments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Key</th>
<th>Score Key</th>
<th>Scored Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major positive</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>Air Quality, Biodiversity, Geodiversity &amp; Green Infrastructure, Climate Change, Community, Health and Well-being, Economy and Environment, Flood Risk, Historic Environment, Housing, Land and Waste, Landscape, Transport, Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor positive</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Same as Major positive score with lower weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Same as Major positive score without weighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Negative</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Same as Major positive score with higher negative weighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Negative</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>Same as Major positive score with very high negative weighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>✓✓/X, ✓/X</td>
<td>As Mixed, but the impact is more balanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>Impact is uncertain, requiring further investigation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.14.1 **Air Quality:** Both options will have minor positive impact. Actively promoting safe and accessible environments can facilitate modal shift to more sustainable forms of transport. Subsequently, this helps to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve air quality.

9.14.2 **Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure:** Both options will have neutral impact.

9.14.3 **Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation):** Both options will have minor positive impact. Actively promoting safe and accessible environments can facilitate modal shift to more sustainable forms of transport. Subsequently this helps to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

9.14.4 **Community, Health and Well-being:** Both options will have a major positive impact. Actively seeking to deliver safe and accessible environments will help to meet the needs of the area’s elderly and disabled population, address negative health indicators, help promote more inclusive and cohesive communities, and improve community safety and reduce crime and the fear of crime.

9.14.5 **Economy and Employment:** Both options will have neutral impact.
9.14.6 **Flood Risk**: Both options will have neutral impact.

9.14.7 **Historic Environment**: Both options will have neutral impact.

9.14.8 **Housing**: Both options will have neutral impact.

9.14.9 **Land and Waste**: Both options will have neutral impact.

9.14.10 **Landscape**: Both options will have neutral impact.

9.14.11 **Transport**: Both options will have a minor positive impact. Actively promoting safe and accessible environments can facilitate a shift to more sustainable modes of transport to reduce carbon emissions and improve access for residents to local services, facilities, places of employment and green infrastructure.

9.14.12 **Water**: Both options will have neutral impact.

9.14.13 **Conclusion**: The two options score identically against the baseline situation. However, relatively-speaking a locally-derived policy (Option A) is better able to reflect local circumstances in terms of safe and accessible environments.

9.15 **Delivery**

9.15.1 Both options would be delivered through the development management process. It is considered that there are no relative delivery benefits between the two options.

9.16 **Preferred Option**

9.16.1 Although all the issues that might be contained in a Local Plan policy are already covered by in the NPPF’s provisions, a Local Plan policy can express them more directly, and can ensure that anyone who wishes to participate in the planning process in South East Lincolnshire is aware of these issues without needing to refer to the NPPF.

9.16.2 Consequently, **Option A** is the preferred option.

**Approach to Equality of Access to Community Facilities**

9.17 **Introduction**

9.17.1 It is necessary to ensure that all sections of the community have access to the services which are needed to support their education, health and social, cultural and spiritual well-being.

9.18 **Reasonable Policy Options**

9.18.1 It is considered that there are two reasonable options related to safe and accessible environments. The first is to have a positive policy approach that seeks to ensure that new development is accessible to all. The second is not to produce a policy approach and rely on national guidance outlined in the NPPF.
9.18.2 **Option A**: To produce a policy approach that seeks to ensure that all sections of the community have access to the services which are needed to support their education, health and social, cultural and spiritual well-being.

9.18.3 **Option B**: Do not produce a policy approach that seeks to ensure that all sections of the community have access to the services which are needed to support their education, health, and social, cultural and spiritual well-being but, instead, rely upon the provisions of the NPPF.

9.19 **Unreasonable Policy Options**

9.19.1 It is considered unreasonable to produce a policy approach that actively seeks to ignore the importance of equality of access to community facilities, as this would be contrary to the provisions of the NPPF.

9.20 **Sustainability Appraisal**

**Table 9.5: SA – Equality of Access to Community Facilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Key</th>
<th>Major positive (✓ ✓)</th>
<th>Minor positive (✓)</th>
<th>Neutral (0)</th>
<th>Minor Negative (X)</th>
<th>Major Negative (XX)</th>
<th>Mixed (e.g. ✓/X, ✓/X)</th>
<th>Uncertain (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scoring for Topic Areas</td>
<td>Option A</td>
<td>Option B</td>
<td>Option C</td>
<td>Option D etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity, Geodiversity &amp; Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, Health and Well-being</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy and Environment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Risk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Environment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Waste</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.20.1 **Air Quality**: Both options will have minor positive impact. Actively promoting equality of access to community facilities can facilitate modal shift to more sustainable forms of transport. Subsequently, this helps to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve air quality.
9.20.2 **Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure:** Both options will have neutral impact.

9.20.3 **Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation):** Both options will have minor positive impact. Actively promoting equality of access to community facilities can facilitate modal shift to more sustainable forms of transport. Subsequently, this helps to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

9.20.4 **Community, Health and Well-being:** Both options will have a major positive impact. Both options will help meet the equality, health and social care needs of the area’s population, help to meet the needs of the area’s elderly and disabled population, help promote more inclusive and cohesive communities, improve access to essential services and facilities, and make opportunities for culture, leisure and recreation readily accessible.

9.20.5 **Economy and Employment:** Both options will have neutral impact.

9.20.6 **Flood Risk:** Both options will have neutral impact.

9.20.7 **Historic Environment:** Both options will have neutral impact.

9.20.8 **Housing:** Both options will have neutral impact.

9.20.9 **Land and Waste:** Both options will have neutral impact.

9.20.10 **Landscape:** Both options will have neutral impact.

9.20.11 **Transport:** Both options will have a minor positive impact on transport, as both seek to improve access for residents to local services, facilities, places of employment and green infrastructure, and thus support initiatives to reduce congestion and the need to travel.

9.20.12 **Water:** Whether a Local Plan policy is included or the provisions of the NPPF are relied upon, there will be no impacts on water issues and problems.

9.20.13 **Conclusion:** The two options score identically against the baseline situation. However, relatively-speaking a locally-derived policy (Option A) is better able to reflect local circumstances in terms of equality of access to community facilities.

9.21 **Delivery**

9.21.1 Both options would be delivered through the development management process. It is considered that there are no relative delivery benefits between the two options.

9.22 **Preferred Option**

9.22.1 Although all the issues that might be contained in a Local Plan policy are already covered by the NPPFs provisions, a Local Plan policy can express them more directly, and can ensure that anyone who wishes to participate in the planning process in South East Lincolnshire is aware of these issues without needing to refer to the NPPF.

9.22.2 Consequently, **Option A** is the preferred option.
9.23 Reason for Preferred Policy Approach

9.23.1 The provisions of the NPPF cover all the key issues identified. Consequently, although the Preferred Option in each case is to include a Local Plan policy, the advantages of this approach (over simply relying on the NPPF) are marginal. In this context, it is not considered appropriate to include a separate policy to deal with each key issue. Instead, a single preferred policy approach to deal with all the issues is deemed adequate.

9.24 Preferred Policy Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community, Health and Well-Being</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Development shall contribute to: the creation of socially-cohesive and inclusive communities; reducing health inequalities; and improving the community’s health and well-being. To this end, it shall create environments which:

- discourage crime and disorder;
- do not create the fear of crime;
- are accessible to all sections of the community;
- facilitate walking, cycling and public transport use; and
- encourage community use.

To enable people to lead healthy and active lifestyles, residential development shall support the provision of new sport and open-space facilities.

The redevelopment or change of use of an existing community, educational, health, recreational, sport, or social facility will be permitted only if the facility is no longer needed by the community (taking account of all the functions it could perform), or adequate alternative provision will be made.

New community, educational, health, recreational, sport, or social facilities shall be:

- located to maximise accessibility for their users;
- well related to public transport infrastructure and walking and cycling routes; and
- compatible with nearby uses and the character and appearance of the neighbourhood.
Table 9.6: HRA/AA Screening – Community, Health and Well-Being

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening of Preferred Policy Approach (√/X)</th>
<th>Does the policy lead to development?</th>
<th>Does the policy specify a quantity or type of development?</th>
<th>Does the policy specify a location for development?</th>
<th>Is the policy implemented through other policies?</th>
<th>Does the policy concentrate development in urban areas?</th>
<th>Does the policy steer development away from European or Ramsar sites?</th>
<th>Does the policy protect the natural environment?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.24.1 The policy is not site-specific and does not put forward any specific development proposals. Although it does not steer development away from European or Ramsar sites or seek to protect the natural environment, these issues would be considered through the provisions of other policies within the Local Plan. Therefore, it is considered that this policy can be screened out of the Habitats Regulations Assessment process.

Table 9.7: Equalities Assessment – Community, Health and Well-Being

| Equalities Analysis of Preferred Policy Approach (√ - may benefit) (0 – neutral) (X – adverse impact) |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Age                                          | Disability                                    | Gender re-assignment                          | Marriage & civil partnership                  | Pregnancy & maternity                          | Race                                          | Religion or belief                             | Sex                                          | Sexual orientation                          |
| √                                            | √                                             | 0                                             | 0                                             | 0                                             | √                                             | 0                                              | √                                             | 0                                             |

9.24.2 The provisions of this policy will have the same impact on most groups. However, its provisions concerned with:
- creating accessible environments may particularly benefit the elderly, the disabled and people with children in prams or pushchairs; and
- preventing the unnecessary loss of community or social facilities may particularly benefit members of religious or belief groups.
10.0 Transport

10.1 Policy Context

Local Plan Strategic Priorities

10.1.1 The following Local Plan strategic priorities are relevant:
- To improve accessibility for all to jobs, services and facilities, thereby minimising the need to travel.
- To maximise the potential for modal shift to sustainable forms of transport, whilst recognising the importance of the private car in rural areas, by seeking to improve South East Lincolnshire’s highway infrastructure and thereby minimising congestion, improving road safety and aiding economic development.

National Planning Policy Framework

Promoting Sustainable Transport

10.1.2 ‘Transport policies have an important role to play in facilitating sustainable development but also in contributing to wider sustainability and health objectives. Smarter use of technologies can reduce the need to travel. The transport system needs to be balanced in favour of sustainable transport modes, giving people a real choice about how they travel. However, the Government recognises that different policies and measures will be required in different communities and opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary from urban to rural areas’.

10.1.3 ‘Encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion. In preparing Local Plans, local planning authorities should therefore support a pattern of development which, where reasonable to do so, facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport’.

10.1.4 ‘When planning for ports, airports and airfields that are not subject to a separate national policy statement, plans should take account of their growth and role in serving business, leisure, training and emergency service needs. Plans should take account of this Framework as well as the principles set out in the relevant national policy statements and the Government Framework for UK Aviation.’

10.1.5 ‘Plans and decisions should ensure that developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised. However this needs to take account of policies set out elsewhere in this Framework, particularly in rural areas.’

10.1.6 ‘Plans should protect and exploit opportunities for the use of sustainable transport modes for the movement of goods or people. Therefore, developments should be located and designed where practical to
- accommodate the efficient delivery of goods and supplies;
- give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements, and have access to high quality public transport facilities;
- create safe and secure layouts which minimise conflicts between traffic and cyclists or pedestrians, avoiding street clutter and where appropriate establishing home zones;
• incorporate facilities for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles; and
• consider the needs of people with disabilities by all modes of transport.’

10.1.7 ‘Planning policies should aim for a balance of land uses within their area so that people can be encouraged to minimise journey lengths for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities.’

10.1.8 ‘For larger scale residential development in particular, planning policies should promote a mix of uses in order to provide opportunities to undertake day-to-day activities including work on site. Where practical, particularly within large-scale development, key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties.’

10.1.9 ‘If setting local parking standards for residential and non-residential development, local planning authorities should take into account:
• the accessibility of development;
• the type, mix and use of development;
• the availability of and opportunities for public transport;
• local car ownership levels; and
• an overall need to reduce the use of high-emission vehicles.’

10.1.10 ‘Local authorities should seek to improve the quality of parking in town centres so that it is convenient, safe and secure, including appropriate provision for motorcycles. They should set appropriate parking charges that do not undermine the vitality of town centres. Parking enforcement should be appropriate.’

10.1.11 ‘Local planning authorities should identify and protect, where there is robust evidence, sites and routes which could be critical in developing infrastructure to widen transport choice.’

East Midlands Regional Plan

10.1.12 Policy 43 of the Regional Plan outlines ‘Regional Transport Objectives’ as follows:
• ‘To support sustainable development in the Region’s Principal Urban Areas, Growth Towns and Sub-Regional Centres described in Policy 3;
• To promote accessibility and overcome peripherality in the Region’s rural areas;
• To support the Region’s regeneration priorities outlined in Policy 19;
• To promote improvements to inter-regional and international linkages that will support sustainable development within the Region;
• To improve safety across the Region and reduce congestion, particularly within the Region’s Principal Urban Areas and on major inter urban corridors;
• To reduce traffic growth across the Region; and
• To improve air quality and reduce carbon emissions from transport by reducing the need to travel and promoting modal shift away from the private car, (particularly towards walking, cycling and public transport and away from other road based transport) and encouraging and supporting innovative transport technologies’.

10.1.13 Policy 44 includes a number of ‘Sub-area Transport Objectives’ relevant to the Eastern Sub-area as follows:
• To develop the transport infrastructure, public transport and services needed to support Lincoln’s role as one of the Region’s five Principal Urban Areas in a sustainable manner.
• To develop opportunities for modal switch away from road based transport in the important food and drink sector.
• To make better use of the opportunities offered by existing ports, in particular Boston, for all freight movements, and improve linkages to major ports in adjacent Regions such as Grimsby, Immingham and Felixstowe.
• To improve access to the Lincolnshire Coast, particularly by public transport.
• To reduce peripherality, particularly to the east of the A15, and overcoming rural isolation for those without access to a private car.
• To reduce the number of fatal and serious road traffic accidents.’

10.1.14 Policy 45 seeks ‘to achieve a progressive reduction over time in the rate of traffic growth’, whilst Policy 46 seeks to ‘encourage a reduction in the need to travel and to change public attitudes toward car usage and public transport, walking and cycling’.

10.1.15 Policy 55 (Implementation of the Regional Freight Strategy) includes a number of key priorities:
• Reducing the environmental impact of all freight;
• Improving the efficiency of the road haulage industry in ways that will also reduce the impact of the environment;
• Expanding the usage of inland waterways and coastal navigation;
• Achieving a significant modal shift from road to rail;
• Identifying new strategic distribution sites, where these can be justified in line with Policy 21 (Strategic Distribution);
• Supporting the sustainable growth of airfreight at EMA by improving rail freight connectivity and identifying opportunities for modal shift from air to rail;
• Promoting a greater use of pipelines; and
• Ensuring integration with land-use planning, environmental and economic strategies.

Lincolnshire County Council Local Transport Plan (LTP) 2011-2013

10.1.16 Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) produces the LTP, which outlines the transport strategy and programme for the County. LTP3 covers the period 2011/12-2012/13. The shortened two-year period for LTP3 will be used to produce a longer-term LTP4 taking into account future announcements from central government on the direction of national transport policy and funding. The key transport objectives of the plan are:
• to assist the sustainable economic growth of Lincolnshire, and the East Midlands region, through improvements to the transport network;
• to increase public transport usage by improving: the quality of vehicles and infrastructure; the reliability, frequency and journey time of services; and bus/rail integration;
• to improve access to key services by widening travel choices, especially for those without the car;
• to make travel for all modes safer and, in particular, reduce the number and severity of road casualties;
• to remove unnecessary HGVs from affected communities through: appropriate traffic management measures; highway improvements; and encouraging the use of alternative modes of transport;
• to maintain the transport system to standards which allow safe and efficient movement of people and goods;
• to protect and enhance the built and natural environment of the county by reducing the adverse impacts of traffic;
• to improve the quality of public spaces for residents, workers and visitors by creating a safe, attractive and accessible environment; and
• to enhance air quality, particularly within declared Air Quality Management Areas.

10.1.17 LTP3 notes that a major concern for the future economy of Spalding town centre is the proposal by Network Rail to route additional freight trains along an upgraded GN/GE Joint Line through the town. Traffic modelling has shown that the increased ‘downtime’ at level crossings will result in severe road-network disruption. This issue could be exacerbated if the idea of developing a rail-freight interchange (RFI) to the south-west of Spalding achieves fruition (this is discussed in further detail in the Economy chapter). Whilst having significant benefits in terms of transferring freight from road to rail, the RFI could serve to increase rail traffic through the town, making it imperative that some infrastructure improvements are carried out. As a result of the above and the recent planning permission for 2,250 homes to the west of Spalding, a Western Relief Road is being promoted. A section of the proposed development road will form the first part of the Western Relief Road and Lincolnshire County Council intends to apply for planning permission for the section between the end of the development road and the A151 Bourne Road in 2012. LTP3 states that the ‘remaining section from the A151 to the B1356 Spalding Road will follow at a later date’.

10.1.18 In terms of Boston, LTP3 notes that areas of land will be identified for development through the Local Plan process, ‘which will help facilitate the possibility of a distributor road to the west of Boston’. LTP3 outlines work that was being undertaken at that time on the implementation of proposals contained in the Transport Strategy for Boston 2006-2021 and Beyond, which was adopted in January 2007.

Transport Strategy for Boston 2006-2021 and Beyond

10.1.19 The strategy’s aims were identified as:
• reduced car usage for journeys wholly within Boston;
• limiting impacts of development;
• reduced delays for traffic on A52/A16 corridor with safe facilities for vulnerable users;
• improved cross-town movements;
• reduced traffic on inappropriate routes;
• improved access to facilities;
• priority for public transport into/within the town centre;
• improved public transport access and provision;
• reduced number and severity of crashes for all modes of transport;
• improved clarity of priority for all road users;
• improved road safety for pedestrians and cyclists;
• improved air quality in the Air Quality Management Area;
• improved cycling and pedestrian management in the town centre;
• improved links between shopping area and public transport facilities; and
• effective management of car parking.
10.1.20 The Strategy recognises that there is a need for additional road infrastructure to provide traffic with an alternative route to travelling through the town centre. Therefore, as part of a longer-term view for Boston, the Strategy considers the justification for major highway improvements, either in the form of a Distributor Road or a full bypass of Boston. Technical analysis has shown a Distributor Road would offer many of the benefits of a bypass, whilst also allowing the opportunity for more vehicles to transfer out of the town centre. In addition, it would also open up land for regeneration and development. The Strategy therefore recommends that the most appropriate way forward is to pursue a Distributor Road as a realistic alternative to a bypass and that Boston Borough Council should seek to maximise contributions towards the cost of a Distributor Road through the Local Plan process.

Local Authority Corporate Plans and other Strategies

10.1.21 Boston Borough Council’s:
- Community Plan 2008-2018 sets out a number of ambitions and actions to achieve them. The following relate to transport: ‘securing a starting date, route and funding for a distributor road’; and ‘short-term road infrastructure and public transport improvements’.
- Corporate Plan 2012-2015 includes priorities to: ‘improve signage on Boston’s roads that will assist motorists reaching their destination and reduce congestion’; and ‘developing schemes to improve traffic flow and reduce congestion and delivery of the Boston Transport Strategy including the distributor road’.

10.1.22 South Holland District Council’s:
- Corporate Plan 2011-2015 includes a number of priorities but none are relevant to transport.

10.2 Evidence Base

Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report

10.2.1 Evidence from the Scoping Report highlights a number of key issues and problems in relation to transport performance in South East Lincolnshire:
- South East Lincolnshire relies more heavily on car usage than the national average, particularly in South Holland. This probably reflects the rural nature of the area and the lack of good quality public transport facilities. Public transport usage is lower than the national average, although bicycle usage in Boston Borough is higher; and
- in terms of access to key services, on average, residents of Boston Borough fare significantly better than those in South Holland.

Boston Distributor Road

10.2.2 As outlined above the potential to deliver a Boston Distributor Road is outlined in the latest LTP. The Transport Strategy for Boston 2006-2021 and Beyond considers the potential Distributor Road and related issues. The Boston Transport Strategy highlighted the A52/A16 corridor as an issue for the town and proposed measures on that corridor have been implemented. To date no detailed modelling has been carried out as to its benefits and no technical work has been undertaken related to
engineering a specific route or estimated costs. Whilst the Boston Distributor Road remains an aspiration, it is unlikely to come forward in its entirety in the plan period. However, there is potential for future development at Boston town to contribute to a ‘first phase’ of a new piece of highway infrastructure, although there is no underlying evidence to draw on relating to this at present. There is no evidence to suggest the implementation of a Boston Distributor Road is critical for the delivery of the growth strategy for Boston to 2031.

**Spalding Western Relief Road (SWRR)**

10.2.3 As outlined above the need for a SWRR has been identified to respond to the impacts of planned future increases in rail crossing downtime through Spalding. In conjunction with Lincolnshire County Council modelling was undertaken to help determine which phases of the road in conjunction with potential locations for growth would have the most benefit in transport terms in light of the known issues with increased rail crossing downtime. The results of this modelling are discussed in more detail in the Housing chapter of this document and are used as an aid in arriving at a conclusion on to the preferred broad location for development around Spalding.

10.2.4 Broadly-speaking the evidence highlights that with the levels of growth planned for Spalding, in conjunction with the planned increases in rail crossing downtime, should a SWRR not be delivered the traffic impacts upon the town would be severe. For this reason it is considered that the SWRR is critical to the delivery of the growth strategy for Spalding. As such, it is important to ensure that the emerging Local Plan facilitates its delivery.

**South East Lincolnshire Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) Baseline and Viability Studies**

10.2.5 The final Strategy and Policies DPD will be accompanied by an IDP. A baseline report on infrastructure will be prepared to inform this Preferred Options document. At present this is still emerging, but it is not envisaged that its contents will impact on the generation of options, as it will simply provide information related to the baseline situation in terms of infrastructure provision.

10.2.6 However, in due course, information relating the deliverability and viability of any critical pieces of infrastructure to support the strategy outlined on the Local Plan will need to be determined. This evidence will need to demonstrate how such infrastructure will be funded. Evidence relating to development viability will be important in this respect, as it will help to determine the capacity of development to contribute to the delivery of such infrastructure. There needs to be a reasonable degree of confidence in the availability of funding for the infrastructure included in the IDP, especially where a piece of infrastructure is identified as critical.

**10.3 Key Issues**

10.3.1 The following key issues emerging from the policy context and evidence base require a policy response:

- the need to promote and facilitate sustainable transport, and to improve accessibility between homes, jobs and services;
• the need to facilitate the delivery of the SWRR to minimise the traffic impact of the upgrade to the ‘Joint Line’ and support the delivery of growth;
• the need to explore an approach to local parking standards in line with the NPPF.

10.4 Other Policies

10.4.1 There is an amount of overlap between the key issues in this chapter and those presented in the Community, Health and Well-Being and Environment chapters, particularly in respect of accessibility and the promotion of sustainable modes of transport.

10.4.2 The SWRR is considered key to the delivery of the housing growth strategy as outlined in the housing chapter of this document and the assessment of broad locations appended to this document. As such, information relating to its deliverability will need to be outlined in the IDP accompanying the Strategy and Policies DPD. The cost of any infrastructure required to support the delivery of the Local Plan will need to be considered within the whole-plan assessment of development viability. Viability, in its broadest sense, is discussed in the Delivery chapter.

10.4.3 The implementation of a Boston Distributor Road in its entirety remains an aspiration. However, the delivery of housing growth at Boston is not reliant upon its implementation, but development could deliver a ‘first phase’ of a potential new route. In the absence of any modelling work or technical evidence of need and costs, it is not possible to include a policy for delivering a stand alone Boston Distributor Road at present, as it cannot be evidenced that there is a reasonable prospect of it coming forward in the plan period.

10.4.4 It is not deemed necessary to outline a specific approach to setting local parking standards. There are currently no statutory standards nationally or locally, and no evidence to support locally-derived standards. Broadly-speaking, parking is dealt with through the approach to sustainable transport and accessibility and in the approach to design of new development in the Environment chapter.

10.4.5 The Spalding RFI is considered in the Economy chapter.

Approach to Sustainable Transport and Accessibility

10.5 Introduction

10.5.1 It is necessary to determine an approach to promoting sustainable transport and improving accessibility between homes, jobs and services.

10.6 Reasonable Policy Options

10.6.1 It is considered that there are only two discrete reasonable options relating to this issue. The first is to produce a policy approach that positively seeks to promote sustainable transport and accessibility. The second is to not produce a preferred policy approach and rely on the NPPF.
10.6.2 **Option A**: To produce a preferred policy approach promoting sustainable transport and accessibility.

10.6.3 **Option B**: To not produce a preferred policy approach and rely on the NPPF.

10.7 **Unreasonable Policy Options**

10.7.1 It is unreasonable to produce a preferred policy approach that fails to recognise the importance of sustainable transport and accessibility as this would be contrary to the provisions of the NPPF.

10.8 **Sustainability Appraisal**

**Table 10.1**: SA – Sustainable Transport and Accessibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major positive (✓✓)</th>
<th>Minor positive (✓)</th>
<th>Neutral (0)</th>
<th>Minor Negative (X)</th>
<th>Major Negative (XX)</th>
<th>Mixed (e.g. ✓✓/X, ✓/X)</th>
<th>Uncertain (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scoring for Topic Areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity, Geodiversity &amp; Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, Health and Well-being</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy and Employment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Risk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Environment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Waste</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.8.1 **Air Quality**: Both options will have a minor positive impact. The promotion of sustainable transport and accessibility should aid in reducing greenhouse gas emissions and thus have a positive impact on air quality. Specifically, seeking to reduce traffic levels will have a positive impact on the two identified Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) in the area.

10.8.2 **Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure**: Both options will have a neutral impact.
10.8.3 Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation): Both options will have a minor positive impact. The promotion of sustainable transport and accessibility should aid in reducing greenhouse gas emissions and thus have a positive impact in terms of climate change adaptation and mitigation.

10.8.4 Community, Health and Well-being: Both options will have a minor positive impact. The provision of choice of sustainable transport and improved accessibility to homes, jobs and services will have a positive impact on both health and equality indicators e.g. by promoting cycling and walking.

10.8.5 Economy and Employment: Both options will have a neutral impact.

10.8.6 Flood Risk: Both options will have a neutral impact.

10.8.7 Historic Environment: Both options will have a neutral impact.

10.8.8 Housing: Both options will have a neutral impact.

10.8.9 Land and Waste: Both options will have a neutral impact.

10.8.10 Landscape: Both options will have a neutral impact.

10.8.11 Transport: Both options will have a major positive impact. The promotion of sustainable transport and accessibility will aid in shifting to more sustainable modes of transport e.g. cycling and walking and also seek to address congestion and reduce the need to travel.

10.8.12 Water: Both options will have a neutral impact.

10.8.13 Conclusion: The two options score identically against the baseline situation. However, relatively-speaking, a locally-derived policy (Option A) is better able to reflect local circumstances in terms of sustainable transport and accessibility.

10.9 Delivery

10.9.1 Both options would be delivered through the development management process and through the emerging Infrastructure Delivery Plan where appropriate. It is considered that there are no relative delivery benefits between the two options.

10.10 Preferred Option

10.10.1 Although all the issues that might be contained in a Local Plan policy are already covered in broad terms by in the NPPF's provisions, a Local Plan policy can express them more directly, and can ensure that anyone who wishes to participate in the planning process in South East Lincolnshire is aware of these issues without needing to refer to the National Planning Policy Framework.

10.10.2 Consequently, Option A is the preferred option.
Approach to the Spalding Western Relief Road (SWRR)

10.11 Introduction

10.11.1 It is necessary to determine an approach to facilitate the delivery of the SWRR to minimise the traffic impact of the upgrade to the ‘Joint Line’ and support growth.

10.12 Reasonable Policy Options

10.12.1 It is considered that there is only one reasonable option relating to this issue and that is to include a preferred policy approach which outlines the important of the SWRR to the growth strategy for Spalding and which seeks to support its delivery and safeguard its implementation.

10.12.2 **Option A**: To produce a policy approach that seeks to support the delivery of the SWRR and safeguard its implementation.

10.13 Unreasonable Policy Options

10.13.1 It is considered unreasonable to not produce a policy approach relating to the delivery of the SWRR. It has been identified as a critical piece of infrastructure required to deliver the growth strategy for Spalding. To not provide a policy basis to seek its deliver and safeguard its implementation would undermine the delivery of the Local Plan.
10.14 Sustainability Appraisal

Table 10.2: SA – Spalding Western Relief Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Key</th>
<th>Major positive (✓✓)</th>
<th>Minor Positive (✓)</th>
<th>Neutral (0)</th>
<th>Minor Negative (X)</th>
<th>Major Negative (XX)</th>
<th>Mixed (eg. ✓✓/X, ✓/X)</th>
<th>Uncertain (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Scoring for Topic Areas**

- **Air Quality**: Option A
  - ✓/X

- **Biodiversity, Geodiversity & Green Infrastructure**: ?

- **Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)**: ✓

- **Community, Health And Well-being**: ✓

- **Economy and Employment**: ✓

- **Flood Risk**: 0

- **Historic Environment**: 0

- **Housing**: ✓

- **Land and Waste**: X

- **Landscape**: X

- **Transport**: ✓✓

- **Water**: 0

10.14.1 **Air Quality**: Option A will have a minor positive/minor negative impact. The delivery of the SWRR will seek to minimise congestion, and therefore air pollution, in the town centre. However, any new level of growth, compared to the baseline situation, is likely to involve greater levels of traffic, therefore, potentially having a negative impact on air quality.

10.14.2 **Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure**: The option will have an uncertain impact pending the availability of more detailed assessments relating to routes for the SWRR.

10.14.3 **Climate Change**: Option A will have a minor positive/minor negative impact. The delivery of the SWRR will seek to minimise congestion, and therefore carbon emissions, in the town centre. However, any new level of growth, compared to the baseline situation, is likely to involve greater levels of traffic, therefore, potentially having a negative impact on climate change.

10.14.4 **Community, Health and Well-Being**: Option A will have a minor positive impact. By minimising congestion in the town centre, where key community facilities are located, accessibility to these facilities will be maintained.
10.14.5 Economy and Employment: Option A will have a minor positive impact. By seeking to minimise congestion and support growth, this will have a positive impact on the economy in terms of continuing to make Spalding an attractive destination for investment and investors.

10.14.6 Flood Risk: Option A will have a neutral impact.

10.14.7 Historic Environment: Option A will have a neutral impact.

10.14.8 Housing: Option A will have a major positive impact. The SWRR is deemed critical to the delivery of the housing strategy for Spalding, in terms of supporting the levels of growth in a sustainable and accessible manner.

10.14.9 Land and Waste: Option A will have a minor negative impact as the development of the road will be on greenfield land.

10.14.10 Landscape: Option A will have a minor negative impact. The SWRR will lead to increased traffic in a greenfield location and the likely requirement for bridges over the railway and watercourses in a flat, fenland landscape will be difficult to mitigate against in landscape terms.

10.14.11 Transport: Option A will have a major positive impact. The SWRR is likely to attract traffic from existing routes, though it will improve links around the town to the benefit of movement options overall, including reliability of public transport, and ease of travel by bicycle and on foot.

10.14.12 Water: Option A will have a neutral impact.

10.14.13 Conclusion: Overall, Option A is deemed to have a broadly positive impact, particularly in relation to seeking to minimise the impact of rail crossing downtime in Spalding town centre. However, it is recognised that any growth can generate an increase in car-borne transport.

10.15 Delivery

10.15.1 Given the critical nature of the SWRR to the growth strategy for Spalding, its delivery will need to be outlined in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) that will support the Strategy and Policies DPD.

10.16 Preferred Option

10.16.1 Option A is the only reasonable option and given the critical nature of the SWRR to the delivery of the growth strategy for Spalding it is the preferred option.

10.17 Reason for Preferred Policy Approaches

10.17.1 It is clear from the information presented that there are limited reasonable options for dealing with the key issues arising from the policy context and evidence base. It is proposed to take forward two preferred policy options. The first will cover sustainable transport and accessibility in its broadest sense and the second will seek to ensure the delivery of the SWRR and safeguard its implementation.
10.18 Preferred Policy Approaches

**Sustainable Transport and Accessibility**

Development should contribute to minimising the need to travel and reducing the impacts of travel; improve accessibility to jobs, services and community facilities; and adapting to and mitigating against climate change. New development will be required to contribute to transport improvements in line with appropriate evidence, including the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, the Local Transport Plan and site-specific transport assessments to ensure that its impacts can be reduced and/or mitigated.

New development proposals should:

- Improve accessibility by public transport, walking and cycling to key destinations such as Boston and Spalding town centres, new employment areas, education and health facilities, and between rural settlements and the Sub-Regional Centres;
- Locate major industrial, warehousing and distribution development where it will encourage efficient, safe and sustainable freight transport, including options for the use of rail and/or water transport;
- Require developments likely to have significant transport implications to integrate measures such as travel planning based on transport assessments, transport statements, and travel plans, where appropriate; and
- Ensure that vehicular traffic generated does not create new, or increase on street parking problems, nor materially increase other traffic problems, taking account of any contributions that have been secured for the provision of off-site works.

**Table 10.3: HRA/AA Screening – Sustainable Transport and Accessibility**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening of Preferred Policy Approach (✓/X)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the policy lead to development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.18.1 This policy is not concerned with development per se, but with ensuring a sustainable approach to transport and accessibility. Therefore, it is considered that this policy can be screened out of the Habitats Regulations Assessment process.
Table 10.4: Equalities Assessment – Sustainable Transport and Accessibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equalities Analysis of Preferred Policy Approach</th>
<th>(✓ - may benefit) (0 – neutral) (X – adverse impact)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender re-assignment</td>
<td>Marriage &amp; civil partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy &amp; maternity</td>
<td>Race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion or belief</td>
<td>Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.18.2 The provisions of this policy will have the same impact on most groups. However, its provisions concerned with:
- improving accessibility to jobs, services and community facilities may particularly benefit the elderly, the disabled and people with children in prams or pushchairs; and
- promoting walking, cycling and public transport may particularly benefit young people by enabling independent travel.

Spalding Western Relief Road (SWRR)

The implementation of a SWRR is critical to minimising the traffic impact of the upgrade to the ‘Joint Line’ and supporting the delivery of growth at Spalding. It will provide a link between the B1172 (Spalding Common and the B1356 (Spalding Road). Its delivery will be linked to the phased development of housing growth to the north and west of Spalding.

Proposals for development which would prejudice the delivery of the SWRR in accordance with the phasing provisions set out in the ‘Broad Locations for Housing Development in Boston and Spalding’ policy will not be permitted.

Table 10.5: HRA/AA Screening – Spalding Western Relief Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening of Preferred Policy Approach (✓/X)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the policy lead to development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the policy specify a quantity or type of development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the policy specify a location for development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the policy implemented through other policies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the policy concentrate development in urban areas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the policy steer development away from European or Ramsar sites?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the policy protect the natural environment?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ✓ | X | X | ✓ | X | X | X |

10.18.3 This policy is concerned with development and therefore should be screened by the Habitats Regulations Assessment process.

Table 10.6: Equalities Assessment – Spalding Western Relief Road
### Equalities Analysis of Preferred Policy Approach

(✓ - may benefit) (0 – neutral) (X – adverse impact)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Gender re-assignment</th>
<th>Marriage &amp; civil partnership</th>
<th>Pregnancy &amp; maternity</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Religion or belief</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Sexual orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.18.4 The provisions of this policy will have the same impact on all groups.
11.0 Delivery

11.1 Policy Context

Local Plan Strategic Priorities

11.1.1 The following Local Plan strategic priority is relevant:

- To ensure that development contributes to the provision of necessary physical, social and green infrastructure to deliver planned levels of growth and mitigate its impacts on existing communities and the environment.

National Planning Policy Framework

Using a proportionate evidence base

11.1.2 ‘Local planning authorities should:

- assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure for transport, water supply, wastewater and its treatment, energy (including heat), telecommunications, utilities, waste, health, social care, education, flood risk and coastal change management, and its ability to meet forecast demands; and
- take account of the need for strategic infrastructure including nationally significant infrastructure within their areas.’

11.1.3 ‘Pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan-making and decision-taking. Plans should be deliverable. Therefore, the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as the requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal costs of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable.’

East Midlands Regional Plan

11.1.4 The Regional Plan states that ‘local authorities should work with developers, statutory agencies and other local stakeholders to produce delivery plans outlining the infrastructure requirements needed to secure the implementation of Local Development Documents (LDDs). These should include guidance on the appropriate levels of developer contributions, and the mechanisms for securing the delivery of such contributions’.

Local Authority Corporate Plans and other Strategies

11.1.5 Boston Borough Council’s:

- Community Plan 2008-2018 sets out a number of ambitions and actions to achieve them. The following relate to infrastructure: ‘securing a starting date, route and funding for a distributor road’; short-term road infrastructure and public transport improvements’; ‘completing the first phase of the Fens Waterways Link’; ‘expanding and re-developing Boston College’; ‘supporting the Boston barrage to moderate the tidal flow and provide extra flood protection’; and ‘supporting the expansion of the Port of Boston’.
• Corporate Plan 2012-2015 outlines the importance of ‘identifying opportunities to bring investment in infrastructure for development vital to the future prosperity of the Borough’. It also highlights the importance of green infrastructure in responding to climate change.

11.1.6 South Holland District Council’s:
• Corporate Plan 2011-2015 does not include a specific reference to infrastructure or development viability.

11.2 Evidence Base

Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report

11.2.1 There is limited information in the Scoping Report regarding delivery and infrastructure. The majority of this information will be contained within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) Baseline Report and Viability Study as outlined below.

South East Lincolnshire Infrastructure Delivery Plan Baseline Report

11.2.2 The final Strategy and Policies DPD will be accompanied by an IDP. To inform this Preferred Options document a baseline report on infrastructure will be prepared. At present this is still emerging, but it is not envisaged that its contents will impact on the generation of options, as it will simply provide information related to the baseline situation in terms of infrastructure provision.

South East Lincolnshire Viability Study

11.2.3 A study assessing the viability of development across the board to inform both affordable housing and infrastructure-related matters (e.g. Community Infrastructure Levy, (CIL)) is currently being produced. This study will report in stages during the plan preparation process. Initial findings related to affordable housing are reported elsewhere in this preferred options document. The overall findings of the study will ensure that the Strategy and Policies DPD does not adversely impact upon the viability of development in South East Lincolnshire. Any final policy related to the delivery of infrastructure will take the findings of the study into account.

11.3 Key Issues

11.3.1 The following key issues require a policy response:
• the need to ensure that the necessary physical, social and green infrastructure is delivered in a timely fashion to support new development; and
• the need to ensure that demands upon development do not undermine viability and deliverability.

11.4 Other Policies

11.4.1 Detailed information relating to the infrastructure requirements and delivery mechanisms for allocated sites will be dealt with through the Site Allocations DPD. The final IDP will accompany the Strategy and Policies DPD and will be updated regularly. At this point in time, pending the outcome of emerging viability work, a
Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is not planned to be adopted at the same time as the Strategy and Policies DPD.

**Approach to the Provision of Infrastructure and Viability**

**11.5 Introduction**

11.5.1 It is important that the necessary infrastructure to support growth is delivered in a timely fashion. It is also equally important to ensure that development supports the delivery of this infrastructure without undermining the overall viability of development. The following section outlines how this might be addressed through planning policy.

**11.6 Reasonable Policy Options**

11.6.1 It is considered that there is only one reasonable option for addressing this issue. This is an approach that clearly outlines the importance of delivering the required infrastructure to support growth in a timely manner and how this will be delivered, including the need for developer contributions, in line with the IDP. It is also important that the approach outlines how viability will be taken into account in the determination of planning applications and what will be prioritised where issues arise, so as not to undermine the viability of development.

11.6.2 **Option A**: To have a preferred policy approach that seeks to deliver and prioritise the necessary physical, social and green infrastructure to support development. This will be achieved through the preparation and regular review of an IDP, by investigating the viability of adopting a CIL and by securing planning obligations. This approach will also outline how requirements are to be prioritised if it is necessary to review their provision in order to ensure that the viability of development is not undermined.

**11.7 Unreasonable Policy Options**

11.7.1 Given the importance of infrastructure and viability to the delivery of Local Plans, as outlined in the NPPF, it is deemed unreasonable to put forward an approach that does not deal with this issue through policy. It is likely that having no policy related to this issue would result in an ‘unsound’ plan. It is not considered that there are any other reasonable options that are discreetly different to option A as outlined above.
11.8 Sustainability Appraisal

Table 11.1: SA – Provision of Infrastructure and Viability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Key</th>
<th>Major positive (✓✓)</th>
<th>Minor positive (✓)</th>
<th>Neutral (0)</th>
<th>Minor Negative (X)</th>
<th>Major Negative (XX)</th>
<th>Mixed (e.g. ✓✓/X, ✓/X)</th>
<th>Uncertain (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Scoring for Topic Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic Area</th>
<th>Option A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity, Geodiversity &amp; Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>✓/?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, Health and Well-being</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy and Employment</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Risk</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Environment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Waste</td>
<td>✓/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>✓/?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.8.1 Air Quality: Option A will have an uncertain impact. New infrastructure could have a negative impact on air quality e.g. the construction of new roads. However, measures to reduce congestion and promote public transport could have a positive impact. The overall impact is dependent upon the type of infrastructure, its scale and location.

11.8.2 Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure: Option A will have a mixed minor positive/uncertain impact. The approach positively seeks to ensure the delivery of all appropriate infrastructure, including green infrastructure. However, the provision of built infrastructure could have negative impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity depending on the location, scale and type of infrastructure provided.

11.8.3 Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation): Option A will have an uncertain impact. The policy positively supports the improving of infrastructure, such as flood resistance and resilience measures, as well as green infrastructure. However, new roads, for example, may lead to greater levels of traffic overall. Overall, the impact is uncertain in that it depends on the type, scale and location of infrastructure.

11.8.4 Community, Health and Well-being: Option A will have a minor positive impact. The approach is concerned with delivering the required infrastructure to support new
development. Where required this could include health and other community facilities.

11.8.5 Economy and Employment: Option A will have a minor positive impact. The provision of required infrastructure helps to enable development, some of which will be employment related. Also the flexible approach to viability helps to promote development.

11.8.6 Flood Risk: Option A will have a minor positive impact. The approach is concerned with delivering the required infrastructure to support new development. Where required this could include flood resistance measures.

11.8.7 Historic Environment: Option A will have a neutral impact.

11.8.8 Housing: Option A will have a minor positive impact. The provision of required infrastructure helps to enable development, a large proportion of which will be housing. Also the flexible approach to viability helps to promote development.

11.8.9 Land and Waste: Option A will have a mixed uncertain/neutral impact. Whilst the construction of new infrastructure may lead to loss of greenfield land, the extent is dependant upon the type, scale and location of the development. There is not considered to be a relationship in terms of waste.

11.8.10 Landscape: Option A has an uncertain impact. Whilst the construction of new infrastructure may impact upon landscape, it is dependant upon the type, scale and location of the development.

11.8.11 Transport: Option A has a mixed minor positive/uncertain impact. The approach is concerned with delivering the required infrastructure to support new development. Where required this could include transport-related infrastructure, such as new roads and public transport provision. Whilst this is likely to have some positive impacts, it is uncertain, for example, as to whether the construction of new roads increases or reduces carbon emissions overall.

11.8.12 Water: Option A has a minor positive impact. The approach is concerned with delivering the required infrastructure to support new development. Where required this could include water-related infrastructure.

11.8.13 Conclusion: Whilst there is a great deal of uncertainty in terms of the impact of this approach based on the type, scale and location of infrastructure required, it has a generally positive impact in that it will have direct benefits in terms of physical, social and green infrastructure provision.

11.9 Delivery

11.9.1 This option will be delivered through the production and review of an IDP, determining the viability of a CIL and through the development management process. As there is only one reasonable option there are no relative benefits in terms of delivery. The policy approach itself also seeks to ensure that the viability of development is not undermined by adopting a flexible approach to negotiating planning obligations.
11.10 Preferred Option

11.10.1 Option A is the only reasonable option and it generally scores positively in terms of the SA process.

11.11 Reason for Preferred Policy Approach

11.11.1 It is clear, given the importance of delivery and viability outlined in the NPPF, that a policy response is required. The only reasonable option is to outline a preferred policy approach to delivering infrastructure and ensuring that the viability of development is not undermined.

11.12 Preferred Policy Approach

## Infrastructure and Viability

The South East Lincolnshire Partner Authorities will seek the delivery of relevant physical, social and green infrastructure to support new development in line with the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and other appropriate evidence. Dependent upon the circumstances, development will be expected to directly deliver in full, or contribute to, the provision of infrastructure. This will be achieved by the following means:

- the preparation and regular review of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) for South East Lincolnshire that will set out the infrastructure required to support development, when and how it will be provided and by who;
- exploring the potential for a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), covering all or part of South East Lincolnshire, that would set out the required level of developer contributions towards new or upgraded infrastructure to support development; and
- negotiating appropriate planning obligations to provide new or upgraded infrastructure to support overall levels of development and to mitigate any adverse impacts of proposed development, whilst avoiding duplications of any payments made through any future CIL covering all or part of South East Lincolnshire.

Where infrastructure items are identified as critical in the IDP and are shown on the Key Diagram they should be protected from development, or the harmful effects of development, and their delivery safeguarded until such time as they are implemented or their delivery becomes unnecessary as a result of changing circumstances. Where the latter is the case, the use of the land required for their development will be considered within the context of other policies in the Local Plan and the most relevant and appropriate up-to-date evidence.

Where viability is considered a constraint to development, negotiation will be conducted on a case-by-case basis. The primary aim of negotiations will be to ensure that the viability of development is not undermined, having regard to the following order of priority:

1. Measures identified as critical in the IDP.
2. Infrastructure supporting sustainable communities.
Table 11.2: HRA/AA Screening – Infrastructure and Viability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening of Preferred Policy Approach (✓/X)</th>
<th>Does the policy lead to development?</th>
<th>Does the policy specify a quantity or type of development?</th>
<th>Does the policy specify a location for development?</th>
<th>Is the policy implemented through other policies?</th>
<th>Does the policy concentrate development in urban areas?</th>
<th>Does the policy steer development away from European or Ramsar sites?</th>
<th>Does the policy protect the natural environment?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.12.1 The preferred policy approach to delivery is not deemed to have a significant impact on a European or Ramsar site. It is not the purpose of this policy to directly lead to development or outline levels or locations of growth. Therefore, it is considered that this policy can be screened out of the Habitats Regulations Assessment.

Table 11.3: Equalities Assessment – Infrastructure and Viability

<p>| Equalities Analysis of Preferred Policy Approach (✓ - may benefit) (0 – neutral) (X – adverse impact) |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Gender re-assignment</th>
<th>Marriage &amp; civil partnership</th>
<th>Pregnancy &amp; maternity</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Religion or belief</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Sexual orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.12.2 The provisions of this policy will have the same impact on all groups.
### 13.0 Glossary of Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>Social rented, affordable rented and intermediate housing, provided to eligible households whose needs are not met by the market. Eligibility is determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices. Affordable housing should include provisions to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households or for the subsidy to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision. <strong>Social rented housing</strong> is owned by local authorities and private registered providers (as defined in section 80 of the Housing and Regeneration Act 2008), for which guideline target rents are determined through the national rent regime. It may also be owned by other persons and provided under equivalent rental arrangements to the above, as agreed with the local authority or with the Homes and Communities Agency. <strong>Affordable rented housing</strong> is let by local authorities or private registered providers of social housing to households who are eligible for social rented housing. <strong>Affordable Rent</strong> is subject to rent controls that require a rent of no more than 80% of the local market rent (including service charges, where applicable). <strong>Intermediate housing</strong> is homes for sale and rent provided at a cost above social rent, but below market levels subject to the criteria in the Affordable Housing definition above. These can include shared equity (shared ownership and equity loans), other low cost homes for sale and intermediate rent, but not affordable rented housing. Homes that do not meet the above definition of affordable housing, such as “low cost market” housing, may not be considered as affordable housing for planning purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Management Areas</td>
<td>Areas designated by local authorities because they are not likely to achieve national air quality objectives by the relevant deadlines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity</td>
<td>A positive element or elements that contribute to the overall character or enjoyment of an area. For example, open land, trees, historic buildings and the inter-relationship between them, or less tangible factors such as tranquillity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate Assessment</td>
<td>An assessment of the affect of a plan or project on Special Protection Areas which are of exceptional importance in respect of rare, endangered or vulnerable natural habitats and species within the European Community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity</td>
<td>The whole variety of life encompassing variations, including plants and animals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change</td>
<td>Long-term changes in temperature, precipitation, wind and all other aspects of the Earth’s climate. Often regarded as a result of human activity and fossil fuel consumption. Mitigation is action to reduce the impact on climate change and adaption is lowering the risks posed by the consequences of climate change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Infrastructure Levy</strong></td>
<td>CIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conservation Areas</strong></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Countryside</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department (for) Environment, Food and Rural Affairs</strong></td>
<td>DEFRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department (of) Communities &amp; Local Government</strong></td>
<td>DCLG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development Plan Document</strong></td>
<td>DPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>‘Dry’ Areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dwellings per annum</strong></td>
<td>DPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dwellings per hectare</strong></td>
<td>DPH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Land Review</strong></td>
<td>ELR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence Base</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Impact Assessment</strong></td>
<td>EIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examination in Public</strong></td>
<td>EIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exceptions Test</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flood Hazard</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flood Probability</strong></td>
<td>The likelihood of a given flood occurrence in a calendar year. It is often quoted as a percentage value called the <em>Annual Exceedance Probability</em> (AEP). For example, a 1% AEP flood has a 1-in-100 chance of occurring once in any given year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flood risk</strong></td>
<td>The combination of probability of a particular flood event and its corresponding hazard and is used to refer to the scale of flood effect, combining hazard and probability, upon a particular site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flood Zone 1 (low probability)</strong></td>
<td>Comprises land assessed as having a less than 1 in 1,000 annual probability of river or sea flooding (&lt;0.1%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flood Zone 2 (medium probability)</strong></td>
<td>Comprises land assessed as having between a 1 in 100 and 1 in 1,000 annual probability of river flooding (1% – 0.1%), or between a 1 in 200 and 1 in 1,000 annual probability of sea flooding (0.5% – 0.1%) in any year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flood Zone 3a (high probability)</strong></td>
<td>Comprises land assessed as having a 1 in 100 or greater annual probability of river flooding (&gt;1%), or a 1 in 200 or greater annual probability of flooding from the sea (&gt;0.5%) in any year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flood Zone 3b (the functional flood plain)</strong></td>
<td>Comprises land where water has to flow or be stored in times of flood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greenfield sites</strong></td>
<td>Land (or a defined site) usually farmland, that has not previously been developed (not be confused with Green Belts, of which there are none in South East Lincolnshire).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment</strong></td>
<td>GTAA A survey of current Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople facilities and needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Habitats Regulations Assessment</strong></td>
<td>HRA Tests the impacts of a proposal on nature conservation sites of European importance and is a requirement under EU legislation for land use plans and projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure Delivery Plan</strong></td>
<td>IDP The IDP will set out the infrastructure required to support development, when and how it will be provided and by who.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joint Planning Unit</strong></td>
<td>JPU A small team of officers drawn from South Holland and Boston Borough Councils, which supports the work of The South East Lincolnshire’s Joint Planning Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joint Strategic Planning Committee</strong></td>
<td>JSPC The Committee which works together to create a single Local Plan for the area of South Holland and Boston Borough comprises nine councillors – three each from South Holland District, Boston Borough and Lincolnshire County Councils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lincolnshire Coastal Study</strong></td>
<td>A study incorporating research and findings about the implications for sustainable development in the face of sea level rises, as a consequence of climate change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Plan</strong></td>
<td>LP The plan for the future development of the local area, drawn up by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the community. In law this is described as the development plan documents adopted under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Current core strategies or other planning policies, which under the regulations would be considered to be development plan documents, form part of the Local Plan. The term includes old policies which have been saved under the 2004 Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Strategic Partnership</td>
<td>LSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Service Centres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Report</td>
<td>MR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Planning Policy Framework</td>
<td>NPPF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office for National Statistics</td>
<td>ONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Inspectorate</td>
<td>PINS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Options (Document)</td>
<td>PO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously Developed Land</td>
<td>PDL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals Map</td>
<td>This illustrates the spatial extent of all the Council’s planning policies and reflects up-to-date planning strategy for the area, which may include separate inset maps for part of an area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Freight Interchange (Spalding)</td>
<td>A facility to transfer as much road traffic related to the local food processing and distribution sector to rail freight as possible. The Interchange is currently proposed close to Deeping St. Nicholas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsar sites</td>
<td>Ramsar sites are wetlands of international importance, designated under the Ramsar Convention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Spatial Strategy</td>
<td>The previous broad spatial strategy for the region prepared by the East Midlands Regional Assembly, which until its impending revocation, forms part of the statutory Development Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered Social Landlords</td>
<td>Technical name for a body registered with the Housing Corporation. Most Housing Associations are RSLs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘ROY’ zones</td>
<td>The Lincolnshire Coastal Study categorises four main flood zones and are coloured red, orange, yellow (ROY) and green (low hazard). Geographical areas coloured red are considered to be Danger for All; orange - Danger for Most; yellow - Danger for Some.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State for Communities &amp; Local Government</td>
<td>The Secretary of State is responsible for the overall strategic direction of the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG). Main areas of responsibility include supporting local government, communities and neighbourhoods, local economic growth, housing, planning, building and fire. The Rt. Hon. Eric Pickles was appointed Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government in May 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequential Test</td>
<td>The Sequential Test is a process that the Local Planning Authority (LPA) must go through to direct development as far as is practicable, to areas at the lowest probability of flooding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Villages</td>
<td>These will act as local service centres for the surrounding rural area. Limited new development should support or improve their role as a focus for social and economic activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline Management Plan</td>
<td>A plan providing a large-scale assessment of the risk to people and to the developed, historic and natural environment associated with coastal processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Allocations DPD</td>
<td>A Development Plan Document comprising land allocated for specific or mixed use development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soundness</td>
<td>Once a Development Plan Document is submitted for approval an Inspector at the Examination in Public will check to see whether correct procedures have been followed, plans and policies are reasonable, supported by evidence and conform to national policy and legislation. This process examines whether the Plan can be deemed ‘sound’ so that it can be adopted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South East Lincolnshire Local Plan</strong></td>
<td>SEL LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spatial Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Areas of Conservation</strong></td>
<td>SAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Protection Areas</strong></td>
<td>SPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statement of Community Involvement</strong></td>
<td>SCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Environmental Assessment</strong></td>
<td>SEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Flood Risk Assessment</strong></td>
<td>SFRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment</strong></td>
<td>SHLAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Housing Market Assessment</strong></td>
<td>SHMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy and Policy DPD</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-regional Centres</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplementary Planning Document</strong></td>
<td>SPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability Appraisal</strong></td>
<td><strong>SA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainable Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transport Assessment</strong></td>
<td><strong>TA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Design</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>'Wet' Areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Windfall site</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 1: Sustainability Topic Guidance and Scoring/Impact Dimension Criteria

**NB**: For use in determining scoring of policies against SA topics.

**SA Topics**:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA TOPIC</th>
<th>KEY ISSUES AND PROBLEMS FROM THE BASELINE SITUATION (NB: options/policies should be appraised with reference to the baseline situation)</th>
<th>KEY SUSTAINABILITY QUESTIONS – Will the option/policy:</th>
<th>POTENTIAL INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Air Quality | • there are currently two AQMAs in South East Lincolnshire, both in Boston  
• there are high levels of car ownership across the area, particularly in South Holland | • improve air quality across the area  
• reduce the number of AQMAs in the area  
• ensure that the air and noise pollution impacts of development are minimised  
• facilitate a shift to more sustainable modes of transport to reduce carbon emissions | • CO₂ emissions per head  
• Number of AQMAs  
• Car ownership rates |
| Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure | • that there are a number of protected sites/habitats within and surrounding the area, including The Wash, which is internationally protected  
• in terms of open space, there is a current shortfall of allotments and some aspects of provision for outdoor sport | • protect and enhance sites of nature conservation importance, both statutory and non-statutory  
• protect and enhance the provision of green infrastructure  
• enhance the quality and connectivity of the public rights-of-way network | • Number of designated sites in (and within close proximity) of South East Lincolnshire  
• UK priority habitats in South East Lincolnshire  
• Public open space provision |
| Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation) | • there is an increasing need for South East Lincolnshire to mitigate and adapt to climate change | • for mitigation, reduce GHG emissions, minimise energy usage and increase the amount of energy generated by decentralised or renewable sources  
• for adaptation, to improve resilience to a changing climate through the careful planning and design of development, including energy-efficiency measures, green infrastructure and managing the risk of flood | • CO₂ emissions per head  
• Car ownership rates  
• Technical renewable-energy resource potential  
• Existing and projected renewable-energy development |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community, Health and Well-being</th>
<th>Economy and Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• the area has a lower proportion of 20-29 year olds and a higher proportion of over 50’s than the England average, which demonstrates an ageing population.</td>
<td>• the area has below-average economic performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• the impact of recent inward migration from other EU countries is unknown.</td>
<td>• the area has a low-wage economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• there is limited ethnic diversity across the area.</td>
<td>• the economy is focussed on a limited number of sectors (i.e. agriculture, food processing and transport).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• health indicators show that, in general terms, the area performs below average nationally, particularly related to life expectancy and levels of obesity.</td>
<td>• there are a high proportion of people with lower/no qualifications, particularly in Boston Borough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• in terms of access to key services, on average, residents of Boston Borough are significantly better than those in South Holland.</td>
<td>• levels of unemployment are below average.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• help meet the equality, health and social care needs of the area’s population.</td>
<td>• there is a significant amount of undeveloped allocated land available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• help meet the needs of the area’s elderly and disabled population.</td>
<td>• help promote business growth and create higher paid, higher skilled employment opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• address negative health indicators.</td>
<td>• broaden the area’s economic base and improve its economic performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• reduce differences in life expectancy.</td>
<td>• broaden the diversity of skills in the workforce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• help promote more inclusive and cohesive communities.</td>
<td>• maintain high and stable levels of employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• improve accessibility to essential services and facilities.</td>
<td>• raise educational achievement levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• make opportunities for culture, leisure and recreation readily accessible.</td>
<td>• ensure that job creation is matched by the provision of appropriate infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• improve community safety and reduce crime and the fear of crime.</td>
<td>• ensure that the vitality and viability of the area’s retail centres is enhanced.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age structure</th>
<th>Working age population/economic activity levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Resident population by ethnic group and religion.</td>
<td>• Highest qualification attained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Life expectancy at birth.</td>
<td>• Industry of employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Levels of obesity.</td>
<td>• Enterprises by industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Levels of physical activity.</td>
<td>• Employment by occupation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Alcohol attributed mortality and hospital admissions.</td>
<td>• Gross mean pay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Percentage of adults smoking and levels of smoking-related deaths.</td>
<td>• Size, age and nature of enterprise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Levels of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease.</td>
<td>• Unemployment rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Numbers and severity of road traffic accidents.</td>
<td>• Land currently in B1, B2 and B8 use classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Qualifications.</td>
<td>• Available allocated employment land with and without planning permission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Notifiable offences recorded by the police.</td>
<td>• Number of vacant ground floor uses in town centres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access to key services.</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Risk</td>
<td>Historic Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• a significant proportion of the area is at risk of hazard from coastal flooding, particularly in Boston Borough</td>
<td>• there are a significant number of historic environment records across the area, with an above-average proportion of Conservations Areas at risk in South Holland and an above-average proportion of Grade I and II* Listed Building in both Boston Borough and South Holland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• there is also risk in certain areas from fluvial flooding</td>
<td>• protect and, where possible, enhance South East Lincolnshire’s historic environment assets (both designated and non-designated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• a number of planning permissions have been granted contrary to EA advice</td>
<td>• recognise and capitalise on the potential for historic assets to contribute to both tourism and place-shaping through their distinctive character and inspiration for the design of new development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• promote flood resilience/resistance in existing and new developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• promote the use of sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Coastal study hazard zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strategic Flood Risk Assessment zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Number and type of designated historic assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Percentage of registered parks and gardens, conservation areas; scheduled monuments and listed buildings on the Heritage at Risk Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gypsy and Traveller caravan count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Average house price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Levels of homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Annual completion rates (including percentage affordable and on brownfield land)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 5.25-year housing land supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gypsy and Traveller caravan count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 5.25-year housing land supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gypsy and Traveller caravan count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of dwellings (including type and tenure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Levels of homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Annual completion rates (including percentage affordable and on brownfield land)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gypsy and Traveller caravan count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 5.25-year housing land supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gypsy and Traveller caravan count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of dwellings (including type and tenure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Levels of homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Annual completion rates (including percentage affordable and on brownfield land)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gypsy and Traveller caravan count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 5.25-year housing land supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gypsy and Traveller caravan count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of dwellings (including type and tenure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Levels of homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Annual completion rates (including percentage affordable and on brownfield land)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gypsy and Traveller caravan count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 5.25-year housing land supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The landscape is low-lying and homogenous. However, there are a number of pressures on landscape character and additional greenfield development would add to this pressure.</td>
<td>- South East Lincolnshire relies more heavily on car usage than the national average, particularly in South Holland. This probably reflects the rural nature of the area and the lack of good quality public transport facilities. Public transport usage is lower than the national average, although bicycle usage in Boston Borough is higher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Protect high grade agricultural land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Maintain and improve soil quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Identify and, if appropriate, remediate contaminated land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Address the waste hierarchy through prevention, reuse, recycling and recovery of waste</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Protect landscape and townscape character from inappropriate development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ensure, where development proceeds, that appropriate mitigation measures are put in place to minimise, and/or compensate, for any harm to the landscape character of South East Lincolnshire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ensure that there is no adverse impact brought about through light pollution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Facilitate a shift to more sustainable modes of transport to reduce carbon emissions and encourage an increase in physical activity rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Maintain and enhance accessibility to public transport throughout the area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improve access for residents across the area to local services, facilities, places of employment and green infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Support initiatives to reduce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Percentage annual gross completions on brownfield/greenfield land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The loss of particular landscape features, such as woodlands and hedgerows</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Vehicle kilometres travelled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bus patronage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mode of travel to work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Car ownership rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Access to key services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
services, on average, residents of Boston Borough fare significantly better than those in South Holland.

congestion and the need to travel
- minimise the traffic impact of new development
- understand the importance of car travel in rural areas
- ensure that increased use of the Joint Line does not lead to significant disruption to movement and activity at Spalding.

### Water

- the area is in the driest region in the country and is currently in drought
- pressures on water supply are forecast to increase over time
- there are some concerns over water quality

- recognise that South East Lincolnshire is located in an area experiencing water resource problems, which are predicted to be exacerbated by climate change and future growth and development over time
- ensure that the distribution and location of development takes water supply and sewerage infrastructure into account
- reduce per capita consumption of water and promote the efficient use of water resources
- protect, and where possible, improve water quality

- Summer effective rainfall
- Number of new dwellings
- Percentage of rivers with good/fair quality in terms of chemical and biological factors

### Scoring Criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Notes to appraisers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✅✅ Major positive</td>
<td>The option or policy is likely to lead to a significant improvement, and to large scale and permanent benefits in the topic area being appraised.</td>
<td>Major positive scores must be justified with a description of the impacts likely to lead to a major beneficial effect. Through reference to the baseline, the likelihood, geographical scale, frequency and permanence of the effects should be recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅ Minor positive</td>
<td>The option or policy is likely to lead to moderate improvement and to large scale temporary or medium scale permanent benefits to the topic area being appraised. Beneficial effects should not be easily reversible in the long-term. A minor positive effect is likely to halt or reverse historic negative trends.</td>
<td>Minor positive scores should be justified with a description of the impacts likely to lead to a beneficial effect. Commentary should include information on how a minor positive option or policy could be strengthened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Neutral</td>
<td>A neutral scoring indicates that there are no effects upon the topic area being appraised. This may include the continuation of a current trend. The condition of any issues may continue to</td>
<td>Neutral scoring should only be used where it is very likely that the effect will be neither positive nor negative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Minor</td>
<td>The option or policy is likely to lead to moderate damage or loss, leading to large scale temporary or medium scale permanent negative effects on the sustainability objective being appraised.</td>
<td>Minor negative effects should be considered able to be mitigated through policy. Commentary should include information on how minor negative effects can be mitigated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX Major negative</td>
<td>The option or policy is likely to lead to significant or severe damage or loss.</td>
<td>Major negative effects should only be recorded where effects are irreversible and difficult to mitigate. Major negative scores should be recorded without taking into account potential for mitigation as there is no guarantee that any mitigation measures will be implemented or successful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed (e.g. ✓/X, ✓/✓)</td>
<td>The effect is likely to be a combination of positive and negative effects.</td>
<td>A mixed effect score may also be combined with an uncertain score where the balance of effects or the nature of effects is uncertain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? Uncertain</td>
<td>The effect of the option or policy is not known or is too unpredictable to assign a conclusive score.</td>
<td>Uncertainties should be acknowledged and recorded rather than attempting to hide a positive, negative or neutral score. Where the option or policy is vague and require assumptions to assess, these should be clearly stated. There may be insufficient information or evidence to come to a conclusion about whether the policy or option would have a positive or negative effect. The commentary should record how the option or policy could be improved to ensure a positive effect.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: East Midlands Regional Plan Policy 5 - Strategy for Lincolnshire Coastal Districts

‘A strategy will be agreed between the Regional Planning Body, the three Lincolnshire coastal districts (East Lindsey, Boston and South Holland), Lincolnshire County Council, the Environment Agency and other relevant regional organisations. This will consider primarily:

- flood risk and flood defence works;
- housing needs;
- regeneration needs, including social and economic factors;
- other infrastructural needs; and
- the protection of the integrity of designated nature conservation sites of international importance.

The strategy should also consider how any infrastructure will be funded and the timing of such works. New housing and other new development will need to be carefully phased in accordance with the provision of necessary new infrastructure.

The agreed strategy will form part of the next RSS review and if agreed before the adoption of the next review it will form a guide to the preparation of local development documents in the three districts until the regional strategy is rolled forward.’
### Appendix 3: Flood-hazard classification used in the Lincolnshire Coastal Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of coastal flood hazard</th>
<th>Hazard Rating</th>
<th>Colour on mapping</th>
<th>Description of flood water</th>
<th>Description of hazard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Little or no hazard</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Outside of flood extent produced by model</td>
<td>Little or no hazard (from coastal flooding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low Hazard</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Shallow flowing or deep standing water</td>
<td>Caution, low risk to people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Danger to some</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Fast flowing or deep standing water</td>
<td>Risk to the vulnerable, such as children, the elderly and the infirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Danger for most</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Fast flowing and deep water with some debris</td>
<td>Risk to most, including the general public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>Danger for all</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Fast flowing deep water with significant debris</td>
<td>Extreme hazard, danger to all, including the emergency services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Defra and Environment Agency. 2008
Appendix 4: Lincolnshire Coastal Study Principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 1 Lincolnshire Coastal Study Principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Study follows the current draft Shoreline Management Plan policies in relation to the line and standard of protection of coastal flood defences. The Study is therefore concerned with residual flood risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The primary principle is to increase the safety of people by reducing the number of people at risk of flood hazard in the Study Area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Principle 1**

Development will be guided by the level of flood hazard.

With respect to the red, orange and yellow zones:

- **Major development** will be employment or business related only;
- Exceptionally, development to meet local housing needs may continue subject to the mitigation of flood risk through flood resilient design and emergency planning;
- It will not be appropriate for housing development in the red, orange and yellow zones to contribute to meeting the Region’s strategic housing requirements. Rather, any new housing development should be of a level and type designed to keep the population in these zones broadly stable.

With respect to the green zone:

- Exceptionally, **major development** may be possible so long as flood risk is mitigated through flood resilient design and emergency planning.

With respect to all flood hazard zones:

- New and replacement community buildings may be permitted subject to flood risk being mitigated through flood resilient design and emergency planning;
- New caravan sites or extensions to existing sites may be allowed for short-let tourist use between the months of April and September subject to the mitigation of flood risk through flood resilient design and emergency planning;
- Development of buildings and infrastructure explicitly for use in emergencies may be permitted subject to flood risk being mitigated through flood resilient design.

**Principle 2**

The consequence of flooding for people in all flood hazard zones will, over time, be reduced by:

- The installation of flood resilience measures in domestic and public buildings, caravan sites and for essential infrastructure;
- Improving emergency planning and emergency response and evacuation arrangements;
- Improving public awareness and understanding of flood risk and responses.

**Principle 3**

Development decisions will aim to improve social, economic and environmental conditions in existing and new communities by:

- Minimising the loss of high quality agricultural land;
- Diversifying the tourism industry;
- Improving green infrastructure;
- Protecting and enhancing water infrastructure;
- Protecting natural, cultural and historic assets;
- Improving transport infrastructure and services;
- Improving the quality of existing housing stock and access to jobs, training and services for local people.

There will be a particular focus on more deprived areas.
Appendix 5: Residual Coastal Flood-hazard Map

Source: The Environment Agency; 2011
Appendix 6: Joint Statement 2010

Taking Forward the Lincolnshire Coastal Study

A Joint Statement by:

Lincolnshire County Council
Boston Borough Council
East Lindsey District Council
South Holland District Council
Environment Agency
Natural England

On 6 July 2010, the Secretary of State revoked the East Midlands Regional Plan (the RSS), published in March 2009. The revocation removes the requirement for a Lincolnshire Coastal Strategy to be developed as part of an RSS Partial Review, which was submitted in draft form to the Secretary of State in March 2010.

To inform the Coastal Strategy, Lincolnshire County Council, Boston Borough Council, East Lindsey District Council and South Holland District Council have been working with the Environment Agency, Natural England and relevant regional bodies to establish an evidence base. This work has been published as the Lincolnshire Coastal Study, available at: www.lincolnshire.gov.uk/coastalstudy.

In the absence of the RSS, Government advice is that local authorities should continue to work with the Environment Agency across administrative boundaries, to plan development that addresses flooding and coastal change and to prevent unnecessary building in areas of high flood risk.

As a result local authorities will now use the Lincolnshire Coastal Study as an evidence base, alongside other evidence required by Planning Policy Statements (PPSs), to inform their Local Development Frameworks (LDFs), working with the Environment Agency and Natural England as appropriate.

Timetables for the completion of LDFs are currently under discussion and will be publicised by the relevant local authorities in due course. However, it is unlikely that any Core Strategy will be adopted before the end of 2012.

Prior to the adoption of Core Strategies, local planning authorities will therefore have regard to the Coastal Study evidence base, along with national policy in PPS25 and relevant information from Strategic Flood Risk Assessments, when making local development decisions.
Taking Forward the Lincolnshire Coastal Study

A Joint Statement by:

Lincolnshire County Council
Boston Borough Council
East Lindsey District Council
South Holland District Council
Environment Agency
Natural England

Government expects local authorities to work with the Environment Agency across administrative boundaries, to plan development that addresses flooding and coastal change and to prevent unnecessary building in areas of high flood risk, or, where development is necessary, ensuring it is safe without increasing risk elsewhere.

To inform development decisions on the Lincolnshire Coast, Lincolnshire County Council, Boston Borough Council, East Lindsey District Council and South Holland District Council have been working with the Environment Agency, Natural England and other relevant bodies to establish an evidence base of information and other context with a view to establishing new development policy. This work has been published as the Lincolnshire Coastal Study, available at: www.lincolnshire.gov.uk/coastalstudy.

Although originally developed to inform a review of the East Midlands Regional Plan, Local authorities have agreed to have regard to the Lincolnshire Coastal Study as an evidence base, alongside other evidence and planning considerations required by Government policy, to inform their Local Development Frameworks (LDFs), working with the Environment Agency and Natural England as appropriate.

Timetables for the completion of LDFs are currently under discussion and will be publicised by the relevant local authorities in due course. However, it is unlikely that any Core Strategy/Local Plan will be adopted before the end of 2012.

Prior to the adoption of Core Strategies/Local Plan documents, local planning authorities will therefore have regard to the Coastal Study evidence base, along with national policy, existing Local Plan policies and relevant information from Strategic Flood Risk Assessments, in addition to other sustainable development policies and other material considerations, when making development decisions.

September 2011
Appendix 8:

PLANNING FOR COASTAL FLOOD RISK IN SOUTH EAST LINCOLNSHIRE

The following statement has been prepared by officers of Boston Borough Council, South Holland District Council and the Environment Agency. It follows discussions about how the findings of the Lincolnshire Coastal Study could inform the preparation of a planning-policy framework to guide development in the areas of South East Lincolnshire\textsuperscript{26} that are subject to coastal flood risk, which concluded at a meeting held at the County Offices, Newland, Lincoln on 20 January 2012.

Planning Aim

The aim in planning for areas at risk from coastal flooding in South East Lincolnshire is to promote sustainable development that reduces the number of people at risk of flood hazard. The pursuit of this aim will be guided by the following principles:

Principles

Development decisions will aim to improve social, economic and environmental conditions in existing and new communities by:

(1) Reducing the exposure of people to flood hazard

In order to reduce exposure of people to flood hazard, the type and location of development will be guided by the level of flood hazard.

Therefore, with respect to development in the red, orange and yellow flood hazard zones:

- employment and business-related development will be supported;
- for such zones situated within the boundary of South East Lincolnshire, it will not be appropriate for additional housing development to exceed the level of local housing need\textsuperscript{27} generated within those zones; and
- development to meet local housing need will be subject to the mitigation of flood risk through flood resilient design and emergency planning.

With respect to development in the green flood hazard zone:

\textsuperscript{26} South East Lincolnshire is the combined areas of Boston Borough Council and South Holland District Council

\textsuperscript{27} Local housing need is defined as the mixture of open market and affordable housing which is required to meet the housing needs of existing communities. The number of dwellings required to meet local housing need generated in the red, orange and yellow flood hazard zones will be calculated on the basis of the proportion of the total South East Lincolnshire population resident within such zones multiplied by South East Lincolnshire’s local housing need. Outside these three zones such considerations will not apply.
in regard to flood risk concerns, there will not be restrictions on employment, business or housing provided flood risk is mitigated through flood-resilient design and emergency planning.

With respect to other types of development in all flood hazard zones:

- new and replacement community buildings may be permitted subject to flood risk being mitigated through flood-resilient design and emergency planning;
- new caravan sites or extensions to existing sites for short-let tourist use between the months of April and September may be permitted subject to flood risk being mitigated through flood-resilient design and emergency planning; and
- development of buildings and infrastructure explicitly for use in emergencies may be permitted subject to flood risk being mitigated through flood-resilient design.

The consequence of flooding for people in all flood hazard zones will, over time, be reduced by:

- the installation of flood-resilience measures in domestic and public buildings, caravan sites and for essential infrastructure;
- improving emergency planning and emergency response and evacuation arrangements; and
- improving public awareness and understanding of flood risk and responses.

(2) Minimising the loss of high quality agricultural land

(3) Diversifying the tourism industry

(4) Improving green infrastructure

(5) Protecting and enhancing water infrastructure

(6) Protecting natural, cultural and historic assets

(7) Improving transport infrastructure and services

(8) Improving the quality of existing housing stock and access to jobs, training and services for local people.
Appendix 9: ‘Available’ SHLAA sites by settlement and ROY/non-ROY zones

Boston Borough:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Available sites submitted through the SHLAA</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In ROY</td>
<td>Outside ROY</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algarkirk</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber Hill</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benington</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>7925</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butterwick</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishtoft</td>
<td>1713</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fosdyke</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frampton</td>
<td>1761</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freiston</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland Fen</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirton</td>
<td>1016</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>1433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leerton</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Leake</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutterton</td>
<td>1244</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>1545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swineshead</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wigtoft</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>3144</td>
<td>3503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrangle</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyberton</td>
<td>4392</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,898</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,097</strong></td>
<td><strong>26,995</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### South Holland District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Available sites submitted through the SHLAA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In ROY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowbit</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowland</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deeping St Nicholas</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donington</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gedney</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gedney Hill</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosberton</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holbeach</td>
<td>3078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Sutton</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Sutton</td>
<td>2429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutton</td>
<td>853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moulton</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinchbeck</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadring</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spalding</td>
<td>2203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surfleet</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton Bridge</td>
<td>1501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton St James</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tydd Gote</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weston</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whaplode</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTH HOLLAND DISTRICT TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,869</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 12: Assessment of Broad Locations for Growth at Boston and Spalding

Purpose and Methodology

As part of the emerging South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, a Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document (DPD) is currently being prepared. As part of this process a Combines Preferred Options (PO) and Sustainability Appraisal (SA) report is being produced. That document will appraise all the reasonable policy options and make use of the SA process to determine a set of preferred policy options. One area where a preferred option will be required is related to future broad locations for development, particularly housing development, in Boston and Spalding. Therefore, in light of the above considerations a number of potential broad locations for housing development have been identified on the following maps around Boston and Spalding towns. This work assume that the allocated land to the south west of Spalding (Holland Park) with outline planning permission for 2,250 dwellings is to be built out in its entirety, including a first Phase of a Spalding Western Relief Road (SWRR), and is therefore included as part of the built-up area. A broad location is assumed to be a location with the potential to deliver at least 1,000 dwellings.

Through the Preferred Options document preferred location(s) for growth at Boston and Spalding will need to be chosen and justified. Throughout the Combined PO & SA report reasonable and unreasonable policy options are explored and Sustainability Appraisal is used to aid in determining which of the reasonable options is the preferred policy approach. As such, the principal function of this background paper is to sieve through the potential broad locations for growth around Boston and Spalding to arrive at a number of reasonable options to take forward through the Preferred Options process. It is not the role of this document to determine the preferred broad location(s) or how to distribute levels of development between them. This is the role of the Housing chapter of the Combined PO & SA report. This process merely acts as a sieving process to determine reasonable options.

Initial consultation was undertaken with infrastructure providers on the range of broad locations for development to inform the sieving process. However, it is apparent that at this stage no critical issues have arisen that would rule a particular location in or out. The results of this consultation are reported below.

Preferred policy approaches to ‘Site Allocations’ and ‘Development and Flood Risk’ are outlined in the Preferred Options document. These, therefore, form an important part of the sieving process. As such, the principles within the policies are explored in the below tables, which outline the pros and cons of each broad location around Boston and Spalding towns. Drawing on the information in the tables key factors for determining ‘reasonable’ and ‘unreasonable’ broad locations at each town are explored. One key factor is the potential for delivery. To this extent the emerging Strategic Housing Land Availability (SHLAA) Study is of great importance. It carries out an assessment of the availability, achievability and suitability of sites that have been put forward through public consultation. However, for the purposes of this exercise, only where land is ‘unavailable’ (i.e. where there is not an identified willing vendor) has it been sieved out. This is because the ‘achievability’ and ‘suitability’ of sites has been assessed through the SHLAA on a site-by-site basis. This does not, therefore, take into account the potential to assemble a number of sites to deliver a larger urban extension and is also based on current planning policy alone. Where developer interest is also known this adds further weight to a site being a reasonable option in terms of delivery. In terms of using the SHLAA as a sieve for identifying broad locations, it is assumed that there must be available land to deliver at least 1,000 dwellings.
In addition to the findings of the SHLAA, other locally-important factors are discussed. These reflect the local circumstances in Boston and Spalding and are outlined below.

All these factors enable conclusions to be reached on reasonable and unreasonable options for broad locations for housing development. The reasonable options are then put through the SA process, in line with the approach taken throughout the Combined PO & SA report. Final conclusions are then drawn on the reasonable options and the potential available dwelling supply (based on information in the SHLAA) at each broad location. This information is then used to inform the Housing chapter of the Combined PO & SA report.
Broad Locations

Boston Town

Spalding

Key:
- Railway
- Watercourse
- Major Road
- Existing Built-up Area
- Potential Broad Location for Growth
Initial Consultation on Infrastructure

Initial consultation was undertaken with infrastructure providers on the above broad locations in September 2012. At the point of the consultation the following assumptions about housing numbers were made. It was assumed that there will be a total of 4,520 new dwellings in Boston Borough between 2011 and 2031. Minus existing commitments this results in a need for 3,584 net additional dwellings. Again, for the purposes of the exercise, it was assumed that a large proportion of this will be developed on greenfield sites around Boston town. In South Holland, over the same time period, it was assumed that there will be a total of 9,400 new dwellings. Minus existing commitments this results in a need for 4,234 net additional dwellings. Again it is likely that a large proportion of this will be developed on greenfield sites around Spalding town.

Four responses were received, with their comments summarised below.

Sport England commented that:
- new residential development should be located where residents will have good access to sports facilities and where there is scope for new provision in or close to the new communities; and
- the NPPF imposes a strong presumption against development that would result in the loss of open space, playing fields or recreational buildings or land.

This response provided no site-specific information that would aid in choosing one broad location over another.

The NHS Lincolnshire Primary Care Trust, Lincolnshire East Clinical Commissioning Group & South Lincolnshire Clinical Commissioning Group commented that:
- in Boston, the likely scale of growth will create an additional 8,500 potential patients who will need a GP place. The capacity of the town’s existing GP practices varies, but the Parkside Surgery (relatively close to the town centre) is being extended, which will enable it to accommodate 7,000 additional patients. Sites which are relatively close to the Parkside Surgery (sites B1, B2, B3, B4, B9, B10 and B11) will therefore be preferable. Southern sites (B5, B6, B7 and B8) are less favoured and, if they are developed, S106 developer contribution are likely to be required to address capacity issues in local GP practices; and
- in Spalding, the likely scale of growth will create an additional 11,000 residents. The results are similar to the situation in Boston but with one caveat. Recent practice developments (all relatively central) lead the GPs to believe they would be able to cope with the additional patients regardless of the sites chosen for development. The caveat for Spalding is that it is believed that there is significant development already planned at Holland Park (the PCT has been in earlier discussions with SHDC regarding the need for a s106 on this site) which may require a 2/3 GP branch surgery to cope with this location (c £700k).

Anglian Water Services Limited commented that:
- the proposed locations are likely to require sewerage network upgrades in order to accommodate the proposed growth;
- water and wastewater assets (most notably Sewage Treatment Works (STWs) and pumping stations) require adequate buffer zones, given their possible impact upon the amenity of nearby dwellings;
- the Boston STW can accommodate the levels of growth proposed. However, there is the risk of lack of capacity in the existing network, and consequently sites that
are located close to the STW are preferrable (i.e. sites located towards the south of the town); and

• in Spalding, there is some capacity within Spalding STW. Further investigations are underway in order to determine whether the proposed growth could be accommodated or whether upgrades would be required. The catchment is predominantly separated and therefore the scope for surface water separation is reduced. Spalding STW is located to the north-northeast of Spalding on the outskirts of the current built up area. Site 1, 2, 3 and 4 could potentially connect directly to the works to avoid current infrastructure. The other sites would be likely to require reinforcement of the existing sewerage infrastructure to prevent any detriment to the network performance caused by the additional foul flows.

The Childcare Sufficiency Team of Lincolnshire County Council commented that:

• in Boston: sites B1 and B11 offer limited access to existing childcare services with no access to full day care early years services; sites B2, B3, B6 and B8 offer limited access to existing childcare services; site B5 offers access to existing early years services with limited access to out of school services; sites B7, B9 and B10 offer access to existing childcare services; and site B4 offers access to all types of childcare services – this would be the best site for access to childcare; and

• in Spalding: sites S7, S8 and S9 offer no access to existing childcare services; sites S2, S3 and S4 offer limited access to existing childcare services; site S1 offers access to existing childcare services; sites S6 and S10 offer access to all types of childcare services; and site S5 offers access to all types of childcare services – this would be the best site for access to childcare.

It is clear from the above information that whilst there are instances of site-specific benefits/disadvantages based on the responses from infrastructure providers, there are no critical ‘show-stopping’ issues. In due course the full infrastructure requirements of the preferred broad location(s) and the Local Plan strategy in general will be explored through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).
# Boston Town

Broad Locations at Boston town

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option (including ‘available’ SHLAA site dwelling supply)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **B1** Potential dwelling supply: 519 | North of Red Cap Lane, Boston | • Grade 1 agricultural land  
• EA Flood Map: Flood zone 3a  
• SFRA 2010: Relative probability of tidal flooding – ‘medium’  
• SFRA 2010: Relative probability of fluvial flooding – predominantly ‘medium’, some ‘high’  
• SFRA flood hazard 2115 – predominantly ‘danger for most’, some ‘danger for some’  
• EA tidal inundation hazard rating 2115 – ‘danger for most’  
• EA flood mapping 2115: depth rating – predominantly medium (predominantly 0.5m to 1m, some 1m to 2m)  
• Modest amount of land promoted in the SHLAA (17.33 hectares)  
• No land promoted in the SHLAA by housebuilders  
• Railway line acts as a barrier and creates poor permeability | • EA flood mapping 2115: velocity rating – predominantly low (predominantly 0m/s to 0.3m/s, some 0.3m/s to 1m/s)  
• Well related to the ‘Distributor Road (Likely Area of Assessment)’  
• No natural or historic environment constraints |
| **B2** Potential dwelling | North and west of Pilgrim Hospital, Boston | • Grade 1 agricultural land  
• EA Flood Map: Flood zone 3a  
• SFRA 2010: Relative probability of tidal flooding – ‘medium’  
• SFRA flood hazard 2115 – predominantly ‘danger for most’, some ‘danger for some’  
• EA tidal inundation hazard rating 2115 – ‘danger for most’  
• EA flood mapping 2115: depth rating – predominantly low (0m/s to 0.3m/s)  
• Well related to the ‘Distributor Road (Likely Area of Assessment)’ |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B3</th>
<th>North of Wainfleet Road, Boston</th>
<th></th>
<th>(Likely Area of Assessment)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Potential dwelling supply: 23 | flooding – predominantly 'medium', some 'low'
  - SFRA 2010: Relative probability of fluvial flooding – predominantly 'medium', some 'low'
  - SFRA flood hazard 2115 – ‘danger for some’/‘danger for most’
  - EA tidal inundation hazard rating 2115 – ‘danger for most’
  - EA flood mapping 2115: depth rating – medium to high (0.5m to 1m/1m to 2m)
  - Small amount of land promoted in the SHLAA (7.51 hectares)
  - No land promoted in the SHLAA by housebuilders
  - SFRA 2010: Relative probability of tidal flooding - 'low'
  - SFRA 2010: Relative probability of fluvial flooding – ‘low’
  - EA flood mapping 2115: velocity rating – low (0m/s to 0.3m/s)
  - No natural or historic environment constraints
  - Good access to A16 and A52 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Potential dwelling supply</th>
<th>Grade 1 agricultural land</th>
<th>EA Flood Map: Flood zone 3a</th>
<th>SFRA 2010: Relative probability of tidal flooding - predominantly 'medium', some 'low'</th>
<th>SFRA flood hazard 2115 – ‘danger for some’/‘danger for most’</th>
<th>EA tidal inundation hazard rating 2115 – ‘danger for most’</th>
<th>EA flood mapping 2115: depth rating – medium to high (0.5m to 1m/1m to 2m)</th>
<th>Small amount of land promoted in the SHLAA (8.12 hectares)</th>
<th>No land promoted in the SHLAA by housebuilders</th>
<th>Unrelated to the ‘Distributor Road (Likely Area of Assessment)’</th>
<th>SFRA 2010: Relative probability of fluvial flooding – ‘low’</th>
<th>EA flood mapping 2115: velocity rating – predominantly low (predominantly 0m/s to 0.3m/s, some 0.3m/s to 1m/s)</th>
<th>No natural or historic environment constraints</th>
<th>Good access to A52 and A16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>South of Wainfleet Road, Boston</td>
<td>244</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>Toot Lane, Boston</td>
<td>910</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Potential dwelling supply</td>
<td>Farmers’ Field Name</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Designation</td>
<td>Relative probability of tidal flooding</td>
<td>Relative probability of fluvial flooding</td>
<td>Promoted land by housebuilders</td>
<td>Constraints</td>
<td>Access to roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>1473</td>
<td>Tytton Lane East, Boston</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3a</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>no by housebuilders</td>
<td>unrelated</td>
<td>good to A16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no constraints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>large in SHLAA (49.11 hectares)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>significant by housebuilder (20.9 hectares)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>related to area of assessment only from A16 to London Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>grade 1, EA flood zone 3a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SFRA 2010: 'danger for all'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EA flood hazard 2115 = 'danger for all'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EA tidal inundation hazard rating 2115 = 'danger for all'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EA flood mapping 2115: depth rating high (1m to 2m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EA flood mapping 2115: velocity rating medium (0.3m/s to 1m/s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>related to area of assessment only from A16 to London Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>1216</td>
<td>Wyberton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3a</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>no by housebuilder</td>
<td>no constraints</td>
<td>good to A16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>large in SHLAA (40.52 hectares)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no historic constraints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SFRA 2010: 'danger for most'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EA flood hazard 2115 = 'danger for most'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EA tidal inundation hazard rating 2115 = 'danger for most'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EA flood mapping 2115: depth rating predominantly high (predominantly 1m to 2m, some 0.5m to 1m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EA flood mapping 2115: velocity rating low to medium (0m/s to 0.3m/s and 0.3m/s to 1m/s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>small area promoted in SHLAA by housebuilder (6.21 hectares)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wyberton West Road/Chain Bridge Road, Boston</td>
<td>EA Flood Map: Flood zone 3a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B8</strong></td>
<td>Potential dwelling supply: 1900</td>
<td>SFRA flood hazard 2115 – ‘danger for all’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EA tidal inundation hazard rating 2115 – ‘danger for all’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EA flood mapping 2115: depth rating – high (1m to 2m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 2 agricultural land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SFRA 2010: Relative probability of tidal flooding - ‘low’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SFRA 2010: Relative probability of fluvial flooding – ‘low’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EA flood mapping 2115: velocity rating – predominantly low (predominantly 0m/s to 0.3m/s, some 0.3m/s to 1m/s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Large amount of land promoted in the SHLAA (63.31 hectares)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Large amount of land promoted in the SHLAA by a housebuilder (63.31 hectares)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Well related to the ‘Distributor Road ( Likely Area of Assessment) ’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No natural or historic environment constraints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proximity to edge-of-town retail (Chain Bridge)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good access to A52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Potential dwelling supply</td>
<td>EA Flood Map: Flood zone 3a</td>
<td>SFRA 2010: Relative probability of tidal flooding - ‘medium’</td>
<td>SFRA flood hazard 2115 – predominantly ‘danger for all’, some ‘danger for most’</td>
<td>EA tidal inundation hazard rating 2115 – ‘danger for all’/‘danger for most’</td>
<td>EA flood mapping 2115: depth rating – predominantly high (predominantly 1m to 2m, some 0.5m to 1m)</td>
<td>EA flood mapping 2115: velocity rating – predominantly medium (predominantly 0.3m/s to 1m/s, some 0m/s to 0.3m/s)</td>
<td>SFRA 2010: Relative probability of fluvial flooding – ‘low’</td>
<td>Large amounts of land promoted in the SHLAA (67.72 hectares)</td>
<td>Significant amount of land promoted in the SHLAA by a housebuilder (22.65 hectares)</td>
<td>Well related to the ‘Distributor Road (Likely Area of Assessment)’</td>
<td>No natural or historic environment constraints</td>
<td>Proximity to edge-of-town retail (Chain Bridge)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B9</strong></td>
<td><strong>South of North Forty Foot Bank, Boston</strong></td>
<td>• EA Flood Map: Flood zone 3a</td>
<td>• SFRA 2010: Relative probability of tidal flooding - ‘medium’</td>
<td>• SFRA flood hazard 2115 – predominantly ‘danger for all’, some ‘danger for most’</td>
<td>• EA tidal inundation hazard rating 2115 – ‘danger for all’/‘danger for most’</td>
<td>• EA flood mapping 2115: depth rating – predominantly high (predominantly 1m to 2m, some 0.5m to 1m)</td>
<td>• EA flood mapping 2115: velocity rating – predominantly medium (predominantly 0.3m/s to 1m/s, some 0m/s to 0.3m/s)</td>
<td>• Grade 2 agricultural land</td>
<td>• SFRA 2010: Relative probability of fluvial flooding – ‘low’</td>
<td>• Large amounts of land promoted in the SHLAA (67.72 hectares)</td>
<td>• Significant amount of land promoted in the SHLAA by a housebuilder (22.65 hectares)</td>
<td>• Well related to the ‘Distributor Road (Likely Area of Assessment)’</td>
<td>• No natural or historic environment constraints</td>
<td>• Proximity to edge-of-town retail (Chain Bridge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B10</strong></td>
<td><strong>East of Punchbowl Lane, Boston</strong></td>
<td>• EA Flood Map: Flood zone 3a</td>
<td>• SFRA 2010: Relative probability of tidal flooding – predominantly ‘medium’, some ‘low’</td>
<td>• SFRA flood hazard 2115 – ‘danger for most’</td>
<td>• EA tidal inundation hazard rating 2115 – ‘danger for most’</td>
<td>• EA flood mapping 2115: depth rating – predominantly medium (predominantly 0.5m to 1m, some 1m to 2m)</td>
<td>• EA flood mapping 2115: velocity rating – predominantly low (predominantly 0m/s to 0.3m/s, some 0.3m/s to 1m/s)</td>
<td>• Grade 2 agricultural land</td>
<td>• SFRA 2010: Relative probability of fluvial flooding – ‘low’</td>
<td>• EA flood mapping 2115: velocity rating – predominantly low (predominantly 0m/s to 0.3m/s, some 0.3m/s to 1m/s)</td>
<td>• Well related to the ‘Distributor Road (Likely Area of Assessment)’</td>
<td>• No natural or historic environment constraints</td>
<td>• Proximity to edge-of-town retail (Chain Bridge)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| B11  | West of Tattershall Road, Boston | • Grade 1 agricultural land  
• EA Flood Map: Flood zone 3a  
• SFRA 2010: Relative probability of tidal flooding – predominantly ‘low’, some ‘medium’  
• SFRA flood hazard 2115 – ‘danger for most’  
• EA tidal inundation hazard rating 2115 – ‘danger for most’/’no hazard’  
• Small area of land promoted in the SHLAA by a housebuilder (7.2 hectares)  
• Part is designated as a Local Wildlife Site and Country Park | • SFRA 2010: Relative probability of tidal flooding – predominantly ‘low’, some ‘medium’  
• SFRA 2010: Relative probability of fluvial flooding – predominantly ‘low’, some ‘medium’  
• EA flood mapping 2115: depth rating – low to medium (0m/0.5m to 1m)  
• EA flood mapping 2115: velocity rating – low (0m/s and 0m/s to 0.3m/s)  
• Large amounts of land promoted in the SHLAA (42.03 hectares)  
• Well related to the ‘Distributor Road (Likely Area of Assessment)’  
• No historic environment constraints |
Reasonable and Unreasonable Options

For Boston the key determining factors for identifying reasonable broad locations for growth will be:

- potential for delivery; and
- flood risk

Potential for delivery

There are two factors which may influence potential for delivery:

1. whether land has been assessed as ‘available’ in the South East Lincolnshire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA); and
2. whether land has been promoted by a house builder

The evidence from the South East Lincolnshire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) demonstrates that the following areas of land are ‘available’ in each of the potential broad locations:

- B1 – 17.33 hectares
- B2 – 7.51 hectares
- B3 – 0.78 hectares
- B4 – 8.12 hectares
- B5 – 30.34 hectares
- B6 – 49.1 hectares
- B7 – 40.52 hectares
- B8 – 63.31 hectares
- B9 – 67.72 hectares
- B10 – 16.44 hectares
- B11 – 42.03 hectares

In five of the broad locations for growth (B1, B2, B3, B4 and B10) the areas of land that have been promoted through the SHLAA are too small to be considered as realistic locations for strategically-scaled (1000+ dwellings) development. B1, B2, B3, B4 and B10 are therefore unreasonable options in terms of potential for delivery.

In the remaining six broad locations, the following areas of land have been promoted by house builders:

- B5 – 0 hectares
- B6 – 20.9 hectares
- B7 – 6.21 hectares
- B8 – 63.31 hectares
- B9 – 22.65 hectares
- B11 – 7.2 hectares

In three locations (B5, B7 and B11), little or no land has been promoted by house builders. Significantly-sized areas of land have been promoted by house builders only at locations B6, B8 and B9. This suggests that locations B6, B8 and B9 have the best potential for delivery, and that B5, B7 and B11 are also unreasonable options in terms of potential for delivery.
Flood risk

The eleven potential broad locations cannot be distinguished from one another in terms of flood zones, as they are all within flood zone 3a. Furthermore, they are all within the ‘ROY’ flood hazard zones (danger to some, danger to most or danger to all), although there is considerable variation in the flood hazard/depth/velocity to which they are potentially exposed.

Their relative probabilities of flooding as identified in the Boston Borough Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (October 2010) are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broad Location</th>
<th>Relative probability of tidal flooding</th>
<th>Relative probability of fluvial flooding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Predominantly medium, some high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Predominantly medium, some low</td>
<td>Predominantly medium, some low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Predominantly medium, some low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>Predominantly medium, some low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10</td>
<td>Predominantly medium, some low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11</td>
<td>Predominantly low, some medium</td>
<td>Predominantly low, some medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B3, B7 and B8 have a low relative probability of both tidal and fluvial flooding and are the sequentially preferable locations. B11 has a predominantly low relative probability of both tidal and fluvial flooding and is therefore the next best option. The other seven broad locations (B1, B2, B4, B5, B6, B9, and B10) are unreasonable options.

N.B. ‘Relative probability’ of flooding is derived by modelling 1 in 100 year and 1 in 1,000 year flood events in the principal fluvial flood risk sources and 1 in 200 year and 1 in 1,000 year tidal flood events in the Wash and River Haven. The latest estimates of peak flood level were inputted to the model and flooding was assumed to occur when a flood defence was overtopped and, if the defence was an earth embankment, it was automatically assumed to breach. The passage of the flood wave created by the overtopping or breaching across the defended area was then modelled. The results of the modelling therefore show the relative probability of land flooding with defences in place.

Reasonable Options

The table below summarises the findings of the above assessments. It shows that (using potential for delivery and probability of flooding as key factors, the only reasonable broad location is B8.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broad location</th>
<th>Potential for Delivery</th>
<th>Probability of flooding</th>
<th>OVERALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1 (North of Red Cap Lane)</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 (North and west of Pilgrim Hospital)</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 (North of Wainfleet Road)</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4 (South of Wainfleet Road)</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5 (Toot Lane)</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6 (Tytton Lane East)</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7 (Wyberton)</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8 (Wyberton West Road/Chain Bridge Road/Swineshead Road)</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9 (South of North Forty Foot Bank)</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10 (East of Punchbowl Lane)</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11 (West of Tattershall Road)</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Paragraph 6.5 of the 3rd Lincolnshire Local Transport Plan (LTP) (April 2011) identifies a priority issue as “making progress on delivering the initiatives identified in the adopted urban transport studies for Lincoln, Boston, Grantham and Gainsborough”. Appendix A of the ‘Transport Strategy for Boston 2006 to 2021 and beyond’ sets out a concept plan (shown below) which identifies a Distributor Road (Likely Area of Assessment) from the A16 at Wyberton, travelling to the west and north of the town to join the A16 Sibsey Road. Of the eleven broad locations, B3, B4, B5 and B7 are unrelated to the ‘Distributor Road (Likely Area of Assessment)’ and B6 is only partly-related.
‘Distributor Road (Likely Area of Assessment)’ from the Transport Strategy for Boston 2006 to 2021 and beyond
### Sustainability Appraisal

#### Scoring Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major positive (✓✓)</th>
<th>Minor positive (✓)</th>
<th>Neutral (0)</th>
<th>Minor Negative (X)</th>
<th>Major Negative (XX)</th>
<th>Mixed (e.g. ✓✓/X, ✓/X)</th>
<th>Uncertain (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Scoring for Topic Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic Area</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broad Location B8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity, Geodiversity &amp; Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>✓/X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)</td>
<td>✓/X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, Health and Well-being</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy and Employment</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Risk</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Environment</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Waste</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>✓/X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Air Quality:** The option has a minor negative impact. Any new development is likely to lead to increased levels of traffic, and to therefore impact on air quality. However, large scale development offers the opportunity to ‘design in’ and establish critical mass for sustainable modes of transport.

**Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure:** The option has a mixed minor positive/minor negative impact. With any new, large-scale greenfield development, some habitat loss is unavoidable, although broad location B8 contains no wildlife designations. However, there is potential to ‘design in’ green infrastructure as part of the new development.

**Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation):** The option will have a mixed minor positive/minor negative impact. Any new development is likely to increase greenhouse gas emissions, both directly and indirectly. However, there are potential positive impacts through opportunities to require energy-efficient design and construction.

**Community, Health and Well-being:** The option has a major positive impact, as the provision of additional housing will have a positive impact on both health and equality.
There is also the potential for new development to support the funding of new community infrastructure.

**Economy and Employment:** The option will have a minor positive impact. More housing will give rise to a larger population, which has the potential to broaden the diversity of skills on offer and, in turn, support business diversification and growth. Furthermore, the development of additional housing will create employment in the construction sector and related industries.

**Flood Risk:** The option will have a neutral impact. The broad location is within flood zone 3a, and its relative probability of both tidal and fluvial flooding is low.

**Historic Environment:** The option will have a minor negative impact. The broad location abuts a Scheduled Ancient Monument and a listed building, and its development may potentially have a negative impact upon these historic assets. However, there is potential to deal with these issues sympathetically as part of the design of new development.

**Housing:** The option will have a major positive impact, as it has the potential to deliver new housing to help meet the needs of South East Lincolnshire.

**Land and Waste:** The option will have a minor negative impact. The broad location is a greenfield site and its development will lead to the loss of agricultural land. However it is unlikely that the area’s housing needs could be met upon previously-developed land alone. Furthermore, there are opportunities to ‘design in’ green infrastructure and ensure access to useable open space. New development will also result in greater levels of waste.

**Landscape:** The option will have a minor negative impact. Large-scale development will inevitably impact upon landscape and townscape. However, there are opportunities to ensure that any development is sympathetic to its surroundings.

**Transport:** The option will have a mixed minor positive/minor negative impact. Large-scale greenfield development will inevitably lead to greater levels of car use and consequential increased greenhouse gas emissions and a potential impact on air quality. However, large-scale development offers the opportunity to ‘design in’ and establish critical mass for sustainable modes of transport.

**Water:** The option will have a minor negative impact. Any new development is likely to increase pressure on water resources.

**Conclusion:** The above appraisal shows a mixed impact in terms of sustainability. Any large-scale development has the potential to impact on the environment, although such impacts can be minimised. However, there are positives in terms of social and economic considerations.

**Conclusions**

In view of the above assessment of potential broad locations for housing development around Boston, it is considered that there is one reasonable option, B8 which has the potential to accommodate approximately 1,900 dwellings.
## Spalding Town

### Broad Locations at Spalding Town

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option (including ‘available’ SHLAA site dwelling supply)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Spalding S1  
Potential dwelling supply: 157 | Land to the East of Pinchbeck | - Grade 1 agricultural land  
- EA Flood Map: Flood zone 3a  
- SFRA 2010: Residual Flood Hazard; Spalding - 2115 (1% fluvial/0.5% tidal probability)  
- A mixture of no, low, moderate and significant flood hazard  
- Represents a significant urban extension to eastern Pinchbeck and is poorly related to other residential locations in Spalding  
- Restricts future extension of the existing allocated employment area | - Close proximity to large employment area (Enterprise Park/Wardentree Lane)  
- EA tidal inundation hazard rating 2115 – no hazard  
- EA flood mapping 2115:  
  - depth rating: low (0m)  
  - velocity rating: low (0m/s to 0.3m/s)  
- Good access to the A16 and the centre of Spalding  
- Small amount of land promoted in the SHLAA  
- The site is in close proximity to and includes a cycleway  
- The area is in close proximity to facilities such as retail, supermarket and hospital  
- No natural or historic environment constraints | |
| S2  
Potential dwelling supply: 2,022 | Land between the A16 and The Vernatt’s Drain | - Grade 1 agricultural land.  
- EA Flood Map: Flood zone 3a  
- SFRA 2010: High probability of | - Some of this area has been promoted in the SHLAA  
- Good access to the A16 | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S3</th>
<th>Land East of the A16 (North of the A151)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Potential dwelling supply: 0** | residual flood risk  
- EA tidal inundation hazard rating 2115 – predominantly ‘danger for all’ some ‘danger for most’  
- The A16 acts as a barrier and creates poor permeability  
- Divorced from Spalding residential areas  
- EA flood mapping 2115:  
  - depth rating: predominantly medium (0.5m to 1m) some low (0.25m to 0.5m) and some high (1m to 2m).  
- No natural or historic environment constraints.  
- EA flood mapping 2115:  
  - velocity rating: low to medium (0.3m/s to 1m/s)  

| EA Flood Map: Flood zone 3a  
- Grade 1 agricultural land  
- Land has not been promoted through the SHLAA  
- SFRA 2010: High probability of residual flood risk  
- EA tidal inundation hazard rating 2115 – predominantly ‘danger for all’, some ‘danger for most’. The A16 acts as a barrier and creates poor permeability  
- Divorced from Spalding residential areas  
- EA flood mapping 2115:  
  - depth rating: medium to high  
- Good access to the A16  
- No natural or historic environment constraints  
- EA flood mapping 2115:  
  - velocity rating: predominantly low, some medium. |  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S4</th>
<th>Land East of the</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Potential dwelling supply: 0** | EA Flood Map: Flood zone 3a  
- Grade 2 agricultural land. |
| Potential dwelling supply: 152 | A16 (South of the A151) | • SFRA 2010: High probability of residual flood risk  
• EA tidal inundation hazard rating 2115 – predominantly ‘danger to some’, with some ‘danger to most’  
The A16 acts as a barrier and creates poor permeability  
• Divorced from Spalding residential areas | • Good access to the A16  
• No natural or historic environment constraints  
• Small amount of land promoted in the SHLAA  
• EA flood mapping 2115:  
  o depth rating: low/medium  
  o velocity rating: low |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S5 | Land to the South of Spalding between the Coronation Channel and the A16 | • EA Flood Map: Flood zone 3a  
• SFRA 2010: Residual Flood Hazard: Spalding - 2115 (1% fluvial/0.5% tidal probability)  
Significant flood hazard  
• EA tidal inundation hazard rating 2115 – predominantly ‘danger to most’, some ‘danger to all’  
• Permeability is constrained by the main rivers  
• Poor access to the town centre  
• Close proximity to ‘bad neighbours’ (Clay Lake industrial area)  
• EA flood mapping 2115:  
  o depth rating: ranging from low to high | • Grade 2 agricultural land.  
• Some of this area has been promoted through the SHLAA  
• Good access to the A16.  
• No natural or historic environment constraints.  
• Urban edge location  
• EA flood mapping 2115:  
  o velocity rating: low |
<p>| S6 | Land between the River Welland and the A1073 | • Functional flood plain (Cowbit Wash) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supply: 0</th>
<th>Potential dwelling supply: 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>S7</strong></td>
<td><strong>Potential dwelling supply: 0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Land to the West of South Drove Drain | • EA Flood Map: A mixture of Flood zone 3a and Flood zone 2.  
• Land has not been promoted through the SHLAA  
• SFRA 2010: High probability of residual flood risk  
• Permeability is constrained by the South Drove Drain and the area is ‘bisected’ by the railway  
• Close proximity to the possible site for the Rail Freight Interchange  
• Poor access to the town centre  
• There are some elements of historical interest |
| **S8**   | **Potential dwelling supply: 1,179** |
| Land between Holland Park and the A157 | • EA Flood Map: Flood zone 3a  
• There are some elements of historical interest  
• Access to the town centre is restricted by the railway line and associated level crossing |
| | • Grade 2 agricultural land.  
• EA tidal inundation hazard rating 2115 – no hazard  
• No natural environment constraints  
• EA flood mapping 2115:  
  o depth rating: low  
  o velocity rating: low |
| | • Grade 2 agricultural land.  
• Most of the area has been promoted through the SHLAA  
• EA tidal inundation hazard rating 2115 – no hazard  
• SFRA 2010: Residual Flood Hazard; Spalding - 2115 (1% fluvial/0.5% tidal probability)  
  Mainly no flood hazard  
• No natural environment constraints  
• Good permeability with the western side of Spalding. |
| S9 | Potential dwelling supply: 1,697 | Land between the Vernatt’s Drain and the A151 | • Grade 1 agricultural land  
• EA Flood Map: Flood zone 3a  
• There are some elements of historical interest  
• Access to the town centre is restricted by the railway line and associated level crossing | • Could assist in the development of a potential Spalding Western Relief Road and allow access to the A151  
• EA flood mapping 2115:  
  o depth rating: low  
  o velocity rating: low |
|----|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| S10 | Potential dwelling supply: 6,965 (6,027) | Land to the North of the Vernatt’s Drain | • Grade 1 agricultural land  
• EA Flood Map: Flood zone 3a  
• Permeability and access to the town centre is restricted by the Vernatt’s | • Most of the area has been promoted through the SHLAA  
• EA tidal inundation hazard rating 2115 – no hazard  
• SFRA 2010: Residual Flood Hazard; Spalding - 2115 (1% fluvial/0.5% tidal probability)  
  A mixture of no and low flood hazard  
• No natural environment constraints  
• Good permeability with the western side of Spalding  
• Could assist in the development of a potential Spalding Western Relief Road  
• EA flood mapping 2115:  
  o depth rating: low  
  o velocity rating: low |
|    |                                 |                                               | • All of the area has been promoted through the SHLAA  
• EA tidal inundation hazard rating 2115 – no hazard |                                                                                                                                   |
| by a developer) | drain and the railway line and associated level crossing  
- Potential coalescence of Spalding and Pinchbeck  
- Divorced from the existing Spalding built-up area by the Vernatts Drain | SFRA 2010: Residual Flood Hazard; Spalding - 2115 (1% fluvial/0.5% tidal probability)  
A mixture of no and low flood hazard  
- No natural or historic environment constraints.  
- Could assist in the development of a potential Spalding Western Relief Road  
- EA flood mapping 2115:  
  - depth rating: low  
  - velocity rating: low |
Reasonable and Unreasonable Options

For Spalding the key determining factors for identifying reasonable broad locations for growth will be:

- potential for delivery;
- flood risk; and
- the potential to deliver a phase of a Spalding Western Relief Road.

Potential for delivery

The evidence from the SHLAA demonstrates that there is available land at all broad locations except for S3, S6 and S7 (as reinforced by the above table). This allows us to determine that these three broad locations are unreasonable as there is no reasonable prospect of delivery at present. S1, S4, and S5 do not have the potential to deliver over 1,000 dwellings and so are not deemed as reasonable options for a broad location. Furthermore, there is currently identified developer interest at S10.

In terms of delivery S1, S3, S4, S5, S6 and S7 are deemed unreasonable.

Flood risk

In terms of flood risk there are two elements to consider: coastal flood hazard as determined in the Lincolnshire Coastal Study; and flood risk in a more general sense, as determined by the South Holland Strategic Flood Risk Assessment: 2010 Update (SFRA 2010). As outlined in the above tables, broad locations S2, S3, S4 and S5 are at risk of coastal flood hazard. In respect of the SFRA 2010, S1 includes areas of moderate and significant flood hazard S6 is a functional flood plain, and S7 has a high probability of residual flood risk.

In flood risk terms S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, S6 and S7 are deemed unreasonable.

Potential to deliver a phase of a Spalding Western Relief Road (SWRR)

The issue of increased rail crossing downtime and a SWRR is discussed in more detail in the Transport chapter of the Combine PO & SA report. As such, it is not intended to go into full detail in this background paper. However, in short, due to the issue of future increased rail crossing downtime in Spalding, a SWRR is seen as a critical piece of infrastructure to ensure that further housing growth does not lead to unacceptable highways implications, particularly in the centre of town (this fact is backed up by existing and emerging transport modelling). The importance of this scheme is reflected by its inclusion in Local Transport Plan (LTP) 3 and the emerging LTP4.

It is clear that any SWRR will have to be funded by development. The first phase will be delivered as part of the Holland Park development to the south west of Spalding, which has outline planning permission for 2,250 dwellings. Detailed costings and evidence on the viability of development and its ability to deliver a SWRR is emerging and will inform delivery mechanisms for the remainder of the road. South Holland District Council is working in partnership with Lincolnshire County Council on a route between Phase 1 to the south and Pinchbeck Road to the north (see below).

The critical nature of this piece of infrastructure in terms of supporting growth in light of the issue of rail downtime in Spalding town centre, and the potential funding mechanisms, mean that development to the west of Spalding is necessary. For this reason it is
considered that broad locations that do not offer the opportunity to deliver the SWRR (either in full or part) are unreasonable.

Therefore, on the basis of delivering the SWRR broad locations S1 – S7 are deemed unreasonable.

**Broad route alignment for a SWRR**
Reasonable Options

The table below summarises the findings of the above assessments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broad location</th>
<th>Potential for Delivery</th>
<th>Flood Risk</th>
<th>Potential to deliver a phase of a Spalding Western Relief Road</th>
<th>OVERALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1 (Land to the East of Pinchbeck)</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2 (Land between the A16 and the Vernatt’s Drain)</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3 (Land East of the A16 – North of the A151)</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4 (Land East of the A16 – South of the A151)</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5 (Land to the South of Spalding between the Coronation Channel and the A16)</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6 (Land between the River Welland and the A1073)</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7 (Land to the West of South Drove Drain)</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8 (Land between Holland Park and the A157)</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9 (Land between the Vernatt’s Drain and the</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Building on the information presented in the above tables, using SHLAA, flood risk and the potential to deliver a SWRR as key factors, the only reasonable broad locations are S8, S9 and S10. Even if the delivery of a Western Relief Road is not forthcoming, S8, S9 and S10 are still deemed the only reasonable sites on flood risk grounds.

**Sustainability Appraisal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Broad Location S8</th>
<th>Broad Location S9</th>
<th>Broad Location S10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Quality</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biodiversity, Geodiversity &amp; Green Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>✓/X</td>
<td>✓/X</td>
<td>✓/X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation)</strong></td>
<td>✓/X</td>
<td>✓/X</td>
<td>✓/X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community, Health and Well-being</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economy and Employment</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flood Risk</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historic Environment</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing</strong></td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land and Waste</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transport</strong></td>
<td>✓/X</td>
<td>✓/X</td>
<td>✓/X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Air Quality:** All options will have a minor negative impact. Any new development will likely lead to greater levels of traffic and therefore impact upon air quality. However, large-scale development does offer the opportunity to design-in and establish critical mass for sustainable modes of transport. Furthermore, all options are seeking to deliver a SWRR, which will seek to mitigate congestion in Spalding town centre.
Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure: All options will have a mixed minor positive/minor negative impact. With any new large-scale greenfield development, some habitat loss in unavoidable. However, there is potential to 'design-in' green infrastructure as part of new development. No site has any identified natural environment constraints.

Climate Change (adaptation and mitigation): All options will have a mixed minor positive/minor negative impact. Any new development is likely to increase greenhouse gas emissions, both directly and indirectly. There are potential positive impacts through the opportunities to require new energy-efficient design and construction.

Community, Health and Well-being: All options have a major positive impact. The provision of additional housing will have appositive impact on both health and equality. There is also potential for new development to support the funding of new community infrastructure.

Economy and Employment: All options will have a minor positive impact. More housing will give rise to a larger population, which has the potential to broaden the diversity of skills on offer and, in turn, support business diversification and growth. Specifically, the provision of additional housing will help to maintain employment in the construction sector and related industries.

Flood Risk: All options will have a neutral impact. None of the identified broad locations are at risk from flooding.

Historic Environment: Broad locations S8 and S9 have a minor negative impact, whilst S10 has a neutral impact. There are recorded historic assets at S8 and S9, whilst there are none at S10. Therefore, in terms of S8 and S9 there is a potential negative impact upon these from development. However, there is potential to treat this sympathetically as part of designing new development.

Housing: All options will have a major positive impact. All sites have the potential to directly deliver housing, to help meet the needs of South East Lincolnshire.

Land and Waste: All options will have a minor negative impact. Greenfield development by its nature often involves the loss of agricultural land; however, to meet housing needs greenfield sites are required. There are opportunities to 'design-in' green infrastructure and ensure access to useable open space. New development will also result in greater levels of waste.

Landscape: All options will have a minor negative impact. Large Greenfield development by its nature will impact upon landscape and townscape. However, there are opportunities to ensure that any development is sympathetic to its surroundings. Relatively-speaking S10 has the potential to cause a real or perceived coalescence with Pinchbeck, which could be argued to be a negative impact upon landscape and townscape. This is particularly pertinent given that it is somewhat divorced from the existing built-up area of Spalding by virtue of the Vernatts Drain.

Transport: All options will have a mixed minor positive/minor negative impact. Large-scale greenfield development will inevitably lead to greater levels of car use and therefore, increased greenhouse gas emissions and a potential impact on air quality. However, large-scale development does offer the opportunity to design-in and establish critical mass for sustainable modes of transport. Furthermore, all options provide the opportunity to deliver a SWRR, which will have the benefit of minimising increases in congestion within Spalding as a result of future planned increased rail crossing downtime.
Water: All options will have a minor negative impact. Any new development is likely to increase pressure on water resources.

Conclusion: The above considerations show that there is a mixed impact in terms of sustainability. Any large-scale new development has the potential to impact on the environment, although there are measures to minimise this. However, there are positives in terms of social and economic considerations, such as access to housing. All options score similarly when compared against the baseline situation of no growth in these locations. Relatively-speaking S10 has the potential to cause the coalescence of Pinchbeck and Spalding, and is somewhat divorced from the built-up area of Spalding; however, there is the potential to address this concern in any site-specific considerations at a latter date. All options provide the potential to contribute toward the delivery of the SWRR.

Conclusions

In view of the above assessment of potential broad locations for housing development around Spalding, it is considered that there are three reasonable options: S8, S9 and S10. These form an arc around the west and north of the town. It is not the role of this paper to assess the final broad location(s) or options for distributing levels of development between them. This will be carried out in the Housing chapter of the Combine PO & SA report. However, it is clear that all three are preferable compared to other locations considered in that they provide available land of a scale to be considered a broad location, they are not considered to be at risk of flooding, and all have the potential to contribute towards a SWRR. However, S10 is currently somewhat divorced from the built-up area of Spalding and could cause coalescence between Spalding and Pinchbeck.

Available dwelling supply:

- S8: 1,179
- S9: 1,697
- S10: 6,965